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Abstract

This study brings up the importance of using the store environment as a tool for creating positive consumer experiences. It compares two consumer shopping motives, hedonic (related to sensations and fun) and utilitarian (related to fulfilling a task). The atmospheric variables that the environment consists of are discussed and found to be affecting these two consumer groups in different ways. The study takes a quantitative approach for investigating how these two consumer types are affected by the store environment. Hedonic and utilitarian consumers are then compared to see if there are any differences in how these consumers experience the store environment. The findings show that there are no differences in what atmospherics that are liked more by a hedonic compared to a utilitarian shopper. However, atmospherics are found to be more memorable for hedonic consumers. Hedonic consumers are also found to like being in the store more when signs are clear, and when it is easy to find departments, fitting rooms and cash registers. The results also showed that to make hedonic customers revisit the store, retailers should focus on the style of the store, floor space allocation, product presentation, sound level, lighting and the interior material. To make utilitarian revisit the store, retailers should focus on atmospherics such as architecture, the cleanliness, floor space allocation, product presentation, flooring, color scheme of the store and the interior material.
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1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the important terms of this study and how they are connected. It is followed by a problem discussion, leading to the purpose of this study.

1.1 Background

Consumers of today demand more from shopping than just the purchasing of a core product (Fiore & Kim, 2007; Turley & Chebat, 2002). Researchers have found two dimensions for consumption reasons; hedonic, relating to feelings of sensations, and utilitarian, relating to fulfilling a task (Batra & Ahtola, 1990 in Voss et al., 2003; Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). Shopping is an experience that fills an emotional function (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006) and some consumers seek arousal and enjoyment from shopping (Turley & Chebat, 2002). The knowledge of this has contributed to the development of the term experience marketing. Experience is what occurs when a person is “encountering, undergoing or living through things” (Schmitt, 1999, p. 57). Experience marketing focuses on creating consumer experiences and retailers compete by trying to stage consumer experiences by stimulating for example senses, feelings and thoughts (Schmitt, 1999). If experiences are managed successfully, consumers spend more time in the store, which may lead to longer browsing time (Turley & Chebat, 2002) which increases impulse shopping (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998).

The consumer experience derives from two factors; the product itself or the environment surrounding it (Berry et al., 2002 in Jain & Bagdare, 2009). Studies show that the store environment functions as a successful tool for creating consumer experiences (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Turley & Milliman, 2000). For example, consumers who find the environment to be pleasing tend to evaluate the products more positively than if the environment is perceived as unpleasant (Obermiller & Bitner, 1984 in Bitner, 1992). In order to create an experience, retailers can shape different controllable elements of the physical store (Jain & Bagdare, 2009; Terrblanche & Boshoff, 2001; Turley & Milliman, 2000), such as color, lighting, music, flooring and product arrangements (Baker et al., 2002; Turley & Chebat, 2002).
Consumers use environmental cues when forming perceptions of the store (Bitner, 1992; Turley & Chebat, 2002; Turley & Milliman, 2000). The store environment is highly connected with successful sales in retail business (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Turley & Milliman, 2000). If retailers know what variables contribute to positive in-store experiences, and combine these in a way that stimulates the consumers positively, it is possible to influence consumers buying intention (Miranda, 2008; Turley & Milliman, 2000). The key to make customers browse more and stay longer in the retail environment is an appropriate combination of atmospherics and providing the customer with an exciting shopping experience (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980). Browsing and staying longer increases impulse shopping and the amount of money customers spend (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998; Turley & Milliman, 2000).

Today it is common that retailers offer similar products, which makes it important to distinguish the company from competitors (Schmitt, 1999; Turley & Chebat, 2002). The physicality of the store is a clear distinguishing factor in retail. It includes merchandise, in-store promotion, location, environment and atmosphere (Davies & Ward, 2005). Store environments are difficult for competitors to copy, which makes them a successful differentiation tool (Baker et al., 1992; Davies & Ward, 2005; Turley & Chebat, 2002) that could give the retailer a competitive advantage. Finding a competitive advantage is critical for retailers as it keeps from focusing on offering a low price. Especially retailers with products similar to competitors have a greater need to differentiate themselves (Turley & Chebat, 2002) and to present a unique shopping experience (Baker et al., 2002; Tynan & McKechnie, 2009). Working effectively with store design should therefore be of primary concern for retailers in competitive situations (Baker et al., 2002; Turley & Chebat, 2002).

