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## Glossary

The glossary gives an overview of the several pertinent terms and which are not in common discourses used in this paper. The words have been arranged in alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand conscious consumers</td>
<td>These are consumers that focus on buying expensive or most popular brands and believe on the higher the price of a product the better it is in quality (Hung, K. &amp; Yu, Y., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>The largest generation cohort in the workforce born between 1945 and 1964 (Wong et al, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>The generation cohort born between 1965 and 1981 (Wong et al, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>The generation cohort born between 1982 and 2000 (Wong et al, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habit</td>
<td>An individual's recurring and often unconscious mode (subconscious) or pattern of personal behavior (standpoint), and which is acquired, established and customary accepted from his or her frequent and repetitive mind or life experiences (Andrews, 1908). This is the physical constitution and manner of his or her manner of conducting the self (Butler &amp; Hope, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>A trait of an individual who has the propensity to strive/demand/work/insist for and on the highest standards of excellence and performance in products and work, and is thus totally displeased or evaluative with anything that is flawed and not of those extreme standards, both with the self or with others (Yang et al, 2012; Stoeber &amp; Childs, 2010; Flett &amp; Hewitt, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement Product</td>
<td>High involvement products can be considered as those products that are higher in cost, have social values, ego support, and requires more attention when processing (Bubphapant, J., &amp; Thammasaro, R., 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Involvement product</td>
<td>Low involvement products are considered as products with little interest, and have less risky cost, with less purchase information and effort (Bubphapant, J., &amp; Thammasaro, R., 2012).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviation

[CDMS] Consumer Decision-Making Style
[CSI]  Consumer Style Inventory
CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Research

The first chapter of this thesis presents the research topic and gives a brief introduction on the background of consumer behavior and decision making style which is followed by problem formulation that leads to research hypothesis and question, purpose and the intended target audience.

1.2 Background of the Study

In the many ways that a person cannot start preparing cooked dinner without adequate food to do so, the initiation of a business firm is the mental presence of customers, but more importantly the awareness of the unique way of accessing them reliably. Customers play an important role in conducting business, this is particularly cardinal in initiating and propelling advanced business marketing practices.

Understanding and having a clear idea of customers’ wants and needs is one of the foundations and essential constructs of the marketing (Evans, Foxall & Jamal, 2009).

Decision-making as it is defined by Rong, (1999) means to choose among all kinds of alternatives. The consumers become and remain the cardinal players in marketing in this arena. How and what consumer chose to buy is the central issue in marketing.

At the onset of this study, the demand of consumers was conceived as a fundamental practice of any form of business. However, the question of how consumers make that final decision has revealed great appeal to previous scholarly interest and activity. When it comes to consumer decision-making due to the importance of the behaviors of that consumer, especially nowadays with high competitive market, this field is considered as a high importance field of study in marketing (Kahneman, D. 2011).

Indeed, the examination and studying of consumer decision-making has a long tradition in marketing and consumer behavior research. As correctly stated by Bauer, Sauer & Becker (2006, p.342), “the investigation of consumer decision-making has a long tradition in marketing and consumer behavior research”, perhaps discussing the diversity of the field in the literature.

One of the first scholars who put lots of effort on studying consumer characteristics and consumer decision-making style was Sproles, who suggests that consumer decision-making style (CDMS) is an emotional, psychological and cognitive guidance in purchasing and it can dominate choice of consumer. He argued a consumer choice between products and services can be affected by one or more decision-making activities in 1985 (Yang, Lin & Chang, 2010). There are several definitions for product involvement by different researches for instance; Zaichkowsky (1985) stated that product involvement for a given product refers to the degree to which an individual is concerned with.
Traylor (1983) defined CDMS as “recognition that certain product classes may be more or less central to an individual’s life, attitudes about self, sense of identity, and relationship to the rest of the world”. Moreover, Houston & Rothschild (1978) as cited by Solomon, M. R., & Assael, H. (1987, p.29) claimed, “For each individual, a set of products can be arrayed on a continuum which is defined by the products’ centrality to the individual”.

After a lengthy but productive study, the researchers noticed that much of today’s marketing approaches are in accordance to Sproles & Kendall (1986) model. The following quote explains better in stating the advances in the field:

“Recently, a number of studies have investigated consumer decision-making styles (CDMS) and their importance to consumer behavior research. However, research designs suggested to date are mainly replications of a study by Sproles and Kendall (1986) proposing eight mental characteristics, the so-called Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI). The CSI has been applied across cultures, but without critically examining its validity and reliability” (Bauer, Sauer & Becker, 2006, p.342).

Sproles and Kendall (1986, p.79) described a CDMS as "a patterned, mental, cognitive orientation towards shopping and purchasing, which constantly dominates the consumer’s choice resulting in a relatively enduring consumer personality". Deep understanding of these styles and the factors influencing consumer purchase decision making can be considered as a powerful and profitable instrument for marketing managers and researchers as well. So far CSI, which stands for consumer decision style, is the most extensively replicated instrument to measure CDMS (Bauer et al., 2006). It measures eight mental characteristics of consumer decision-making: Perfectionism, Brand Consciousness, Novelty-Fashion Consciousness, Recreational, price value, consciousness impulsiveness, confusedly over choice, and brand-loyal/habitual.

Since 1986 when Sproles and Kendall introduced Consumer Style Inventory, a large number of researches have been employing this instrument to study consumer decision-making style in different countries and cultures. This include Hafstromm, Jung & Young (1992); Durvasula, Lyonski & Andrews (1993); Lyonski, Durvasula, & Zotos (1996); Fan & Xiao (1998); Mitchell & Bates (1998); Walsh, Henning-Thura & Mitchell (2001), Hanzaee & Aghasibeig (2008); Yang, Lin & Chang (2010); Anic, Anita-Ciunova-Suleska, & Rajh (2010); Chen, Po & Kuo (2012), among others.

Consequent to studying these vital areas of the field, the researchers then settled back to wonder the extent to which consumers were themselves allowed changing their purchase decisions. Three critical areas were viewed in this approach. First, there was the question of age, then that of location and finally that of differing products. The researchers were left conceptualizing the level of consumer choice and decision-making, whenever a target consumer had these three factors at his or her disposal. This study was thus born out of this virginal approach to the literature, and is thus a spirited look at the modern over-developed markets with a primary investigation of how contemporary markets enable consumers the decision of purchase when product, location and age factors are concerned.
1.3 Statement of the Problem

1.3.1 Research problem

The purpose of any research study should always be cemented by establishing what is already known or furthering what has been established. Researchers assert the applicability of CSI by examining this model in different cultures. Particularly vital is the model developed and further developed from the contributions of Sproles and Kendall in 1986. However, their eight factors of CDMS were not completely reliable, and some features are suggested in some countries according to national cultures. For example, Walsh, Henning-Thura & Mitchell (2001) identified the dimension of “variety seekers” for German consumers, while Mitchell & Bates (1998) found the new dimensions of “time-energy conserving” and “store loyal consumers” for UK consumers. This means that the dimensions of location, age and product within a marketer’s conceptualization, often differ; historical models have asserted what may be a divergent model for modern marketers.

The current researchers amassed volumes of studies confirming this model, but there were still others that claimed that CDMS is not product-independent. Of particular interest were studies that asserted that CDMS, as conceived by Sproles and Kendall (1986), is influenced by product category if it is a high or low involvement product. Of particularly importance are studies in this area by Bauer et al. (2006) and Gupta, Brantly & Jacsson (2010).

This study was born from the need to find and add useful information as well as investigating the relation between product high-low involvement and consumer decision-making style in Sweden among the young generation of the country’s consumers.

1.3.2 Purpose, Objective and Hypothesis of the Study

The purpose of this study is to provide a precise and concise view of modern day interpretations of the consumer choice, subject to his or her predisposal to location, age and product. Consequently, the main purpose of this research undertaking was to study the Swedish generation Y decision-making style and examine if there is a relation between product involvement and consumer decision-making style. The unique factors of the study were the age factor (generation Y), definition of product (two selected product’s high-low involvement) and location (Sweden).

Having identified and defined the purpose of this dissertation, the study hoped to provide useful information for researchers and marketers in the related fields. This overall objective was broken down to the following aims:

a) To identify age, location and product-oriented factors that are significant in product decision-making processes in two objective cases

b) To identify the most salient research and scholarship questions that remain unanswered for the future of marketing
Finally, the study had a purpose, objective, and aims to pursue. However, in its implementation, the study had to be conducted based on a practical and meticulous analysis of the marketing knowledge that is so far part of the available discourse. A committed appreciation of this discourse shed most of the basis upon which this study has been implemented. However, the researchers gained valuable data upon which some of the most valid answers to the study’s aims were apparent. This process and its outcomes thus constituted the very hypotheses of this study. As such, this study’s hypotheses were:

- The modern-day Generation Y, currently in Sweden, follow a product decision-making and selection process as well as its style, that differs significantly from the original model presented in 1986 by Sproles and Kendall

- In consumer decision-making style and manner, the modern-day Generation Y in Sweden, there is a significant correspondence between age, location and product-orientation not predicted by Sproles and Kendall in 1986.

1.4 Research Question

In scholarly research practices, the research questions constitute the guideline that directs the steps of an investigation. This study only arrived at its hypotheses after determining its research questions, which in turn were prescribed by the study’s purpose, objective and narrow aims. According to Bryman (2007), research questioning is a tool, which connects the researches theoretical framework to the type of data suitable for the investigation. This study was interested in determining the applicability of Sproles and Kendall’s model in modern product decision-making processes of generation Y currently within the Swedish jurisdiction. In this effort, the study posed the following research questions:

a) How does product involvement influence consumer decision-making styles in Generation Y of Swedish nationals for the two selected products?

b) To what level does the model proposed by Sproles and Kendall in 1986 now apply to the modern-day Generation Y in Sweden as they decide on both of the selected products?

1.5 Research Target Group and Methodological Planning

To conduct this study in a comparative manner to the model proposed by Sproles and Kendall in 1986, there was a critical need to determine the current marketing considerations with those of almost three decades ago, and do so from the perspective of consumer decision-making. Perhaps the marketing information or the consumer decision-making (for specified products, distinctly aged and within a particular location) may indicate variant assertions in this accord. For the study commitment, slightly selected for the researchers’ preference, the research was conducted in Sweden for two objectively selected products, and among a randomly picked sample of Swedish generation Y consumers.
As such, this paper was written in accordance to a research study that sought to establish the styles employed by this generation and their decision-making styles. As such, the findings reflected are of interest to different audience groups involved in any business marketing process. Primarily, it will be a great instrument for the academic purposes not only in the studied country but also in other Scandinavian countries as well as all other countries.

Furthermore, this study hopes to give an update point of view to the relevant researches and scholars about the impact of product category on consumer decision making as well as the validity and reliability of CDMS and CSI as proposed by Sproles and Kendall in 1986. This comparison was conducted based on contemporary primary research versus what was proposed as ideal for last three generations of consumer interest groups.

1.6 Structure of the Study

The foregoing chapter constituted the introduction to the study. As part of the introduction, the chapter provided some background information predisposing the study, identified the research problem that the study will attempt to resolve, defined the study’s adopted purpose, listed the study’s objective and aims, posed the research questions that guided the study’s implementation and finally identifies the significance of the prospected findings. In so doing, the chapter provided an adequate and elaborate explanation of what this study sought to do, why and how. Based on the introduction thus provided, the subsequent chapters of the dissertation will now detail the actual study as it was conducted.

In the immediately next chapter, the study will focus on providing a detailed, comprehensive and critical review of literature based on an optimally selected theoretical framework. The theoretical and literature review will focus on what scholars and practitioners have published in peer-reviewed academic journals and reputable textbooks, as an attempt to provide an insight into the concept of young consumers’ selection process in Sweden. Beginning brief introduction to the literature review, the chapter will contain a detailed theoretical framework and closely followed by a review of the marketing, covering such important aspects as the role of consumers in product-based decision-making styles. Thereafter, the review will focus on detailed review of product orientation as covered variously in the literature. The final section of the chapter will discuss the Swedish generation Y and a detailed conceptual framework. Ultimately, a brief chapter summary will terminate the literature review.

The third chapter of the dissertation will present a detailed description of the research methodology chosen for the present study. After a brief chapter introduction, there will be subsequent sections discussing the research questions, the chosen research design and philosophy, the target population, the sampling frame and procedure, as well as the sample size and sample characteristics. This will be followed by a discussion on data collection criteria, strategies and instruments for the primary data. Thereafter, the third chapter will discuss how both the primary data collected will be analyzed to attain relevant findings. The methodology chapter will also discuss the ethical issues and ethical parameters encountered.
during the study’s implementation, a discussion of validity and reliability of the findings generated, and a review of methodological limitations and delimitations peculiar to this study. The third chapter will then terminate with a brief chapter summary.

