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Abstract

Businesses are constantly trying to find new strategies that help them gain loyal customers, in order to avoid the considerable cost of attracting new customers. This thesis analyzes if service quality has any significant impact on brand loyalty, where customer satisfaction is used as an indicator for brand loyalty. Additionally, it tests if the factor of generations, and the generational differences has any impact on how service quality is valued by the consumer in terms of customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. To answer this, an experiment in the form of two surveys was sent out and answered by 99 participants belonging to either Generation X or Generation Y, where customer satisfaction was measured as a result of either neutral or excellent service quality. The results showed and confirmed what previous studies have claimed, that service quality has a significant effect on both customer satisfaction and brand loyalty, where evidence was found that excellent service quality highly impacted the participants’ satisfaction as well as their level of loyalty towards a brand. Furthermore, the study concluded that there is no difference in how Generation X and Generation Y value service quality, despite what previous research has claimed in regard to generational differences.
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1. Introduction

In this part of the thesis, an introduction to the key topics is presented as well as a brief explanation of the various keywords used throughout the thesis. Following is a discussion of the problem the study will address, as well as a clear and distinct explanation of the purpose.

All over the world businesses try to find new and innovating ways to gain more customers and become more financially successful. One of the most vital components for a business to become successful is to have content customers. 96% of consumers all over the globe consider service quality to be an important aspect of them choosing to be loyal to a brand (Willot, 2020). 70% of customers claim that they are loyal to brands because of their great customer service (Willot, 2020). 52% of consumers state that they have bought additional products from a company simply because they previously have experienced great service quality from that company (Willot, 2020). These numbers indicate that several different factors, such as service quality, customer satisfaction and brand loyalty are all important for company to be profitable. Furthermore, how to acquire and maintain factors such as these continue to be an imperative challenge for companies today, and has been for a long time.

How to create customer satisfaction and how to ensure customer retention has long been an objective for businesses. Not only to secure recurring customers, but also to reduce internal costs and evaluate how to allocate available resources when trying to ensure that customers stay satisfied. Customer satisfaction is often the effect of sufficient service quality, where service quality is defined as the customer’s perception of the businesses’ long-term service performance (Bateson & Hoffman, 2001). In the minds of consumers, service quality often includes the quality of the product and/or the service itself, the demeanor and behavior of the employees, how willing the business is to be flexible and responsive (Sundbo, 2015). Furthermore, it has long been argued that there is a connection between service quality and customer retention, and that service quality often
has a positive effect on brand loyalty (Bowen & Chen, 2001; Yang, Yang, Chang & Chien, 2017).

Brand loyalty is a complex concept since there are several different interpretations to what the idea consists of (Jacoby & Kyner, 1973). Jacoby and Kyner (1973) describes that various researchers depict brand loyalty in contrasting manners in terms of what factors are incorporated. Depending on what elements are included in the research, new theories regarding brand loyalty and its meaning can be constructed (Jacoby & Kyner, 1973). However, recent research has pointed towards a decline in overall brand loyalty in certain markets (Dawes, Meyer-Waarden & Driesener, 2015) and recent studies show that younger people have a significantly harder time to trust brands in comparison to other generations (Gözükara & Çolakoğlu, 2016). Those other generations are, for example, Generation X which are people born between the early 60s and early 80s (McGaugh, 2003). Moreover, those younger people refer to Generation Y, whom are defined as the age group consisting of people born between the early 80s and early 2000s (Gözükara & Çolakoğlu, 2016). The higher distrust of Generation Y towards companies might result in it being more difficult for companies to ensure brand loyalty in Generation Y consumers. Several different reasons can be pointed to as the underlying cause for this decline. One prominent reason might be the decrease in how service quality is valued by the general consumer. Research show that during the past years, a lot more emphasis is put on the service experience rather than service quality (Sundbo, 2015), which raises the question of whether or not service quality is valued differently by different generations.

Service quality is a changing aspect of service management within businesses. Consumers are changing and so are their expectations regarding their purchasing experiences (Brophy, Blackler & Popovic, 2015). In order to continuously be successful, companies need to adapt accordingly to the current markets (Azadegan, Teich & Mora-Monge, 2010). Studies have been conducted to answer the question whether demographic factors, for example age, could be a contributing factor to the changing phenomenon (Deshwal, 2016). Parment (2013) argues that there is a clear difference between various generations’ values, preferences and attitudes, which in turn, directly influence their general purchase patterns. These shared values and attitudes are often an effect of impactful societal events,
and tend to stay relatively stable throughout the lives of those generations (Parment, 2013).

Moreover, Parment (2013), Balakrishnan and Chakraborty (2017) and several other researchers, argues that there is a difference in purchasing behavior between various generations. According to Balakrishnan and Chakraborty (2017) findings, Generation Y’s purchasing capacity is more conscious. Moreover, Gen X is less concerned with buying from new brands compared to older and younger generations. To conclude, this might suggest a difference in how generations value certain aspects of the purchasing experience, such as service quality.

1.1 Problem Discussion

A clear change in the evaluation of service quality in the past years, combined with the unequivocal differences in values and perceptions of different generations, leads to, as previously mentioned, a discussion whether or not service quality might be valued differently by various generations. However, due to the decline in brand loyalty proposed by recent research, there is a clear gap in the connection of perceived value of service quality between different generations and whether or not the evaluation of service quality is connected to the decline in brand loyalty. This topic is an interesting field of study because service quality and maintaining brand loyalty among consumers is a substantial cost for companies. If the importance of the relationship between service quality and brand loyalty is decreasing among younger generations, then companies should be aware of this situation and reassess how they allocate their resources, to become more efficient in terms of internal costs.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to identify if there is a difference in how various generations value service quality and how that importance perceived by them affects their loyalty towards brands. Furthermore, this thesis aims to measure the impact that service quality has on customer satisfaction, as well as if service quality has any significant effect on brand loyalty. This study also aspires to further explore the correlation between the different factors that cause a consumer to become loyal to a brand.
1.3 Delimitation

This study experienced some delimitations that affected the study in different ways. First of all, the study was limited to only two generations, Generation X and Generation Y, due to the timeframe of the thesis as well as lack of resources. Secondly, due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, Jönköping University was brought into an involuntary long-distance learning, the pandemic also forced the people of Sweden into social distancing. The outbreak and the government imposed restrictions that took place during the final two months of the thesis-writing which resulted in some inevitable changes to data collection of the study. The initial population studied were supposed to be people living in Jönköping where data was to be collected both through personal contacts and by gathering answers on the streets and at Jönköping University. However, due to the situation, a convenience sample was chosen instead and the population was changed to Sweden where data was collected through a digital survey.
2. Frame of Reference

In this section, the theoretical framework of the thesis will be explained, and a connection between the different theories will be drawn in order to provide clarity. Furthermore, it explains the purpose that each part of the framework has and how the specific keywords are important for the study as a whole.

The purpose of this section of the thesis to explore if there is a connection between service quality and brand loyalty, and if so, how that connection is made. Where customer satisfaction is identified as the intermediate factor in the connection between service quality and brand loyalty. Furthermore, the frame of reference will further explain the different aspects in more detail, in order to provide general clarity in regard to the subject as a whole. Moreover, the model SERVQUAL will be further explained and discussed in the frame of reference in order to illustrate its function as well as to provide the reader with a better understanding of how the experiment of this thesis was constructed. Lastly, the element of generations was also researched as it was this differentiating point that first interested the researchers.

When reviewing the literature, several different topics pervade through the selected articles; namely service quality, customer satisfaction, brand loyalty as well as the relationship among the three factors (Feng & Yanru, 2013; Krystallis & Chrysochou, 2014; Nazir, Ali & Jamil, 2016; Yang et al., 2017). Additionally, the variable of age, in other words generations, is also a theme that continuously appear throughout the literature (Gözükara & Çolakoğlu, 2016; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Parment, 2013). Therefore, the fundamental conceptual framework for this thesis will revolve around these concepts.

2.1 Keywords

In order to gain an understanding of the topic, its findings and find a gap within the field of service quality, customer satisfaction and brand loyalty, a secondary data collection was executed. For the frame of reference, databases used to conduct the research were mainly; Google Scholar, Jönköping University Library, Primo and Scopus. The most prominent used keywords were “Service Quality”, “SERVQUAL”, “Brand Loyalty”, 
“Customer Satisfaction”, “Customer Retention”, “Customer Service” “Generation X”, “Generation Y”, “Generational differences” and “Generations”. When selecting the appropriate literature that would build the foundation for this thesis, only peer-reviewed articles were used as well as several articles written by experts within this field, for example, J. Jacoby, A. Parment and A. Parasuraman. Moreover, in the first round of searches, the articles were sorted based on the year of publication. In other words, the articles used were published between year 2016 and year 2020. After that, articles were found by scanning their references which led to many articles that were highly relevant for this thesis and which had been cited by many previous authors.

2.2 Service Quality

Service quality is the customer’s perception of the general service performance of a company in a long-term setting (Hoffman & Bateson, 2001). Even though it is clear what service quality entails, an issue is how to properly measure if a particular service is of high quality, due to it being based on perceptions and perceptions being very subjective to the individual.