In order to satisfy the needs of the modern consumer retailers have to focus on providing consumers with positive shopping experiences (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Schmitt, 1999; Tynan & McKechnie, 2009). Some retailers have acknowledged this and are spending more focus and resources to create such experiences (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006, Bigham, 2008 in Tynan & McKechnie, 2009).
1.2 Problem discussion

There are many variables to consider when developing a successful shopping experience (Fiore & Kim, 2007; Turley & Milliman, 2000). In order to understand how experiences are formed, there is a need to take a customer perspective (Tynan & McKechnie, 2009). Previous studies (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006) have demonstrated that the personnel have an immense impact on customer experience and satisfaction in retail environments (Bitner, 1992). Bäckström and Johansson (2006) examined how both consumers and retailers relate to in-store experiences. Their result showed that even though retailers use new techniques to enhance consumer experiences, the consumers’ seemed to be more interested in values of a more traditional nature, such as the behavior of personnel, a satisfactory product range and a facilitating store layout. However, a study by Lin and Liang (2011), showed that the physical environment is more important than the social environment in service environments. According to their study, both ambient and design factors are more influential on customer emotion and satisfaction than personnel and the customer climate (Ibid). Since the physical environment is shown to be more influential on customer emotion, this study will only focus on the store environment.

Research by Babin and Darden (1995) suggest that retailers should not expect atmospherics to have the same effect on all consumers. According to Babin et al. (1995) shopping experiences are subjective and may provide both utilitarian and hedonic value to customers. Depending on the shopping motive, one of the values may inhibit the other. For example a customer that is focused on a task might be distracted from what otherwise would contribute to an enjoyable experience (Ibid). The problem that arises, because of different shopping motives, is that it becomes difficult for the retailer to customize experiences that fit all customer types. In order to create positive experiences for customers, regardless of their shopping motive, retailers need to know what both types of customers’ value.

Although most major retailers nowadays do not make unconsidered decisions about store layout and design, there are still many small and medium sized retailers that do (Turley & Milliman, 2000). This is a problem since redesigning unsuccessful store environments requires a lot of time and resources (Turley & Chebat, 2002). Retailers that successfully plan the store environment can make consumers feel pleasure and arousal. This increases the likelihood that consumers will
stay longer and spend more money (Babin & Dardin, 1995; Baker et al., 1992; Donovan et al., 1994; Turley & Milliman, 2000). Managers need to understand how the environment can be used to create customer experiences because if experiences are managed successfully, this will not only contribute to increased sales numbers (Babin & Dardin, 1995; Baker et al., 1992; Donovan et al., 1994; Turley & Milliman, 2000) but could also give a competitive advantage (Tynan & McKechnie, 2009), and result in loyal customers that spread positive word of mouth (Smilansky, 2009 in Tynan & McKechnie, 2009). In order to create value for the company with the help of the retail environment, managers need to have knowledge about what environmental aspects create experiences that are valuable to different types of customers.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to identify what creates positive consumer experiences in physical retail environments.

1.4 Outline of thesis

The following chapters in this thesis will contain of:

*Theory*  
The theoretical chapter will present experience marketing, hedonic and utilitarian value, approach and avoidance behavior, atmospherics and the research gap.

*Method*  
The methodology chapter starts with a description of the research purpose, approach, strategy and design. This is followed by an explanation of the quantitative research method, survey design, sampling, data analysis method, operationalization, reliability and validity.

*Data analysis*  
The data analysis chapter consists of results from the quantitative study and that are presented through text, tables and figures.

*Discussion*  
The discussion chapter the survey results will be compared with the theoretical chapter.

*Conclusion*  
The conclusion chapter will present the findings, the academic and managerial implications, limitations and suggestions for further research.
2. Literature review

This literature review will first present the term experience marketing and how it can be used as a marketing tool. Consumption motives, approach and avoidance behavior and the term atmospherics are investigated and followed by a discussion of a research gap.

2.1 Experience marketing

2.1.1 What is experience marketing?

The term experience can be interpreted in different ways. It is for example used to express a process, participation in an activity, the emotions that are felt through different stimuli and as an outcome of learning experiences (Poulsson & Kale, 2004). Pine and Gilmore (1998, p. 98) described experience as something that occurs “when a company intentionally uses services as the stage and goods as props, to engage individual customers in a way that creates a memorable event”. According to Schmitt (1999, p. 57) experiences “provide sensory, emotional, cognitive, behavioral and relational values” which occurs “as a result of encountering, undergoing or living through things”. Poulsson and Kale, (2004, p. 270) developed the definition of commercial experiences as “engaging acts of co-creation between a provider and a consumer wherein the consumer perceives value in the encounter and in the subsequent memory of that encounter.” The value in experience comes from its intensity and the feelings of delight associated with it (Ibid). Since experiences are co-created (Poulsson & Kale, 2004; Tynan & McKechnie, 2009), the marketing practitioner should be flexible when responding to customer needs. The provider of experiences should come up with values that their customers will value. The value proposition offered should be a combination of sensory, relational, emotional, functional/utilitarian, social and informational values (Tynan & McKechnie, 2009).

