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Background: Brand loyalty is becoming increasingly important for brands in the competitive market. To get brand loyal customers is something that every brand should strive for, since they are a great source of possible income. Getting customers involved in a brand is a way to create brand loyalty. Customers have stronger reactions when exposed to a brand and, therefore, involvement is often seen as an important step in a company’s brand strategy.

Research questions: RQ1: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and behavioral brand loyalty be expressed?
RQ2: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and cognitive brand loyalty be expressed?
RQ3: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and emotional brand loyalty be expressed?

Purpose: The purpose is to explore how low product involvement is related to brand loyalty.

Methodology: A qualitative study with an exploratory approach using semi-structured interviews.

Conclusion: The empirical investigation demonstrated that customers could be brand loyal to low involvement products through the facets pleasure, risk probability, quality, and sentimentality.
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1 Introduction

The introduction chapter starts off with informing the reader about the concept of brand loyalty and product involvement followed by a problem discussion where the researchers problematize the research area. Lastly, the chapter ends with the authors stating the purpose of the study.

1.1 Background

It is becoming increasingly important for brands to make sure that they are competitive in every possible way. Building a strong brand that customers can be loyal towards could be done with the help of a name, sign, symbol, term, design, or a combination of these. Today everything is branded in order to make it easier for customers to purchase products that they will appreciate, find useful and of course be able to identify and come back to (Armstrong et al, 2009). If a brand is competitive and consumers see value in the brand, they will most likely repurchase it (Aaker, 1991).

To have consumers that are loyal towards your brand is something that every brand should prioritize, since those customers are a great source of possible income (Roy, 2011). Jacoby and Kyner (1973) describe brand loyalty as different factors for a customer to engage in, those are; the buying decisions has to be nonrandom, expressed over time, a behavioral response, occur decision making unit, conscious choose the brand even though it exist brands who offer similar products, and it does also have to be a psychological evaluation process. Managers must try to identify these customers, which often have similar tendencies among each other (Hanzaeet al, 2011).

Getting customers involved with a brand is a way to create brand loyalty (Jacoby and Kyner, 1973). The central premise in research is that the more involved a consumer is with a brand, the more loyal the consumer will be towards the brand (Quester and Lim, 2003). Involvement is somewhat differently referred to depending on the research, but there is an emerging consensus for the definition: “Involvement is an unobservable state of motivation, arousal or interest. It is evoked by a particular stimulus or situation and has drive properties. Its consequences are types of searching, information-processing and decision making.” (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985, p.49). Quester and Lim (2003) stress the importance that research must discuss the concept of product involvement from the perspective of the consumer rather than
the product. It is a consumer-defined concept as it is consumers that respond and be involved with products (Quester & Lim, 2003). Quester and Lim (2003) discuss involvement, compared to Kapferer & Laurent (1985) as a consumer’s ongoing commitment in the form of feelings, thoughts and behavioral response towards products. Involved consumers will have stronger reactions when exposed to a certain product, such as in in advertising. Product involvement is today often seen as an important step of a branding strategy (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985).

1.2 Problem discussion
Kapferer and Laurent (1985) argue that individuals are involved with products for different reasons, while also stating that it is hard to determine what it is that makes one involved with a product. An individual might be involved due to cognitive reasons, derived from utilitarian motives. Another might be involved due to affective reasons, derived from emotional motives (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). It is argued that it is especially hard to determine the motives for purchases for low involvement products (Quester and Lim, 2003). There is a discussion in research on which variables that are related to the concept of product involvement (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). Kapferer and Laurent (1985) argue that product involvement cannot be viewed as a single dimensional construct, which it occasionally is, where only one variable relates to product involvement. It should instead be seen as a multidimensional construct with several variables that relate product involvement (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985).

Quester and Lim (2003) discuss the relationship between brand loyalty and product involvement and state that there is a relationship between them, something that can be seen in other research as well (Leclerc & Little, 1997; Iwasaki & Havitz, 1998). The relationship between product involvement and brand loyalty is described in research as a complex relationship that has come to obscure studies as researchers take on different approaches due to the complex nature (Quester & Lim (2003). When researchers refer to this relationship, it is typically done by examining high product involvement or the concept of product involvement from a more general standpoint, instead of examining low product involvement. Researchers tend to choose not to investigate the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty as there are research that argues that there can only be a relationship between high product involvement and brand loyalty (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985; Quester and Lim, 2003; Traylor, 1983). There are however researchers as well that argues for possibilities of a
relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty (Quester and Lim, 2003; Traylor, 1983).

This study will concern low involvement as the gap in research for the relationship between low involvement products and brand loyalty is addressed, something that Quester and Lim (2003) state is needed. Marketers must be able to adapt their branding strategies according to the type of involvement that customers holds towards a product. Because of this, it is important for marketers to understand the dynamics of consumers’ relationships towards different products (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). This is especially essential for marketers concerned with low involvement products as these, compared to high involvement products, typically are more difficult to determine the purchase motives for (Quester and Lim, 2003). Variables typical for examining high product involvement and its relation to brand loyalty will be used when examining low product involvement and its relation to brand loyalty in order to provide a basic framework. The study is furthermore going to explore possible new variables for low involvement products. The exploratory kind of the research is used due to the fact that there are none to little research examining this relationship (Quester and Lim, 2003; Traylor, 1983) and this study will furthermore serve as a starting point for future research to build on when examining the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.

1.3 Purpose
The purpose for this study is to explore how low product involvement is related to brand loyalty.
2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is a literature review of existing literature within the field of brand loyalty and product involvement. The chapter begins with the authors discussing the concept of brand loyalty followed by the theoretical explanation of product involvement. Moreover, the researchers discuss different facets of product involvement, which laid the foundation of this study.

2.1 Brand Loyalty

The building of a strong and positive brand generally leads to a preference of a particular brand among the customers, which over time might lead to brand loyalty. Loyalty consists of a high degree of bonding between customer and a brand. Furthermore, loyal customers are unwilling to switch brands and prefer to stick with a brand that they feel comfortable and satisfied with (Rosenbaum-Elliott et al, 2011). Customers who are loyal towards a brand are also less price sensitive and open to pay a higher price for a specific brand compared to other alternatives, since customers may perceive a unique value in the brand. Another advantage for companies with brand loyal customers is the fact that it can lead to market benefits. Companies get trade leverage and do not need to advertise as much as companies without loyal customers (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001). Marketing advantages can also be obtained from enhanced word of mouth among brand loyal customers (Dick & Basu, 1994) resulting in higher profitability (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001).

Jacoby and Kyner (1973) argue for whether or not a consumer is brand loyal or if the consumer only has a repeated purchase behavior. A consumer who only purchases a brand because it is the cheapest compared to another consumer who actually buys the brand due to satisfaction are examples of different types of brand loyalty (Jacoby & Kyner, 1973). Mittal and Kamakura (2001) mean that consumers who have repeated purchase behavior are less sensitive if changes in satisfaction would arise compared to brand loyal consumers. There are also studies that show a difference in products that are being returned after purchase. Consumers who are purchasing a product due to satisfaction rather than repeated purchase behavior are less likely to return the product to the store (Mittal & Kamakura, 2001).
According to Bloemer and Kasper (1995), it is important to differentiate between consumers who do not have any attachment to the brand and repurchase the brand because of convenience etc., and a consumer who is brand loyal to the brand. A consumer who is committed to the brand is called a brand loyal consumer while a consumer with lack of attachment to the brand is called a spurious consumer. The spurious brand loyal consumer can easily change brand if a better offer would occur, or if some other brand would be more comfortable to buy (Bloemer & Kasper, 1995). Since brands want to achieve brand loyal consumers, different researches have been made to find the most suitable way to do so.

Several authors mentions two important factors that need to be fulfilled by a brand in order to achieve brand loyal consumers. According to He et al (2011); Kabiraj & Shanmugan (2011); Mittal & Kamakura (2001); Rajah et al (2008); and Thompson et al (2014), satisfaction and trust are two of the pillars for building brand loyalty.

Satisfaction and trust are as mentioned two of the most important factors for achieving brand loyalty. The component satisfaction’s relationship to brand loyalty is most often based on consumers repeated purchase behavior. Low satisfaction among consumers does not generate repeated purchases, unless there is no option. Trust on the other hand is in a relationship with both satisfaction and brand loyalty. The more satisfied a consumer is with a brand, the more trust one is going to feel towards both the brand and the producer, which will strengthen the relationship (Rajah et al, 2008). Iglesias et al (2011) also argues about how satisfaction can influence brand loyalty, they mean that positive experiences is underlying in order to make consumers be brand loyal towards a brand.

According to He et al (2011), satisfaction and trust are affiliated to a brand's identity and hence brand loyalty. Uniqueness, economic value and reputation are factors within a luxurious brand’s identity that may satisfy a consumer's symbolic needs and in the long run create trust towards a brand. It is less likely that a luxurious brand’s identity fulfills a consumer's functional needs, this since a consumer most often do not purchases a luxurious brand or product for functional needs (He et al, 2011). Kabiraj and Shanmugan (2011) mean that loyalty may indicate satisfaction but satisfaction is not always connected to loyalty. Arguments for being loyal towards a brand even though it does not satisfies their needs are for example price, availability, switching costs and lack of attractive alternatives. However, in order for a brand to keep their loyal consumers, authentic satisfaction is essential (Kabiraj & Shanmugan, 2011).
2.1.1 Behavioral and Attitudinal Brand Loyalty

In order for researchers to be able to explain brand loyalty as clear as possible, Kabiraj and Shanmugan (2011) and Kim et al (2008) have divided brand loyalty into two different sections; behavioral and attitudinal brand loyalty. Roy (2011), adds one extra section in addition to behavioral and attitudinal brand loyalty as he splits attitudinal loyalty into cognitive and emotional loyalty. An uncomplicated definition of behavioral loyalty is that it is based on consumer’s behavior, how they act in different situations (Kabiraj & Shanmugan, 2011; Roy, 2011). Oliver (1999) use a similar definition to explain behavioral loyalty; it is when a consumer have decided to buy something, in other words it is not a coincidence that a specific brand is purchased, and the consumer have also decided to repurchase it. In addition to these definitions, Hunt et al, (2012) mean that there needs to exist continual purchase occasions to be a behavioral brand loyal consumer. A problem with this type of loyalty research is the fact that one does not discover why consumers repurchase etc. a brand, instead one only finds out the outcome of the behavior (Dick & Basu, 1994).