In 1985, a model for measuring service quality was brought forward by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, which was later refined in 1988 and again in 1991 due to evaluations from other researchers. The model, named SERVQUAL, measures whether or not a service is of high quality based on five dimensions; tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy, and does this by asking participants 22 questions in order to differentiate perception and performance of a particular service (Parasuraman, Berry & Zeithaml, 1991). For example, one of the 22 questions ask if the employees of a firm provide their services at the time promised, which, if positive, would indicate reliability. Where reliability is defined as the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). There are 4 questions for each dimension, and if positive, point toward said dimension being fulfilled in terms of service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

SERVQUAL has been used by many researchers and companies to measure the quality of particular services. However, Robinson (1999) conducted a re-evaluation of SERVQUAL to check the validity in the models attempt to measure service quality, and
concluded that it may not be as viable as many had previously believed. He concluded that SERVQUAL is best applicable to situations close to its original setting, and that the development of newer models is necessary (Robinson, 1999). Nonetheless, despite the criticism, there is a clear reason for why SERVQUAL has been widely used in several past research. Mainly because of its adept ability to provide a foundation for measuring service quality which can be modified to best fit the specific circumstances of a particular organization (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

The measurement of service quality is a complex matter, requiring many factors to be taken into consideration. SERVQUAL tries to include all aspects of a service when measuring its quality, but has still been criticized to some extent. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, it is important to find a more easily measured factor that might point to a positively perceived service quality. Namely, customer satisfaction, which will be discussed further below. However, the SERVQUAL dimensions will be used in this thesis to build the foundation for the experiment, in order to build an objectively good service experience in the scenarios of the experiment, which will be further discussed in the methodology.

2.3 Customer Satisfaction

The concept of customer satisfaction can be defined as a consumer fulfilment response where consumers experience contentment with the product or service that they have purchased (Oliver, 2010). Furthermore, some researchers choose to focus on the complete consumer experience as the basis of customer satisfaction instead of only the fulfilment response after the purchase (Gerpott, Rams & Schindler, 2001; Hill, Roche & Allen, 2007). More specifically, the complete consumer experience includes factors such as quality, price, functions of the product, and personal benefits gained from the product (Gerpott et al., 2001). This is further supported by Harris and Goode (2004) as well as Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1994) who all argue that a consumer experience is a comprehensive satisfaction, that is more permanent, rather than only the transactional-based satisfaction. Where a transactional-based satisfaction can be explained as the satisfaction achieved from simply the transaction between the consumer and the company, and comprehensive satisfaction as the satisfaction achieved when all aspects of a consumer to business relationship are considered. A reason for this is because if the
entire experience is positive, the consumers are more likely to repeat the process with that company over and over again (Hill et al., 2007).

Customer satisfaction is one of the most studied topics in marketing. It is an aspect that is the main goal for most organizations, and is often a consistent theme in practically all organizational efforts. The reason for this is that customer satisfaction and retention is more profitable than constantly having to acquire new customers (Hill et al., 2007; Peterson & Wilson, 1992). It is also a very old concept that has been studied for over 200 years (Hill et al., 2007). Which would suggest that it is not going to change in the upcoming years and is therefore an essential part for businesses to focus in order to promote longevity.

On the other hand, Keiningham, Gupta, Aksoy and Buoye (2014) argue that even though consumers might be satisfied with the services and products that are available, that does not necessarily mean that it will lead to an increase in consumer spending. Furthermore, they also claim that businesses do not always obtain a positive return on investment if they increase their funds for customer satisfaction. Instead, the effect of an increased spending concerning customer satisfaction often leads to an ROI that is generally small or sometimes even negative. According to Keiningham et al., (2014), their research conducted that what is the most beneficial for a company in terms of customer satisfaction is how their consumers rank their customer satisfaction approaches compared to that of their competitor’s.

Customer satisfaction is therefore the result of consumers being fully content with the general experience of a purchase, which includes the service quality among other aspects of the purchasing experience. However, the relationship between the two will be further discussed in section 2.5.

2.4 Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty has long been a topic of interest when operating a business since it can increase the profit of the firm (Juhl, Kristensen & Østergaard, 2002; Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). The increased profit as a result of brand loyalty comes from the ability to reduce marketing costs and increase sales (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). Since it is considered to
be such a broad topic, brand loyalty can be defined in several different manners. Firstly, Jacoby and Olson (1970) define the concept of brand loyalty as including several different aspects, for example behavioral responses, being non-random, that the behavior is exhibited over a period of time, as well as the psychological factors, such as the decision-making process, resulting in brand commitment. Secondly, Mao (2010) describes brand loyalty as when a specific product or service is preferable to a consumer. Moreover, according to Mao (2010), brand loyalty is achieved when the consumer speaks highly of that brand and often think that the specific brand they are loyal to, are superior to other brands. Thirdly, Oliver, Rust and Varki (1997) explains brand loyalty as a profound commitment to repurchase the same product or service consistently over time. The authors further state that brand loyalty also involves the consumer staying committed to a brand even though marketing practices and situational influences tries to convince them to shift their loyalties. On the other hand, Colombo and Morrison (1989) argue that there is not an absolute definition of the concept of brand loyalty, alternatively only the author’s imagination limits the number of plausible definitions. The consistent factor across most definitions is that brand loyalty is a concept that is created by demonstrating commitment to a specific product or service over a period of time (Bloemer & Kasper; 1995; Jacoby & Olson, 1970; Oliver et al., 1997).

Understanding brand awareness and maintaining brand loyalty has become an increasingly important topic for modern businesses. According to Shankar, Smith and Rangaswamy (2003), maintaining brand loyalty could result in greater market shares and greater profitability. Moreover, Pan, Sheng and Xie (2012) states that by retaining customer loyalty towards a brand, firms can develop long-term relationships with its customers that can therefore benefit both parties. Furthermore, besides the proven benefits of brand loyalty, it has also been argued by researchers that brand loyalty has become a critically significant factor for continued prosperity among firms in order to retain customers in the long run (Russell-Bennett, McColl-Kennedy & Coote, 2007). This study is therefore important, since, if brand loyalty is a crucial factor for firms to retain customers, the factors that result in brand loyalty need to be properly identified. And the question if different consumers, belonging to different generations, value said factors dissimilarly, becomes increasingly important.
Furthermore, brand loyalty and repurchasing behavior is sometimes used as interchangeable terms, especially in the marketing literature (Algesheimer, Dholakia & Herrmann, 2005; Sahin, Zehir & Kitapçı, 2011). However, Bloemer and Kasper (1995) differentiates the concepts as repurchasing behavior being the action of buying from the same brand multiple times, while brand loyalty is additionally the phenomenon of subconsciously being attracted to the same brand continuously. Being committed to the brand and exhibiting brand loyalty is also different from repurchasing behavior from the involvement aspects with the brand. This differentiation has been made several times throughout marketing literature, but was first identified by Jacoby and Kyner (1973). They discovered six elements that causes a consumer to become brand loyal. In their study, they conclude that it is the final element, subconscious psychological aspects, that induce a consumer to evolve into being brand loyal, rather than simply exhibiting repurchasing behavior. This means that when a consumer is brand loyal, they have a relationship with a brand, whereas repurchasing behavior is simply the action of buying the same product or service over and over again. The differentiation of the two concepts is particularly important for this study, as it is important to avoid the common confusion that repurchasing behavior is equivalent to brand loyalty. Therefore, this paragraph tries to further clarify brand loyalty and its place in this thesis.

2.5 Relationship Between Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, and Brand Loyalty

Several recent studies agree on the fact that customer satisfaction has a significant positive effect on both customer retention as well as brand loyalty (Nazir et al., 2016; Krystalllis & Chryssochou, 2014; Yang et al., 2017; Feng & Yanru, 2013). Moreover, the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction is often mentioned in previous literature (Ali & Raza, 2015; Angelova & Zekiri, 2011; Kuo, Chang, Cheng & Lia, 2013; Naik, Gantasala & Prabhakar, 2010; Siddiqi, 2011). Kuo et al., (2013) states that companies often enhance their service quality as a way to increase customer satisfaction. It has become a popular trend to retain a high service quality throughout several different industries, and the market is moving more and more towards a state where consumers demand better quality, regarding both services and products, in order for them to be satisfied (Angelova & Zekiri, 2011). Furthermore, Siddiqi (2011), as well as Naik et al., (2010), demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between service quality, more
specifically SERVQUAL, and customer satisfaction. The study conducted by Siddiqi (2011) determined that utilizing all five dimensions of SERVQUAL increases customer satisfaction, while the study performed by Naik \textit{et al.}, (2010) established that consumers view the promptness of service and service quality as one of the most important factors contributing to them being satisfied. The relationship was further established in more recent research, such as Ali and Raza (2015), which determined that the elements of SERVQUAL has a significant and positive impact on how satisfied customers feel.

The claim that customer satisfaction has a positive influence on brand loyalty has been supported several times (Back & Parks, 2003; Ene & Ozkaya, 2014; Fornell, 1992; Hussain, Al Nasser & Hussain, 2015). From the literature, it can therefore be assumed that there is a strong relation between customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. Hussain \textit{et al.} (2015) confirmed in their research that loyal consumers tend to spread a positive word-of-mouth, as well as frequently buy new products that the company produce, which are both positive consequences for the company. However, Fornell (1992) discovered in his research that satisfied customers are more likely to be loyal to a brand, nevertheless, loyal customers are not automatically satisfied.