The consumption of experiences is traditionally associated with entertainment and leisure industries such as amusement parks and theaters. Today, many industries such as tourism, restaurants, manufacturing and retailing offer experiences to their customers in order to compete on the market (Pine & Gilmore, 1998; Poulsson & Kale, 2004).
2.1.2 Experience marketing as a tool

Some retailers use experiences as a marketing tool by offering fun events, astonishing displays and promotional activities that draw the customers to the store (Poulsson & Kale, 2004). According to Pine and Gilmore (1998) experiences are created every time a company manages to engage their customers in a personal or memorable way. Retailers should create marketing experiences and captivate their customers by tying design elements and staged events to a coherent theme. Further the retailers should focus on creating positive impressions and eliminating negative ones, engage all five senses to support the theme and create memorable experiences (Ibid). Schmitt (1999) presented an implementation tool for marketing managers, suggesting experiences can be provided through; communications, displays of visual and verbal identity, co-branding, product presence, spatial environments, electronic media and people. These experience providers must be managed coherently, consistently and by paying attention to detail (Ibid). According to Poulsson and Kale (2004) a successful experience should contain a mixture of relevance, novelty, surprise, learning and engagement in order to provide meaningful value to the customer. The more elements of this mix a marketer can offer, the greater the intensity of the experience will be for the customer (Ibid).

There is an increase in experience-orientation among retailers, which can be seen in the variety of activities that they engage in to satisfy their customers. A study by Bäckström and Johansson (2006) showed the techniques retailers use when trying to create compelling in-store experiences for their customers; (1) Education and knowledge intermediaries provide help and instructions on how to use products. The use of technology is used more frequently to make the knowledge more easy and fun. (2) Inspiration means presenting products in interesting ways to provide the customer with suggestions and ideas on combinations or the usage of products. (3) Innovation and facilitating cross-shopping by combining product categories that usually is not bought in the same store to enhance the in-store experience. (4) Try-out opportunities allows and encourages the customers to test the, fit, feel, taste or performance of products in the store. This increases the possibility of a pleasurable experience as well as help consumers visualize the benefits of the product offering. (5) Stimulating senses attracts the consumers’ attention. Besides the usage of music or scents many stores entertain their customers with the help of technology-induced movement (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). Sensory experiences add value such as aesthetics or
excitement to products (Schmitt, 1999). By using multiple sensory cues retailers can increase the effect and make it a more memorable (Pine & Gilmore, 1998) and positive experience for customers (Tynan & McKechnie, 2009).

2.1.3 Personal variables affecting experience

People's reactions to retail settings are not universal. Different types of consumers behave differently when exposed to the same atmospheric stimulus (Turley & Milliman, 2000). Different individuals perceive experiences differently because they are personal and develop from the interaction between a staged event and the state of mind (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). By interacting with the customers the retailer is able to engage them in the experience (Poulsson & Kale, 2004).

Bäckström and Johansson (2006) present a theoretical framework for aspects that traditionally are said to influence customers’ in-store experience. The framework consists of personal and situational variables. Personal variables like age and mood influence consumers’ experiences. Situational variables consist of elements in the store environment that influences consumers. These variables correlate with different aspects that influence in-store experiences. Consumers that are in a good mood tend to evaluate the store positively, whilst consumers that feel worn out or tired may evaluate the store more negatively (Ibid).

A study by Eroglu and Machleit (1993) showed that customers experience the shopping environment differently depending on their shopping motives. Task-oriented customers experience more crowding and less satisfaction with the shopping environment than non-task oriented customers (Ibid). The task-oriented customer pays little attention to the aspects of the store environment that do not help them achieve their goal (Korgaonkar, 1981 in Eroglu & Machleit, 1993). Non-task-oriented shoppers are shoppers who sees shopping and browsing as a form of recreation or entertainment. These types of recreational customers are more engaged in information seeking and pay more attention to stimulating and surprising environmental cues. This makes an attractive decor and effective in-store merchandising key in attracting recreational shoppers (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980).
2.2 Hedonic and utilitarian values

Voss (et al., 2003) mean that there are two reasons for consuming products, hedonic and utilitarian. Measuring hedonic and utilitarian dimensions is useful when companies want to know the effects of experiential marketing or functional positioning strategies (Ibid).