In comparison to behavioral brand loyalty, attitudinal loyalty focuses on consumer’s attitude towards a brand, how they feel and what perceive the brand rather than how they behave towards it (Kabiraj Shanmugan, 2011). Attitudinal loyalty concerns one’s preferences for different brands, the commitment and the intended purchases for the future. Furthermore, a consumer can have both a negative and positive attitude towards a brand (Härtel & Russell-Bennett, 2010). As mentioned earlier, Roy (2011) divided attitudinal loyalty into cognitive and emotional loyalty, where cognitive loyalty represents what a consumer think about a brand and emotional loyalty represents how one feel about a brand. The cognitive loyalty is based on what a consumer is aware of regarding a brand, for example prices and features, and the psychological preferences towards a brand exists (Roy, 2011). According to Oliver (1994), cognitive loyalty is the most preferred form of loyalty since it is about information gathering and preferences about different brands. Härtel and Russell-Bennett (2010) argue that a purchase decision based on cognitive brand loyalty are evaluated and based on decisions, compared to emotional where it is more likely to be a spontaneous purchasing decision.

Emotional brand loyalty is more based on satisfaction than behavioral and cognitive brand loyalty. In this case, brand loyalty is based on to what degree positive feelings occur when purchasing a specific brand (Roy, 2011). It is attachment to the brand rather than a positive
attitude towards it that makes a consumer repurchases the brand (Härtel & Russell-Bennett, 2010). The products which consumers are emotionally brand loyal towards are most often products that create enjoyment, entertainment and satisfaction. However, one can also be emotionally brand loyal to for example different sports, movies and products that create emotional attachment (Roy, 2011).

2.2 Product Involvement
Product involvement is a term that is derived from social psychology and refers to the relationship between an individual and an object (Hanzaee et al, 2011), often described as the individual’s general interest in the product (Lada et al, 2014). This interest could take the form of an individual's feelings, thoughts and behavioral response. The concept has been applied into marketing and consumer behavior with numerous researchers using the concept as way to understand both various consumer groups and behavioral habits (Hanzaee et al, 2011).

Product involvement is typically divided into two categories, high or low. An individual that spend a lot of time and energy in decision making and searching for information for differences among products can be considered a highly involved consumer. An individual that on the contrast spends limited time and effort in decision-making and information search can be considered a low involved customer (Lada et al, 2014).

2.2.1 Facets of product involvement
Product involvement should according to Hanzaee et al (2011) and Lada et al (2014) be viewed as a multidimensional construct. The concept of product involvement is rich in nature and it would seem insufficient to examine it from only a singular variable (Hanzaee et al, 2011). The way to describe the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty is through different facets. A facet is used often together with others to describe a concept, such as product involvement. The emergence of the today's often used facets to describe product involvement can be traced back to the first discussion on consumer behavior by Festinger (1957). Festinger (1957) firstly discussed dissonance regarding the involvement process in the decision-making and post decisional making of product purchases. The discussion concern the consumers thought on a purchased product in relation the pre alternatives (Festinger, 1957). Kapferer and Laurent (1985) mention this as two of the five
facets that make up for product involvement, called risk probability and risk importance. Risk probability regards an individual's probability of making a miss purchase. This could take the form of the individual not being sure of what product to choose. Risk importance concerns an individual's negative perceived consequences after a miss purchase. This concerns the individual's view on whether a miss purchase is considered annoying or not (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985).

Kapferer and Laurent (1985) compiled the five often used facets, which are independent of each other in the sense that do not continually build on each other, to examine and describe product involvement today. The other facets except for the two previously mentioned of risk probability and risk importance are interest, pleasure and sign. Interest concerns the general interest or attached importance that an individual holds towards products (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). It occupies an individual's thoughts without necessarily leading to an immediate purchase. Interest in a product often comes from that the individual perceive that the product meet one's important goals and values (Hanzaee et al, 2011). Pleasure concerns the rewarding value connected with certain products (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985), which provides the individual with enjoyment and pleasure (Hanzaee et al, 2011). Sign concerns the perceived image that one holds with a product and how that is related to oneself. If a product’s perceived image lies near the individual's self-perception, there is an increased chance of purchase. It is important to be aware of the distinction between whether an individual purchases the product because of its image lying near one’s self-perception, as previously mentioned, or because of the image it portrays towards others, which also could justify a purchase. Individuals do not always purchase a product since its image is suited with one's view of oneself, but because you will be perceived by others depending on the purchased product (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985).

Kapferer and Laurent (1985) compiled these five facets after studying previous research of involvement. Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) five developed facets have been acknowledged in other research concerning product involvement thereafter (Hanzaee et al, 2011; Lada et al, 2014; Quester & Lim, 2003). Though the five facets are acknowledged in research (Hanzaee et al, 2011; Kapferer & Laurent, 1985; Lada et al, 2014; Quester & Lim, 2003), the facet of price is mentioned as well (Behe et al, 2015; Lada et al, 2014). Behe et al (2015) state that there is not much research examining the relationship between price and product involvement, but mention that the little there is discusses the price sensitivity aspect for low product
involvement and high product involvement. This discussion concerns the degree to which an individual react upon the change in price depending on the product (Behe et al, 2015). Behe et al (2015) mention that the little research done examining this relationship often state that the more involved an individual is with a product, the less price sensitive this individual is and vice versa. Behe et al (2015) study however shows inconsistencies with the previously little research done on this relationship as the mentioned of high product involvement relating to low price sensitive and vice versa is not supported in their research, meaning as mentioned by Behe et al (2015) that the relationship must be further examined.

### 2.3 Theoretical summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concepts</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>An individual’s different ways of bonding with a certain brand, which can be drawn to a consumer’s willingness to repurchase a brand or unwillingness to switch brand (Armstrong et al, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral-, Cognitive- and Emotional Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Brand loyalty divided in order to differentiate between a consumer’s purchase behavior and what thoughts and feelings a consumer has when making a decision (Kabiraj &amp; Shanmugan: Roy, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Involvement</td>
<td>An individual’s spent time and energy towards an object, often viewed to characterize various consumer groups and behavioral habits (Hanzaee et al, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facets of product involvement</td>
<td>Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) five acknowledged, compiled facets of interest, pleasure, sign, risk probability and risk importance which are used to study product involvement. Furthermore, price has been used as well to study product involvement (Behe et al, 2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Research model and research questions

The authors constructed a research model based on the existing literature. The model constructed shows the different facets that are intended to explore brand loyalty and landed in three research questions that needed to be answered in order to meet the purpose.

3.1 Research model

The purpose for this thesis was to explore how low product involvement is related to brand loyalty since this is an unexplored gap in research. There are researches that examine high product involvement and its relation to brand loyalty, and this research (Quester & Lim, 2003) will work as a framework for which to base this thesis on. This will be done by examining the five facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) together with the facet price (Behe et al, 2015). This will be done in order to see how the different facets affect brand loyalty for low product involvement while also having an open mind for new possible facets, which might be explored for low involvement products. Brand loyalty was determined from the components behavioral-, cognitive- and emotional brand loyalty (Kabiraj & Shanmugan, 2011).

The approach is exploratory due to the reason that it is an unexplored gap in research (Quester & Lim, 2003), and because of that, the study will serve as a starting point for future research to build on when examining the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.
3.2 Research questions

**RQ1**: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and behavioral brand loyalty be expressed?

**RQ2**: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and cognitive brand loyalty be expressed?

**RQ3**: How can the relationship between the facets for low product involvement and emotional brand loyalty be expressed?
4 Methodology chapter

This methodological chapter will explain the researcher's approach to the study. The chapter consists of theoretical explanations of the methods used, followed by the authors motivating choice and approach of the study. The researchers criteria when searching for accurate sources can be found in Appendix 1.

4.1 Research approach

4.1.1 Inductive vs. Deductive research
There are two research designs that can be used when conducting a study, inductive and deductive research. Inductive research strategy is grounded on that the theory is the result of the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Furthermore, inductive research can be explained as the research improves or creates the theory out of the data collected during the study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Accordingly, inductive research signifies that the conclusions are based on the observations and, through it, forms a new theory. The opposite of inductive reasoning is deductive research where a hypothesis is constructed based on existing literature (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The deductive approach initiates with an investigation of existing literature, and from that, a hypothesis can be founded that is based on the existing literature. The hypothesis constructed needs to be expressed in operational terms. In other words, it has to be shown precisely how variables or concepts are to be measured prior to the empirical testing (Saunders et al, 2009). Depending on the collected data from the research, the hypothesis can either be rejected or accepted. Lastly, potential modification of the existing theory might be a fact depending on the findings (Bryman & Bell 2011).