The fourth chapter will then focus on presenting the findings generated by the study after its implementation as well as a literature-based discussion of the same. After a brief chapter introduction, the chapter will provide an overview of the three research questions. This will then be followed by a presentation of the findings systematically arranged to correspond to each research question posed by the study.

The fifth and final chapter of the dissertation will then endeavor to provide a conclusion to the study. First, the chapter will detail an overview of the entire research process leading to a conclusion on the findings and a brief review of possible implications that the study’s findings could have. Based on the foregoing, the chapter will then provide the study’s recommendations both in regards to the findings generated as well as on future research. A sample of research instruments used by the study as well as a list of defenses will then be attached to the dissertation as appendices.
CHAPTER 2: Theoretical Framework

2.1 Generation Y

For the purpose of this research, the authors defined Generation Y according to the definition of Wong et al, (2008): “The generation Y born between 1982 and 2000”. They have been portrayed as the subsequent massive generation. It is an enormously high effective group that has the sheer numbers to positively change the structure or form of each life stage it enters (Smith, W. S. 2008). They were brought up through the ‘empowerment’ years where everyone gained and everyone obtained a medal. Raised by dad and mom who nurtured and structured their lives, they have been drawn to their families for safety and security. Technological comfort has also been expanded to other realms of life inside Generation Y, with communication gadgets getting used as a social enabler relatively than just as tools for communication (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2009). They have been also inspired to make their very own choices and taught to query authority. This group was additionally raised in a client economic system, and as such, expects to affect the terms and conditions of their job (Smith, et al. 2008).

Generations are most affected by authority figures and Baby boomers make choices based mostly on information and facts. Post-trendy youth usually tend to decide based on the affected of their peers (McCrindle et al., 2009). The latest acknowledgement and exploration of a new sizable market section referred to as “Generation Y” Newborne and Kerwin (1999), American Demographics (1995), Tru (1999) and Tomkins (1999) has been stimulated by recognition that they have been socialized into consuming earlier than previous generations and have better disposable income (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003).

As consumer attitudes, conduct and expertise are acquired via socialization brokers comparable to household, friends, faculty and the mass media (Moschis, 1987), the proliferation of media decisions including TV, the Web and magazines has resulted in higher diversity of product and life-style choices for Generation Y and marketing and retailing to this cohort requires a distinct approach (Phelp, 1999). Generation Y have been raised up during the period in time when shopping was never seen as an easy act of purchasing. The rapid increase in number of retail and product choice has resulted in a retail culture where acts of shopping have taken on new leisure and/or experiential dimensions (Maenpaa, 1997).

Consequently, era Y is likely to have developed a distinct purchasing style in contrast with previous generations. Notwithstanding this, there have been only a few tutorial studies, which concentrate on purchasing styles of Generation Y consumers and supply tips to marketers and retailers on how these consumers make their choices. Cohort generations are argued to share a standard and distinct social character formed by their experiences by time (Schewe & Noble, 2000). Generation Y has been brought up with unprecedented selection amongst most consumer’s goods and companies (Quelch & Kenny, 1994). A good
example is the fact that seventy-five different sorts of toothbrush and 240 shampoos in
Boots the Chemist and 347 separate kinds of Nike coach (Fielding, 1994).

2.2 Consumer Behavior and Decision Making

2.2.1 Contextual Consumer Behavior

There are several different perspectives, which researchers attempt to define consumer
behavior (Solomon & Rabolt (2004); Solomon, Marshall, & Stuart (2011); Hawkins, Best &
Coney (2000); Kotler (1997); De Mooij (2004) and Kotler (2011)). Consumer behavior is not
considered to happen solely at the moment of purchase. It is investigated as an on-going
process. It includes stages before, during, and after the buying experience (Solomon &
Rabolt (2004); Solomon, Marshall, & Stuart (2011); Ling, Chai, & Piew (2010)).

Hawkins, Best, & Coney, (2000, p.7) defined consumer behavioral “the study of individual,
groups, or organizations and the processes they use to select, secure, use, and dispose of
products, services, experiences, or ideas to satisfy needs and the impacts that these
processes have on the consumer and society”. Any consumer is a group of wide range of
needs, desires, and motivations, hence consumer behavior is very difficult to study and
measure.

2.2.2 Consumer Decision Making

Consumer behavior, specifically when it comes to making individual decision to choose a
product between alternatives, is probably one of the most studied fields of consumer-
oriented research (Sproles & Kendall, 1986) and in recent year has become an important
noticeable topic in the different fields of consumer science (Erasmus, Boshoff & Rousseau,
2001). Consumer decision making imaged as a result to find solution in solving consumer’s
problems, a problem which is referred to as “a discrepancy between a desired state and an
Ideal state which is sufficient to arouse and activate a decision process” (Jobanputra, 2009).
In line with the above comment, Mowen (1988), stated that in early 80s, most of the
researches done on the consumers behavior, have focused strictly on the decision-
making process, and under this decision making perspective, purchasing has been seen as a problem
solving activities, giving the consumers the opportunity to move through stages in the
essence of solving their problems.

Figure 1 diagram outlines the five processes of consumer’s decision-making. These are
problem recognition, information search, and evaluation of alternatives, purchase, and post-
purchase evaluation. The diagram illustrates the first step is the problem recognition; this
simply means the act of identifying problems and needs. These problems might be triggered
because of an internal or external responds (Kotler & Armstrong, 2008). Nevertheless, it is
not clear how much one is trigged from the stable state until the point on which they might
perceived discrepancy developed between an actual and a desired state of being”. Hoyer &
Maclnnes (2010) presented “need”, as an unstable force of desired and psychological state, which leads to an internal tension.

2.3 Consumer Decision Making Style

Most relevant studies and researches regarding consumer decision-making style (CDMS) discuss three approaches to describe the distinctive styles of consumer behavior: the consumer typology. These studies include those by Darden & Ashton (1974). Some other studies also highlight the lifestyle/psychographic approach of consumers in their purchase decisions such as the one conducted by Joachimsthaler & Lastovicka (1984). Some other studies have highlighted the consumer characteristics approach, most notably the studies by Sproles (1985), Westbrook & Black (1985) and one by Sproles & Kendall (1986).

Figure 2 diagrams provide an illustration that is commonly adopted in the literature about how consumers behave when making the purchase decision, although most of them are advanced variously. For this study, the adopted style is the consumer characteristics approach (CCA) as developed by Lyonski, Durvasula & Zotos (1996), and which among all these three approaches, seems to be more explanatory. This is because it concentrates on the mental orientation of consumers while decision making (Lyonski, Durvasula & Zotos, 1996).
It has been argued in many researches that although there are several different factors that can influence consumer’s decision, they can be characterized in some certain styles. These styles include novelty seekers, information seekers, comparison seekers, quality and habitual or brand loyal consumers. Studies propagating this accord in the styles adopted by consumers include those published by Bettman (1979); Jacoby and Chestnut (1978); Maynes (1976); Miller (1981); Sproles (1979); and Thorelli, Becker & Engeldow (1975). Consumer decision-making styles is defined as a “patterned, mental, cognitive orientation towards shopping and purchasing, which constantly dominates the consumer’s choices” by Bauer, Sauer and Becker (2006).

To measure CDMS, Sproles & Kendall (1986), used previously mentioned characteristics and some other traits, introduced, and developed their consumer styles inventory (CSI) based on an exploratory study of 482 students in five high schools in Tucson area. This is a useful instrument to scale eight mental factors of CDMS. Since then, CSI is replicated in several researches in different cultures and countries. Example of such cultures and nations include the US, Korea, New Zealand, Greece, India, China, Malaysia, Germany, UK, Iran and Turkey as attested by such studies as Hafstromm, Jung & Young (1992); Durvasula, Lysonski & Andrews (1993); Lysonski, Durvasula & Zotos (1996); Mitchell & Bates (1998); Fan & Xiao (1998); Walsh, Henning-Thura & Mitchell (2001), and Hanzee & Aghasibeig (2008). As such, CSI is the most replicated tool used for consumer decision making and in this paper, the same original model containing 8 factors for consumer characteristics used by Sproles and Kendall (1986) is used to study the Swedish young generation purchase decision-making style.

Perfectionism, brand consciousness, novelty fashion consciousness, recreational, price value consciousness impulsiveness, confusedly over choice, and brand-loyal/habitual are the moral factors, which have been taken into consideration in consumer decision making style by Sproles and Kendall (1986) and also used in their consumer style inventory. This is properly illustrated in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers Decision Making Styles</th>
<th>Consumer Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Perfectionist, High-Quality Conscious Consumer | ➢ Measured a high-quality conscious consumer characteristic  
➢ Items loading on this factor measure a consumer's search for the very best quality in products.  
➢ Those consumers higher in perfectionism also could be expected to shop more carefully, more systematically, or by comparison. |
| Brand Conscious, 'Price Equals Quality' Consumer | ➢ Measures consumer's orientation toward buying the more expensive, well-known brands  
➢ They appear to have positive attitudes toward department and specialty stores, where brand names and higher prices are prevalent.  
➢ They also appear to prefer best selling, advertised brands |
| Novelty-Fashion Conscious Consumer | ➢ High scores on this characteristic are likely to gain excitement and pleasure from seeking out new things.  
➢ They keep up to date with styles.  
➢ Variety seeking also appears to be an important aspect of this characteristic. |
| Recreational, Hedonistic Consumer | ➢ Those scoring high on this find shopping pleasant  
➢ They shop just for the fun of it. |
| Price Conscious, 'Value for Money' Consumer | ➢ Those scoring high look for sale prices and appear conscious about lower prices in general.  
➢ Importantly, they also are concerned with getting the best value for their money. |
| Impulsive, Careless Consumer | ➢ High scores on this characteristic mean they do not plan their shopping. Furthermore, they appear unconcerned about how much they spend or about the 'best buys.' |
| Confused by Over Choice Consumer | ➢ High scores on this characteristic perceive many brands and stores from which to choose and have difficulty in making choices.  
➢ Furthermore, they experience information overload. |
| Habitual, Brand-Loyal Consumer | ➢ High scores on this characteristic are likely to have favorite brands and stores, and to have formed habits in choosing these.  
➢ Habitual behavior is a well-known aspect of consumer decision-making, and this factor reinforces its existence as a general characteristic |

Table 1: Characteristic of 8 consumer decision-making style developed by Sproles & Kendall in 1986
However, research results have shown that decision making style can vary between different countries with different cultures (Bauer et al., 2006). In some studies, some new traits are added. One example is the study, which was carried out in the UK (Bakewell & Mitchell 2003, 2004) and the researchers could identify “confused time restricted”, “time-energy conserving” and “store promiscuous” as three new traits to the so called CSI (Hanzaee & Aghasibeig, 2008).

As it cited by Bauer et al. (2006) it has to be claimed that the CSI does not include all relevant styles in a cross-cultural context (Samiee & Jeong, 1994). Bauer et al., (2006) addressed a concern regarding the CDMS, which have not been studied before, and that is the product independency, as identified and claimed by Sproles & Kendall (1986) themselves. Further, they recommended further research to apply the framework to different product categories and cultural contexts: “Indeed, a consumer may have different consumer styles for each product category” (Sproles & Kendall, 1986, p. 277).

Consumer decision-making style to the date of Bauer et al. research has only been tested in a product-neutral setting. Bauer et al., (2006) studied the relationship between CDMS and different categories of products and product involvement as well. As a result of their research, Bauer et al. (2006) found that there is a relation between those two and consumer decision-making is controlled or affected by the perceived product involvement.

The theoretical framework, which Bauer et al. (2006) used for their research was the standard scheme that “classifies consumer decision-making tasks into extended, limited, habitual, and impulsive purchase decisions dependent on product” (Howard & Sheth, 1969). In extended purchase decision consumer acts more rational and behaves with higher cognitive involvement to choose his/her alternative carefully. It usually happens regarding to buying a product, which is very important to the consumer.

In limited purchase decision consumer shows restricted problem-solving efforts and less cognitive power (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2004); in this case information search is limited to a few information pieces such as price or brand information. Habitual decision making mostly occurs when a consumer knows a product therefore a routine habitual decision is being made based on a positive experience with a small degree of cognitive involvement in compare with the two last described purchase decisions (Bauer et al., 2006). Moreover, the last decision-making style, which has the least level of cognitive involvement, is impulsive; study of this style goes back to Stern (1962), Kollat & Willet (1967). This behavior is usually occurs when purchasing low-involvement, low-price products to respond to some periodical needs.

Generally Bauer et al. (2006), used seven-factor inventory of CDMS described by Sproles, Kendall, 1986 in CSI, due to dependency of these factors to products. These factors are summarized in the CDMS figure below.
2.4 Product Involvement

In order to understand the concept of product involvement, authors have looked into different concepts such as product and involvement separately and finally the combination of both. In regards to this, products can often be considered in a narrow sense as something tangible that can be described in terms of physical attributes, such as shape, dimension, components, form, and color (Palmer, 2003). Notwithstanding that product is anything that can be offered to the market to attract consumers and satisfy the consumers’ needs and wants, they can also be seen as services. Service can be seen as a form of product that includes activities, benefits etcetera (Kotler & Armstrong, 2008, p.248).