Hedonic value is described to reflect the emotional value of the shopping (Baker et al., 2002), and relates to the senses involved in using the product (Voss et al., 2003). Hedonic value is subjective and personal and results from feelings, fun, fantasies and playing (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). According to Solomon et al. (2010) there are different sorts of hedonic shopping motives such as utility anticipation, the optimization of choice, negotiation, the feeling of power and authority, affiliation and stimulation. Hirschman and Holbrook (1982, p. 92) define hedonic consumption as; “Those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of product usage experience”. The experiential value of the shopping experience includes fun and aesthetic pleasure from imaginary and sensory elements (Ibid). A study by Olsen and Skallerud (2011) suggests that hedonic shopping value is for instance positively linked to accessibility and product value, which activates the emotional worth and felt pleasure of the shopping experience. Physical aspects had a negative effect on the hedonic shopping value (Ibid).

Utilitarian value is described as fulfilling a task (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006) and relates to the functions of a product (Voss et al., 2003), as well as its performance. The selection of a product is efficient and instrumental, and based on logical reasoning regarding the available product information (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). Solomon et al., (2010) describes the satisfaction of utilitarian needs as emphasizing the objective and tangibles. Utilitarian function is related to the basics of reward or punishment, meaning the attitude towards if it will be pleasurable or painful (Ibid). Olsen and Skallerud (2011) study results showed that utilitarian shopping value is positively linked to the physical aspects and product assortment that is driven by a sense of accomplishment, a goal to obtain sought-after goods, of the shopping trip (Ibid).

A Swedish study showed that retailers mainly focus their efforts on providing hedonic values with the exception of grocery retailers who also represented a glimpse of utilitarian values. Even
though companies are using an increasing amount of advanced techniques to create positive hedonic oriented consumer experiences, the consumers describe utilitarian aspects such as layout and price as the most memorable experiences. This result suggests that utilitarian values such as tidiness, a facilitating store layout, accommodating personnel and satisfying selection of products need to be prioritized (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006).

2.3 Approach and avoidance-behavior

In order to conceptualize the effects of the store environment on consumer and employee behavior, Bitner (1992) introduced the term *servicescape*. The servicescape is the physical setting of the store, which includes environmental dimensions that influence humans cognitively, emotionally and physiologically. These influences result in a behavior to approach or avoid the servicescape (Ibid). Approach and avoidance-behavior originates from Mehrabian and Russel’s (1974, in Bitner, 1992) research about how humans are affected by the physical environment. Positive store atmosphere has been shown to increase approach behavior (Donovan & Rossiter, 1982) and approach behavior to an environment results in wanting to stay for a long time, exploring the environment further (Bitner, 1992; Maymand & Ahmadinejad, 2011). Negative atmosphere increases avoidance-behavior (Donovan & Rossiter, 1982) and avoidance behavior comes from negative experiences, which results in wanting to leave the environment and never return (Bitner, 1992). Retailers that seek to give customers a pleasurable experience should encourage approach behavior not only to gain pleased customers (Bitner, 1992), but also because pleasurable experiences from store environment leads to approach behavior, staying longer in the store. Longer time spent in the store increases the likelihood of impulse shopping and impulsive buying intentions that positively affects spending more money (Beatty & Ferrell, 1998; Donovan & Rossiter, 1982; Maymand & Ahmadinejad, 2011).

2.4 Atmospherics

Researches that seek to conceptualize different aspects of the store environment that influences experiences and behaviors often refer to these aspects as *atmospherics* (Baker, 1986; Sullivan & Adcock, 2002 in Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). Kotler introduced the term atmospherics in 1973. It is the concept that has received the most attention regarding effects of the environment on consumers (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). According to Kotler (1973), atmospherics consist
of controllable elements of the store environment that the retailer consciously manipulates in order to create certain effects on buyers. Many suggestions have been made about what elements of the store environment should be regarded as atmospherics (Turley & Milliman, 2000; Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). Bitner (1992) suggest the term *environmental dimensions* that divided environmental cues into ambient conditions, space/function and signs, symbols and artifacts. Ambient conditions are explained to consist of temperature, air quality, noise music and odor (Ibid). These ambient factors, as well as design factors, are related to the customer’s overall satisfaction (Lin & Liang, 2011).

Bitner’s (1992) environmental dimensions and Kotler’s (1973) atmospherics both describe controllable aspects of the environment and Turley and Hoffman (2002) suggest that these terms should be regarded as equal, since they both describe the same things. Turley and Milliman (2000) try to classify atmospherics cues by using Berman and Evans (1995 in Turley & Milliman, 2000) research. It is meant to help managers to identify and plan for using different atmospherics, which will help to reach their target customers. Atmospherics are divided into; external variables, general interior variables, layout and design variables, point of purchase and decoration variables and human variables (Ibid).