Furthermore, in a study conducted by Bowen and Chen (2001), they agreed with the fact that customer satisfaction has a positive effect on brand loyalty. However, Bowen and Chen (2001) stated that the effect only becomes significant when customer satisfaction reaches high levels, where customers need to be extremely satisfied in order to become loyal to a certain brand. This is an important study, since partially satisfied customers does not seem to induce customer retention or brand loyalty at any significant level. This is further supported by a study conducted by Oliva, Oliver and MacMillian (1992). They also concluded that customer satisfaction does not always lead to consumers being loyal to that brand. Instead, they deduced that satisfaction and loyalty have little effect on each other until the consumers reach a point of immense satisfaction. Subsequently, there is a place reached in how satisfied the consumers are, where the loyalty towards a brand drastically increases. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that in order for service quality to induce completely satisfied customers, it needs to be of extremely high quality, where it fulfills all the 5 dimensions of the SERVQUAL model. Thus, a lack of customer
satisfaction in a company’s consumers most often also equals a lack of loyalty to that particular company (Bowen & Chen, 2001).

Moreover, a study conducted by Allan (2016), found that service quality positively affects brand loyalty, where customer satisfaction serves as a mediator between good service quality and brand loyalty. By using the SERVQUAL measurement of service quality as a foundation, Allan (2016) states that the five components of SERVQUAL needs to be partially fulfilled in order to induce a positive effect on customer satisfaction, and consequently brand loyalty. In the study conducted by Yang et al. (2017) done on the clothing company Superdry, stationed in Taiwan, they agree with the point Allan (2016) is making, where they also state that service quality has a positive influence on customer satisfaction. The factor of good service quality in a purchasing experience is therefore a key driver for having satisfied customers, which in turn would induce brand loyalty. This is further supported by Kuo et al. (2013) where they demonstrated that service quality and brand loyalty are interrelated with customer satisfaction as a mediator.

Furthermore, studies often differentiate customer retention from brand loyalty (Feng & Yanru, 2013; Krystallis & Chrysochou, 2014). On the other hand, research has found that customer retention has a highly significant effect on brand loyalty, meaning that customer retention serves as a step in the many factors that connect service quality with brand loyalty (Yang et al., 2017). Brand loyalty is therefore not a direct effect of service quality. Instead, service quality serves as a key basis for customer satisfaction, which has a positive effect on customer retention, which lastly has a significantly positive effect on brand loyalty. The connection between service quality, customer satisfaction and brand loyalty is vital for the execution of this study, as service quality, as discussed before, is noticeably hard to measure. By detecting that service quality has a positive effect on customer satisfaction, which then positively affects brand loyalty, the long complex process of measuring consumers’ perception of service quality is partly avoided. Also, by identifying the connection between service quality and brand loyalty, it can be seen that service quality has a highly significant role in the overall purchasing experience and is a key factor in the purchasing decisions of today’s customers.
2.6 Generations

Previous studies have shown that market trends, attitudes and consumer behavior varies among generations (Gurău, 2012; Lissitsa & Kol, 2016; Parment, 2013; Williams & Page, 2011) and therefore, in order to understand the different consumers wants and needs, studying the generational differences is necessary (Gözükara & Çolakoğlu, 2016).

Generation Y, also known as Millennials, has no definite description. However, researchers generally define Generation Y as people born in the time period between 1980 to early 2000s. For instance, Zemke, Raines and Filipczak (2000) defined the time period as 1980 to 2000, while Howe and Strauss (2000) defined Generation Y as people born between 1982 and 2004. Moreover, in a study conducted by Lancaster and Stillman (2010), Generation Y was defined as the time period born between 1981 and 2000. Nonetheless, studies agree that people belonging to this generation share similar characteristics. According to a study conducted by Rahulan, Troynikov, Watson, Janta and Senner (2015), Generation Y greatly value technical product information compared to other generations. Moreover, Generation Y spends more time on high-involvement product decisions (Parment, 2012).

Moreover, Generation X are people born between 1961 and 1981 (McGaugh, 2003). Generation X is more concerned with product features and prefers to be advised by salespeople or friends of the benefits of such features (Williams & Page, 2011). According to a study conducted by Jackson, Stoel and Brantley (2011), common characteristics of Generation X is that they are often dissatisfied with cultural icons and that they therefore have negative reactions to brands that use celebrity endorsements and that they are generally fascinated by the Internet. Furthermore, other characteristics that define Generation X is that they value their independence and freedom as well as they value a balance between work and everyday life to a high degree (Jorgensen, 2003).

The discussion of the generational tendencies is important in order to prove that there is indeed a difference in the behavioral characteristics of generations. It was included in the frame of reference as it is essential for the foundation of the thesis and serves as a clarification for the reader in order to avoid any confusion in terms of age spans as well as the different characteristics. Furthermore, due to the difference in characteristics, the
authors of this thesis thought it was interesting to see if the difference in behavior between the generations might affect any key factors of their purchasing decisions.

2.7 Hypotheses Formulation

Based on the examination of previous literature, several hypotheses were constructed;

**H1:** *Customer satisfaction has a positive influence on brand loyalty*

**H2:** *Service quality has a positive influence on brand loyalty*

**H3:** *There is a difference between generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty*

**H4:** *Generation Y will be less affected by the level of service quality in regard to brand loyalty in comparison to Generation X*

The first two hypotheses for this thesis were mainly composed to confirm previous studies claims about the relationship between service quality, customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. More specifically, when customers are satisfied with their purchase then that satisfaction could generate brand loyalty. Secondly, if a company provides excellent service quality, then that quality could also cause brand loyalty.

The third and fourth hypotheses were newly constructed since they had not been tested before in this type of setting. Here, the assumption being made is that the younger participants, belonging to Generation Y, will not be affected by poor service quality to the same extent as the older participants, belonging to Generation X. Furthermore, this means that there is a difference between the generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty.
3. Method

In this part of the thesis, the general approach as well as the philosophy is presented. Following with a thorough explanation of the experiment as well as the choice of participants in the experiment. Furthermore, the sampling method as well as the various sampling errors are brought forward, and the section is concluded with an explanation of the method of analysis.

This study attempted to measure the impact that service quality has on customer satisfaction, as well as if service quality has an effect on brand loyalty. Furthermore, the study investigated if there was any clear evidence that service quality had an impact on customer satisfaction and if the impact differed between generations. Where the specific generations tested in this study were Generation X in comparison to Generation Y.

3.1 Methodology

The main question that the research answered was regarding the relationship between service quality and brand loyalty and if the parameter of generational characteristics had an impact on how content the participants were with the service that they were given. To answer the hypotheses, data from both primary and secondary sources were used. The primary data was collected in a quantitative manner with the use of an experiment, while the secondary data was collected through empirical articles found primarily online. The primary data was collected using a quantitative method since that was the preferred way of addressing the hypotheses. The research problem is of a theoretical nature, since it studies a relationship between three factors; service quality, customer satisfaction, and brand loyalty (McCombes, 2020). This is because the method had to consider parameters such as age, as well as be able to make a generalization from the results onto a larger scale, more specifically, the population. A quantitative method was therefore the best fit in answering the hypotheses.

The research was conducted through a positivistic paradigm since it focused on facts and was aiming to find a causality (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). Further factors that are consistent with the positivistic ideal are firstly, research that is conducted with
hypothesis testing and second, research that use a relatively large sample. The sample size was constructed with regard to be able to later generalize the results on the population. Furthermore, a deductive approach was applied to the research (Saunders et al., 2009). This was because a theory was established from the previous literature and then developed into some hypotheses to be tested. Additional factors that strengthen the deductive approach being used was that an abundance of literary sources was used to formulate the theory as well as that the study was conducted to prove a causality between variables (Saunders et al., 2009).

3.1.1 Ethical Considerations

When conducting the study several different ethical factors had to be considered. Firstly, all participants had to confirm that they were over 18 years of age and that they were willingly participating in the study. This meant that the researchers did not need to add a paragraph about parental agreement for any of the participants and that none of the subjects were to feel forced to participate in the study. However, a concern might be that the subjects still felt pressured into participating in the experiment since the questionnaires were sent out directly to the participant’s personal Facebook accounts, which might have made it more difficult for them to decline if they wished to do so. Secondly, there was also an ethical consideration regarding gender and the fact that all participants should feel included and represented in the possible options when answering which gender they identified with. Therefore, three options; “male”, “female” and “other”, was available for the participants and when choosing the option “other”, the participants could state which gender they mostly identified with. Thirdly, it was also made clear to the participants that their answers would only be shared amongst the researchers as well as only saved for the duration of the study being conducted. The answers were then deleted. Lastly, the questionnaire was anonymous so that the participants would feel safe and comfortable to tell the truth about their experiences in the experiment. The researchers had no way of knowing which participant had answered which specific questionnaire.