The authors implemented a deductive approach when conducting the study due to the fact that the data gathering process derives from existing literature. The researchers utilized existing literature when investigating low product involvement within the concept of brand loyalty in this exploratory study. Based on the findings, the researchers developed an own conceptual model that was presented in the analysis chapter.

4.1.2 Qualitative vs. Quantitative
A qualitative compared to a quantitative study can be seen as having a more exploratory orientation (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). A qualitative study uses words rather than numbers to explain findings and theories (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This as the data gathering process
takes place more near the natural environment, close to individuals, taking their perspectives and say into account (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). This approach is therefore seen as more subjective compared to a quantitative study (Abusabha, 2003). Researchers interpret the findings in a qualitative study from that very context differently, in their own way. A qualitative study can also be seen as less formal as the steps in the procedure are not as clear and distinct, much focus in a qualitative study lies on the process, which compared to a quantitative study, is more dynamic and shifting (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Emphasis in a qualitative study is on understanding (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005), meaning to obtain a deeper knowledge of the whole picture (Bryman & Bell, 2011) rather than to test and verify previous findings, as in a quantitative study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

This thesis was conducted with a qualitative approach, as the purpose of the study was to explore the relatively unexplored gap in research concerning the relationship between the concepts of low product involvement and brand loyalty. This thesis will hence serve as starting point for future research to build on when examining this relationship. The data gathering process took place within the specific context of the particular chosen products in order to meet the purpose.

4.2 Research strategy
The research strategy means the framework or plan for data gathering, answering of the research question(s) and the way the data is to be analyzed. The research strategy therefore influences what kind of data is gathered and its quality. As the research strategy is connected to the research questions, a poor research strategy framework will inevitably lead to badly formulated or answered research questions. It is therefore important for researchers to be able to choose the right research strategy in order to execute the research in the best possible manner (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

Jacobsen (2002) argue for an exploratory strategy approach when research is unexplored and the researchers expect to present new relationships (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). This is done in order to concretize something that there is a need to get a better understanding of. Exploratory research are often said to develop new theories and hypotheses. The research for exploratory studies is hence often characterized by being open (Jacobsen, 2002). The exploratory research requires a more flexible approach due to this in order to solve the
research problem(s). The skillset needed by the researchers in exploratory research is their ability to observe, obtain information, and theorize (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

This thesis is going to be of an exploratory kind as the purpose is to explore the relatively unexplored gap in research concerning the relationship between the concepts of low product involvement and brand loyalty. Since the authors have not used the facets in the same context as Kapferer and Laurent (1985), the exploratory approach was seen as most suitable for this study.

4.3 Data source
Data sources can be categorized as either primary or secondary. Primary data is data collected by the researcher personally (Larsen, 2009) for the specific research problem at hand (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005) while secondary data is data collected from previous research (Larsen, 2009). Data gathered directly from people in the form of interviews, for example, is considered as primary data. The researcher gathers the information directly from the source, hence the term primary data (Jacobsen, 2002). This thesis had its focus on primary data solely. The empirical material was gathered through semi-structured interviews. There are advantages and disadvantages with both primary and secondary data. However the decision on which, or both, to use depends much on the research question(s), research objectives and what research that has previously been done. The main advantage with primary data is that the researchers collect information for a specific research at hand. This makes the researchers more consistent with their research objectives and research design. However, collecting primary data can take long time and may cost a lot, which is considered to be the main disadvantage with primary data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

The researchers conducted interviews in order to be able to collect primary data to meet the purpose of exploring the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty. The researchers had to gather primary data due to the unexplored gap in research. The researchers could not adopt any secondary data since there were no studies done examining the relationship between brand loyalty and low product involvement.
4.4 Research Design
A research design is considered to be a framework for the collection and analysis of data and it is related to the criteria that are employed for evaluating business research. Furthermore, a research design should be selected based on the study's research question and the set of criteria that suits the researchers interest (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Bryman & Bell (2011) mentions experimental design, quasi-experiment, cross-sectional design, longitudinal design, and case study as different research design approaches. The authors evaluated the research design approach for this study and agreed upon a cross-sectional design.

Bryman and Bell (2011) discuss the cross-sectional research design, stating that this type of research must involve at least two different cases and is most often used during a quantitative study, even though it can be used in a qualitative study as well. Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) mention that a cross-sectional case study includes numerous observations to be examined. For a study to use cross-sectional design, it should be interested in some sort of variation. This type of research design is used in order to find patterns of association and study relationships between different variables. It is hard to show if the relationship between the variables are a casual or a “real” relationship since no experimental design have been used. Instead, the researcher only discovers the existence of a relationship between variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The reason the cross-sectional design is used in this study is due to the fact that it examines if and how of a relationship between different variables exist. Since this study seeks to explore if there exist any relationship between Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) five facets, price, and low product involvement, the cross-sectional design was seen as the most suitable (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

4.5 Data collection method
There are different ways of gathering data depending on the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and its research question(s) and research problem(s). The selected method is thus not a choice of quality but of best-suited procedure for the research. The different data gathering procedures are related to either a quantitative or a qualitative approach. The simple distinction between the two of them is that the quantitative data gathering methods are regarded more statistical with employed measurements. Qualitative data gathering methods are instead, compared to quantitative data gathering methods, rational, exploratory and intuitive (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005) with the researcher working closer to the participants (Bryman & Bell,
Because of this, the skill set of the researcher(s) plays an important role in the gathering (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and analysis of data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

Data collecting methods considered quantitative are structured interviews, structured observations, surveys and experiments. Data gathering procedures considered qualitative are unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews, participant observations and focus groups (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The qualitative data collecting method chosen for this thesis was semi-structured interviews since it enables the researchers to ask questions about the chosen facets while also being open enough to talk freely and explore other possibilities for brand loyalty and its relation to low involvement products.

4.5.1 Semi-structured interviews
According to Bryman and Bell (2011), interviews are presumably the most used method for collecting data in a qualitative study. In a semi-structured interview, the interviewer has a type of interview guide with various topics that are meant to be discussed. This type of interviewing is most often used during a qualitative research, even though exceptions may appear. The researcher leads the interviewee into subjects but the interviewee is free to elaborate his/hers answers and bring up information that could be valid to the subject. This also invites the interviewer to ask follow-up questions in order to further develop the answer (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In a study, which is using semi-structured interviews, both the topic and people who are going to be interviewed are decided before the study starts. It is also, in comparison to structured interviews, demanding more from the interviewers. A researcher, who are using semi-structured interviews are often collecting information that could be considered personal, attitudinal and value-laden material, this means that the interviewer needs to have the social aspects in mind when collecting and using the information (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) also argue for the fact that semi-structured and unstructured interviews compared to structured interviews are more suitable when one wants to discover new information, this since the interviewees have an opportunity to develop their answers further.

It is argued by Bryman and Bell (2011) that flexible is a word that can be used to describe the process of semi-structured interviews. The interviewer is not completely aware of which type of information one will receive or how the interview will come along. Because of this, a great
responsibility rests on the interviewers to keep both the interview to what is relevant and to be able to understand or discover patterns in the interviewee's behavior while conducting the interview (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

**Interview Guide**

An interview guide in a qualitative research can relate to a shorter list with different subjects that are meant to be covered during the interview. Compared to an interview schedule, which is used during a structured interview, an interview guide is much less specific. What is important is that the questioning is flexible and allows the respondent to elaborate their answers (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Before using the interview guide, it is important that questions have been compared to the research subject in order to test both the consistency of the questions and to make sure that the questions are accurate and correct. This to get as relevant information as possible for the study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

The questions that were used in the interviews were based on the theoretical chapters where Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) five facets, and price (Behe et al, 2015) together with other possible facets were discussed in relation to behavioral, cognitive and emotional brand loyalty.

The interview guide that was used during the interviews where based on chapter *Operationalization* (4.5.2). The interview guide can be found in appendix two.

**Pre-test**

It is considered wise before conducting interviews to do pre-tests of the interviews that are to come. This will give the researchers an indication of whether the questions will work, if the interviewees understand the questions, if the information gathered are relevant or if there are any other problems that might occur during the interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It is hence important that one makes a plan for both how to present the information for the interviewees in the best possible manner as well as determining the time-frame for conducting the interviews. The researchers must also take the issue of social conventions into calculation when conducting the interviews. That is how to behave and present yourself so that you as researchers give a good impression. If possible, the researchers should go through the interview questions together with a tutor/supervisor before the pre-test in order to assure that everything will work (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).
The researchers made sure to check the questions with the tutor for this study in order to make sure that they were to be perceived correctly and that they would give the information wanted in regard to the operationalization and conceptual model. The feedback helped the researchers to improve the questions and once they were approved, the researchers started the pre-testing of the interviews. A total of three individuals were pre-interviewed, and as these interviews seemed to be working fine without any real problems, the researchers took the decision to do the real interviews.