It is specifically stated that the concept of involvement has been extensively studied by consumer behavior scholars, and is thought to exert a considerable influence over consumers’ decision processes (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985). Onkvisit & Shaw (2004) and Solomon (2012) described involvement, as “a person’s perceived relevance of object based on inherent need, value, and interest.” Comparatively, Andrews, Durvasula & Akhter (1990), as well as Mitchell, (1981), have broadened the view of Involvement as an inward state of arousal, which consists of three main values, such as, intensity, direction, and persistence. This goes according to Zaichkowsky (1985), who saw involvement as “a person’s perceived relevance of the object based on inherent needs, values, and interests”. Researchers have typically analyzed the influence of product involvement on consumers’ attitudes, brand preferences, and perceptions, with the purpose of assisting market segmentation (Brisoux & Cheron, 1990; Celsi & Olson, 1988).
Product involvement however can solemnly depend on the situation present at a particular time. In other words, Product Involvement can be seen as a consumer level, curiosity or attention on a product (Solomon, 2012). Warrington and Shim (2000) also postulate that, product involvement is theoretically analogous to the concept of ego involvement. According to Sherif & Cantril, (1947), they argued that ego involvement could be experienced in a situation where an object is connected to a special type of character and value that relates to an individual self-concept. Similarly, product involvement exists when a product category is expounded to individuals centrally held values and self-idea (Houston & Rothschild, 1978).

The studies have generally uncovered a relationship between product involvement and aspects of consumer behavior, many researchers argue that effective segmentation of markets also requires a consideration of the usage situation. According to Belk (1974), any investigation of buyer behavior that ignores situational effects is likely to provide unreliable results unless the characteristics of buyers or choice alternatives are so intense as to be influential across all relevant situations (Pascale, Quester & Smart, 1998).

The rarity of products devoid of situational influences has encouraged an alternative approach called person-by-situation interactionism, based on the observation that the person/situation interaction accounts for considerably more variation in consumer behavior than do either individual or situational factors in isolation (Hornik, 1982). Hughes, Hutchins and Karathanassi (1998, p.344) argued that involvement “means personal relevance or importance”. Product involvement can as well be connected to product importance. Bloch and Richins, (1983), further states that a person will not feel involvement with a product which is not perceived to be important. Product importance is therefore treated as a facet of product involvement (Hugheset et al., 1998, p.344).

To measure product involvement 13 items were formulated which are attributed to three factors of product involvement: importance, pleasure and sign value (Bauer et al., 2006). They have pre-selected the following six products: stereo system, jeans, wristwatch as high-involved products and toothpaste, chocolate bar and yogurt as low involvement products. Due to the results of the measurement jeans were selected as high involvement and yogurt as low involvement product to the rest of the study on relationship between product involvement and decision making style (Gupta, Brantly and Jacsson, 2010). The theoretical foundation of this study is based on CDMS model of Bauer et al., (2006) which apply Sproles and Kendall’s (1986) consumer style inventory to examine the relationship between consumer decision making style and level of product involvement.

Therefore this paper is conducted to replicate the revised version of Sproles and Kendall (1986) CSI, proposed by Bauer et al. (1981) and Costeley (1988) state that information search, processing and saving is influenced by involvement. Bauer et al., (2006) as cited by Gupta, Brantly and Jacsson (2010, 29) indicated, “Since CDMS are closely related to information handling, they believe product involvement to govern CDMS”.
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Product involvement is a complex mental and enduring, intervening construct that stands between the consumer and their behavior, and therefore influences their purchase decision process. Since laptop is considered as a high involvement product due to the previous definition of product involvement and the high risk, the consumer perceives in term of its price or uncertainty. This is on whether it works properly, in this paper this product have been chosen to be studied while yogurt is chose as low involvement product of this study according to two former researches done by Bauer et al. (2006) and Gupta, Brantly and Jacsson (2010).

2.5 Study’s Conceptual Framework

2.5.1 Foundational Theorem

Why do people shop, and how do they choose what to shop for among many choices? So, how does a product become the choice of certain consumers and consumer groups? How can marketers constitute the portfolio of such a product, among the diverse consumers/customers? Given that “the consumer purchase decision making is more complex and even more important for consumers today than it was in the past”, now that we have more consumers to target and the information age has transformed almost everything, how do we “… marketers … learn how and why people shop” (Jain & Sharma, 2013, p. 40). In the words of Boonlertvanich (2009), “how do consumers decide which particular product, brand, or service to purchase?” (p. 57). There are instances in consumer decision-making (particularly their style), when the entire decision-making process is largely influenced by their involvement with the concerned product (or rather, their interaction with the available information).

This means that consumers in their unique positions initiate the search for an ideal product, are inspired to selectively process the available product information, and finally resolve a saved perspective about such products, based on how much they are involved. Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010) accurately describes this phenomenon in the following words, “this concept is important to marketing because it determines consumer behavior and is relevant for market segmentation”, citing such scholars as Sproles & Kendall (1986) and Walsh et al (2001). Omar et al (2007) affirms that, “the learning processes that every consumer goes through would be the determining factors to the decisions a consumer makes when one is purchasing a product or paying for a service” (p. 26). One of the most important roles of a marketer, in research as well as in practice, is profiling consumption trends and factors. Indeed, “having a reliable and valid instrument is a prerequisite for creating shopping orientation profile of consumers that can be used to guide marketing strategy” (Anic, Suleska & Rajh, 2010, p. 103).

This instrumental study was inspired and subsequently influenced by Sproles and Kendall (1986), in their popular consumer model, Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI). These respected scholars profiled the styles of a consumer (the consumer characteristic approach) based on pre-determined aspects of the product marketing (the diverse cognitive dimensions of the consumer’s decision-making process). In their instrumental experiment, Sproles and Kendall
(1986) sampled American female student groups to prescribe the eight characteristics of this consumer group in their product-based decision-making. This instrumental CSI model, the one they proposed, has extensively been studied among varied consumer groups and across nations. Despite this variation of the original sample, researchers still hold the CSI model with esteem across persons and nations that could otherwise be thought to be distinct. As mentioned by Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010), “researchers and marketers show a growing interest in the research of consumers’ decision-making styles to understand how and why people shop” (pp. 102).

At the beginning of the year in which this particular study was concluded, respected scholars Jain & Sharma (2013) argued that “the purchase of goods or services includes a number of factors that affect decision making” (p. 40). The scholars employed the Kotler model that defined the purchase process as incorporating the five stages of “need recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, purchase decision, and post purchase behavior” (p. 40). What is so significant to this study is how these authors validated and sometimes amended previous consumer decision-making models. They review very many studies and at the beginning of this year concluded that, “five characteristics are indispensable to all consumers irrespective of country, gender, age, culture and religion... (namely) high quality conscious consumer, brand conscious price equals quality consumer, recreational/hedonistic consumer, price conscious value for money consumer, and confused by over choice consumer” (p. 40). At the consideration of changing times, altered consumer groups and varied products, the inventory developed by Sproles and Kendall three decades ago is found still “a basic model” (p. 40). In the words of Omar et al. (2007), “the availability of multi-component products and electronic purchasing capabilities not only it has broadened the sphere of consumer choice, it also adds complication in making a purchase decision” (p. 26).

Establishing a gap in this line of research was thus instrumental. Not validating nor questioning the dominant conclusion, the present study was concerned with the applicability of Sproles and Kendall’s proposal among a hitherto uncharacterized consumer group. As better explained by Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010), “although decision-making styles have been examined in various cultural environments, the generalizability of Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) instrument has not been established yet”, a truth also mentioned by such scholars as Lysonski, Durvasula & Zotos (1996), Hanzae & Aghasibeg (2008) as well as Yasin (2009). In the words of Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010), “…CSI is a comprehensive instrument developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986) used for measuring consumer decision making styles”, but “more research is needed to examine consumer decision making styles and to test CSI instrument in different countries” (p. 102). Even today, what Sproles & Kendall (1986) proposed as a factor- “relationship has not been systematically explored in consumer research,” mainly because scholars have assumed it (Omar et al, 2007, p. 26).
2.5.2 Developing the Framework

As such, this study was shaped by a custom-made conceptual model, derived from this proposition. It is very important to mention at this juncture of the paper, that the study did neither question nor contravene the proposition by Sproles and Kendall (1986), as revised and further advanced in two cases by notable scholars, Bauer et al. (1981) and Costeley (1988). What it did however, was test the proposition and its applicability among a unique consumer group of Swedish youngsters. Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010) also conducted a recent but critical study aimed at addressing these issues. Their empirical research study was used to build upon “the stream of research that attempts to test the generalizability of the consumer styles inventory” (p. 103).

The empirical study conducted by Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010) examined and tested the decision-making styles proposed by Sproles & Kendall’s (1986) in their CSI instrument. These recent scholars tested the CSI model by measuring it among the relatively young-adult consumers who operated within the Republic of Macedonia, as compared to this study’s young consumers in urban Sweden. In their study, Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010) segmented the young-adult consumers based on their decision-making styles, thereafter determining the differences occurring across different consumer groups in terms of decision-making styles.

What is of greater essence to this study is the fact that Anic, Suleska & Rajh (2010) statistically confirmed the 8-factor model proposed three decades earlier by Sproles & Kendall’s (1986) across two homogeneous consumers groups. The differences they highlighted were across gender segmentations. Such differing modifications have been frequent in recent researches. For instance as shall be explained further hereunder, such results were generated by Boonlertvanich (2009) among consumers’ behavior when purchasing digital still cameras within modern Thailand.

Having selectively chosen a high-involvement product of laptops, and the low-involvement product of the yogurt, to represent a product inventory under inspection, this study sought to review the extent to which a selective generation Y group of consumers made the purchase decision. This study sought to establish or otherwise discredit this famous assertion that consumer choice is directed or at least influenced by product information involvement as inventoried by Sproles and Kendall three decades ago. In essence, therefore, the present study affirmed that product involvement (predisposing consumer styles) is a complex mental and enduring process among consumers that optimally influences their purchase decision process. Such style influenced might predictably be price and product-use precision in case of laptops for instance (the high involvement product), or product-characteristics in case of Swedish yogurt (the low involvement product), predicates consequent to two critical historical studies by Bauer et al. (2006) and Gupta, Brantly and Jacsson (2010).

One could expect that several other un-included factors (items in this effect) could have significant influence on the consumer decision-making process. Culture for instance, social
class and age are factors that Sproles & Kendall (1986) failed to include, and which have significant element in the present Swedish generation Y sample. As mentioned by Omar et al. (2007) for the modern generation of consumers, “the number of product increases and the variety of goods available in the stores and shopping malls multiplies, and this helps to broaden-up consumer choices” that now influence today’s consumer (p. 26). The culture and age factor additions thus seem very significant. Confirming this, Mokhlis & Salleh (2009) also agree that, “although consumer decision-making style represents a relatively consistent pattern of cognitive and affective responses, culture has been proven to impact significantly on individual values and attitudes, thus, culture is expected to have a significant influence on consumer decision-making styles” (p. 50). In agreement, the Sproles & Kendall (1986) development “has not been systematically explored in consumer research...” (Omar et al, 2007, p. 26).

Swedish young consumers were expected to modify the CSI framework proposed by Sproles & Kendall (1986). As proposed by the present study, this seclusion could have a basis in changing the sampled nationalities. In their sample selected of young Malaysian, Chinese and Indian product consumers, Mokhlis & Salleh (2009) investigates these nationalities and age limitation in understanding how Malaysian, Chinese and Indian youngsters consumers carried out their decision-making styles using the Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) proposed by Sproles & Kendall (1986). In the study, Mokhlis & Salleh (2009) found that the CSI psychometric properties were still similar to those of Sproles & Kendall (1986) prediction, regardless. However, their predicted differences within consumer decision-making styles still occurred, notably across ethnic groups. As such, the CSI modifications were influenced by a consumer’s ethnicity. As such, their conclusion was affirmably, that “identification of new traits exclusive to each ethnic group suggests that CSI cannot be applied without considering the cultural factors” (p. 50).

Employing the CSI proposal developed by Sproles & Kendall (1986), Boonlertvanich (2009) added three additional factors (media, social and lifestyle influences) to the CSI, among a selected sample of 400 undergraduate university students living in Bangkok. This scholar instrumentally found that the CSI model proposed by Sproles & Kendall (1986) was accurate, with the addition of two extra factors. The factor analysis resulted to a ‘Thai consumer decision-making style mode’ of quality consciousness, impulse consciousness, price consciousness, fashion consciousness, confusion consciousness, brand and or store loyalty, social influence, mass media influence, lifestyle influence, and finally recreation consciousness (Boonlertvanich, 2009, p. 57). Such accurate and recent prescriptions can only be attributed to the novel sample used, something that can understand vary in the present unique sample of Swedish generation Y’s.