Marketers claim that working with atmospherics is an important marketing strategy (Turley & Milliman, 2000) and atmospheric planning can determine the success or failure of a company (Bitner, 1990 in Turley & Milliman, 2000). In Turley and Milliman’s (2000) literature review, 25 of 28 studies found that atmospherics had a significant influence on sales. It was also concluded that if atmospherics are managed properly, the outcome would be a unique shopping experience for the customer (Turley & Chebat, 2002). Turley and Hoffman (2002) argue that working with atmospherics is essential in order to create and offer in-store experiences. By doing this, retailers have the possibility to influence consumer product decision (Ibid). However, since store atmospherics interact with personal characteristics (Bitner, 1992) different customer groups and individuals are differently affected by store atmospherics (Babin & Dardin, 1995; Bitner, 1992; Turley & Chebat, 2002; Turley & Milliman, 2000). This makes the environment possible to use as a segmentation tool (Turley & Chebat, 2002).
2.4.1 Layout and design

Store design usually describes tangible elements of the store environment. It could consist of the overall style expressed through decoration and architecture (Gottdeiner, 1998, in Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). It often relates to store layout and display, where display relates to the presentation of products. Store design needs to fill certain factors as having a clean environment (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006). Layout and design variables consists of space and allocation, placement of merchandise, grouping of merchandise, placement of equipment, placement of cash registers, waiting areas and waiting rooms, department locations, traffic flow, racks and cases and furniture (Turley & Milliman, 2000).

Bäckström & Johansson (2006) imply that positive store layout experiences often derive from products being available and easy to find. Using signs and information bills, making it easier for the customer to find what he or she needs, has also been found to enhance positive consumer experience. How products are displayed and presented in a store seems to enhance positive consumer experience. When the products are easily available for the customer and are sorted in a range of varieties (by color, trademark and style) this has a positive effect on consumer experience (Ibid).

2.4.2 General interior variables

General interior variables consist of flooring and carpeting, color schemes, lighting, music, scents, width of aisles, wall composition, paint and wallpaper, cleanliness. Several studies have investigated general interior variables and consumers perceptions of these. What these studies have in common is that perceptions of the interior influences approach and avoidance-behavior, time spent in environment and sales (Turley & Milliman, 2000).

Single atmospherics such as music, scents, lighting and color has been the object for many studies (Turley & Milliman, 2000). It has been found that playing music in stores has a significant impact on consumer behavior. It affects sales, arousal, perceptions of time, and in-store traffic flow (Turley & Milliman, 2002). In a study by Kerfoot et al. (2003), merchandise color was found to have an immediate impact on the respondents, and tended to be the key presentation element of a display. Color coordination was shown to be very important, since
using strongly contrasting colors and uncoordinated color arrangement resulted in unpleasant responses and was associated with cramped and jumbled presentations. Using a wide variety of colors was viewed as attractive and appealing, and had potential to positively impact respondents to browse more. The respondents in this study only commented on the color in relation to merchandise and not the background color (Ibid). Color has also been found to affect time spent in store, pleasant feelings, arousal, image, and the ability to attract customers (Turley & Milliman, 2000).

What is aesthetically pleasing is closely connected to the materials used in a store or display. For example, glass cubes were thought of as being unusual, neat and tidy and displaying a smart appearance associated with an up-market image. The combination of glass and chrome were deemed as funky and fashionable. Shelves and rails were unattractive and red as a fixture color was seen as tacky and garish, and were associated with low quality. Wood, on the other hand, was associated with quality. It was inviting, seen as light and airy when used in displays, and gave a more exclusive ambience when used for flooring and hangers. Displays that were neat and sparse were associated with more exclusive brands, showing that the respondents associated space with quality. Though, too much space made the respondents feel uncomfortable, since they felt as if the personnel were staring at them, leaving them no privacy to browse alone (Kerfoot et al., 2003).

2.5 Research gap

According to Turley and Hoffman (2002), offering a positive store environment is crucial in order to offer experiences rather than just products or services (Ibid). Retail environments consist of atmospherics (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Kotler, 1973; Turley & Milliman, 2000), and there has been little research done about the layout and design aspects of the atmospherics (Turley and Milliman, 2000). Multiple studies have investigated how singular atmospheric variables such as color, music, material, scent, lighting and etcetera affect consumers in store experiences (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Turley & Milliman, 2000). However there is a lack of research regarding the interaction of the atmospherics in the store environment and how these create and affect the consumer in-store experience (Baker et al., 1992; Beatty & Ferrell, 1998; Davies & Ward, 2005).
The retail stores studied by Bäckström and Johansson (2006) all emphasized giving the customers hedonic experiences, but the customers valued utilitarian experiences more. There seems to be a knowledge gap amongst retailers regarding what factors in the retail environment contributes to a positive store visit for the customers. Understanding and creating consumer experiences requires a holistic approach from the consumers’ point of view (Tynan & McKechnie, 2009). Researchers agree that the store environment can be used to create customer experiences (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006; Turley & Milliman, 2000), however no study combine the effects of atmospherics and how these affect hedonic and utilitarian consumers experiences, although there is said to be a difference on how these types of customers experience the store environment. Utilitarian consumers are said to pay little attention to things in the environment that does not help them achieve their goal. Hedonic consumers are said to pay more attention to decor and in-store merchandising and are also said to be more satisfied with the environment than utilitarian consumers (Eroglu & Machleit, 1993; Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980). Voss et al. (2003) say that measuring hedonic and utilitarian dimensions is useful when companies want to know the effects of experiential marketing or functional positioning strategies (Ibid). Retailers need to know how the store environment should be designed to provide experiences for both hedonic and utilitarian consumers. But no study, to the authors’ knowledge, provides information that focuses on controllable elements of the store and how these can be used to create positive experiences for both customer types.