3.1.2 Validity and Reliability

Furthermore, regarding validity, there are four different factors that cause a study to have validity; construct validity, content validity, face validity and criterion validity
Construct validity refers to whether or not a study measures the intended concept. Content validity examines if a study entirely measures its intended goal. Moreover, face validity refers to if a study, from a more subjective perspective, contains the right elements to test its aims. Finally, criterion validity states if a study’s results coincide with previous studies (Middleton, 2020a). Firstly, this experiment demonstrates construct validity through the questions that are specifically constructed towards answering the hypotheses. The questions were also evaluated by the researchers to prevent unnecessary or excessive questions being asked. Secondly, the study displays content validity through the aspect that all factors that were intended to be measured were measured. Brand loyalty, service quality and customer satisfaction are all represented in the experiment to the extent that was necessary for the hypotheses to be answered. Thirdly, similarly to content validity, the experiment further exhibits face validity through including questions regarding the three main topics on a basic level. Meaning, when glancing over the questionnaire the questions seems to be connected to the topic that was aimed to be studied. Lastly, the research demonstrates criterion validity since the research results corresponds with what previous research have determined.

In terms of reliability, the research displays internal consistency since the researchers had lengthy discussions regarding what factors were to be measured and how they were to be analyzed (Middleton, 2020b). This ensured that the aspects of the study were considered in identical ways by the researchers and decreased confusion when examining the result.

3.2 Measurements

A common method used when measuring customer satisfaction is the CSAT method (Karatepe, 2011; Rotella & Chulani, 2012; Verma & Singh, 2017). The method consists of asking consumers to rate different scenarios on a scale, often on a 1-5 point Likert Scale, but other scales ranging from 1-3, 1-7 or 1-10 can also be used (Pascal, 2016). On the scales, 1 represents a bad experience, for example strongly disagree, very dissatisfied or not likely at all, while the opposing side of the range (3, 5, 7, 10, etc.) represents a good experience, such as strongly agree, very satisfied, or extremely likely to (Karatepe, 2011). Furthermore, when choosing which range to utilize, different factors need to be considered. Culture is one factor that can play a big part in which range that fits best with a study (Pascal, 2016). For example, individualistic countries, according to Hofstede's
cultural dimensions, are more likely to choose the “extreme” options on a scale, while non-individualistic countries are more likely to gravitate towards the more neutral options in the middle (Chen, Lee & Stevenson, 1995). This means that Swedish consumers, who are native to an individualistic country, are more prone to choose very dissatisfied or very satisfied on a scale, while for example, Chinese consumers, who are native to a non-individualistic country, are more probable to select the option in the middle of the scale.

In this study, the CSAT method was utilized by attaching descriptors to each number on the 1-5 scale that was used in the questionnaire. The descriptors ranged from 1=Very Dissatisfied to 5=Very Satisfied and 1=Very Low Probability to 5=Very High Probability. A scale of 1-5 was chosen because a scale that has more options results in a smaller difference between the numbers and it would therefore be more difficult to differentiate between them as well as the cultural factors that were previously discussed in this chapter. The study was conducted in Sweden on Swedish consumers, which means that a scale with a smaller range is more appropriate since they are more likely to choose one of the extreme options.

3.3 Data Collection

The data was collected through an experiment which was designed as two separate questionnaires using the online survey software SurveyMonkey.com. Each questionnaire included a background section, with 6 background questions, a scenario section and 4 scenario-related questions. Both questionnaires had identical background and scenario-related questions, however, the scenarios differed in perceived service quality. Since the purpose of this thesis was to prove an existing causation between generations and the degree to which service quality has an effect on brand loyalty, the nature of collecting the data had to be quantitative in order for the sample to be able to properly represent the population, as well as enabling the data to be generalized. (Babbie, 2012). Additionally, since the aim was to prove causality, conducting an experiment was the optimal way of collecting the data, as there is a clear deficiency of purely statistical methods that are able to prove a cause-effect relationship (Chambliss & Schutt, 2006).

Moreover, the two surveys were both written in Swedish in order to avoid any possible language barriers that might have occurred due to a lack of English proficiency among
the participants. Since the study was conducted in Sweden, the majority of the respondents' native language was Swedish, however, all of them understood Swedish. Therefore, by writing the experiment in Swedish, the rate of which the participants properly understood the questions was most likely significantly higher.

Furthermore, SurveyMonkey.com was used mainly since the website offers the most tools when collecting the results, compared to Google Forms which was previously known to the researchers. However, one downside to SurveyMonkey.com is that the program limited the researchers to 10 questions, as adding more would require a purchase of a premium membership. Due to the lack of financing for this particular study, purchasing the premium membership was not an option. The study was therefore quite limited in terms of questions used in the surveys. On the other hand, one advantage to being limited to 10 questions is the likelihood of more participants answering the questions without losing interest or it takes up too much of their time. Therefore, SurveyMonkey.com was the ideal option for these surveys.

Finally, a range of methodological choices were considered for this study in order to properly execute the experiment as well as produce as accurate of a result as possible. The choices as well as a detailed description of the experiment will be further discussed below.

3.3.1 The Experiment

The choice to use an experiment, instead of a standard survey, as the method of data collection was because it is a beneficial research design when the researchers want to prove a cause and effect relationship, which is an aim of this thesis (Sumeracki, 2018). Advantages of using an experiment as the research design include that it is a straightforward approach to confirming a causality, with the possibility of manipulating different variables to recognize how the variables affect the constant (Sumeracki, 2018). On the other hand, disadvantages of using an experimental research design involve finding the correct balance of the amount of control. The more control the researchers have over the experiment, the more precise and detailed the experiment will be. However, if the researchers practice too much control, the experiment will seem artificial and
fabricated. This, in turn, might lead to the result not being generalizable since the results then only confirm one very specific situation (Sumeracki, 2018).

Moreover, the most important aspects of the experiment were that the participants were unaware of the topic of the thesis and unaware of the hypothesis. The participants were also unaware of the fact that there were two different surveys designed that contained different purchasing scenarios. The participants were only asked to reply to one of the two surveys.

Furthermore, when conducting an experiment, it is important that two or more separate groups of participants received two different types of treatments. It is also important that there is only one factor that is a variable while all other factors are constant. This is so that the researcher can clearly tell which of the aspects it is that influences the participants. Furthermore, the different groups must receive different types of treatments, meaning that the varying factor differences between the groups. In regard to this thesis, the different treatment that the groups received was the varying level of service quality (Söderlund, 2018).

3.3.2 The Participants

The experiment was sent to 147 participants in total, who were divided into two groups based on age. The age-groups selected were firstly based on several different definitions of Generation X and Generation Y. As previously mentioned, Generation X encompasses people born between 1961 and 1981, however in the case of the experiment, the ages were limited to people in the ages of 40 to 60 years old. Moreover, Generation Y consists of people born somewhere between 1981 and 2004. However, since the participants were required to at least be 18 years old, the youngest participants had to have turned 18 and be born before year 2001. Therefore, for the experiment, people in the ages of 18 to 29 years old represented Generation Y. As can be seen, there was a gap of people in the age span of 30-39, i.e. people born between 1981 and 1990. The reason for that choice was to create a clearer difference in the different age-groups, since it was assumed that participants too close in age might answer too similarly. To formulate, the first age-group in the experiment contained participants born between 1991 and 2001 and the second age-group contained people born between 1960 and 1980.
Afterwards, the participants were either placed in a group that received treatment or a group that received no treatment. When conducting an experiment, the experimenter impose treatment, in other words an independent variable, to one of the subject groups in order to measure the effect of that variable against the rest of the experiment (Söderlund, 2018). Moreover, in order to measure the effect of the chosen variable, all other factors in the experiment must be constant. The other group being studied is called the control group since it will receive no treatment and therefore “controls” the effect of the chosen variable. The control group can also determine if the variable has any effect or if there are other factors besides the variable that affect the results (Söderlund, 2018). In this study, the treatment variable was service quality which was incorporated in the scenario for subject group 1. The second group, subject group 2, received no treatment meaning a lack of service quality in their scenario. In both scenarios, the constant was customer satisfaction. To further explain the initial distribution process of the questionnaires; 25 participants of the total 50 participants belonging to Generation Y received treatment, and the other 25 did not. The same process was made with the 50 participants belonging to Generation X, where 25 of those participants received treatment and the other 25 did not.

After one week of the initial distribution, the questionnaires were only fully completed by 90% of the participants that received the survey. Therefore, a total of 47 new participants were given questionnaires in order to reach at least 100 responses. The 47 new subjects were divided by age and level of treatment precisely as in the initial distribution. However, in the initial distribution the response rate was higher among subject group 2, which were the ones that receives no treatment. As a result, the new participants were divided to minimize the response gap between the two questionnaires. In other words, 28 treatment questionnaires were distributed and 19 no treatment questionnaires were distributed. The original goal was to receive at least 100 responses since that amount was the most reasonable amount of responses attainable for the researchers to collect through a convenience sample and due to the limited timeframe and available resources. Out of the 47 new surveys sent out, only 9 were answered. The reason behind this could be that the 47 new participants who received the survey did not have as close of a relationship to the authors as the initial 100 participants who received the survey, which would explain the significantly lower response rate.
3.3.3 Background Questions

The first section of the experiment displayed a description of what to expect in the following survey without disclosing the purpose of the survey and the fact that the survey was indeed an experiment. Secondly, the survey presented a disclaimer stating that all gathered data would remain anonymous, secured solely among the researchers and erased once the thesis was finalized. Furthermore, after the disclaimer, the participants had to agree to be over 18 years old and agree to participate the in the study.