### 2.5.3 The Conceptual Framework

Consequently, in developing the study’s conceptual framework, the researcher employed the Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI) developed by Sproles & Kendall (1986). Sproles & Kendall (1986) proposed the CSI as the earliest systematic attempt to measure the decision-making orientations of consumers in their shopping orientations. Their approach however
assumed that, an individual consumer bears specific decision-making styles, which are predisposed or accrue from the amiable combination each consumer’s individual decision-making dimensions. Although they first featured 50 measurement items as central in the general orientations of a consumer towards shopping, Sproles & Kendall later proposed that these items could be instrumentalized to 40, thus the Consumer Style Inventory (CSI). These measurement items propelled eight dimensions that characterized all and any consumer.

Consequently, according to the scholars, high school students in the US, representing a general interpretation of all consumer groups, had eight distinct decision-making dimensions. These included:

a) Perfectionism or high-quality consciousness (perfectionists and high-quality conscious consumers only interested in the finest quality of products beyond the merely good enough products.

b) Brand consciousness among consumers (consumers who purchase the best, the most expensive, highest advertised and critically established national brands believing that the higher the price the better the product’s quality).

c) Novelty and fashion consciousness (consumers who prefer what is new, fashionable and novel among available products, such that they are up-to-date and well groomed in modern styles).

d) Recreational and hedonistic consciousness during shopping sprees (consumers who derive fun, joy and even lifestyles in conducting pleasant shopping sprees).

e) Price consciousness (consumers who are purely motivated to purchase because of the comparative sale price and often look for the product with the lowest of possible price, thus merely concerned about gaining the best value for their money).

f) Impulsiveness (the consumers who never plan or strategize on their shopping sprees, only care about the moment rather than their spending or their product choice).

g) Confused purchase choice (consumers who experience great difficulty when making a product choices, particularly because they have too much (information overload) regarding a product during the purchase moment.

h) Brand-loyal orientation (consumers who are and remain royal to a favorite brand and or shopping store, regardless of historical experiences, such that they retain their choices during every shopping spree).

Adopting these dimensions, the researchers developed the following framework as the test for the unique sample of consumers.
Chapter Summary

The foregoing chapter of the dissertation has focused on providing a detailed critical review of the literature on consumer purchase styles, when such consumers as well as the products are varied within the Swedish background. In so doing, the chapter explored what scholars and practitioners have published in peer reviewed academic journals posted regarding consumer purchase decisions. To begin with, the chapter provided a review of the consumer behavior and decision-making, discussing in details the contextual consumer behavior as well as the consumer decision-making processes. Thereafter, the chapter reviewed paid special interest on the literature on the integrative developmental model as it relates to consumer decision making styles, thus concentrating on the product involvement techniques and the business context of Generation Y in Sweden. The final section of the chapter discussed the study’s conceptual framework, adopting a unique but well based approach in testing new choice-steps in these decisions.
In summary, the review highlighted the study by Hawkins, Best & Coney, (2000), who define consumer behavioral “the study of individuals, groups, or organizations and the processes they use to select, secure, use, and dispose of products, services, experiences, or ideas to satisfy needs and the impacts that these processes have on the consumer and society” (7). According to the present study, any consumer is a group of wide range of needs, desires, and motivations. This means that consumer behavior is very difficult to study and measure. Consumer behavior, specifically when it comes to making individual decision to choose a product between alternatives, is probably one of the most studied fields of consumer-oriented research (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). Early in the 1980s, Mowen (1988) stated that most of the researches done on the consumers behavior, have focused strictly on the decision-making process, and under this decision making perspective, purchasing has been seen as a problem solving activities, giving the consumers the opportunity to move through stages in the essence of solving their problems.

The present study seeks to characterize the Swedish young purchasers in the product and purchase decisions. The review also showed a diagram that outlines the five processes of consumer’s decision-making, which are problem recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, purchase, and post-purchase evaluation. Changes to this model occur. According to Mowen, J. C. & Minor, M. (2000), “problem recognition, occurs when a perceived discrepancy developed between an actual and a desired state of being”. For instance, Hoyer & Maclnnes (2010) presented “need”, as an unstable force of desired and psychological state, which leads to an internal tension. This means that the most relevant studies and researches regarding consumer decision-making style (CDMS) discuss three approaches to describe the distinctive styles of consumer behavior: the consumer typology. These studies include those by Darden & Ashton (1974). However, some other studies also highlight the lifestyle/psychographic approach of consumers in their purchase decisions such as the one conducted by Lastovicka (1982). Some other studies have highlighted the consumer characteristics approach, most notably the studies by Sproles (1985), Westbrook & Black (1985) and one by Sproles & Kendall (1986).

Consequently, it has been argued in many researches that although there are several different factors that can influence consumer’s decision, they can be characterized in some certain styles. These styles include novelty seekers, information seekers, comparison seekers, quality and habitual or brand loyal consumers. Studies propagating this accord in the styles adopted by consumers include those published by Bettman (1979); Jacoby and Chestnut (1978); Maynes (1976); Miller (1981); Sproles (1979); and Thorelli, Becker & Engeldow (1975). Indeed, consumer decision-making styles is defined as a “patterned, mental, cognitive orientation towards shopping and purchasing, which constantly dominates the consumer’s choices” by Bauer, Sauer and Becker (2006).

Back through the ages, Sproles & Kendall (1986), measure CDMS, uniquely. They mentioned characteristics and some other traits of the consumers, introduced, and developed their consumer styles inventory (CSI) based on an exploratory study of 482 students in five high schools in Tucson area. This is a useful instrument to scale eight mental factors of CDMS. Since then, CSI is replicated in several researches in different cultures and countries.
Example of such cultures and nations include the US, Korea, New Zealand, Greece, India, China, Malaysia, Germany, UK, Iran and Turkey. Perfectionism, brand consciousness, novelty fashion consciousness, recreational, price value consciousness impulsiveness, confusedly over choice, and brand-loyal/habitual are the moral factors, which have been taken into consideration in consumer decision making style by Sproles and Kendall (1986) and also used in their consumer style inventory.

However, research results have shown that decision making style can vary between different countries with different cultures (Bauer et al., 2006). In some studies, some new traits are added. One example is the study, which was carried out in the UK (Bakewell & Mitchell 2003, 2004) and the researchers could identify “confused time restricted”, “time-energy conserving” and “store promiscuous” as four new traits to the so called CSI (Hanzaee & Aghasibeig, 2008). This means that a product is often considered in a narrow sense as something tangible that can be described in terms of physical attributes, such as shape, dimension, components, form, and color (Palmer, 2003).

This study provides a unique look into a distinctly Swedish consumer, his behaviors, and styles for a specific product range. This is because the author believes that this novel context can exert a considerable influence over consumers’ decision processes (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985), specifically for such a unique people as those of Generation Y in Sweden. This is because the age or life-stage of different eras makes them distinctive to different cohorts. Being the younger generation, for instance, have different priorities to older generations. In this respect, generation Y was born between 1982 and 2000.
CHAPTER 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Chapter Introduction

The consumer decision-making style and manner is hoped to have a significant correspondence between age, location and product-orientation, factors that were not predicted by Sproles and Kendall in 1986. To determine the ideal research design, the researchers employed the model developed by Sproles & Kendall (1986). This earlier model framework helps researchers everyday, in identifying and constituting different research philosophies, approaches, strategies, choices, time horizon, techniques and procedures and to match them appropriately to their research needs. This study used the factors in the variations of age, location and product-orientation as sentimental to the final consumer decision-making style and manner.

In the present chapter, there were distinct sections following this introduction to the research methodology employed. There was a brief review of objective and research questions, just before detailing the adopted research design. This will then be followed by a discussion of the study’s target population, sampling procedure and sample characteristics, in its data collection process.

In regards to the data collection process, there were distinct sections profiling the data collection instruments and instrumentation, which covers the primary data collection and ultimately the secondary data collection instruments and instrumentation. Thereafter, the chapter detailed the data analysis tools and strategies employed to arrive at the findings. These sections of the chapter was followed by brief explanations of the ethical concerns, issues on reliability and validity, measures adopted for the methodological limitations and delimitations, and finally providing a concise chapter summary.

3.2 Review of Objective and Research Questions

While preparing this study, the researchers’ objective was to provide a precise and concise view of modern day interpretations of the consumer choice and decision-making processes, subject to his or her predisposal to location, age and product. This study hoped to discover and investigate the Swedish generation Y decision-making style and examine if there is a relation between product involvement and consumer decision-making style. The unique factors of the study were the age factor (generation Y), definition of product (two selected product’s involvements) and location (Sweden).

The overall objective was broken down to two narrow aims. These were, firstly, to determine the process through which consumers select any of the two products on offer. And finally, to identify age, location and product-oriented factors those are significant in product decision-making processes in two objective cases.
Accordingly, the study posed two research questions. Firstly, the study asked whether product involvement does influence consumer decision-making styles in Generation Y of Swedish nationals for the two selected products. Finally, the study questioned the level that the model proposed by Sproles and Kendall in 1986 now applies to the modern-day Generation Y in Sweden as they decide on both of the selected products.

3.3 Research Design

According to Bryman and Bell (2007), they emphasized on the fact that amidst quantitative and qualitative research method, occasionally become indistinct. Qualitative research is mostly based on gaining an in-depth understanding of elemental logic and interest in nature whereas quantitative is mostly to quantify data and derive conclusion based on the sample to the population in question. Considering that the present study employed a descriptive research methodology. In this study, the authors have chosen to use a quantitative method and the purpose was to describe the customer decision process when choosing between varied products, at a varied age and within a Swedish market. Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) described quantitative method of research as characterized through emphasis on measurement although following a cogent and demanding approach. As such, simply describing the decision process that could be observed realistically was adequate (Kothari 2008, p. 2 – 7).

This research was conducted using a controlled measurement in the conducting of the questionnaire, and was constructed along these lines as it uses controlled measurement through the conducting of a questionnaire, examining the research problem with the use of primary data as well as existing literature instead of only analyzing the findings. Considering these quantitative research characteristics, the authors concentrated on the logic behind a social event, which is seen to be the Swedish young generation Y in there style of decision making towards these selected products. Nevertheless, the quantitative research design chosen by for this dissertation, matches with Bryman and Bell’s (2007, p. 33) which states that “if we are interested in teasing out the relative importance of a number of causes of a social phenomenon, it is likely that a quantitative strategy will meet our needs.”

This dissertation goes in line with the descriptive research design that was explained by Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) and this research design is suitable where the problem is structured and subsists of perceptible concepts.

The third choice criterion was the research strategy employed in the study. According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2006), a researcher can choose from several strategies. Firstly, he or she can choose an experiment, involving exposing two random samples to a treatment to determine its effect by showing the differences attained by the treated experimental group as compared to the untreated control group. The researcher can also choose a survey, which is a random collection of data from an equally representative sample where all members of the target population have an equal chance of being sampled. The researcher can also opt for a case study, which is a descriptive analysis of an individual entity.
3.4 Review of literature

The focus will be on providing a detailed critical review of the literature on consumer decision-making during purchases, particularly focusing on previously non-highlighted regions like Sweden, as well as how this phenomenon relates with the vast development of marketing professionals. As such, the literature and theoretical part of this thesis will provide a theoretical foundation that easily guides its readers through the discussions and the analysis.

The present researchers had the advantage of initiating the literature review process with a clear understanding of the topic and the scope of the intended study. This study, as previously mentioned, was based on a reflection of the field, particularly the study conducted by Sproles and Kendall about three decades ago, in 1986.

While Sproles and Kendall’s study and those of subsequent scholars have brilliantly highlighted on the consumer decision-making process, something that has huge support in the literature, the model they developed may or may not apply to the latest generation of Swedish consumers. The present study sought to recruit a novel modernistic sample in a non-studied region instead of merely studying a singular state with an older sample.

This means that even at the start of the literature review process, the researchers already knew what the variables of the study were, the literature to seek for and the scope to cover in the critical review. This well-defined scope of interest and clarity of purpose was instrumental while seeking for, choosing, and critically evaluating previous literature since it provided a focusing lens. As such, the researchers first identified the key search words and phrases relevant to the study’s area of interest to include:

- Consumer Behavior*
- Generation Y *
- Consumer Decision Making*
- Product Involvement*
- Consumer Decision-Making Style*
- Swedish Consumers*
- Consumption Style *

Having defined this search words and phrases, the next step was to define where the keywords and phrases would be used. The researchers attempted to use the search words and phrases in the local university database, but only fourteen relevant literature sources were accessed there. It soon became apparent that only online/electronic databases could facilitate the generation of adequate literature resources necessary for a study of this magnitude. There was thus the need to know which databases were available and which among them were appropriate for the present study. These key words and phrases were fed into the Google search engine, and the researchers identified as many databases as possible from the search results.
This search process enabled the research to identify numerous admissible databases and journals which were deemed as the most appropriate for the present study (based on the foregoing choice criteria). These databases alongside the major journals used in the study included ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, ScienceDirect, Academic Journals Database, Springer Link, Google Scholar, Social Science Research Resources Network (SSRN), Social Science Research Network (SSRN), Emerald Insight, Marketing Power, European journal of Marketing and Journal of Consumer Marketing among many others. Once the databases and major journals were identified, the researchers used the list of keywords and phrases to look for peer-reviewed journal articles relevant to the topic of interest.