This leaves the opportunity to research how hedonic and utilitarian customer groups are affected by the store environment. An understanding of what factors in the environment that contributes to approach and avoidance for these customer groups is important, because this helps retailers to understand the outcome of the experience. By comparing hedonic and utilitarian consumers and their experiences in retail environments there is a possibility to see differences in how they are affected by the store atmospherics, and how these could be used to create positive experiences.

2.5.1 Research question

What atmospherics in a retail environment create a positive experience for hedonic compared to utilitarian customers?
3. Method

This chapter presents the methods used in order to gather the empirical information required to answer the research question.

3.1 Research purpose

A research purpose can be explanatory, exploratory or descriptive. The formulation of the research question determines the research purpose and thus indicates the direction of the study. Exploratory research purposes are useful when there is little knowledge about an area and there is a need to create an overriding picture. Explanatory research purposes helps to explain why things work in a specific way, since it seeks to identify the reason for a specific cause. When there is a lot of information to be found about a specific marketing problem, but a clear and distinct image is missing, a descriptive design is preferable (Christensen et al., 2001).

Descriptive research purposes answer questions of how, how many and also who-, what- and when- questions. It is more common to use a descriptive research design when it is desirable to investigate how things are, instead of explaining why they are the way they are (Christensen et al., 2010). Because this study wants to answer the question of “what” it is appropriate to use a descriptive research approach.

3.2 Research approach

Research can take an inductive or deductive approach. An inductive approach is often used for qualitative studies since it is a process that involves gathering information about a topic in order to formulate a research problem. Deductive approaches follows a linear research process and starts with a research problem and then follows with gathering empirical data that is supposed to answer the question (Bryman & Bell, 2005). A deductive approach is useful when it is desirable to gather empirical information on the individual's view on defined conditions (Jacobsen, 2002), which is the case in this study.
This study follows a deductive research approach since the research follows a linear process that started out with the gathering of information on a specific topic. The research question will be answered by gathering relevant empirical information.

### 3.3 Research strategy

There are different approaches for gathering data. Qualitative data often consists of words and pictures, with methods that often require some form of deep interview in order to gather empirical information. Quantitative data is more often statistically oriented and a common method for collecting quantitative data is surveys. This is because researchers often want to gather a large amount of results than can be generalized to a whole population. Quantitative research approach seeks to measure, detect and determine relationships between different variables. This makes a quantitative approach useful when some knowledge about the investigation area already exists (Christensen et al., 2001).

According to Bryman and Bell (2005), quantitative studies are highly connected to a deductive research approach and are very useful when wanting to answer questions of what. A quantitative method makes it more likely to reach a larger group of respondents (Bryman & Bell, 2005). This is of importance since in order to reach as many respondents as possible; it is useful to use quantitative data. This is because there is no possibility to conduct interviews with a large representative group of people in the given amount of time. Since the authors wish to answer the question of what atmospherics create a positive in-store experience generally, a quantitative strategy is appropriate. In this way a larger group of respondents can be investigated.

### 3.4 Research design

Comparative research design is applicable for studies when it is of interest to compare two different cases to each other. This type of research design makes it possible to use quantitative as well as qualitative methods (Bryman & Bell, 2005) and can focus on individuals, groups, organizations and even societies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In quantitative research, comparative studies are often used as a prolonging of a cross-sectional research design. Cross sectional research design is a wide and shallow investigation that studies a representative group of people
in a specific moment in time, and allows the results to be statistically generalized over a population (Christensen et al., 2001).

This study is based on a comparative research design as it investigates differences between hedonic and utilitarian consumers. Consumers will be divided into either utilitarian or hedonic consumers and differences between what atmospherics affect these groups will then be investigated. This makes it appropriate to use comparative design as a prolonging of a cross-sectional design, since this study is of quantitative character.