4.5.2 Operationalization
It is important in research to define concepts and theories in order to be able to connect them together and relate them to gather data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). This in order to assure that the examined is in alignment with the operationalization for the research. The operationalization hence helps to ensure that the concepts help gather suitable data (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The facets/concepts serve as a basis of the operationalization for this thesis. These facets/concepts were gathered when reviewing existing literature and are described in the operationalization figure. The facets of product involvement in the operationalization model are conceptually and operationally defined. There are corresponding questions, which were used in the interviews, in their relation to behavioral, cognitive and emotional brand loyalty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept/facet</th>
<th>Conceptual definition</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interest          | Concerns an individual’s general interest in a product (Kapferer and Laurent, 1985)  | Used to explore if and how much one’s possible interest in low involvement products could affect the behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty. | - How is your interest in the product expressed through your purchase behavior? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- How is your interest towards the product affected by your thoughts about it? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- How is your interest towards the product affected by your feelings about it? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
| Pleasure          | “Hedonic and rewarding value of the product class” (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985, p 50)  | Used to explore if and how much one’s possible pleasure in low involvement products could affect the behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty. | - Do you find pleasure in purchasing the product? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- How is your pleasure towards the product affected by your thoughts about it? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- How is your pleasure towards the product affected by your feelings about it? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
| Sign              | Concerns an individuals perceived correspondence with a product and the image which it portrays (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985) | Used to explore if and how much one’s possibly perceived sign value in low involvement products could affect the behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty. | - Do you buy the product because it tells something about you? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- Do you think about what the product tells about you? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- Can the sign value of the product affect your feelings towards it? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
| Risk probability  | “Subjective probability of making a miss purchase” (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985, p. 50) | Used to explore if and how much one’s possible risk probability in low involvement products could affect the behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty. | - Are you sometimes unsure in your choice when purchasing the product? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- What are your thoughts towards the product when there is uncertainty in choice? (Cognitive brand loyalty) |
| Risk importance | “Perceived importance of the negative consequences of making a mispurchase” (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985, p. 50) | Used to explore if and how much one’s possible risk importance in low involvement products could affect the behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty. | - How do you react when/if you miss purchase the product? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- What are your thoughts when/if you miss purchase the product? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- What are your feelings when/if you miss purchase the product? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Price          | Perceived price sensitivity in regard to purchased product (Behe et al, 2015)                    | Used to explore if and how much one perceives price to affect them in their behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty towards low involvement products. | - Does the price affect your purchase behavior towards the product? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- Does the price affect your thoughts about the product? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- Does the price affect your feelings about the product? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
| Other          | -                                                                                               | Used to explore if there are other facets in addition to Kapferer and Laurent’s five (1985) and price that affect individuals in their behavioral-, cognitive-, and emotional brand loyalty towards low involvement products. | - Do you believe that there is something else that affects your purchase behavior towards the product? (Behavioral brand loyalty)  
- Do you believe that there is something else that affects your thoughts towards the product? (Cognitive brand loyalty)  
- Do you believe that there is something else that affects your feelings towards the product? (Emotional brand loyalty) |
4.6 Sampling
Once the research problem(s), research design and data collected method is determined, the elements for which the information will be gathered must be addressed. This is an important step in the sampling process as the gathered data should be as representative as possible. Sampling is thus referred to as the way of which information is gathered. The data is applied for a whole specific population, but gathered by only examining a part of the whole population. Doing otherwise, that is examining not only a sample but also the whole population, would be too expensive and time consuming. The sample selection of people must therefore be representative for the whole population. In order to decide on the sample population, the researchers must be clear on what kind of information is wanted. Otherwise, the configuration for the whole sampling process will lead to examine data not relevant for the study (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

The sampling process involves a series of steps when determining the target group relevant for the research. The first step is considered to be a definition of the chosen target group (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The target group should be defined in terms of elements, sampling units, and the extent and time for the research. The term element explains criteria’s for which the information is relevant. Sampling unit refers to a single or set of elements considered for selection during the course of the sampling process. Extent is referred to the geographical boundaries for the study while time explains the restricted time frame for the research. The second step is to determine the sampling frame, which is described as the actual individuals chosen for the sampling process (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The next step is to determine the whole procedure for how the sample gathering is going to take place followed by deciding on number of sample units. Once the units are selected, the researchers go out in the field and collect the data from the sampling units (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

4.6.1 Sampling population and sampling procedure
The first step is to determine the relevant target group with following time- and boundaries constraints for the sampling procedure. This in order to get as correct reliable data gathered as possible. The sample population should be as similar in characteristics to the actual population as possible as deficiencies otherwise will lead to non-representative results. It is therefore important to be as comprehensive as possible when setting up the frame for which the people are going to be chosen by. This is especially important in research were the goal is to examine something where there is known to be differences between the ones involved in
the research area and those not. Researchers must be precise and make sure that the interviewees know the area that they are talking about. This kind of research is considered to be more purposive than random. Though this is considered a more strategic way of sampling data gathering, it is not to be considered completely non-random (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The researchers conducting the study applied the concept of snowball sampling when the interviews were set-up. The authors established contact with a group of people whom were relevant for the topic, and then used these people to establish contact with others that as well were relevant for the topic. Snowball sampling is not considered to be random since it is difficult to know the exact extent of the population. By large, snowball sampling is not used within quantitative studies, but within qualitative. The choice of sampling application was selected due to the fact that there is no available framework for sampling the population from which it should be taken, and the trouble of establishing such a framework means that an approach as snowball sampling is the only feasible one (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Since the purpose of thesis was to explore the relationship between brand loyalty and low product involvement, the researchers needed products established for being regarded as low involvement products. Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) research mentioned such products, many of them being household products. Thereby, the researchers used three examples of low involvement products when conducting the semi-structured interviews for the sampling process. This in order to assure that the interviewees had a product to connect and consider to when answering the questions, which would allow for a better flow in the interview. Hence, all the interviewees had to be at least partly responsible for making purchases of low involvement products for their household. This was done in order to assure that those interviewed would represent the whole population of those purchasing such household products (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Though the choice in sample population had to be partly responsible for household purchases, the choice of respondents depended on the snowball sampling. The researchers made sure that there were no attachments towards the interviewed either, as this has the possibility to affect the gathered data. This will in greater extent lead to more adequate gathered data, freer from deficiencies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Once ten interviews were conducted (list of respondents can be seen in appendix three), the researchers determined that theoretical saturation was reached as the answers were considered similar and repetitive with deep enough data to conduct a reliable analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2011).
The interviews took place face-to-face rather than over telephone as it is considered more personal and enabled the interviewees to talk more freely. The interviewers also made sure that it was the interviewees that decided where they wanted to be interviewed as this meant they would, in greater extent, be interviewed in their more natural environment. The interviewers also made sure that there were only two interviewers at each interview as it was considered that more could perhaps create a more tense setting as the interviewee might feel like there were too many people watching and observing. It was neither practicable to conduct an interview by oneself, this since the answers from the respondents had to be recorded, both by notes and audio. This at the same time as the actual interview was conducted. Therefore, the interviews were conducted with two interviewers in order to ensure that nothing of the discussed content would be missed or misinterpreted (Jacobsen, 2002).

4.7 Ethical issues
Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) defines ethics as “moral principles and values that influence the way a researcher or a group of researchers conduct their research activities” (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005, p19). Ethics are applied to any situation or social setting where potential harm may occur to anybody (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Discussions about ethical issues occur when conducting business research. It may involve how to treat the participants of a study and how to behave against them. Ethical issues may occur when the researchers conceals the purpose with an investigation for a specific reason (Jacobsen, 2002). Bryman & Bell (2011) mentions four main issues within ethical issues that the researcher should take under consideration when conducting the interviews: (1) Harm to participants may include mental harm as well as physical harm. The participants should never feel that the researchers have lowered their self-esteem or that their identity has been exposed during an investigation. Confidentiality is something the researchers need to take under consideration in order to minimize the risk of the participants being identified. (2) Lack of informed consent means that if the researcher asks people to participate in a study, the respondents should receive complete information about the research process. Furthermore, the MRS’s\(^1\) Code of Conduct states that if the researchers decide to record the interview, the participants should be informed and asked about it prior to the interview. The principal of this is that the respondents should be

\(^1\) Marketing Research Society, professional association, which formulates codes of ethics.
informed in fully about the research and have an opportunity to accept or decline participation. (3) Invasion of privacy is an issue that concerns to what degree the researchers may invade the privacy of the participants. The MRS guidelines state clearly that the aim for a research is to not give the researcher any right to invade the privacy of the participants or should not, in any way, disrespect the participant’s values. (4) Deception refers to the AoM’s Code of Ethical Conduct as they state that false reflections should be minimized and, if it is still necessary, the degree and effects of this should be as minimal as possible. Researchers should be careful when considering the potential benefits of a research in respect with not harming the participant’s dignity. If a research reaches a point where deception or false reflections occur, the participants that have been harmed should receive a complete and understandable explanation and, if needed, even provide the participants with psychological counseling (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The researchers conducted the interview with these four ethical issues in concern. The authors made sure that the respondents were aware that their answers were treated completely anonymously. If a respondent stated something interesting, they were also asked if the researchers could use the information as quotations in the study. The researchers also made sure that the respondents understood the research area and what they were expected to answer to. This was done in order to ensure that the questions would not be misinterpreted and that no inaccurate data would be used in the study. It was also made clear to the respondents that they were not forced to answer any question if they did not want or could do so. After the conducted interviews, the investigators discussed the gathered data in order to make sure that content were interpreted similarly. This in order to make sure that gathered material was reflected accurately.

4.8 Data Analysis Method- Grounded Theory

According to Bryman and Bell (2011), grounded theory is by far the most common framework for analyzing qualitative data, and it is defined as “theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process.” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p.576). Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) discuss grounded theory as well, stating that any type of research needs theories, both in order to make sense of the collected data and to be able to conduct the study. A qualitative research is relatively demanding for a researcher in

---

2 American Academy of Management, professional association, which formulates codes of ethics.
regard to the fact that one should be able to observe, conceptualize and theorize. When using grounded theory, the data collection, analysis and theories have a close relationship to each other, and is described as an iterative approach where data collection and analysis is repeatedly referring back to one another (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Three aspects of grounded theory which are used in this research are coding, theoretical saturation and constant comparison.