A total of 172 source materials were collected, using the keywords from all the databases and journals listed above. Some of these articles could not be used in the study, while some were very valuable. Consequently, the researchers developed the inclusion/exclusion criteria for use in deciding which articles would be used in the literature review. Using this criterion, the researchers settled on 102 journal articles for the literature search, out of the 172 articles and reference sources generated from all the databases and journals. The criterion was:

a) The literature sources had to be a peer-reviewed academic publication.

b) The author and his or her academic qualifications as well as area of interest had to be provided alongside the journal article.

c) The author had to have reliable academic qualifications and experience in researching product involvement and consumption.

d) The article had to have all the appropriate features of a high quality academic paper.

e) The article had to cover any one or several of the clarified passwords and phrases.

All the selected sources are in peer-reviewed academic publications, have been authored by people with clear and relevant academic qualifications and expertise in the area of interest, are published as or in high quality academic publication, bear one or several of the clarified passwords and phrases, as well as are very recent (post 2000). These sources will be studied, summarized, and analyzed based on the results generated by the primary data research, in comparison with the anticipations’ originating from Sproles and Kendall (1986).

3.5 Data Collection Instruments and Instrumentation

3.5.1 Primary Data Collection Instruments

Having decided on the target population, the sampling procedure and the ideal sample pool, the next step collected the relevant data from the respondents. The study needed both primary and secondary data for its analysis and findings. To begin with, the primary data required by the present study was solely collected using survey questionnaires, having opted
to avoid any form of interviews due to the time and interaction required. As such, due to the distance between respondents and the availability of the researchers, it will be impossible for the researchers to use any other direct data collection instruments such as interviews and observation. Survey questionnaires were deemed as ideally suitable to collect comprehensive, detailed and sufficient data from the respondents currently living in the Swedish market. The survey questionnaires were easily and conveniently sent to and from the Swedish respondents as hand out and online questionnaire. A majority of the members of generation Y Swedish respondents are students of Mälardalens University, while the rest are elementary students and working class generation y Swedish inhabitants.

3.5.1.1 Target Population

Investigating the Swedish generation Y decision-making style in relation to product involvement and consumer decision-making style, the study had to select a primary-date sample that had a unique age factor (generation Y), definition of product (two selected product’s involvement) and location (Sweden). As such, a high-involvement group of consumers was selected in view of their purchase of laptops, while another low-involvement group of consumers was selected in view of their purchase of yogurt drink. The study sought to review the extent to which a selective generation Y group of consumers in Sweden made the purchase decision for these two products. Further, the selected sample has to be comparative to product information involvement as inventoried by Sproles and Kendall (1986).

To effectively capture all the elements of the purpose and to ensure a comprehensive coverage of the various perspectives, the researchers gathered data from as many participants and observers of the two-products markets in Sweden. As such, the target population of this study incorporated with groups of Y-generation consumers in Sweden, who purchase either laptops or yogurt drink on a regular basis.

This population is conceived as encompassing all those who are influenced by and are in consistent interaction with product involvement or information, leading to their purchase decisions as Generation Y Swedish consumers. Hopefully, the target population operating in origin Swedish markets, as well as being active product consumers could provide an insight into their knowledge, expertise, trends and decision-making roles during their product selection ventures, in comparative analysis with that of Sproles and Kendall (1986).

3.5.1.2 Purposeful sampling

Having read through the different articles, they have been really interesting points how consumers perceive product and there decision style, with respect to their different demographic factors such as culture. The authors have conducted this research in Sweden because it would be interesting to see how these factors affect the decision making of the target group. The authors found it more convenient to focus in Sweden because it will give them an easy access to the materials and information’s needed for the paper work. When it comes to product involvement, the authors have chosen two products on different categories (High and Low involvement product), which Laptop is regarded as high
involvement and yoghurt as low involvement product. These two products were chosen, because they are among the most commonly used products, mostly among generation Y. With these chosen products, they are possibilities for the authors to reach their targeted number of responds.

The next step would be to determine how to collect data from this broad population. Given that the target population includes thousands of potential respondents, each of whom could be sampled for the present study, there was a need to determine how to select representatives of this population. The scope and mandate of the present study will not allow for a census of all potential respondents. As such, there will be need to extract a representative sample from the population to act as the study’s respondents. The representative sample would be candidates who are born and brought up in the Swedish society within the age range of 18-31 or candidates that possess the same culture and norm of the Swedish society and as well within the same age bracket.

3.5.1.3 Questionnaire Structure and Design

The questionnaire was designed with four purposes in order to ask the respondents about demographic, buying behavior on involvement product, consumer perspective and 8 factors model as Sproles and Kendall (1986). The articles used for these questionnaires by Bauer et al “Investigating the relationship between product involvement and consumer decision-making styles” and Hanzaee & Aghasibeig “Generation Y female and male decision-making style in Iran” are replication of the study by Sproles and Kendall, which proposed the eight mutual characteristics of CSI. However, these articles have been further modified and have been applied to different product categories. Being that the research is connected to product involvement, the authors found these articles a perfect tool for the research development. Thus this will also increase the reliability of the work as well as the validity.

These researches test the applicability of CSI in different countries. Since it has been proven that national culture have a noticeable impact on individual attitudes (Hofstede, 1980), therefore according to Cheryl, Bennett and Hartel (2005) culture is expected to have influence on consumer decision-making style. Bauer et al. (2006) examined the CSI with different products in two countries, United Kingdom and Germany. By their investigation, they claimed that there is a relation between product involvement and consumer decision-making style although CSI was assumed to be product independent.

The aims of these questionnaires (Appendix 1) are to answer the intended research questions and as well being guided by the conceptual framework as table shows below;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim of Questionnaire</th>
<th>Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type of Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking respondent’s demographic</td>
<td>No.1-4</td>
<td>The authors want to know the personal information’s of the respondent.</td>
<td>Factors influencing the cell phone brand loyalty of Swedish generation Y. (Ahmed &amp; Moosavi, 2013)</td>
<td>Dichotomous question and multiple choice question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking respondent’s buying behavior on involvement product</td>
<td>No.5</td>
<td>The author’s wants to know the number of respondents that falls within each product category (High and Low involvement product),</td>
<td>Consumers’ Psychological factors association with brand equity with high involvement product: Case of laptop (Wahida Farzana, 2012) Investigating the relationship between product involvement and consumer decision making style (Bauer et al. 2006)</td>
<td>Dichotomous question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking respondent’s consumer perspective</td>
<td>No.6-8</td>
<td>The author wants to know how the respondents perceive there products they buy as well as the decision making style characteristics.</td>
<td>Investigating the relationship between product involvement and consumer decision making style (Bauer et al. 2006, p.350)</td>
<td>multiple choice question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking respondent’s 8 factor model as Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
<td>No.9-17</td>
<td>The effectiveness of decision making style was asked, by using the 8 factor model from Sprole and Kendall</td>
<td>Generation Y female and male decision-making style in Iran: are they different? (Hanzae &amp; Aghasibeig, 2008, p.528-532)</td>
<td>multiple choice question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Questionnaire design, source: Authors
3.6 Data Analysis Tools and Strategies

Once both primary and secondary data were collected and conducted the appropriate analysis of the collected data for relevant and appropriate/accurate findings. All data collected and subsequently analyzed was grouped into two, based on the selected product, laptop or yogurt, and each group of respondents, Sample A and Sample B. All primary data collected by the proposed study was subsequently analyzed quantitatively using basic statistical tools, for each group of respondents. Efforts were taken to keep the analysis as simple and straightforward as possible, while also maintaining a high level of accuracy, reliability, and validity for the findings.

Responses generated from each group of respondents would then be further grouped into their respective research questions. This means that, the data collection instrument was specialized during formation based on the study’s research questions. As such, while formulating the open-ended survey questionnaires, the researchers based the survey questionnaires on, and targeted the survey questionnaires towards answering the research questions posed by the study. Thus, all responses were analyzed for the respective research questions they were intended to answer. It was however important to note that the same survey questionnaires were served to both groups of respondents, without differentiation despite their varied products. Then be to incorporate the secondary data analysis and reach the findings sought for by the study. As mentioned above, the researchers began by collecting primary data from two groups of consumers regarding two selected products.

Thereafter, the primary data from each sample group was collectively analyzed and compared, to reach a conclusion for the primary research process. While the data was sourced from two groups of consumers with two distinct products, their responses were compared and used to constitute the study’s primary data conclusion. The conclusion thus reached then is compared to the assertions of Sproles and Kendall (1986), and the interpretations derived therefrom, by various relevant scholars. This provided an enriched but accurate representation of both the varied primary and secondary data analysis sought for by the study. Finally, it is important to point out that this study used simple statistical calculations of central tendencies.

3.7 Ethical Concerns

The primary research particularly required the participation of human subjects from Sweden. These respondents have very important and sensitive roles and social positions, given that they are both students and very young citizens. It will thus be important to consider their image and reputation in the manner they are depicted as participants in this study.

The researchers ensured that all participants are treated with respect and dignity. Further, the participants were accorded complete anonymity. The data generated from respondents
was used exclusively for the purposes of the study and was not availed to third parties for any other purpose whatsoever.

During the data collection processes, the researchers provided adequate time for respondents to fill and return the survey questionnaires, with respect to their busy schedules. Finally, all participants were consulted and requested to participate voluntarily prior to the study. The research purpose, objective and research questions were provided to all respondents in preparation for the data collection process, so that they were adequately aware of what is required of their participation.

3.8 Reliability

According to Bryman and Bell (2007 p. 40) statement on reliability, is concerned with the query of whether or not the outcomes of a research are repeatable. Bryman and Bell (2007) additional clarify that reliability is worried with the consistency of measures used all through a project. Factors to be considered when judging the reliability of measures embody stability, whether or not a measure is secure over time and the possibility that there will likely be variation in the results if the same sample was conducted at a later date. The present study was inspired and greatly informed by the research reports reported by Sproles and Kendall in 1986, particularly their Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI). However, much of the inspiration and subsequent implementation was consequent to the diverse and deeply informative works of authors and scholarly experts who have published voluminous critics and support for consumer model developed by Sproles and Kendall (1986). Different components under consideration embrace inner reliability; are the symptoms that make up the scales reliable, are respondent’s scores on any indicator associated to their scores on other indicators; and eventually the presence of inter-observer consistency (Bryman & Bell, 2007). As such, the authors of this paper were also faced with the challenges on the reliability of this work. However, this threats has been acknowledged and as well been guided against to ensure a trusted reliable and as well maintain consistency throughout the thesis. Important therefore, is the note that in the present study’s triangulation of primary data and secondary data research, there was a vital comparison of both the old consumer-dimension assertions and contemporary findings.

3.9 Validity

When conducting research, the researchers need to take the validity of the research into account. Validity reflects the accurateness of analysis materials and considers if a research makes use of the right means and ideas to measure something. According to Bryman and Bell (2007, p. 159), they pinpointed validity as a problem of whether or not an indicator that’s devised to gauge an idea really measures that concept. Fisher (2007, p. 272-275) discussed the differences between four several types of validity: Starting with Construct or measurement validity, which he refers to as a research that includes questionnaires to assess whether or not an individual reveals explicit traits and questions whether the measurements used in the investigation act as true measures.
Internal validity which is anxious with the accuracy of any cause-impact relationship implied in research. Exterior or population validity which appears to be whether or not findings can really be generalized throughout an entire group or population, and lastly ecological validity which explores if the findings obtained from contrived circumstances have validity in real-life situations outdoors of a controlled analysis environment. The authors have chosen to go with the Inhabitants validity since is of particular relevance to this study.

This was judged based on its aim to determine findings associated to a whole generational age group, and as such we give this form of validity excessive regard when deciding our sample size. Part of this study relies on the present study and went a step further and compared contemporary findings in this regard, with what Sproles and Kendall (1986) and subsequent CSI scholars assert. Besides the works, research methodology and subsequent assertions by Sproles and Kendall (1986), the present study goes a step further to adopt triangulation of contemporary data (on the CSI’s measures of consumer decision-making orientations) with related literature published in contention and support of what was published by Sproles and Kendall (1986) in their Consumer Styles Inventory. For instance, if an individual consumer bears specific decision-making styles, which are predisposed or accrue from the amiable combination of each consumer’s individual decision-making dimensions, then the present study’s style ought to conform with what Sproles & Kendall proposed, as well as what many other subsequent scholars have argued in the same regards.