3.5 Data sources

Secondary data is previously collected data that has been compiled in a different context and for another purpose. The data consist of information found within organizations, in various databases, scientific journals, reports and so forth. Secondary data is inexpensive and time saving, but it can be difficult to find the specific data needed and it may be outdated when found. This is a reason for the collection of new information, so called primary data. Primary data is up-to-date and the needed information can be collected in the format most suitable for the research purpose. Primary data is obtained through observations or communication with individuals or groups. Techniques used to gather information are surveys, interviews, observations and experiments (Christensen et al., 2001).

For this study, primary data has been used. By using a survey as a method for collecting primary data, the researchers were able to adjust the questions to the research purpose and collect up-to-date quantifiable data.

3.5.1 Source criticism

To ensure the reliability of secondary data (Christensen et al., 2001) the sources was reviewed critically.

The authors chose to present definitions of the term experience marketing made by Pine and Gilmore (1998), Schmitt (1999) and Poulsson and Kale (2004). Schmitt, Pine and Gilmore are pioneers on the subject of experience marketing and even if their articles would not qualify as
scientific, their definitions of the term are valid and frequently used by other researchers. This is the reason why the authors of this thesis estimated that their work still was relevant enough to present and use as definitions.

Baker et al., (1992) examines the store environments effect on consumer behavior. Their study is limited to only a few atmospherics, and includes social factors, meaning interaction from personnel, as an atmospheric. The term atmospherics is not used in this study, instead a framework including factors in the store environment, and social factors as personnel is presented. However the study indicated that pleasure and arousal derived from the environment, increased the willingness to buy, and further research on environmental cues is suggested.

Lin and Liang (2011) investigate the effects of the store environment, and even though this study focuses on social aspects and service environments they state that the physical environment is more important than the social, which makes their research interesting for this study.

3.6 Research method

The five major research methods are; experiments, surveys, archival analyses, histories and case studies. The suitability of the different research methods varies depending on the type of research question, the degree of control that the researcher has over the event and if the focus lies on current instead of historical events (Yin, 2006). One of the most common methods for collecting quantitative data when following comparative design is survey (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The survey method is appropriate to use when the researcher focuses on current events, has no control over respondent behavior or the investigated event and the research question is who, what, where, how many or how much (Yin, 2006).

A survey study is a cross-sectional study where data is collected using questionnaires or structured interviews on one occasion. The aim is to obtain quantitative data relating to two or more variables, which are reviewed in order to find covariance patterns (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Questionnaires can be made online and shared easily through email, web pages or social media. These web-surveys have the advantage of being cheap, fast and easy to distribute but have the
disadvantage of low response rates due to internet and computer availability (Christensen et al. 2010)

Since the researchers want to know what atmospherics create a positive experience, and have no control over respondents’ behavior and are interested in present events, the most appropriate research method for this study is to conduct a survey. A survey facilitates the possibility to investigate the correlation between several variables and to reach many respondents (Bryman & Bell, 2005), which is what the authors strive to do. By conducting structured interviews the authors would not be able to collect a sufficient amount of responses to study the variety. To reach as many respondents as possible, at a low price and fast, the authors conducted a web-survey.

3.7 Survey design

The survey consisted of a short introduction text, together with personal questions, and statements (see Appendix 1 for the actual survey and Appendix 2 for English translation).

3.7.1 General design

The respondents could see the whole survey, look through it and see all the questions at the same time (see Appendix 1). By doing this, the authors hoped that respondents would see the survey as relatively short, and would be more likely to answer. Authors also tried to keep an “airy” look on the survey, with space between the questions, and with a simple design, making it easy to browse through. Bryman & Bell (2005) means that a light and short looking survey has a positive effect on response rate (Ibid). All questions were mandatory to answer, in order to be able to get a result out of the survey questions. The survey was sent to Swedish respondents and was therefore written in Swedish.

3.7.2 Introduction text

The authors followed Bryman and Bell’s (2005) suggestions on presenting an introducing text prior to the survey, containing details about the survey. It is recommended to explain the purpose of the study, what the survey is a part of (for example a thesis), and who is conducting the survey. It is also important to explain the role the respondent has in answering the survey. It
should be declared that the respondent has anonymity and that he or she answers voluntarily. Information about how to contact the researchers should also be included in case the respondent would have any further questions (Ibid). In order to have a high response rate, authors ensured the anonymity in the introducing text. The estimated time of filling in the survey was presented so that the respondent would be prepared on how much time the survey takes to complete (see Appendix 1 & 2).