Following came background questions to determine characteristics of the sample. This part included questions about their gender, their age and what city they were born in. There were also some questions regarding their current relationship to brand loyalty, what TV-manufacturer they were currently using and how often they purchase products from the same brand. After the opening questions, the participants were presented with a scenario.

3.3.4 The Scenarios

The variable used to analyze the experiment was service quality. Service quality was therefore manipulated in the two scenarios of the questionnaires (see Appendix 4 & 5). The experiment scenarios introduced a made-up television brand called Televisa AB. The two separate scenarios differed in the level of service given to the customer when purchasing a television from Televisa AB. The scenarios were based upon the five dimensions of SERVQUAL, a measurement tool of service quality (Parasuraman et al. 1994). This was done in order to create service experiences that could be, to the extent possible, objectively considered good or bad. Additionally, the made-up television brand was used to remove some of the biases that might exist among the participants, that result from their personal beliefs, opinions, and past experiences towards existing television brands. In subject group 1, also known as the treatment group, excellent service quality was presented when purchasing the television which meant, in accordance to the SERVQUAL model, having ideal quality in all five dimensions. In contrast, in subject group 2, also known as the no treatment group, the scenario had a lack of service quality, which meant that it was missing certain aspects of the five dimensions that measures the ideal service experience. In other words, subject group 1 received a positive service experience while subject group 2 received a neutral service experience.
After the scenario, the participants were asked questions about their purchasing experience in the scenario and how they felt about the service that they were given. They were also asked if they would consider switching from their current TV-manufacturer to Televisa AB and if they would consider buying additional products from Televisa AB based on their experience with the new brand. Regardless if the participants were presented with the scenario with excellent service quality, or with the scenario where there was a lack of service quality, they were asked the same questions about their experience.

Finally, the television industry was chosen for the experiment as it represents a high-involvement product which the authors believe to not be affected by highly opinionated consumers in comparison to other high-involvement products, such as smartphones. Where high involvement is defined as when the consumer perceives a high level of risk as well as a high personal relevance in regard to a purchase (Fill & Turnbull, 2016). Furthermore, a television does not require extensive knowledge about the product in comparison to computers or other tech-products, due to the limited usage of televisions compared to other high-involvement tech-products. Therefore, televisions were chosen in order to reduce the number of outside factors that might affect the participants answers due to pre-existing opinions and beliefs about the specific product.

3.4 Sampling

Data was collected from 110 participants out of the 147 who received the questionnaire, meaning that the experiment had a response rate of 75%. Moreover, 10% of the collected data contained unfinished results, either respondents did not want to finish the questionnaire or they were unaware of the third page of the experiment. It was not possible to remind the 10% to complete their survey, since the questionnaires were anonymous. It also might have influenced their answers and therefore made them invalid if they had been notified to answer the questionnaire repeatedly. Therefore, data was used from a total of 99 questionnaires. Furthermore, the data was gathered by a convenience sample, which is a sampling method which relies on data collected from a population that is conveniently available to participate in the study (Saunders et al., 2009). In this case, the questionnaires were distributed personally to each participant through Facebook and
email. That mode of distribution was chosen because it was the favored way of gaining direct contact with the participants. Facebook messenger was the preferred choice of distribution since it made it possible for the researchers to determine if the participants had received the questionnaires or not through the “seen” symbol at the bottom of the Facebook messenger function. Also, it was distributed individually to each participant since they had to answer the survey by themselves in order to not have their answers influenced by anyone else. The reason for choosing a convenience sample was mainly due to the limited timeframe in which the experiment had to be conducted, and also in order to have enough time to properly analyze the collected data. Moreover, since the experiment contained two separate questionnaires, the experiment could not be distributed on social media or through other channels. Instead, the surveys had to be sent personally to each participant in order to distribute the questionnaires equally, and in order to make sure that the participants were inherent to the correct generation.

3.4.1 Sampling Error

When conducting an experiment, it is important to be aware that there is a possibility that there will be some errors made in the sampling process. In this research, a possible error was that the participants might know each other and discuss the questionnaire amongst themselves before everyone had a chance to complete the survey, since the research was conducted using a convenience sample. This might affect and influence the participant’s answers when responding to the survey. Another possible sampling error was that, since the sample consists of people that the authors know, the participants might be likeminded and therefore not be an accurate representation of the entire population. Meaning, that the generalization that is made is not completely legitimate. Lastly, since the participants had some sort of relationship to the authors, they might have been hesitant to answer in a negative manner in either survey for the sake of not hurting the author's feelings, which could have affected the answers.

3.5 Method of Analysis

The main method for analyzing the results was to compare the answers of both surveys on how satisfied the participants were with the purchasing experience, as well as how likely they were to purchase additional products from Televisa AB, and if they would consider switching to Televisa AB from their existing preferred television brand. By doing
so, the researchers tried to identify any causation between service quality and customer satisfaction as well as brand loyalty of the participants. The conclusion that might be possible to draw from the experiment is that customer satisfaction and brand loyalty is a result of service quality, since all factors besides service quality were constant in both questionnaires.

The analysis begun with interpreting and evaluating the data. When the results were organized in a sufficient manner, they were entered into SPSS to be analyzed further. SPSS is a software program that aid in managing and analyzing statistical data (Foley, 2018). This software program was chosen for this task since it is a leading data analysis program as well as the world standard when analyzing business statistics (Foley, 2018). It also provides the necessary tools needed in order to properly analyze the data. Furthermore, after entering the data into SPSS, several different analyses were conducted. To specify, a regression analysis as well as a correlation analysis were executed. A regression analysis was used since it is a common form of analysis to utilize when the researchers want to investigate a relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables (Beers, 2020). In this study, the dependent variable that was used was customer satisfaction, while the independent variables were service quality, generations, gender and county. Moreover, a correlation analysis was used to detect if there was a correlation between two or more factors (Hayes, 2019). The factors that were used in this study was service quality, generations, customer satisfaction, likelihood of repurchase and willingness of the consumers to switch their current TV-brand. In this research, as previously mentioned, the relationship that was focused on what the relationship between how valuable the service quality received was, and the generation of the participant, where customer satisfaction represented the value of service quality.
4. Empirical Findings

This section presents the various results of the experiment, and presents the data using text and figures. The section clearly states the results gathered from each individual question, and gives a clear understanding of what the collected data looks like and what the most common responses were. Lastly, the section helps provide a foundation for the analysis of the data.

In total, there were 110 participants that took part in the experiment. However, only 99 out of the 110 participants completed either of the surveys and could be included in the study. Out of the 99 viable answers, 52 belonged to the treatment group, and 47 belonged to the no treatment group. However, an approximately equal amount of both the treatment and no treatment was sent out, but the response rate of the treatment survey was slightly higher, and therefore the number of answers was slightly higher.

Furthermore, in regard to the generations in both surveys, the treatment survey was answered by 27 participants belonging to Generation X, and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y. The no treatment survey was answered by 22 participants belonging to Generation X, and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y.

4.1 Background Questions

The background-related questions were asked in both questionnaires and served the purpose of identifying the characteristics of the population (see Appendix 2). Moreover, question 3, regarding which year the participants were born in, were mainly asked to gather information about the population’s age in order to draw conclusions based on Generation X and Generation Y. Furthermore, the other background-related questions such as gender, birthplace and pre-existing loyalties to the television industry were asked in order to possibly find other factors that could explain the result. The results are presented below.
4.1.1 Year of Birth

As previously mentioned, the years of birth among the participants was fairly equally distributed in both surveys. Where the treatment survey gathered answers from 27 participants belonging to Generation X and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y, which approximately represents 52% and 48% respectively. The no treatment survey gathered answers from 22 participants belonging to Generation X and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y, which approximately represents 47% and 53% respectively. Finally, virtually the entire spectrum of ages within the generations were represented. The years of birth within Generation X varied between 1960-1978 and the year of births within Generation Y varied between 2001-1991 (see Appendix 6).

4.1.2 Gender

As previously mentioned, the years of birth among the participants was fairly equally distributed in both surveys. Where the treatment survey gathered answers from 27 participants belonging to Generation X and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y, which approximately represents 52% and 48% respectively. The no treatment survey gathered answers from 22 participants belonging to Generation X and 25 participants belonging to Generation Y, which approximately represents 47% and 53% respectively. Finally, virtually the entire spectrum of ages within the generations were represented. The years of birth within Generation X varied between 1960-1978 and the year of births within Generation Y varied between 2001-1991 (see Appendix 6).
As previously mentioned in chapter 3 of the thesis, gender was included in order to test if the variable of gender had any impact on the perceived satisfaction of the participants. The gender of the participants was divided equally in the treatment survey, but predominantly female in the no treatment survey. The reason for this was that the convenience sample was predominantly female, as well as the response rate of female participants being slightly higher for the no treatment survey. In the treatment survey, the division of gender was 50% male and 50% female, and in the no treatment survey, the division was 28% male and 72% female. However, the disproportionate division of gender in the no treatment survey did not have a significant effect on the result of the study, as will be further discussed in the analysis.