A questionnaire aiming at gathering responses on decision making style of Swedish Generation Y, in consequence assemble validity must be assessed. The authors matched the analysis of the handout questionnaires with the theoretical findings.

The study incorporated a meticulous process of secondary data analysis, which the process began with an organized search for appropriate sources of these secondary data’s. The search for sources requires that the research identify numerous admissible databases and journals, which are deemed as the most appropriate for the present study. The selected databases alongside the major journals used in the study which include ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, Science Direct, Academic Journals Database, Springer Link, Google Scholar, Social Science Research Resources Network (SSRRN), Social Science Research Network (SSRN), Emerald Insight, Marketing Power, European journal of Marketing and Journal of Consumer Marketing as mentioned above, which are the multiple sources of provenance and serves as a means of increasing the research validity of this thesis.

### 3.10 Methodological Limitations and Delimitations

The proposed study was primarily liable to the risk of biased data collection and analysis since part of the data was generated from a qualitative secondary data analysis. It was very possible that the researcher may allow a level of bias to interfere with the research process either consciously or unconsciously, such as by selecting certain authors or propelling a certain perspective available in the contemporary discourse regarding this area of study. Since primary data findings were compared to the available discourse, there was a quantitative aspect to the ultimate conclusion or conclusions drawn.
However, the researchers fundamentally enhanced the level of objectivity, particularly in the quantitative data collection and analysis stages of the research. This was done by using standardized structure and a pre-defined thematic content analysis. This also enabled the researchers to refrain any personal bias and preconceptions from interfering with the research process. The secondary data analysis criterion had already been developed prior to the actual study such that all the documents generated will be treated in an objective pre-determined way, in addition to a standardized data collection instrument and approach. The same degree of objectivity will be employed in employing sampling procedure, dealing with respondents as well as during the processing of primary data findings. It is hoped that the findings drawn will not in any way reflect the biased perceptions and interpretations of the authors.

3.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter of the dissertation was geared towards describing the research methodology and methods chosen for the study. The chapter had in great details elaborated on the chosen research design, the prospective target population, the anticipated sampling frame and procedure, a possibly resultant sample groups, sample size and sample characteristics, and the primary and secondary data collection criteria. Further, the chapter had also described the strategies and instruments to be adopted in collecting the primary and secondary data sets, as well as the data analysis tools and strategies to be adopted. Finally, the chapters also bore vital sections discussing the enumerated ethical issues and ethical parameters, the validity and reliability of findings generated, as well as the methodological limitations and delimitations peculiar to this study.

In summary, it emerged that the methodology chosen specifically custom-designed to facilitate the most accurate and reliable answers to the three research questions posed by the study. Further, all the findings generated by the research methodology was the answers generated for each of these research questions. It emerged from the chapter that the study implemented a mixed research design, which enabled the researcher to triangulate the collected data for more comprehensive and reliable findings. The two research phases of the custom research design were a quantitative field survey (to gather practical and realistic appraisals of two groups of actual and potential consumers who purchase two products, laptops and yogurt), and a secondary data analysis (to review the current literature (post 2000) on the CIS dimensions proposed by Sproles and Kendall (1986)).

The target population for the study included Swedish generation Y consumers in Sweden who has the age of 13-31. These respondents will be selected using simple random method, and further determined by their willingness to participate in answering and returning the survey questionnaire. After executing the sampling procedure detailed above, the study used survey questionnaires as the ideal instrument in collecting data from these two groups of consumers (the primary data sample). Thereafter, the primary data process was compared with selected analysis of secondary data.
CHAPTER 4: Finding

The overviews of collected data were provided in this chapter. The results are presented as pie and doughnut charts in multi-choice questions.

4.1 Demographic

A total of 447 responses were submitted, of which 9 completed questionnaires were disqualified, as their general information was not match with the age of target respondents (Swedish Generation Y who has the age of 13-31). Also, the total number of 438 accepted respondents was taken into analyzed consideration of this research.

The questions 1 to 4 were conducted an overview on the general information of respondents. All of accepted responses are Swedish which 60.50% of female and 39.50% of male. All of their age is in the generation Y that 70% of them were between 19-24 years old. The most respondents have finished high school (61.50%) and others have graduated Bachelor’s degree (27%) and Master’s degree (6%).

Question 1: Are you male or female?

Question 2: How old are you?
Question 3: What is your current graduation level?

- High school: 67.35%
- Bachelor's degree: 26.71%
- Master's degree: 5.93%
- Doctoral's degree: 0%

Figure 6: The high and low involvement products

Question 4: What is your nationality?

- 100% Swedish

Figure 5: The demographics

4.2 High and low involvement product

Question 5: You recently bought and have your own laptop computer or you buy and consume a yogurt drink regularly?

- Laptop: 56.62%
- Yogurt: 43.38%

Figure 6: The high and low involvement products
The researchers aimed to find out about the results of Swedish Generation Y Decision-Making Style between High Involvement and Low Involvement Products by random. In this question, the target respondents were separated to be both groups based on their answer. The results showed 56.62% of respondents chose the high involvement product (laptop) and 43.38% of respondents chose the low involvement product (yogurt).

4.3 Consumer perspective and decision making process by factors model as per Sproles and Kendall (1986)

4.3.1 Consumer perspective.

In this part, the both target groups were asked about consumer perspective including 3 questions as Product value, importance of product message and resultant consumer pleasure.

Question 6: Product value as a sign - When people see you either using your laptop, the product:

![Product value as a sign (laptop group)](image)

After the respondents in laptop group were asked about product values as a sign, 66.13% of all targeted respondents thought Laptop value does not reflect their personality. In contrast, 21.77% of them thought it can tell other people something about them, 8.06% thought it helps them express their personality and others 4.03% of them said it is part of their self-image.
On the other hand, 62.63\% of respondents in yogurt group thought that the product value does not reflect their personality. In contrast, 17.37\% of them thought it can tell other people something about them, 12.63\% of them said it is part of their self-image and others 7.37\% thought it is helps them express their personality.

**Question 7: Importance of product message** - When people see you either using your laptop or your yogurt, the product:

40.72\% of respondents in laptop group answered when people see them using their laptop, it does not matter to them, 25.80\% of respondents thought laptop is not relevant to them and 15.32\% agreed this product is of no concern to them. While only 18.14\% of respondents answered the laptop is important to them.
Figure 10: Importance of product message (yogurt group)

When asked, the respondents from yogurt group, 38.42% of respondents thought the yogurt drink does not matter to them, 33.15% answered that the low involvement product is of no concern to them. 16.84% of those surveyed agreed it is not relevant to them. Whilst only 11.57% said the yogurt drink is important to them.

**Question 8: Resultant consumer pleasure** - Assuredly your laptop or the yogurt drink product:

Figure 11: Resultant consumer pleasure (laptop group)

When asked, the respondents in laptop group about resultant consumer pleasure in product, the most popular answer thought it is fun, with 63.30% of respondents. Other respondents agreed laptop gave them exciting with 13.70% exciting, and 9.67% very interesting.
Figure 12: Resultant consumer pleasure (yogurt group)

The yogurt group, the most popular answered the yogurt drink is fun. 18.42% thought this product is exciting. Whereas 15.78% agreed this low involvement product is very interested and other 11.05% of respondents responded that is fascinating.

4.3.2 Decision making process by factors model as per Sproles and Kendall (1986)

Question 9: The fashion conscious consumer – Please only Tick ONE sentence that best describes you and the laptop or yogurt drink.

Figure 13: The fashion conscious consumer (laptop group)

When the respondents were asked about the fashion conscious consumer, a majority of laptop group thought laptop is not concerned with the fashion. 18.14% answered they keep their possession/usage up to date with the changing market trends. Just 12.90% of those surveyed agreed that the fashionable and attractive style of laptop is very important to them. Finally, 10.88% of this group stated they usually have one or more of the newest releases of this product line around them.
The most popular answer to this question was that the respondents in yogurt group thought yogurt drink is not concerned with fashion. 17.89% thought they keep themselves update trend of product, 8.94% stated they have at least one of newest yogurt drink around them and 8.42% concerned about the fashionable and attractively product is very important to them.

**Question 10: The brand conscious consumer (Price = quality)** – Ideally, as far as this product is concerned (laptop or yogurt drink):

The majority of respondents in laptop group felt brand was important concern, 44.75% stated the well-known brands are best for them and 21.37% of respondents believed they prefer buying the best-selling brands. Whereas, 12.50% stated that high-end department offers them the best products, 10.88% felt the higher price product will be better quality and 6.04% stated their choices are depend on the more expensive brands, it will be better quality. Finally, only 4.43% believed the most advertised brands are very good choices.
Figure 16: The brand conscious consumer (Yogurt group)

When asked the yogurt drink group, the most popular 37.36% prefer the well-known brands to be best for them. Whilst 18.42% stated the high-end department can offer them the best yogurt drinks, 16.84% of respondents felt the higher price is the better quality and 8.42% believed in the advertised brands are very good choices. Finally, only 4.21% stated the more expensive brands always are their choices.

Question 11: The non-precise and otherwise occupied consumer – Regarding this product line:

Figure 17: The non-precise and otherwise occupied consumer (laptop group)

After asked the respondents in laptop group about the non-precise, 41.93% stated when they learn more about product if it’s hard for them to choose the best one. In the same time 26.61% said many brands in the market often make them confused and 12.90% said they are confuse when they got all information. While 11.69% stated it is hard to choose in which stores to shop.
stores to shop and only 6.85% of respondents mentioned they don’t give your purchases much thought or care in product.

Figure 18: The non-precise and otherwise occupied consumer (yogurt group)

33.15 % of respondents in yogurt drink group chose the option stated when they learnt more about products, it was harder to choose the best one. 20% of those surveyed felt when they get on different of all information’s products that made them confused. Just 18.94% stated they don’t give much thought or care when they buy while 16.31% of respondents agreed to many brands in the market that make them confused often. 8.94% thought they made careless purchase and only 2.63% stated sometimes, it is hard to choose the product for them.

Question 12: The quality/value conscious consumer - Ideally, as far as this product is concerned:

Figure 19: The quality/value conscious consumer (laptop group)

The most majority of respondents (48.39%) in laptop group stated that, they look carefully to find the best value for their money, 19.35% accepted they have high expectations for
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products. 17.34% felt they spend with carefully and just 14.92% of respondents agreed the made special effort to choose the best quality products.

![Figure 20: The quality/value conscious consumer (yogurt group)](image)

45.79% of respondents in Yogurt drink group agreed they look carefully to find the best value for their money. 25.79% felt they watched how much they spent wisely while 19.47% thought they have the high standard to buy the product. Finally, only 8.95% stated they made special effort to choose the very best quality products.

**Question 13: The recreational & hedonistic consumer** – To you, in view of a laptop:

![Figure 21: The recreational & hedonistic consumer (laptop group)](image)

When asked the respondents of laptop group about the recreational & hedonistic consumer, a majority of them approximately 43.95% chose that it was fun to buy something new, while 18.55% thought going shopping is one of enjoyable activities whilst 16.53% of those surveyed agreed shopping is not a pleasant activity to them. Just 10.89% felt they enjoy shopping for fun and 10.08% of respondents stated shopping in stores wastes their time.
Figure 22: The recreational & hedonistic consumer (yogurt group)

A majority of 36.32% respondents in yogurt drink group chose the shopping is not their pleasant activity. 28.95% thought it is fun to buy something new while 13.26% agreed shopping in stores wastes their time. Just 12.11% chose their one of enjoyable activities is shopping and 9.47% thought shopping is fun activity for them.

**Question 14: The perfectionist & high-quality conscious consumer** - For you, with regards to a laptop:

Figure 23: The perfectionist & high-quality conscious consumer (laptop group)

When asked about perfectionist and high-quality product with laptop group, a majority of them, 35.09% of respondents stated getting very good quality is the most important to them. 27.82% answered they try to choose the best choice of laptops when they need to buy, while 22.98% thought laptop doesn’t have to be perfect or the best in order to satisfy them. Finally, 14.11% of respondents usually try to buy the best overall quality.
When asked yogurt drink group, 38.37% of respondents answered the product doesn’t have to be the best or perfect for their satisfaction. Some of them (26.32%) usually try to buy the best overall quality while 25.26% thought the good quality of yogurt drink is important part to them. Finally, only 11.05% of respondents stated they tried to get very best or perfect choice.