The most important procedure within grounded theory is coding, where data are broken down into different components. Simply put, codes serve as a sort of tool to label, separate, compile and organize the data. The collected data is regarded as potential indicators of different concepts, which constantly are compared (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Strauss and Corbin (1990) has developed three different types of coding within grounded theory, these are Open coding, Axial coding and Selective coding. Open coding is the “the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p.61). Axial coding is “a set of procedures whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding, by making connections between categories” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p.96). Selective coding is “the procedure of selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p116).

As mentioned in the sampling procedure (4.6.1), all interview were recorded with notes taken. Once the interviews were conducted, the researchers started the coding process of the gathered material in order to find patterns. The process could be connected to open coding, as the researchers examined, compared and categorized the gathered data in order to be able to create the models mentioned in the analysis.

Another aspect to consider is theoretical saturation, which is divided into two different parts, the coding of data and the collection of data. The coding of data refers to when the researcher considers that there is no need for further investigation to see how well it fits with the categories or concepts. Regardless of how much more data being collected, no difference will occur. The collection of data means that the researchers has developed a concept, and may decide to collect more data to determine the nature of it. However, the researchers might
eventually reach a point where the data does not irradiate the concept further and may therefore stop the data gathering process for further investigation (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Bryman & Bell (2011) describes constant comparison as a process of preserving the close conjunction between the data and the research concept so the researchers indication is not lost. The constant comparison allows the researcher to compare the coded phenomenon under constant occasions in order for a theoretical elaboration to be raised (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Regardless of the researchers pointing out the aim for constant comparison, the techniques and methods remain rather unclear due to the reason that it is up to the researchers to estimate what they consider to be relevant information for the study. It is therefore important for the researchers conducting the study to understand the procedure in order to estimate the value of the research (Boeije, 2002).

### 4.9 Quality Criteria

Bryman and Bell (2011), and Golafshani (2003) both discuss reliability, validity, and replication as essential criteria’s for estimating the quality in business research. A study should be a method for collecting empirical data. No matter what kind of empirical data that is gathered, the research should achieve two requirements. The study should; (1) be valid and relevant (validity), and (2) reliable and credible (reliability) (Jacobsen, 2002). Reliability refers to the question if the outcome of a research is repeatable. Reliability is closely related to the criterion replicability. In order for a study to be considered reliable and replicable, the research must be able to be replicated and repeated. Validity refers to the outcome of the conclusion based on the research and that the measurement instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. It is a matter of whether or not the research concept measures what it has been constructed to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Bryman & Bell (2011) highlights *external reliability, internal reliability, internal validity, and external validity* as criteria in relation to qualitative research.

#### 4.9.1 External reliability

External reliability is concerned with the degree if a study can be replicated and repeated. It is a challenging criterion when it comes to qualitative research, since it is considered to be impossible to “freeze” a social environment. However, there are suggestions of approaches that one can introduce in order to endeavor external reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Bryman & Bell (2011) mentions that in order to achieve external reliability, the qualitative
researcher that replicates the study needs to apply a similar social setting as adopted by the original researcher. Otherwise the researcher replicating the original study will not hear or see the same information, and will therefore not be comparable to the original study (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Since it is difficult to achieve external reliability in a qualitative study, the authors explained the environment in which the interviews took place and in what way the interviews were conducted in order to endeavor as high external reliability as possible. The researchers explained in what way the respondents were chosen for participation. This led to the authors conducting interviews with a relevant target group for the study.

4.9.2 Internal reliability
What Bryman & Bell (2011) mean with internal reliability is that the research team, two or more, agree upon what they see and hear. It is therefore up to the researchers to determine how to interpret the data and if the information gathered is relevant for their study (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The authors implemented the criterion of internal reliability by recording the interviews and taking notes during the interviews. The recorded material was transcribed in order for the researchers to get an overview of the empirical data and extracted the most relevant information for the study. Furthermore, the researchers implemented Bryman & Bell (2011) method of grounded theory and coding in order to analyze the data properly.

4.9.3 Internal validity
Internal validity concerns the issue of whether or not there is a good connection between the observations of the researchers and the theoretical concepts that they elaborate. It is argued that internal validity is a strength when it comes to qualitative research since the participation of groups and social settings over some time enables the investigator to ensure a high level of conformity between the concepts and observations (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It is a matter of whether the results of the investigation are true (Grønhaug, 2005).

In order to attempt to achieve internal validity, the authors constructed questions for the participants based on the theoretical framework used in this study. The semi-structured questions were constructed in a way that let the respondents discuss and elaborate their
answers while not drifting away from the original concept. In the end, the facets were intended to explore the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.

**4.9.4 External validity**
External validity is an issue that is concerned with the question that if the results of a research can be generalized. It includes the issue of how different people are selected for participation in the research. Apart from internal validity, external validity tends to be an issue for qualitative studies due to their inclination to apply case studies and small samples (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Generalizability was not possible for this study, due to the reason that investigation, purpose, target group, chosen products, etc., are typical for this field of research. External validity was included in order to present the other criteria Bryman & Bell (2011) mentions as criteria for quality in qualitative research.
5 Empirical Investigation

The empirical investigation consists of primary data collected by ten semi-structured interviews conducted by the researchers. The collected material from the interviewees is divided and presented in the three components within brand loyalty: behavioral brand loyalty, cognitive brand loyalty, and emotional brand loyalty.

Interview introduction

All interviews started with a narrow explanation of both brand loyalty and low product involvement. This in order to make sure that the respondents would understand the questions and for the researchers to extract relevant information. The researchers had selected three different household products that the respondents could have in mind while answering the questions. The three products were dish soap, detergent and hand soap and these were chosen since research have shown that these are considered as low involvement products (Kapferer & Laurent, 1985). There has been ten different interviews conducted whence nine were women and one was a man.

In clarification for the reader, the facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) and the facet price (Behe et al, 2015) are referred to as facets while other, new explored are referred to as factors.

5.1 Behavioral Brand Loyalty

The interviews were as mentioned based on Kapferer and Laurent’s (1985) five facets and price that Behe (2015) mentions as an extended facet. The first facet that was discussed was whether or not it existed an interest towards the product and if this could be reflected in a consumer's purchase behavior. Everybody stated that they did not have any interest at all regarding these type of products, it was rather a product one needed to have and the fact that it should work as good as possible was the only thing that mattered. Since this was so important, the need was not just to have the product but to have a product which one felt were performing well. If they felt that, they stuck with their brand.

The next facet that was examined concerned whether or not a consumer could have any pleasure in buying these types of products. Six of the respondents said that they could find pleasure when purchasing the product due to the fact that it gave a satisfying result. It was
said that by respondent I that “It is fun to get a pleasing result. This makes the whole process of purchasing and using the product much more enjoyable”. It was also said that a likeable scent added the perceived pleasure of the product. The overall impression was that pleasure could be something to consider as a connection to the purchasing phase.

The third facet the interviewees had to consider was sign, thus if the sign of the product could affect the consumer’s purchase behavior. Generally speaking, the respondents did not consider themselves to be affected in their purchase behavior by the sign of the product. It was said by respondent C “I do not care what the product could say about me, it is not a product that anyone else sees”. There was no connection between sign and behavioral brand loyalty.

The next facet that was brought to discussion was if the respondents ever were unsure in their choice when purchasing the product. All the respondents were very clear on the fact that they were not unsure what so ever regarding which product to purchase. This as they had their brand, which they knew, performed. This meant that they always went back for it without really looks for other alternatives. It was mentioned from one of the respondents that this is a boring purchase, which is made without thoughts. It was also mentioned that if you would be in a position where you did not know, as someone where when they were about to purchase the product in the younger years, for the first time, that there could be some uncertainty. However, now when they knew what performed, they all stuck with their alternative.

In addition to the uncertainty, it was also discussed about the interviewee's reaction if they had miss purchased a product. All the respondents more or less never switched their brand, but mentioned that they for some reason at least had done it at some point. Those few times they had done so, they had often returned straight back to their old alternative, which they believed performed better. They had tried a new product due curiosity or an offer, but almost every time, it did not work as well as their previous alternative, which made them go back to their old product. A question, which occurred in connection to this discussion, was if anyone could go back to the store to return it (in case of miss purchase). No one of the respondents said to be willing to go back and return the product, it was both to cheap for it and the pride was more important than the money.
The sixth facet that was considered was the price facet. From a behavioral perspective, the price was no significant facet. The participants said that the quality was more important than what the price. Respondent B mentioned that the price only was a facet if it was between two equivalent products, otherwise not. The respondent however very rarely where in a situation where he stood between to equivalent products, where price where to decide the choice in product as he considered himself brand loyal to his product. A lot of the respondents meant that they were in a stage in life where they did not have to consider the price, which made the facet about quality more important. One of the respondents were more price conscious when one’s children still lived home and it was spent considerably more of the product. When the amount of used detergent, etc. were less, the price facet became less important.

The last facet that was discussed during the behavioral brand loyalty part was if the respondents thought that there were any other factors that could affect their purchase behavior. Using the same brand that one’s parents or grandparents had used was a factor that was mentioned by many of the respondents. This regarded sentimentality as some of the respondents used the same brand as their parents had used since they were familiar with the brand and the result of that product. This had initiated them to purchase the product from the start and if they were satisfied with the results, they would stay with the brand. The scent was a recurring reason and someone also mentioned the lack of allergies.

The respondents also mentioned their purchases as being partly based on them being environmentally friendly. This was discussed as they said it was important for them to purchase environmentally friendly products, as long as the quality was not compromised. It was stated that they were in a stage in life where they could afford the often more expensive alternatives, which often were environmentally friendly. They stated that in other stages of their life, when money often was more of an issue, that they did not always purchase environmentally friendly products as these were often more expensive.