4.1.3 Birthplace
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As previously stated, the participants were asked to state their birthplace which was later divided by the authors into counties. This was done in order to be able to categorize the participants birthplaces and to test, in the analysis, if the variable of geographical location had any effect on the perceived satisfaction of the participants. The result showed that 36% of the participants were born in Jönköpings county and 25% were born in Stockholms county. Moreover, 7% of the participants were born in Västra Götalands county, 5% were born in Kronobergs county and finally, the remaining 27% of the
participants were scattered amongst several different counties (see Appendix 7). The result presents a somewhat large spread among the respondents in the study.

For the presentation of the results, the counties were then again categorized into the three country regions of Sweden: Norrland, Svealand and Götaland. Which was done in order to make it easier for the reader to interpret the results as well as to be able to integrate all responses into larger, well established categories.

4.1.4 Loyalty Inducing Factors

The questionnaire asked the participants to “Identify three factors that causes you to be loyal towards a brand”. This question was asked to see what other factors the participants perceive could induce loyalty in them. The four most commonly answered factors were quality, price, service and sustainability. This was the case for both Generation Y and Generation X. However, Generation X also felt that design and previous experience with the brand were equally as important as sustainability. Quality was stated by 28% of the participants belonging to Generation X, and 27% of the participants belonging to Generation Y. Secondly, price was mentioned by 16% of the participants belonging to Generation X and 17% of the participants belonging to Generation Y. Thirdly, service was mentioned by 8% of the participants belonging to Generation X and mentioned by 11% of the participants belonging to Generation Y. Lastly, sustainability was mentioned by 8% of the participants belonging to Generation X and 9% of the participants belonging
to Generation Y. Furthermore, the remaining percentages (18% in Generation X and 16% in Generation Y) are included in Appendix 8.

4.1.5 Current TV-Brand
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**Figure 4.5 “Television Brands”**

This background question asked, “Which television the participants owned at the time they participated in the study”. The question was asked as a preparative question for the last scenario question, which asked whether they would consider switching from their current TV-brand to Televisa AB. This helped the participants think of their current TV-brand, meaning that they could easier make the connection when asked if they would consider switching to Televisa AB. The participants owned a range of different TV’s. However, the most prominent brands in both Generation X and Generation Y were Samsung, LG, and Philips, representing in total 32% of Generation X’s and 37% of Generation Y’s current TV’s.
4.1.6 Previous Purchasing Habits

The last question of the background section in both surveys asked, “How often do you purchase products from the same brand?” Where the question was asked to detect if the participants perceived themselves to be brand loyal, in order to be able to compare the participant’s self-perceived brand loyalty with their actual actions. The participants were asked to answer on a scale from 1-5, where 1 = Very Seldom and 5 = Very Often (see Appendix 2).

4.2 Scenario-Related Questions

The scenario-related questions were follow-up questions from the provided scenario. The participants in both experiments were asked the same follow-up questions regardless of the amount of treatment they received. The questions were asked to determine the satisfaction rate of the purchasing experience, to discover suggestions for a more satisfied experience, and to identify if any indicators for brand loyalty towards Televisa AB could be seen in the participants.
4.2.1 Customer Satisfaction with *Televisa AB*

The first question asked, after the reader was introduced to the scenario, was “How satisfied would you have been with the purchasing experience at *Televisa AB*?” This question was asked in order to find out the level of perceived satisfaction attained by the participant as a result of service quality. The participants answered the question by rating the experience from 1-5, where 1=Very dissatisfied and 5=Very Satisfied (see Appendix 3). In the treatment survey, the mean answer for Generation Y was $\mu = 4.44$ and for Generation X the mean answer was $\mu = 4.22$. In the no treatment survey, the mean answer was $\mu = 2.92$ for Generation Y and $\mu = 2.64$ for Generation X.
4.2.2 Satisfaction Increasing Factors

Figure 4.8 “Satisfaction Increasing Factors: Treatment”

Figure 4.9 “Satisfaction Increasing Factors: No Treatment”

The second scenario-related question asked, “What would have made you more satisfied with the purchasing experience?” The participants were asked to state a few factors that would have made them more satisfied with the overall purchasing experience described in the scenario. This question was asked to detect if there were factors that the participants were dissatisfied with, in order to confirm that the treatment scenario with excellent service quality, was actually perceived as excellent service quality. Also, to detect if service quality was a factor that the participants felt was missing in the no treatment survey.
As seen in Figure 4.8, in the treatment survey, the most common answers were lower prices and discounts, even though price was never mentioned in the scenario. Moreover, a few participants in the treatment survey thought the scenario described the salespeople of Televisa AB as too eager to help. As seen in Figure 4.9, in the no treatment survey, many of the participants said that they would have appreciated some sort of contact with the store personnel, and many wanted confirmation of the information they received from the information leaflet from a store clerk. Moreover, larger assortment of products was also mentioned. The “other” category represents factors that were only mentioned by one participant, for example that the TV will live up to the promised standard and if they had been offered complementing products to the TV.

4.2.3 Likelihood of Purchasing Additional Products
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The third question asked after the scenario was “How likely are you to purchase an additional product from Televisa AB?”. This question was used as an indicator for brand loyalty, where the higher the probability of them purchasing additional goods, the higher the likelihood is of them being brand loyal. The participants answered the question by rating the probability of them purchasing additional products from Televisa AB on a scale from 1-5, where a 1=Very Unlikely and 5=Very Likely (see Appendix 3). In the treatment survey, the mean answer for Generation Y was $\mu = 4.04$ and the mean for Generation X
was \( \mu = 3.81 \). In the no treatment survey, the mean answer for Generation Y was \( \mu = 3.04 \) and \( \mu = 2.91 \) for Generation X.

4.2.4 Switching of TV-Brand

![Graph showing switching of TV-brands for different generations](image)

**Figure 4.11 “Switching TV-Brand”**

The last question asked after the scenario was, “Based on your purchasing experience at Televisa AB, would you consider switching from your current television brand to a Televisa AB television?”. This question, similarly to the previous question, was used as an indicator for brand loyalty. The question was answered with either Yes or No in both the treatment and no treatment surveys. In the treatment survey, out of the 25 participants belonging to Generation Y, 17 answered Yes and 9 answered No. Out of the 27 participants belonging to Generation X, 20 answered Yes and 7 answered No. In the no treatment survey, out of the 25 answers from Generation Y, 8 answered Yes and 17 answered No. And out of the 22 answers from Generation X, 6 answered Yes and 16 answered No (see Figure 4.11).
5. Analysis and Interpretation

In this part, the findings analyzed using SPSS are presented and explained. A correlation analysis as well as a linear multiple regression analysis is applied to the dataset, and the various hypotheses are either rejected or supported in conformity with the data results.

For the interpretation and analysis of the primary data, SPSS was used in order to gain a more thorough and in-depth understanding of the primary data in general. Five different variables were used in order to execute the various analyses. Service quality, shortened to ServiceQual, was one, which contained two values; treatment and no treatment. The second one was Generation, which also contained two values, Generation Y and Generation X. The third variable was Satisfaction, which contained five values that followed an ordinal scale of 1-5, where each number represented an appropriate value, in the form of a word, according to the CSAT approach. The fourth variable was County, which had a total of 18 values, where 1-17 represented the different counties throughout the entirety of Sweden, and 18 represented “others”. The “others” category consisted of counties that were picked by less than two participants. The last variable was Gender, which had two values, female and male, since the value “other” was not chosen by any of the respondents.

The following analyses will be conducted to test the previously mentioned hypotheses. This chapter will either support or reject the author’s theorem.

**H1:** Customer satisfaction has a positive influence on brand loyalty

**H2:** Service quality has a positive influence on brand loyalty

**H3:** There is a difference between generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty

**H4:** Generation Y will be less affected by the level of service quality in regard to their brand loyalty in comparison to Generation X
5.1 Correlation Analysis

To begin, a correlation analysis was conducted in SPSS, using the available data, in order to test all four hypotheses. As can be seen in Table 5.1 “Correlations A”, supposing that the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction is linear; the Pearson Correlation value between the variables ServiceQual and Satisfaction is indeed significant. Where ServiceQual had a correlation with Satisfaction of 0.766, and Satisfaction had a correlation with ServiceQual of 0.766, with a significance value of 0.000. Where the Pearson Correlation value 1 means a perfect correlation between variables. The analysis therefore clearly indicated a high correlation between the level of satisfaction in the participants and whether or not they received treatment. This demonstrates that the consumers that received a positive purchasing experience (treatment) in their scenario, would theoretically attain a higher satisfaction.

However, the variable Generation, which represents the two values Generation Y and Generation X, did not have any significant correlation with satisfaction. Due to the significant value being 0.405, and 0.405 > 0.01, making the correlation insignificant. This means that the satisfaction that the participants felt that they achieved was not affected by the generation that they belong to.