**Question 15: The time-energy conservationist consumer** - Actually, for as long as a laptop is concerned:

After the respondents were asked about shopping time when they buy laptop, 68.95% of all target respondents have taken time to shop carefully. However, 16.53% of them stated they make their shopping trip fast and 14.52% they shop quickly by buying the first brand, which they thought it good enough.
Figure 26: The time-energy conservationist consumer (laptop group)

51.58% of respondents in yogurt drink group answered they take time to buy product carefully. However, 27.89% of them stated they make their shopping fast and 20.53% stated they buy quickly when they find that seems good enough.

**Question 16: The variety seeking consumer** - For you, with regards to a laptop:

Figure 27: The variety seeking consumer (laptop group)

In laptop group, 42.74% of respondents indicated they get shop different stores and choose different brands. 35.08% of them stated they prefer to go to the same stores each time they shop and 22.18% answered they changed regularly brand when they buy laptop.
45.27% of respondents in yogurt drink group indicated they buy the product the same stores. However, 30.53% answered they buy it in different stores and brands. Only 24.21% of them change brands regularly when they buy a yogurt drink.

**Question 17: The habitual & brand-loyal consumer** - For you, with regards to a laptop:

When the respondents in laptop group were asked about brand-loyalty, 46.37% of the respondents stated when they have found laptop they like then they stick with it. Moreover, 22.58% agreed they have favorite brand which were bought over and over. However, 31.05% of respondents stated they will change the brand depend on the period time.
Figure 30: The habitual & brand-loyal consumer (yogurt group)

Looking at the doughnut chart above, you would observe that almost a half of respondents in yogurt group (44.21%) stated they have stuck brand which they like. 32.63% of them answered when they have favorite brand they buy it over and over. Whereas 23.16% agreed they change brand depend on time they buy.
Chapter 5: Analysis

There are number factors that influence the decision making process of the generation Y in Sweden. The purpose of buying is associated with the intention and choices made by the consumers in the process of buying. Generation Y is known to reason out actions and incorporate the perception of peers. Social pressure and the need to fit into groupings have a profound impact on the consumer buying behavior in generation Y. In any business, consumers are known to play a critical role. Generation Y tends to heavily reflect the reality of facts on the ground. Consumer buying behavior and decision making process is intertwined to the perceived outcomes. Different consumers have different needs based on the prevailing demographic factors and the level of understanding. Factors that affect the decision making process of consumers include gender, age, perceived utility of the products and social status. The needs of consumers keep evolving based on the needs and expectations of consumers within different market segments. The survey conducted was aimed at establishing consumer selection and decision-making process with regard to high and low involvement products among the members of generation Y in Sweden.

5.1 Select group

Figure 31: Number and Percentage of respondent in High and low involvement product
(Source: Own researchers)

The respondents confirmed that about 56.62% were in possession of a high involvement product, that is, a laptop. This constituted 56.62% respondents in total. Others 43.38% of the respondents confirmed that they are regular consumers of yogurt, which is a low involvement product. From the data collected. A majority of the members of generation Y are students of Mälardalens University, while the rest are elementary students and working class generation y Swedish inhabitants. More than half of the respondents possess laptops while a significant number of the group is regular consumers of low involvement products.
5.2 Consumer perspective

5.2.1 Product value as a sign

Generation Y considers high involvement products as a show of social class and status according to the research. Consumer perspective in the process of decision-making can be influenced by product value and the perceived mental impact. Over 62% of the respondents stated that the use of high and low involvement products does not reflect their personality. This constituted 283 respondents. Over 23% believed that the use of high involvement products acts as a sign of status. More than 8% use high involvement products as a means to express their personality and therefore important in the consumer buying behavior of the generation Y. About 4 percent believe that high involvement products, in this case laptops, helps in improving their self-image. When it comes to the use of low involvement products, the research used yogurt as a sample product. Over 62 percent stated that they do not perceive low involvement products as necessary in reflecting their status. This means that they do not use product value as a sign. Only 17.37% respondents believe that low involvement products enhance their image in the society. Over 12.63% believe that low involvement product enhance their self-image. This constituted to be 7.37% of respondents. Generation Y believes that the process of decision making entails self-considerations and social status.

5.2.2 Important of product message

Product messages are necessary in the process of assessing the consumer buying behavior of this age group. The respondents were requested to state the importance of product messages. Over 40% of the respondents in laptop group said they are no careful to the importance of the product messages. When it comes to high involvement products, 25.80% of the respondents stated that the product messages are irrelevant while 15.32% stated that
the messages were not of concern to them. Over 18% believed that the product messages that touched on the high involvement products enhance their self-importance. Majority of the respondents (38.42%) believed that low involvement products do not matter. This indicated that generation Y in Sweden does not necessarily consider yoghurt and other such products as an image for social status. Over 33%, which represented 63 respondents, said that they were not concerned which product message. Only a minimal number indicated that low involvement products are of importance to their social image. The majority of the members of generation Y appeared to believe that the low involvement product like yogurt does not have a profound impact of their buying behavior. Research shows that consumer perception is heavily dependent of social status. The decision making process of most of the members of generation Y in Sweden tends to focus on utility as opposed to enhancing the social image. The perspective of the consumers towards high and low involvement products in a number of instances appears to be proportional.

5.2.3 Resultant consumer pleasure

The use of high and low involvement products as a sign of status and self-importance is not prominent. It is likely that majority of the respondents focus on the utility of the products in the process of decision-making just before procurement. Majority of the respondents indicated that the use of the high involvement product was perceived to be fun. Over 63% indicated that their laptops were a source of fun while only 13.30% through the product was very interesting. About 9.67% of the respondents believed the laptops were fascinating. The generation Y in Sweden appears to have a special liking for fun. This means that the decision making process was heavily influenced by the perceived fun in a product. The consumers within the same generation considered the perceived fun in the decision making process while purchasing low involvement products. Over 54% stated that their consume yogurt because it is fun. Only a minimal number considered yoghurt to be extremely exciting. The resultant consumer pleasure plays a significant role in the buying process of youthful consumers. The response from both high and low involvement products appear to be proportional. Generation Y in Sweden is particular when it comes to the fun generated through the decision making process of either categories of products in discussion.
5.3 Decision making process by factors model as per Sproles and Kendall (1986)

The respondents of Laptop and Yogurt were not keen to be defined based on the fashion consciousness of both the high involvement products (58.06% of Laptop & 64.73% of Yogurt)

The respondents of both group believed the well-known brands are the best quality= high quality for them (44.75% of Laptop & 37.36% of Yogurt)

The respondents of both group stated they have the difficult time choosing the best alternative. (41.93% of Laptop & 33.15% of Yogurt)

The respondents of both group stated they look carefully to find the best value for the money. (48.39% of Laptop & 45.79% of Yogurt)

- The 43.95% respondents in laptop group thought it is fun to buy new laptop and exciting.
- The 36.32% respondents in yogurt group thought shopping is not a pleasant activity to them

- The 35.09% respondents in laptop group are perfectionists and they look for the best products while buying.
- The 38.37% respondents in yogurt group stated the products do not have to be perfect for them to get satisfied.

The majority of both respondent groups make buying decisions after a careful assessment. (41.93% of Laptop & 33.15% of Yogurt)

- The 42.74% respondents in laptop group like to shop different stores and choose different brands.
- The 45.27% respondents in yogurt group stated they go to the same stores each time they shop.

The respondents of both group stated that once they find a brand, they stick with it. (46.37% of Laptop & 44.21% of Yogurt)

Figure 33: majority Percentage of both respondent groups in decision making process by factors model as per Sproles and Kendall (1986) (Source: Own researchers)
An overwhelming number of respondents were not keen to be defined based on the fashion consciousness of both the high involvement products. The same case appeared to be reflected in the low end products. The consumer buying behavior of generation Y in Sweden appeared to largely depend on the perceived fun within a product as opposed to social status.

This fact is emphasis by the number of respondents stating that they prefer best-selling brands. This means that majority of the generation Y consumers believe that high prices mean high quality. A large percentage indicated they believe that prices are directly proportional to quality. Most of the buyers from generation Y based their decision making process on brand strength and pricing. Most of these buyers within this group show minimal rational thinking when making the purchase decisions. Most of the respondents appeared to have a strong preference for the best-selling brands. Most of the respondents prefer low involvement products that are of better quality and high prices. The best known brands are often the most preferred.

The study showed that the more respondents learn about products, the more they have a difficult time choosing the best alternative. This constituted about 41.93% of the respondents. A significant percentage of the respondents admitted to making careless purchase decisions they do not intend to purchase.

The majority of the respondents stated that once they find a brand, they stick with it. This applied to both high and low involvement products. This formed over 46% of respondents in high involvement products. Most of the respondents make repeat purchases on the same stores they purchase. When it comes to seeking variety seeking, most of the respondents opted to use different types of stores in both kinds of products. Over 22% percent of the respondents stated that they visited the same stores over and over when it came to high involvement products. The number of respondents visiting the same stores was 32.63%. The slightly less number of people stated that they were involved in purchasing from different shops in order to the best low involvement products.

According to the research conducted, majority of the consumers within the generation Y appear to be motivated by the quality and the perceived utility of both the high and the low involvement products. Consumer decision-making process is normally based on the perceived values and the needs of the consumers. The research shows that the products messages are rarely the driving force behind the consumer buying behavior within among the members of generation Y in Sweden. This means that the majority of consumers in this age group pay more attention to fun and other forms of attraction that have minimal regard for product messages and branding slogans.

The buying behavior and decision making process is not overly different when it comes to dealing with high and low involvement products. Given that no respondent was beyond 31 years or less than 13 years, the survey indicated that the majority of the respondents were young adults who are struggling with identity. The gender appears to have played an important role. Most of the respondents, over 60 percent were females. This explains the
desire to have lesser details when it came to purchasing high involving products. The survey shows that the age, level of education and gender has a profound effect on the consumer buying behaviors. The demographics within the survey indicate that the consumer buying behavior and perspectives affect the choices made on both high and low involvement products among members of generation Y in Sweden. High involvement products have a higher percentage of choice within this age group. It is perceived that majority of the members of this target market are in education institutions and hence the need to have laptops. It is unusual to have a significantly low number of respondents state that they are not overly excited by the status reflected by the products they have. This includes the use of product values as a sign. Studies show that the consumer buying behavior is enhanced by the social status reflected through the possessing of a product. This includes the perceived pleasure a product brings and the messages carried in the product.

Consumers within generation Y in the Sweden institution appeared to be less concerned by the fashion-ability of the products they intended to use. The survey indicated that over 58 percent did not have an obsession about the fashion indicted by the laptops. There is a likelihood that these statistics are likely to change with time as the respondents proceed to other age groups or increase the level of education. Respondents indicated that the economic status have a bearing on their buying behavior. This survey did not assess strongly the consumer buying behaviors. The buying ability is likely to change if majority of the members of generation Y are empowered to purchase whatever the categories they which after being financially empowered.

When it came to time-energy conservation portrayed by consumers, over 68 percent of respondents indicated that they spend time to assess products carefully before making purchases with regard to high involvement products. This is equivalent to 68.95% of respondents in Laptop group. Majority of the respondents are careful to have the best buys. About 51.58% stated that they purchase low involvement products after performing a careful analysis of the products. Given that majority of respondents indicated that they visit a variety of shops with an aim of ensuring they get the best products, the survey revealed that majority of the respondents make buying decisions after a careful assessment. The consumer buying behavior and decision-making process entails ensuring that the needs and expectations of generation Y are reflected after the survey is conducted. Only a small percentage of the respondents pointed to the fact that they make quick buying decisions.

The survey indicated that only few respondents change brands regularly. This indicated that the consumer selection and decision making process is pegged on the level of appearance and perception created in the buying process. When it came to high involvement products, majority of respondents indicated that they are perfectionists and they look for the best products while making purchases. This group formed 35.09% of the respondents. Over 27.52% said they try to make the best procurement in the process of buying high involvement products. According to this survey, there is a deliberate effort to ensure that best purchases are made with regard to high involvement products. The results were slightly different when it came to low involvement products. The majority of respondents stated the products do not have to be perfect for them to get satisfied. This appeared to be a sharp
contrast compared to high involvement products. Only 25.26% of the respondents indicated that they must use the best yoghurt.

The survey revealed that consumers are intentional when it comes to the dynamics that touch on a product. The survey indicates a determination by the generation Y to make informed buying decisions that are based on utility and understanding of the fundamental demographic factors. To many respondents, getting good products is essential. In both high and low involvement products, respondents stated that the perceived fun and excitement is a major issue in the process of making purchases. However, when it came to the recreational consumers, shopping low involvement products was not perceived to be an exciting issue.

The consumer selection process appears to be category specific in some instances with consumers making decisions are reveal they perception in the buying process. A significant number of consumers indicate that the quality and perfection status of a product is of essence to them. Given that majority of the respondents are between the age 19 and 24 and have high school level of education, it is easier to understand why most of the buying behaviors are based on fun and excitement.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In conclusion, the consumer perception and buying behavior in Sweden can be addressed based on a number of demographic factors. These include the factors like age, gender, and the intentions of purchasing the products under discussion among other factors.