5.2 Cognitive Brand Loyalty
In the cognitive part of the interview, the respondents were asked to describe their thought process when they purchased these products rather than their actual purchase behavior. The same facets were used in the cognitive and emotional part of the interview as in the behavioral. Just like in the behavioral part of the interview, nobody expressed an interest for
the products, it was rather a product one should have and it should work as expected. It was more of a loyalty towards the product they bought rather than an interest for it. Many even mentioned this type of purchasing as boring.

When the respondents were asked about their pleasure in a cognitive sense, most said that they had tried their product before and therefore had a certain pleasure because they knew it was going to work. Respondent A said that “One was pleased with the product even before one had purchased it due to the satisfying feeling of knowing that the product were going to work”. The environmentally friendly aspect could create pleasure in purchasing the products. It was said that they put a lot of thought into purchases of an environmentally friendly product, that it was important. Most of the respondents purchased environmentally friendly products as this gave them a sense of pleasure, knowing that they took responsibility for the environment.

Regarding the sign facet, most of the interviewee’s meant that since these are products that is not displayed to others, they did not care or think about what it could say about themselves. Once again, the need for the product was mentioned as more important than what it could possibly say about the respondents. A lot of the respondents also said that these are products that one does not want to put any time or energy on, which makes it less important.

The next facet that was in focus was whether or not the respondents had any specific thoughts when they were uncertain in their choice of product. When this was brought up, many of the participants meant that scents were a factor that was compared and thought of before a decision was taken. A part of the respondents said that a new or appealing design with a lot of colors, flowers or in otherwise appealing manner, could decide which product one should purchase. Others also said that if a new or pleasing scent existed in the store, it could help them make the decision. However, if one were uncertain, it was regarded the same brand. The respondents were loyal towards their brand and could occasionally try another scent or similar, just as long as it were the same brand. This since they trusted the brand and knew it was going to perform anyway.

When the researchers asked about the thoughts the respondents had when they potentially had miss purchased a product, the answers were typically that it did not matter that much. This was something that did not occur very often but those few times it did, it was said to be
unnecessary to think much about it, instead they knew that they would not repurchase the product. Respondent D only thought it was annoying to “use money on something that I was not satisfied with” but not to the extent to return it to the store, once again the pride was a conflicting factor. Instead they would return to their previous alternative, which they knew worked and not thinks more about it. Overall, the respondents did not think that much about miss purchased product.

The price facet within the cognitive aspect was similar to the behavioral aspect, the price was not particularly important to the respondents. They did not really care about the price or thought too much about it. They had no problem with spending more money on their product when they knew the results were satisfying. Quality and getting pleasing results were seen as much more important than saving money on a cheaper product. This since achieving a good result was the main reason for using the product.

Other factors that could affect the cognitive stage according to the respondents were then environmentally friendly aspect. Both respondent A and C mentioned environmentally friendly as an important factor for the thoughts they had regarding the product. They associated positive thoughts with the product if it was environmentally friendly which had been one of the reasons for why they considered themselves brand loyal towards the product.

5.3 Emotional Brand Loyalty

The last type of brand loyalty that was discussed in conjunction with the chosen facets was emotional brand loyalty. When the emotional stage was discussed, the researchers were looking for information about how the respondents felt rather than thought when purchasing these types of products. Just as within behavioral and cognitive brand loyalty, most did not feel any sort of interest for these products and the “must-have” motivation was mentioned once again.

“Via is like a friend of mine”, this was the way respondent A described her relationship with her detergent. She meant that she was highly emotional towards her brand. This was something that could be seen in most of the interviews, as there were a clear connection between emotional brand loyalty and pleasure. This was based on the respondent’s statements that it was a pleasure due to the fact that they knew that the result would please their
expectations. As long as the quality and the result meets the anticipations, there was a greater chance to feel pleasure and a good feeling for the product. The respondents could easily connect their feelings to pleasure.

Many of the respondents had a hard time to put a feeling on the sign value since they did not feel that it existed in their case. Nevertheless, two of the respondents meant that it was important that the detergent was environmentally friendly since they wanted to see themselves as environmentally friendly persons. By purchasing detergent that was environmentally friendly, a positive feeling did occur. Aside from this, the general impression from the respondents was that it does not exist any sign value in connection to one's feelings regarding these products.

When the facet regarding what feelings that could occur during uncertainty in a store was discussed, the participants did not have much to add. It was hard for them to discuss emotions of uncertainty since it more or less never occurred. Emotion was not an aspect involved anyway the few times that uncertainty occurred; it had more to do with the thought process.

The facet of risk importance was next and it was discussed if one would be emotionally affected if the wrong product were purchased. The general feeling was that one would be a little bit irritated if the wrong product were purchased. Not because it really mattered that much, but because one expects the products purchased to work and if they do not, one felt let down by the product. It was said that it was most often not that much of a big deal since it often is not that expensive, but it is important that the results are good. If a miss purchase had been made, one had to take the decision on whether the product should be thrown away so that the new, better product could be purchased and used. Even though it would be worth it as the results would be better, it still would sting that a product should be thrown away and that one in some way feels cheated on by the brand selling the purchased product. But overall, this did not happen that often since the respondents were considered themselves brand loyal towards their product.

The next facet concerned price, individuals could be emotionally affected with price if they decided to buy something more costly because they wanted a better result but ended up being disappointed since it did not give the wanted results. This would generate a feeling of disappointment and irritation of why one would either have chosen that alternative or why one
would switch from something that they otherwise work. This however occurred very rarely as the respondents mostly stuck with their product no matter the price on the product or its competitors. It was also discussed that one would sometimes avoid to purchase the absolutely cheapest products, the few times one decided to try something new, since these alternatives could be considered suspiciously cheap. It was said that it should not be possible to have such prices and provide a good enough product. This would give a bad feeling that something was not right, which one would want to avoid. The absolute most important thing was that they felt secure in their product as the performance would be good, and thus, the cheapest alternatives were out of the question.

Another facet that could affect the respondent’s emotional reasons for being brand loyal was the environment aspect. The environmental aspect was mentioned as this could make an individual feel good about oneself. This as it was seen as if one purchases environmentally friendly products, one get a good feeling since one is aware of the fact that they do not harm the environment with their usage of the product.
6 Analysis

The chapter starts of with an analysis of the gathered material, connected to the three components of brand loyalty. Moreover, the authors present the final conceptual model after these chapters, which led to the researcher’s conclusions.

In the end of the chapters of behavioral, cognitive and emotional brand loyalty, a model is presented. These models present the facets of low product involvement relevant for that type of brand loyalty. These are highlighted (green) among all the facets used in order to show the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty. This is done to be able to distinguish what facets that are typical for the specific type of brand loyalty. Furthermore, a final, conclusive model, with all the relevant facets for behavioral, cognitive, and emotional brand loyalty, is presented in the end of the analysis chapter.

6.1 Behavioral brand loyalty

One thing that became clear when conducting the interviews, where the fact that one of the most essential aspects when purchasing a low involvement product was the need for it to performs well. This could be due to the fact that the results of the product must be good. Even though it is understandable that one would want a satisfying result, it was a bit surprising that the facet quality were seen as much more important than the rest of the facets/factors. It was thought that price would be more of an important facet, which would affect one’s purchase decision regarding low involvement products. This was however not the case according to the respondents. They stated that the result was the vital aspect of their purchase decision. It was for example mentioned by respondent A that “the difference in price is not as considerable as the difference in quality”, which were mentioned in a similar way by other respondents as well. Even a small difference in performance or quality would most likely be something that one could think paying for since the results were very important. Behe et al (2015) state that there are inconsistencies in research examining the price sensitivity towards high and low product involvement. The results for in this thesis supports the belief that low involvement products should not be considered as that price sensitive as they sometimes are.

It was important according to the respondents that the right product was purchased. The respondents were not willing to compromise with the quality of the product. Respondents all throughout the interviews repeatedly mentioned the quality of the product. Considering the
chosen products for this study (detergent, dish soap and hand soap), the need for them to actually execute its purpose, which of course is to create cleanliness, was essential. This is obviously something that one did not want to compromise with, since it concerns one’s personal hygiene. The final result was much more important than anything else. The need for a good result determined what product one became brand loyal to. Once the right product was found, the respondents had a hard time to even consider trying another alternative. This could be connected to the facet pleasure, as it was mentioned that pleasure could be felt when purchasing products that gave a good result. Some of the respondents mentioned that before they had become loyal towards their product, finding a product that would give a good result were a crucial part in order for them to be loyalty towards it. This since pleasure is created due to a good result and a feeling of well invested money.

The fact that all the respondents were loyal to the product they had chosen to base their interview on led them to not be uncertain in their choice. It was rarely that the respondents switched brand, which in turn meant that they were not unsure in their purchase that often. Because of this, the respondents could not connect the facet of risk probability to the behavioral brand loyalty part of the study. As mentioned, the quality was of great importance for everyone and when they knew that their product worked, they were not particularly eager to try a new brand. This also led to the non-connection to the facet risk importance. This since the respondents rarely switched brands, leading to few occasions where they could be affected by a miss purchase. In these rare occasions, they were most often not that much negatively affected as they most often found that another brand did not perform as well as their previous alternative, which led them to switch back as soon as possible.