Concerning Hypothesis 3, which states that “There is a difference between generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty”, the analysis above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>ServiceQual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServiceQual</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.766**</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  

Table 5.1. “Correlations A”
rejects that statement since, as previously mentioned, no significant correlation between the two variables could be detected. Nevertheless, a very small difference could be seen in how the generations are affected by service quality, however, it was not large enough for it to be considered statistically significant.

This analysis also rejects Hypothesis 4 which states that “Generation Y will be less affected by the level of service quality in regard to their brand loyalty in comparison to Generation X”, as no correlation between generations and customer satisfaction can be proven. And since it has been established in the Frame of Reference chapter that customer satisfaction serves as an indicator of brand loyalty, the lack of correlation means that there is no difference in the effect that service quality has on the level of brand loyalty among Generation X and Generation Y.

Table 5.2 “Mean of Satisfaction”

In order to further strengthen the claim that customer satisfaction is affected by the level of service quality, an analysis of the mean satisfaction in the participants from both the treatment and the no treatment groups were compared and interpreted with a line graph (see Table 5.2). Where the Y-axis shows the mean satisfaction of the participants and the X-axis shows whether or not they belong to the treatment or no treatment group. This analysis continues to sustain the claims made previously, where the mean satisfaction of the no treatment group was approximately $\mu = 2.8$ and approximately $\mu = 4.3$ for the treatment group. This would indicate a 54% increase in satisfaction if service quality is increased from neutral to excellent quality.
These analyses support the claims made by Allan (2016), and Yang et al. (2017) that service quality indeed does have a positive influence on customer satisfaction. Where, according to the findings of this study, the participants’ satisfaction is greatly influenced by the level of service that they were presented with. Furthermore, the treatment survey of the experiment in this study is in accordance with Bowen and Chen’s (2001) claims that the service quality needs to be excellent and fulfill all dimensions of the SERVQUAL model in order to have any significant effect on a customer’s satisfaction. This is supported due to the fact that the treatment scenario included a service experience which implemented all five dimensions of the SERVQUAL model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations B</th>
<th>ServiceQual</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>TeleRepurchase</th>
<th>Switch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ServiceQual</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.766**</td>
<td>.597**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.766**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.689**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeleRepurchase</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.597**</td>
<td>.689**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.261**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.3 “Correlations B”

In table 5.3 “Correlations B”, two additional variables were added to the correlations analysis in order to see if customer satisfaction has any significant effect on brand loyalty. The additional variables added were TeleRepurchase and Switch. Where TeleRepurchase represented the probability of the participants purchasing additional products from Televisa AB, ranging from 1-5 on an ordinal scale, again, with an attached word to each number following the CSAT approach. Switch represented whether or not the participants answered Yes or No if they were willing to switch from their current TV-brand to Televisa AB. These variables were used together as indicators of brand loyalty. Where participants who answered that they were very likely to purchase additional goods as well as switch
to Televisa AB from their current TV-brand, could be considered as partly loyal to Televisa AB based on their purchasing experience.

By looking at Table 5.3, a clear correlation between the ServiceQual variable and both TeleRepurchase and Switch can be seen, where the Pearson Correlation numbers are 0.597 and 0.352 respectively for the variables. The significance level is also below 0.05 (both variables are at a 0.000 level) for both the TeleRepurchase variable and the Switch variable, which means that the correlation is significant.

Furthermore, according to the analysis shown in Table 5.3, the variable Satisfaction also has a significant effect on both TeleRepurchase and Switch, with a Pearson Correlation of 0.689 for Satisfaction against TeleRepurchase, and a Pearson Correlation of 0.322 for Satisfaction against the variable Switch. Additionally, both variables have a significance value lower than 0.05, proving a significant correlation. This means that the more satisfied the consumers are, the higher the probability of them purchasing additional products from Televisa AB, and also the more likely they are to switch to Televisa AB from their current TV-brand.

This analysis supports Hypothesis 1 which states that “Customer satisfaction has a positive influence on brand loyalty”, since, as previously mentioned, the TeleRepurchase and Switch variables represents and indicate brand loyalty. Hypothesis 1 is thereby not rejected.

Moreover, this analysis also supports Hypothesis 2 which states that “Service quality has a positive influence on brand loyalty”, due to service qualities positive influence on TeleRepurchase and Switch. Thus, Hypothesis 2 is not rejected.
5.2 Regression Analysis

The second analysis made was a multiple linear regression analysis, which further tested Hypotheses 3 and 4. The analysis was made in order to evaluate whether or not the other variables, namely County, Generation and Gender, that were measured in the experiment, had any significant effect on the customer satisfaction of the participants. The regression analysis was made using Satisfaction as the dependent variable, and Generation, ServiceQual, Gender, and County as the constant or, in other words, independent variables.

![Model Summary](image)

*Table 5.4 “Model Summary”*

![Coefficients A](image)

*Table 5.5 “Coefficients A”*

By looking at Table 5.4 “Model Summary”, which shows a fairly high R Square, meaning how much of the variance in Satisfaction can be predicted by the constants, it was clear that the constants had a significant effect on the dependent variable Satisfaction. Where a R Square value of 0.611 means that the constants used could predict approximately 61% of the variance in the dependent variable Satisfaction.

Moreover, interpreting table 5.5 “Coefficients A”, where the significance of each individual constant can be seen by looking at the Sig. value (significance value). With a
confidence interval of 95%, as is the standard, only two of the four independent variables can be considered to have a significant effect on the dependent variable Satisfaction, since only two constants had a significance lower than 0.05. Where the ServiceQual variable had a significance value of 0.00 and the Generation variable had a significance value of 0.031. Furthermore, it can be concluded that neither Gender nor County had any significant effect on how satisfied the participants were. They can both thereby be dismissed as having a sufficient influence on customer satisfaction. Therefore, the disproportionate division of both gender and county does not have a significant effect on the overall result, considering that neither variable correlates with customer satisfaction.

However, the analysis proves that there is a correlation between customer satisfaction and service quality, it also states a correlation between generations and the level of satisfaction of the participants, where Generation X are in general less satisfied. This contradicts the previous analysis conclusion that the variable Generation had no significant correlation with the level of satisfaction of the participants.

Referring to Table 5.6 “Coefficients B”, when removing the variables ServiceQual, Gender, and County, the significance level of the effect that variable Generations has on the dependent variable Satisfaction is 0.405. Which is considerably higher than 0.05, meaning that the correlation is insignificant, and the variable Generation that the participants belonged to does not influence their level of customer satisfaction. A reason for the difference in terms of significance value between Table 5.5 and Table 5.6 might be that the inclusion of the variables ServiceQual, Gender, and County included an excessive amount of overlap between the different variables, and gave a falsely interpreted significance value of the Generation variable in Table 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.850</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>12.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 5.6 “Coefficients B”
Regarding Hypothesis 3, Table 5.6 rejects this hypothesis, which states “There is a difference between generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty”, since, as previously mentioned in this section, the results in this analysis could not be considered statistically significant.

Furthermore, this analysis would have supported Hypothesis 4 which states “Generation Y will be less affected by the level of service quality in regard to their brand loyalty in comparison to Generation X” if the analysis could be considered statistically significant. However, due to the interference of the other variables, the conclusion is that the Generation variable is insignificant and therefore rejects Hypothesis 4.

5.3 Analysis of Empirical Findings

This section was included in order to provide readers with the analysis of the empirical findings that did not have a tremendous effect on the overall results of the study. However, it provided the authors with valuable insights that could contribute to the explanation of the results and also, be interesting for future research.

First and foremost, referring to section 4.1.4, regarding loyalty inducing factors among the participants, where service was, as assumed by the authors, one of the most important factors. However, quality, price and sustainability were mentioned by several participants, indicating that these factors could also have a significant effect on brand loyalty. Based on these results, Generation X and Generation Y had similar ideas concerning what was important factors for inducing brand loyalty. Both generations also answered relatively similar, proportion-wise, regarding these factors. This suggests that there are hardly any differences between Generation X and Generation Y regarding perceived quality, price and sustainability. Same as what the regression -and correlation analysis demonstrated, that service quality has similar impact on the two generations. Indicating that in modern times, generational differences do not have a compelling impact on brand loyalty.

Secondly, regarding section 4.1.6, where the question was used in order to detect if the participants perceived themselves to be brand loyal. The overall responses support the conclusions drawn in previous analyses, where there was no difference in brand loyalty
between the generations. Therefore, the perception of the participants agrees with the results of previous analysis.

5.4 Interpretation of Analysis

H1: “Customer satisfaction has a positive influence on brand loyalty” is not rejected.
H2: “Service quality has a positive influence on brand loyalty” is not rejected.

H3: “There is a difference between generations concerning service quality and its relationship to brand loyalty” is rejected.
H4: “Generation Y will be less affected by the level of service quality in regard to their brand loyalty in comparison to Generation X” is rejected.

No evidence that would suggest any statistically significant differences between Generation X and Generation Y could be found in this study, despite previous research claiming a difference in generational values and purchasing behavior. The reason behind why the results contradict previous studies are unknown, however, the authors have speculated on a few factors that might have influenced the result. Firstly, that the generational differences in Sweden might not be as significant as they are in other countries. This is mainly based on the fact that the research used in the Frame of Reference chapter is done on other geographical areas and countries than Sweden, since there is a clear shortage of studies conducted on the population of Sweden regarding generational differences. Secondly, the results could also point towards the difference in generations being less impactful in present day than they were when the research used in the Frame of Reference was conducted.
6. Conclusion

This section provides a conclusion of the results of the thesis and provides a clear explanation of what was concluded in the analysis.