According to the survey majority of the respondents stated that they make personal considerations before making purchases. These considerations include understanding the perceived quality of the high or low involvement product and the utility value. Majority of the respondents in this survey were not keen to reflect social status. This can be explained by the age of most of the respondents in the study. Consumer buying behaviors is pegged on the perceived value and the quality of interaction at interface level. The study showed that most of the consumers spend considerable time assessing the importance of the products before they can procure them.

An overwhelming majority of the respondents argue that keen to purchase products that are fun and exciting. The generation Y in Sweden appears to believe that high involvement products must be excited as a prerequisite to making purchases. Only 4 percent of the respondents believed that high involvement products improve self-image. Consumer buying behavior is influenced by the policy and the mental status of the buyers. The mental processing capacity can be perceived as a rare resource among consumers. The decision making process is multifaceted. Consumers are expected to purchase products that make them feel superior or comfortable in some way. The generation Y appears to be keen on ensuring that they make the most acceptable buying process.

The decision making process among the members of generation Y have been closely related to the particular interests within the age group. It can be argued that majority of the members of the generation Y in Sweden have a limited understanding of purchasing behavior at large. According to the respondents, consumer selection can be said to be depend on the current needs and understanding of products. The study reveals that marketing needs to incorporate the realities of prevailing demographics. These include the need to have products that are developed to accommodate certain age groups. It can be argued that majority of the respondents aged between 19 and 24 have a preference for exciting high involvement products.

The study showed a small number of respondents who were over 24 years. It can be stated that this group were more interrogative into the purposes and intents of high involvement products compared to the younger age groups. This can also be connected to the model proposed by Sproles and Kendall in 1986 when they took out some sample of female for their survey. Nevertheless, one could expect that several other un-included factors could have significant influence on the consumer decision-making process. Culture for instance, social class and ages are factors that Sproles & Kendall (1986) failed to include, and which have significant element in the present Swedish generation Y sample. However, comparing the result from Sproles and Kendall research to the one conducted by the present
researchers in Sweden can be seen to have differences in the outcome based on these demographic factors.

For realistic assertions to be made, consumer behaviors must be contextualized during market research. The study reveals that consumer buying behavior and marketing in general is vulnerable to the understanding of the consumers within a given environment. When it comes to low involvement products, most of the respondents argued that they were not overly specific on quality although they prefer good products. This suggests that majority of consumers make average decisions when considering low involvement products.

With regard to high involvement products, the majority of consumers appear to be careful in the process of selection and buying behavior. The study revealed that consumers are willing to take time and travel to a number of shops with an aim of getting an ideal high involvement product. The study revealed that consumers must perceive the products to be exciting and fun for them to buy it.

Generation Y in Sweden is careful to ensure that the process of selection and decision-making is not overly influenced by popular perceptions. Arguably, Consumers in the study were more interested in self-comfort as opposed to belonging to a social class or status. Research shows that consumer buying behavior can be influenced by the external attributes of a product. These include appearance, texture, shape and size. The study revealed that the perceived utility of a product is necessary in the buying process among the Swedish members of generation Y. However, they demographics are supposed to create a mental appeal that endears the consumers to the products. The study revealed that majority of the respondents make a deliberate attempt to reach the best buying purchase decisions. This includes travelling to various shops. The process entails careful considerations of the products being offered.

The situational influences include market offerings, demographics and complexities involved. The internal factors involved in the process of consumer purchasing can affect the motivation and the socialization of the potential buyers among the age group in discussion. The comparative study of the consumer selection and decision-making process that touches on the high and low involvement products reveals that consumers treat different products categories differently. Consumers tend to recognize the need to search for information and make cautious buying decisions especially in high involvement products. This includes an intentional process of evaluating alternatives in the process of making purchases. The study revealed that many respondents did not appear to have strong reference groups. However, the number that made purchases that aimed at establishing self-importance and social classes was significant. Generation Y in Sweden is expected to continue to play an important role when it comes to making purchases in high and low involvement products.

The respondents in the study appeared to be cautious of the psychological risks. Consumers tend to have a decision making process that has an emotional attachment to brand, effectiveness and the perceived outcomes. The consumer buying behavior is subject to social and psychological risks in any given context. The demographic influences play a critical role in the process of determining the buying behavior. The culture of generation Y indicates
that social values can alter the purchase decision-making process. Majority of the respondents, up to 295, had elementary education level. Consumer selection and decision making process with regard to high and low involvement products is dependent of the demographics that matter to most of the members of generation Y in Sweden.
Chapter 7: Recommendation

7.1 Recommendations for Marketing Practitioners

This research studied how Swedish generation Y alters their decision-making style between high involvement and low involvement products that can give information to practitioners. It can help them to brighten their understanding about the Swedish Generation Y buying behaviors. Primarily, it will be a great instrument for the marketers and business managers not only in the studied country but also in other Scandinavian countries as well as all other countries, but especially those who aim to enter Scandinavian market, to have a better knowledge and understanding of today’s consumers.

According to the results, most of the respondents always spend time to consider the important detail of products before purchase. For the high involvement products, the practitioners should take into consideration when developing new product to manufacture products that can encourage the consumer’s excitement and fun. The quality of products is an important factor for attracting the consumer to consider buying the low involvement product.

7.2 Recommendations for Further Research

This study only focused on the Swedish generation Y decision-making style between high involvement and low Involvement Products in Sweden by proposed the model of Spores and Kendall in 1986. This showed that the model of Spores and Kendall apply to the morden day generation Y decision-making.

Therefore further research should be considered in deeper factors of CSI, which the current generation of consumer has been emphasized as fashion conscious consumer, the variety seeking consumer and the habitual & brand-loyal consumer. However, this research investigated to understand the decision making style only in Sweden academic field. This model can also be used for gathering valuable insight for business development.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire


This questionnaire was prepared to be a part of Master thesis of international marketing students at Mälardalen University. This research would like to investigate the Swedish generation Y decision-making style between product high- low involvement and consumer decision-making style. The target group of this questionnaire is Swedish generation Y who has the age between 13 - 31 years old.

All of the data will be used for the academic research with high confidentiality.

### Part A: Demographic

1. **Are you male or female?**
   - Male
   - Female

2. **How old are you?**
   - < 13 years old
   - 13-18 years old
   - 19-24 years old
   - 25-31 years old
   - > 31 years old

3. **What is your current graduation level?**
   - High school
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Doctoral ’s degree

4. **What is your nationality?**
   - Swedish
   - Others

### Part B: High and Low Involvement Product

High involvement product is product which the buyer has to spend time to consider the price, quality and value of product before buy such as laptop, smart phone and jewelry.

Low involvement product is the products which the buyer can buy and use/ eat frequently. Does not need to concern the price such as yogurt, milk and pen.

Please choose ONLY ONE of the following groups of respondents based on your selection
5. You recently bought and have your own laptop computer OR You buy and consume a yogurt drink regularly?

Yes

Part C: Consumer Perspective and Decision making process

6. Product value as a sign - When people see you either using your laptop or drinking your yoghurt brand, the product:
   - Tells other people something about you
   - Helps me express your personality
   - Does not reflect your personality
   - Is part of your self-image

7. Importance of product message - When people see you either using your laptop or drinking your yoghurt brand, the product:
   - Is not relevant to you
   - Does not matter to you
   - Is of no concern to you
   - Is important to you

8. Resultant consumer pleasure - Assuredly your laptop or the yoghurt drink product:
   - Is fun
   - Is fascinating
   - Is exciting
   - Is very interested

9. The fashion conscious consumer – Please only choose ONE sentence that best describes you and the laptop or yogurt drink
   - You usually have one or more of the newest releases of this product line around you
   - As far as this product is concerned, being fashionable and attractively styled is very important to you
   - You keep your possession/usage up to date with the changing market trends in this product line
   - None of them
10. **The brand conscious consumer (Price = quality)** – Ideally, as far as this product is concerned (laptop or yoghurt):
   - The most advertised brands are usually very good choices
   - High-end department and specialty stores offer me the best products
   - The higher the price of a product, the better its quality
   - The more expensive brands usually are my choices
   - You prefer buying the best-selling brands
   - The well-known brands are best for you

11. **The non-precise and otherwise occupied consumer** – Regarding this product line (your laptop or yoghurt drink):
   - All information you get on different products confuses you
   - The more you learn about products, the harder it seems to choose the best
   - There are so many brands to choose from that often you feel confused
   - Often, you make careless purchases you later wish you had not
   - You really don’t give your purchases much thought or care
   - Sometimes, it is hard to choose in which stores to shop

12. **The quality/value conscious consumer** - Ideally, as far as this product is concerned (laptop or yoghurt):
   - Your standards and expectations for products you buy are very high
   - You look carefully to find the best value for the money
   - You make special effort to choose the very best quality products
   - You carefully watch how much you spend.

13. **The recreational & hedonistic consumer** – To you, in view of a laptop or a yoghurt drink:
   - Shopping is not a pleasant activity to you
   - Shopping in stores wastes your time
   - Going shopping is one of the enjoyable activities of your life
   - It is fun to buy something new and exciting
   - You enjoy shopping just for the fun of it

14. **The perfectionist & high-quality conscious consumer**- For you, with regards to a laptop or a yoghurt drink:
   - Getting very good quality is very important to you
   - When it comes to purchasing products, you try to get the very best or perfect choice
In general, you usually try to buy the best overall quality
A product doesn’t have to be perfect, or the best, to satisfy you

15. The time-energy conservationist consumer - Actually, for as long as a laptop or yoghurt drink is concerned:
   o You make your shopping trip fast
   o You shop quickly, buying the first product or brand you find that seems good enough
   o You take time to shop carefully for best buys

16. The variety seeking consumer - For you, with regards to a laptop or a yoghurt drink:
   o You regularly change brands that you buy
   o To get variety, you shop different stores and choose different brands
   o You go to the same stores each time you shop

17. The habitual & brand-loyal consumer - For you, with regards to a laptop or a yoghurt drink:
   o Once you find a product or brand you like, you stick with it
   o You have favorite brands you buy over and over
   o You change brand depend on the period time you buy

Thank you for your time and participation in this study 😊 Tack så mycket 😊
Appendix 2: Cross tabulation of respondents in Demographic

(Total respondents = 438)

- **Question 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.49772</td>
<td>60.50228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.762557</td>
<td>70.09132</td>
<td>22.14612</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>67.3516</td>
<td>26.71233</td>
<td>5.936073</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.621</td>
<td>43.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Cross tabulation of respondents in Laptop group

(Total respondents = 248)

- **Question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.77419</td>
<td>8.064516</td>
<td>66.12903</td>
<td>4.03225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.80645</td>
<td>40.72581</td>
<td>15.32258</td>
<td>18.14516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.30645</td>
<td>9.677419</td>
<td>13.70968</td>
<td>13.30645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.8871</td>
<td>12.90323</td>
<td>18.14516</td>
<td>58.06452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.435484</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.8871</td>
<td>6.048387</td>
<td>21.37097</td>
<td>44.75806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.90323</td>
<td>41.93548</td>
<td>26.6129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.854839</td>
<td>11.69355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.35484</td>
<td>48.3871</td>
<td>14.91935</td>
<td>17.33871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.53226</td>
<td>10.08065</td>
<td>18.54839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.08065</td>
<td>27.82258</td>
<td>14.1129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.53226</td>
<td>14.51613</td>
<td>68.95161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.17742</td>
<td>42.74194</td>
<td>35.08065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.37097</td>
<td>22.58065</td>
<td>31.04839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Cross tabulation of respondents in Yogurt group

(Total respondents = 190)

- **Question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.36842</td>
<td>7.368421</td>
<td>62.63158</td>
<td>12.63158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.84211</td>
<td>38.42105</td>
<td>33.15789</td>
<td>11.57895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.73684</td>
<td>11.05263</td>
<td>18.42105</td>
<td>15.78947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.947368</td>
<td>8.421053</td>
<td>17.89474</td>
<td>64.73684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.421053</td>
<td>18.42105</td>
<td>16.84211</td>
<td>4.210526</td>
<td>14.73684</td>
<td>37.36842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.15789</td>
<td>16.31579</td>
<td>8.947368</td>
<td>18.94737</td>
<td>2.631579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.47368</td>
<td>45.78947</td>
<td>8.947368</td>
<td>25.78947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>36.31579</td>
<td>13.15789</td>
<td>12.10526</td>
<td>28.94737</td>
<td>9.473684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.26316</td>
<td>11.05263</td>
<td>26.31579</td>
<td>37.36842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.89474</td>
<td>20.52632</td>
<td>51.57895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.21053</td>
<td>30.52632</td>
<td>45.26316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.21053</td>
<td>32.63158</td>
<td>23.15789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>