Once an individual had found a product they were pleased with, they became loyal towards that product. Brands ought to try to identify first time users of these products and make them try out their products. If these individuals would do so and be pleased with the results, they would hopefully stick with that brand. Getting first-time users to try one’s products could perhaps be seen as hard since it is difficult to know who is a first-time user. In order for it to be reasonably affordable for the brand, it should be done at gatherings were a lot of potential first-time users are present. One could hand out samples of the product and maybe some sort of discount, this to place their brand and product in the consumer's mind.
Something that was mentioned by a lot of the respondents was that they started with the product they had due to the fact that they had some kind connection with it from an early age. It was often that their parents or other family had used a certain product, which they been brand loyal towards, which they remembered and knew worked. By using the same product as their parents, they also excluded the risk of allergies and such since they knew that the product had not caused such problems in the past. This led to a kind of bonding with the product since they did not try to figure out what product purchase, but rather choose the one their parents or other family members had used. This of course as long as it performed as it should, which they most often found out it did after trying it, leading them to stick with it.

This would perhaps interfere with a brand’s possible desire to reach out and affect first-time users, as one would perhaps think that they would already have made up their mind and chose the same brand as their family members used. The belief however is that choosing the same as one’s family members used, would at least partly be based on the fact that one did not know how other products worked. Trying another product, which they would be pleased with, could lead them to choose that alternative instead. They could then select to stick and be brand loyal with that alternative instead of the one, which their family had used. Even though the sentimental aspect was important in what product one first select, it is believed that the product choice could be affected.

Even though it was important that the product performed, there was no interest for the product at all. If one were to switch brand to another product, one would try to assure oneself to get an as well performing product as possible. There was however, still no interest in this process but rather something that just needed to be done. The reason for why the respondents did not have any interest in low involvement products could perhaps also be connected to the non-sign value. The respondents did not purchase a certain product because it did say anything special, as they had no concern in what the products said about them. This could perhaps be due to the reason, as a respondent mentioned, that it is not products that people tend to display for others anyway. Brands should therefore not lay any focus on the sign value of these products.

The respondents suggested the importance of products being environmentally friendly as well. It was said that it was an important aspect, which could determine what product they purchased. The performance of the product was the most important factor, but the respondents still tried to purchase as environmentally friendly products as possible. Someone mentioned that they had tried a product that was environmentally friendly once, but they were unsatisfied
with the result and changed back the next time they purchased the product. Most customers however do not have to make the choice between either environmentally friendly and performance (regarding detergent and dish soap), as it was mentioned that most products today are environmentally friendly and work fine. This can be traced to the increasingly important aspect of environmentally friendly conscious customers (Rahbar and Wahid, 2011), something that brands must take into consideration.

Even though the overall quality was the most important aspect, the environmentally friendly aspect could make one determine which brand to purchase. This could be seen as even more important for products where there are chemicals involved that are being missioned. The impression was that the respondents were more involved with environmentally friendly products than another segment perhaps would be. The environmentally friendly aspect is seen as an criteria for judging the quality of low involvement products, and thus fall under the facet quality for not only behavioral brand loyalty, but also for cognitive and emotional brand loyalty.

Something that was brought up and seen as interesting regarding the facet price, which could be connected the environmentally friendly quality, were the fact that all the respondents were in a stage in life where they had the opportunity to prioritize quality over price. It was however mentioned that in other stages of life, one were perhaps more affected by price, and hence, cheaper products were occasionally purchased. One could then perhaps think of purchasing a cheaper alternative even though it would not perform as well. These cheaper products would then most often be less environmentally friendly and hence be of less quality. It could then be important for brands to have the environmentally friendly quality aspect in mind when considering, which segments to target. If brands for example were to target the younger generation, the environmentally friendly quality aspect would perhaps not be as important as the price facet.

Figure 2- The Behavioral brand loyalty model shows the facets/factors of low product involvement previously mentioned in the chapter and how they are related to behavioral brand loyalty. The green ones show the how pleasure, quality and sentimentality are related to behavioral brand loyalty.
6.2 Cognitive brand loyalty

Just as within the behavioral brand loyalty, pleasure could be connected to cognitive brand loyalty. The respondents said that they already before a purchase knew that the result would be pleasing and thinking about that made them satisfied. Having a product, which you can trust, that performs as expected, was considered very pleasing. Another aspect that was brought up and seen as pleasing was the environmentally friendly aspect. It was said by the respondents that purchasing a product, which they knew were environmentally friendly were pleasing in the sense that they felt good for maintaining an as healthy environment as possible. It was more of a surprise that pleasure could be drawn to cognitive brand loyalty than to behavioral and emotional brand loyalty. The fact that the respondents actually referred to a thought process taking place where one were able to think back and be aware of your working product seemed far-fetched, but it was something that was referred to by the respondents. It was stated that one could think quite a lot on whether a product work or not. A product that did not work could be seen as a distraction in the mind, which one could think of and be affected by. On the other hand, being able to have in mind one’s properly working product would be very pleasing.
The fact that the respondents thought about the product and the pleasure they got from the product in the extent they did, made it possible for the researchers to draw a connection between quality and cognitive brand loyalty. The quality was important and something the respondents thought of before the purchase. A qualitative product that performed as expected gave pleasure, just even when they were thinking about it, something that was thought of as a bit surprising by the researchers.

The facet risk probability could be connected to cognitive brand loyalty. The respondent said that they would stick to the same brand, as they knew it would work. But often, if they knew the product of that certain brand worked, they could think of trying another product within the same brand. That would give them the opportunity to try a new product while still being considerably sure that the product would work, since one could trust that brand. This does not affect the behavioral brand loyalty as they still purchase from the same brand. Risk importance could neither be connected to cognitive brand loyalty as the very few times the respondent purchased the wrong product, it did not matter that much. It was not something they put a lot of thought into, it was more of an emotional response. Quester and Lim (1985) mentions the five facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (2003) and state that there are possibilities of a relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty, even though research generally only relates high product involvement towards brand loyalty. As been examined in this research, some facets are possible to relate to brand loyalty. Risk importance however cannot be connected to the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty whatsoever. This study supports Quester and Lim (2003) regarding the fact that it is possible for a relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty to exist, even though it might not be through all of the five facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985).

As been examined in this research, some facets are possible to relate to brand loyalty. However, neither sign nor interest were facets that could be related to the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.

Interest could neither be connected to the cognitive brand loyalty. This as the respondents did not have any interest in the product at all in any level. They even had a hard time to understand the fact that one could have an interest to these types of products. This meant that
they did not have anything to say regarding how their thinking in terms of interest affected them to be brand loyal towards a certain product. The same regarded the sign facet; the respondents said that they had not purchased any product due to what it said about them as a person. Therefore they had no thoughts of the sign value of the product. Since this did not affect the purchase behavior among the respondents, there was no surprise that it neither existed a thought process regarding these facets.

The sentimental aspect, regarding purchasing the same brand as one’s family members did, could not be connected to the cognitive aspect of brand loyalty. This due to the fact the same product is purchased not because of the person’s thoughts about the product; it is rather an emotional response. The awareness of past experience of the product working could not be connected to cognitive brand loyalty. The interpretation was according to the researches that this was not something that the respondent thought much about. It was considered more as an emotional attachment towards something that one was growing up with, an awareness of a product and its benefit rather than a lot of thoughts regarding the product.

Figure 3- The *Cognitive brand loyalty model* shows the facets/factors of low product involvement previously mentioned in the chapter and how they are related to behavioral brand loyalty. The green ones show the how *pleasure*, *risk probability* and *quality* are related to cognitive brand loyalty.
6.3 Emotional brand loyalty

The overall impression by the researchers was that the respondents were more emotional than expected. It was said that a well performing product brought much enjoyment, this, as it was important that it did so. It was said to be very pleasing to have a quality product that worked, hence the connection to both quality and pleasure could be done. Pleasure was seen as something very emotional, a good feeling that was associated with the purchase of certain products. The emotional response was based on the results of the product rather than the product itself. Pleasure was the one facet out of the facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) that had the clearest connection to brand loyalty. The findings in this study suggest that pleasure is a facet that can help enhance the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.

The environmentally friendly quality aspect could be connected to emotional brand loyalty. It was stated by the respondents that they would get a good and satisfied feeling from purchasing environmentally friendly products. This as they knew they were contributing to a healthier environment which in that manner also enabling them to feel good about themselves.
and their purchase habits. It was slightly easier for them to connect a feeling rather than a thought to their willingness to purchase environmentally friendly products.

Just like in the behavioral and cognitive part of the interview, the respondents had no interest in the product, meaning that interest could not be connected to emotional brand loyalty. It was hard to feel an interest to a product that one neither cared about when purchasing or thought about in conjunction with purchase. Moreover, sign was also a facet that the respondents were unable to connect to emotional brand loyalty. They said it was hard to connect a feeling with what a product could say about one as a consumer, which made them deny any type of connection between sign and emotional brand loyalty. As been examined in this research, some facets compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) are possible to relate to brand loyalty. However, neither sign nor interest were facets that could be related to the relationship between low product involvement and brand loyalty.

Risk importance was not connected to emotional brand loyalty, this since the few times the respondents switched product, they were not emotional in their process of doing so. They could feel a bit disappointed with the results when switching brand, and an irritation could emerge. These feelings however were only associated with products which the respondents were not brand loyal to and hence not something affecting one’s emotional brand loyalty towards the product one actually is brand loyal towards. The same concept concerned price in an emotional sense. If one were to purchase a more expensive product and did not enjoy the result, one felt irritated. This however, just as with risk importance, only occurred when purchasing new brands which one did not enjoy, thus a product one would not be brand loyal towards.