This thesis aimed to identify if there is a difference in how various generations value service quality and how that importance perceived by them affects their loyalty towards brands. Furthermore, the purpose of this thesis was to measure the impact that service quality has on customer satisfaction, as well as if service quality has any significant effect on brand loyalty. Based on a quantitative analysis, the most compelling conclusion was that service quality has a relatively large impact on customer satisfaction, where the impact seems to be more significant if the service quality reaches high levels.

Additionally, evidence seems to support previous studies claim that service quality has a positive effect on brand loyalty. However, similar to the previous statement and complying with previous research on the topic, the effect seems to become considerably more significant when the service quality is excellent or of very high level.

Moreover, no statistically significant evidence could be found that there was a difference in customer satisfaction as well as brand loyalty in regard to service quality between Generation X and Generation Y. This was concluded despite the considerable amount of research supporting a difference between generational tendencies. Although a smaller difference in the general satisfaction between Generation X and Generation Y could be seen when interpreting the results of the experiment, the correlation was not statistically significant.

Lastly, the variables of both geographical location and gender was tested in correlation to customer satisfaction, however no statistically significant correlation between either geographical location or gender could be concluded.
7. Discussion

This section is divided into three parts. Firstly, it discusses the various limitations of the research. Secondly, the section presents the author’s recommendations on future research, and lastly, the overall contributions of the thesis are given.

7.1 Limitations

This thesis has a range of limitations. Firstly, regarding the sampling method, due to the participants of the experiment being chosen out of convenience, the geographical spread of the participants is fairly narrow. This might result in the study not being able to represent the entirety of Sweden. Furthermore, due to certain time limitations, the study was only able to acquire a total of 99 completed survey results, resulting in a low spread in terms of the ages of the participants, and might therefore reduce the precision of the research.

Secondly, as the research was conducted, a realization occurred that the TV industry might not have been the most suitable industry for this sample. This is due to feedback received that many of the participants in the younger generation were unfamiliar with that kind of purchase and therefore had a difficult time relating to the scenario. This might have affected their answers as well as their sincerity.

Thirdly, the survey service “SurveyMonkey.com” only allow 10 questions to be used without paying a subscription fee. This meant that in some instances, several inquiries were made under the same question, which might have confused and thereby limited the thoroughness of the answers from the participants. Lastly, the authors recognize that a bias might have been present in the participants when answering the survey, since they were acquaintances of the authors.

7.2 Future Research

For future research, it could be relevant to use a different type of product, more specifically a product that is considered to be a low involvement product, to conduct the research, and thereby see if the results are considerably different. Additionally, in order
to contribute to the validity of the claim that there is no difference in valuing service quality between Generation X and Generation Y, a larger sample should be tested in order to see if the result deviate from that of this study. Furthermore, it would also be interesting to see if there is a difference between other generations, and if the results would contest the results of this study.

Moreover, it could be interesting to explore if a small increase in service quality, instead of a substantial difference as tested in this thesis, also has a significant effect on customer satisfaction. And if it in turn would have any effect on brand loyalty. This could be done by having several levels of treatment in the experiment, instead of only having two groups that either received treatment or no treatment. Furthermore, in future studies, it might be intriguing to conduct a similar study but to implement the other loyalty inducing factors that were found in this study, and correlate them to service quality.

Lastly, the authors suggest that research is done using subjects from other areas in Sweden, in contrast to primarily Stockholm and Jönköping, which were the main areas used for this thesis. And perhaps use subjects from other countries to see if cultural differences might have an impact on service quality effect on customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. Also, to test if the generational differences are less impactful in Sweden in comparison to other countries.

7.3 Contributions

This thesis has contributed to the field of brand loyalty, both from a managerial and theoretical aspect. These will be further discussed below.

7.3.1 Managerial Contributions

The findings of this study are mainly relevant for companies that deal with high-involvement products similar to that of televisions. These companies can use this information to further strengthen their service quality in order to maintain a higher customer satisfaction, and in turn, induce brand loyalty in their customers.

However, it is important for companies to note that customer satisfaction seem to only have a significant effect on brand loyalty when it reaches higher levels. Therefore, the
need for companies to focus on excellent service quality is essential in order for them to be able to induce high levels of customer satisfaction in search for loyal customers.

7.3.2 Theoretical Contributions

Since the results of this study conclude that there is no difference in how Generation X and Generation Y value service quality, the study contributes to opportunities to further discussion of the subject of generational differences. Where the results of this study point towards generational differences not being as relevant today as they were when previous research was conducted.

Moreover, this type of study, focusing on service quality’s effect on customer satisfaction, is highly scarce in regard to Sweden as a geographical area, and this thesis has therefore contributed to providing a foundation for future researches on this topic that wish to focus on Sweden or other Nordic countries.
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9. Appendix

9.1 Appendix 1 – Background (Both Surveys)

**Bachelor Thesis 2020**

**Bakgrund:**

På följande sidor kommer du ombes svara på ett antal frågor om dig själv samt att besvara frågor kring din attityd och upplevelse i ett kort scenario. Enkäten tar upp till 5 min att svara på.

Vänligen läs igenom all information noggrant och svara så ärligt du kan.

**OBS:**

Dina svar som du anger i denna studien kommer att förbliv anonyma och de kommer endast att sparas tills studien är färdigställd. Därefter kommer svaren att raderas.

Resultaten kommer endast att användas till denna studien och kommer endast att delas mellan de ansvariga för studien.

9.2 Appendix 2 – Background Questions

* 1. Jag är 18 år och godkänner min medverkan i denna studie.
  - Ja
  - Nej

* 2. KÖN
  - Man
  - Kvinna
  - Annan...

* 3. Födelseår & Födelseort (Exempelvis ”1972” och ”Jönköping”)

* 4. Vad får dig att vara lojal mot varumärken? (Nämn minst 3 faktorer)


9.3 Appendix 3 – Post-Scenario Questions

**Bachelor Thesis 2020**

* 6. Hur nöjd hade du varit med köpplevelsen på Televisa AB?

[ ] Inte alls nöjd  [ ] Ganska nöjd  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Nöjd  [ ] Väldigt nöjd

* 7. Vad hade fått dig att känna dig *mer* nöjd med köpplevelsen på Televisa AB?

* 8. Vad är sannolikheten att du skulle köpa ytterligare en produkt från Televisa AB?

[ ] Väldigt låg  [ ] Låg  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Hög  [ ] Väldigt hög

* 9. Baserat på din köpplevelse hos Televisa AB, skulle du kunna tänka dig att byta från din nuvarande TV-leverantör, till Televisa AB?

[ ] Ja  [ ] Nej  [ ] Om nej, varför inte....

* 10. Hur ofta köper du produkter från samma varumärke?

[ ] Inte ofta alls  [ ] Ganska ofta  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Ofa  [ ] Väldigt ofta
9.4 Appendix 4 – Scenario for Treatment Survey

**English Translation of Appendix 9.4**

**Scenario**

Televisa AB has just released a new TV that possess all the characteristics that you are looking for and that is within your budget. You arrive at your closest Televisa store to complete the purchase.

When you enter the store, you immediately go over to the TV department and find a wall filled with your desired TV. At the TV department, you begin reading the product description at the same time as an employee from Televisa introduces themselves with a smile while asking if they can assist you with something.

You ask a couple of questions regarding the smart functions that the TV possess, that you want to have answered before purchasing the TV. The employee answers your questions in an interested and knowledgeable manner. You get all your questions answered by the employee and proceed to the registers to purchase the TV.

After the purchase, you leave the store with the new TV and go home.

MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE READ THE SCENARIO CAREFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
9.5 Appendix 5 – Scenario for No Treatment Survey

**English Translation of Appendix 9.5**

**Scenario**

Televisa AB has just released a new TV that possess all the characteristics that you are looking for and that is within your budget. You arrive at your closest Televisa store to complete the purchase.

When you enter the store, you immediately go over to the TV department and notice that some of the products in the store seems to be sold out since a few of the shelves are empty. At the TV department, you begin reading the product description, but realize that you still have a couple of questions regarding the smart functions that the TV possess. You would like to get your questions answered before buying the TV.

You look around and realize the only employee at Televisa is busy assisting another customer as well as there are several other customers waiting for assistance from the employee. Instead of waiting for the employee to answer your questions, you find an information leaflet that answer the questions you had and proceed to the registers to purchase the TV.

After the purchase, you leave the store with the new TV and go home.

MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE READ THE SCENARIO CAREFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
Appendix 6 – Year of Birth - Detailed
9.7 Appendix 7 – Birthplace by County
## 9.8 Appendix 8 – “Other Factors” Loyalty Inducing Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other factors that induce loyalty in the consumers</th>
<th>Generation Y</th>
<th>Generation X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product/Function</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern/Trendy</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Experience</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Status</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Time</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large range of products</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in product’s community</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>