The sentimental connection could be drawn since the respondents said they had a binding towards a certain product from younger years when family member purchased that very product. The emotional *sentimentality* was thus expressed through a subconscious state more than anything else. They were aware of the product’s performance but that was not something that they considered that much. It was instead a feeling of recognition that made one choose that product among other products, which in fact could work just as well.

Figure 4- The *Emotional brand loyalty model* shows the facets/factors of low product involvement previously mentioned in the chapter and how they are related to behavioral brand
loyalty. The green ones show the how pleasure, quality and sentimentality are related to emotional brand loyalty.

Figure 4- Emotional brand loyalty model. (Ingemansson, Nilsson & Villasalija, 2015)

6.4 New developed conceptual model
Figure 5- The Low product involvement and brand loyalty model works as the new developed conceptual model, and it is based on the gathered empirical material. This figure shows all the relevant facets for low product involvement in its relationship to behavioral, cognitive and emotional brand loyalty.

In order for the facets to be a part of the new model, one had to be able to connect them to at least one of the three parts of brand loyalty. Compared to the prepared research model (3.1), this new model only consists of two of the facets mentioned by Kapferer and Laurent (1985). Pleasure could be connected to behavioral, cognitive and emotional brand loyalty, while risk probability only could be connected to cognitive brand loyalty, based on the empirical findings. The facet price has also been removed, as the respondents could not connect it to any of the three parts of brand loyalty. Instead of the remaining facets in the old model, two
new factors for have been presented. *Quality* was the most important factor when discussing low product involvement in connection to brand loyalty, hence it is related to all three parts of brand loyalty. The last factor that affected brand loyalty within low involvement products was *Sentimentality*. Thus, if one gets influenced to purchase a specific brand due to what product one's parents or other family members are using. The motivation of how and in what way these different facets/factors are connected to the parts of brand loyalty is described in the subchapters of the analysis.

![Diagram of brand loyalty conceptual model](image)

*Figure 5- Low product involvement and brand loyalty conceptual model. (Ingemansson, Nilsson & Vllasalija, 2015).*
7 Conclusion

The research revealed that the respondents were more brand loyal than perhaps were expected. The idea before was that the respondents maybe would have purchased the same product due to a habit, but it was a more conscious choice. They could have both a cognitive and emotional attachment towards the product as well. This mostly due to the results it would give. Getting a satisfying result could be very pleasing and something the respondents were willing to spend money on. They did not really see the price as a determinant facet, if they had a product that they enjoyed, they did not really consider the price. As mentioned however, the attachment towards the product were not due to the product itself and what it represented, it was mostly the results that mattered. This meant that facets such as sign or interest could not be connected to the relationship between brand loyalty and low product involvement.

It was discussed that the respondents often had been introduced to a certain brand due to a family member previously using it. The first time one is to purchase these types of products, one can have a hard time to know the quality of the products. Because of this, the first time one purchased these products, one usually purchased the same as a one’s family. If they were satisfied with the results then, they tended to stick with the product. The factor of sentimentally was therefore seen as an important factor for connecting low involvement products to brand loyalty.

The environmentally friendly aspect was mentioned as a quite important factor for the respondents, which could affect them in their purchase decision. It was said that it felt good for them to purchase environmentally friendly products since they then knew that they had contributed for maintaining a healthier environment. This demonstrated the fact that the environmentally friendly aspect was something to consider for the brands as they in this case, concerned hygiene products.

The research model with its containing facets was typical for the context of high product involvement. After testing those facets in the context of low product involvement, the researchers developed a new model were some of the old facets had to be removed for the reason that they could not be connected low involvement products. Instead new factors were added which had a better connection to low product involvement and brand loyalty. The final facets/factors that could be connected to the relationship between brand loyalty and low product involvement were pleasure, risk probability, quality, and sentimentality.
7.1 Delimitations

In order to gather data to draw a conclusion, interviews were necessary. These interviews were done according to the sampling process called snowball sampling. In this case, most of the respondents were quite similar as they were about the same age and social class. This could be a reason for why the answers were similar in the sense they were. If the research had been based on another segment, their answers would perhaps differ. This was indicated during the data gathering process as it was mentioned that other variables possibly could have a different effect on one’s involvement towards low involvement products depending on what life stage one were in.

The fact that the researchers had to choose certain products for the interview was also delimitation. Even though it was necessary to do so, this may have affected the results. This as all the products acknowledged for being low involvement products did not have to be within the same products category, as within the used for this thesis. Moreover, the facets used to explore the relationship of low product involvement were the ones compiled by Kapferer and Laurent (1985) and the facet price (Behe et al, 2015). These facets could have led the research in the specific direction it did.
8 Research Implications

This chapter provides the reader with directions for further research.

Directions for future research

Since the research on the relationship between brand loyalty and low product involvement is unexplored (Kapferer, 1985; Quester & Lim, 2003, Traylor, 1983) the research had its aim on exploring that gap. This in order to spread some clarity on the field and develop some sort of framework, which future research could build on when examining this relationship. The authors had to choose products acknowledged for being low involvement products in order to conduct the interviews. These products however were household products, and even though many low involvements products are within that category (Kapferer & Laurent (1985), not all are. This could affect the result in a way that other product perhaps would not have done. Future research should examine more product categories to see if the results are equivalent to the ones concluded in this thesis. Once this is done and there is a general acceptance of what facets of low product involvement that can be related to brand loyalty, more quantitative research could be conducted in order to measure and determine the more precise relationship for the different facets. One thing that emerge during the research however were that the respondents most likely reacted differently to the some of the facets due their life stage/age they were in. This would be something to take into consideration when conducting future research.
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Appendices

1. Source Criticism

Academic publications are evaluated through a peer review process prior to the publishing where the articles become quality controlled against other journals that have been evaluated within their field (Coniam, 2012). A peer review’s purpose is to improve the work before it is published. This will help ensure that the published articles are scientifically while non-scientific articles are to be rejected. A journal that is peer-reviewed is usually sent to experts outside the staff conducting the research. The purpose of sending the journals outside of the personnel of research is to get a professional opinion outside of the personnel (van Rooyen, 1998). Although the peer review process is an established component of published material, Coniam (2012) mentions that there are some issues that might arise. Issues include degrees of feedback researchers give in the case of rejection, explicit guidelines for the reviewers and authors. More issues that may arise are the reliability and validity of the published material in the terms of the degree in discussion between the authors and reviewers for the topic of the work and the quality and length of the published journal, which may lessen the opportunity to evaluate the material and hence the chance for improving it (Coniam, 2012).

Coniam (2012) mentions five criteria for evaluating the material: originality, ethical issues, language, structure, and previous research. Originality discusses if the published material contributes with any kind of knowledge and if it is interesting and adequate. Ethical issues refer to if the journal contains any plagiarism or fraud. Language indicates if the work contains the proper language and grammar as well as the understanding of the material. Structure is an overview of the article as a whole, if the key components such as abstract, introduction, methodology, and conclusion are all presented in the work. The last criteria, previous research, concerns whether an article is based on previous research and thus also referred to correctly and appropriately (Coniam, 2012).

Apart from the criteria highlighted by Coniam (2012), Rhoades (2011) discusses the reader’s accurate judgment and evaluation as a portion of validity of the journals. When evaluating the collected material, the reader should remain critical in order to evaluate the data professionally. Out of the evaluator’s reflective way of thinking and expertise, the researchers can make proper discernments of what is considered to be suitable articles and relevant information for the study conducted (Rhoades, 2011).
2. Interview Guide
This was only a guide for the researchers to follow during the interview. It occurred rather a
discussion about the facets and topics.

Behavioral brand loyalty
- How is your interest in the product expressed through your purchase behavior?
- Do you find pleasure in purchasing the product?
- Do you buy the product because it tells something about you?
- Are you sometimes unsure in your choice when purchasing the product?
- How do you react when/if you miss purchase the product?
- Does the price affect your purchase behavior towards the product?
- Do you believe that there is something else that affects your purchase behavior towards the
  product?

Cognitive brand loyalty
- How is your interest towards the product affected by your thoughts about it?
- How is your pleasure towards the product affected by your thoughts about it?
- Do you think about what the product tells about you?
- What are your thoughts towards the product when there is uncertainty in choice?
- What are your thoughts when/if you miss purchase the product?
- Does the price affect your thoughts about the product?
- Do you believe that there is something else that affects your thoughts towards the product?

Emotional brand loyalty
- How is your interest towards the product affected by your feelings about it?
- How is your pleasure towards the product affected by your feelings about it?
- Can the sign value of the product affect your feelings towards it?
- What are your feelings towards the product when there is uncertainty in choice?
- What are your feelings when/if you miss purchase the product?
- Does the price affect your feelings about the product?
- Do you believe that there is something else that affects your feelings towards the product?
3. Description of Respondents

Respondent A - Woman, between the ages of 45-55. Have two grown up children. Mostly based her interview on detergent.

Respondent B - Man, between the ages of 50-60. Have one grown up child. Mostly based his interview on dish soap.

Respondent C - Woman, between the ages of 55-65. Have two grown up children. Mostly based her interview on detergent.

Respondent D - Woman, between the ages of 45-55. Have three grown up children. Mostly based her interview on dish soap.

Respondent E - Woman, between the ages of 50-60. Have two grown up children. Mostly based her interview on detergent.

Respondent F - Woman, between the ages of 55-65. Have three grown up children. Mostly based her interview on hand soap.

Respondent G - Woman, between the ages of 35-45. Have two children in their teenagers. Mostly based her interview on dish soap.

Respondent H - Woman, between the ages of 45-55. Have two grown up children. Mostly based her interview on detergent.

Respondent I - Woman, between the ages of 24-29. Have no children. Mostly based her interview on detergent.