Grocery retailers sell fast moving essential and non-essential consumer goods such as food, toiletries, disposable diapers etcetera. The authors believe that consumers visit grocery stores and supermarkets more frequently than other retail stores because of the vital qualities of goods such as food. Since food is essential for survival the authors also believe that grocery stores and supermarkets are visited mainly for utilitarian reasons. These beliefs lead to the decision to exclude these types of retail-stores from the survey, in order not to get a preponderance of utilitarian oriented answers. A short sentence informing the respondents that the survey does not include grocery stores was therefore added to the introduction text and repeated as a reminder twice in the survey.

3.7.3 Question types

The survey started with personal questions such as gender, age, occupation. After these questions a short text followed, informing respondents that following questions will be about their most recent store visit, and reminded them that grocery stores and service were excluded from this study. The authors wanted the respondents to base their answers on their latest store visit because according to Pine and Gilmore (1998) experiences occur when a company intentionally uses services and goods to engage customers in a way that creates a memorable event (Ibid). Therefore the atmospherics the respondents remembered from this store visit is considered by the authors to be part of their experience.

The survey for this study consists almost exclusively of closed questions. Closed questions are easier to process, because the code for the analysis can be derived directly from the available answers (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Closed questions help to clarify the meaning of the question for the respondent and are easier and quicker for the respondents to fill in. Closed questions also
reduce the possibility for the researchers interpreting respondents answer in the wrong way (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

According to Bryman and Bell (2011), open questions take time to analyze, because the answers need to be coded. Open questions also require more time and effort from respondents, which could mean that respondents avoid answering those questions, or the entire survey. This may lead to low response rate (Ibid). Open questions, where respondents have the opportunity to answer with own words, has been avoided in the survey, to save time when analyzing, and to obtain a high response rate. For questions where there could be other answers possible than those available in the survey, the respondents had the ability to click “Other” and type the answers themselves. The Other answer was used for questions like; my current occupation, how I felt when leaving/entering the store and the type of store that I last visited. However, this was only done with questions where the respondent could choose one single word.

Bryman and Bell (2005) argue that questions need to be easy to understand, not include negations, or be leading. Questions should also not be formulated as double questions since this can make respondents confused (Ibid). When formulating questions, authors strived to keep the text simple and without words that could be misunderstood or difficult to understand. Instead of asking, are you a hedonic or a utilitarian shopper the authors asked did you have an errand. Every question was carefully looked through by the authors, the tutor and a test group that was asked to give feedback. Some questions were skipped due to being too similar to each other, which could have made respondents irritated.

Statements were used instead of questions because authors believed that it is easier to approve or deny a statement.

### 3.8 Sampling

The population for this study is everyone that visits stores. As a method for selecting respondents, authors used convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is when researchers use respondents that are available and easy to reach (Bryman & Bell, 2005). For this reason the survey was conducted in Sweden and within the social network of the authors. For the survey,
600 respondents were chosen to participate and were invited via the social networking site Facebook. All contacts of the authors that spoke Swedish were invited and asked to answer the survey that was presented in a link on the event page.

Another form of sampling, similar to snowball sampling was also used, in order to complement the convenience sampling. Snowball sampling means that selected respondents answer the researchers’ questions, and then recommend other respondents for the researchers (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Since the authors' contacts on Facebook mainly consisted of people aged 20-40, other age groups were underrepresented in the sample. In order to reach specific respondent age groups that the authors had difficulties to reach, some contacts in the desired age were selected to pass the survey on to peers.

In line with Christensen et al. (2010) recommendations, the researchers sent out reminders to those respondents who had not confirmed their participation in the survey. Because of the limited time frame and since keysurvey.com demanded a fee after 200 responses, the authors set a response limit at 200 respondents.

3.9 Data analysis method

There are multiple ways to analyze data; univariate analysis, bivariate analysis and multivariate analysis. In a univariate analysis the researcher analyses one variable at the time. This can be done by conducting for example a frequency table or a diagram. In a bivariate analysis the researcher analyze two variables at the time to uncover whether the variables are related or not. This can be done by testing the variables in for example a contingency table, Pearson’s r, Phi and Cramer’s V (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A dichotomous variable can also be translated into a two-point scale, which can be treated as a nominal scale (microsiris.com).

First, a descriptive data analysis was conducted in order to present the response rate and frequencies. This was done by conducting univariate analysis, which was read by looking at the amount and percentages of what the respondents answered. By looking at the univariate analysis, it was possible to quickly see which questions that were not answered. The questions that are not answered or answered wrongly will be removed. The frequency examination will present the
most basic information about the respondents, meaning if they are usually more hedonic than utilitarian, how often they shop, what their last shopping motive was, which shop that was the most recently visited retail store and what the occupation of the respondents were.

Secondly, in order to see if the survey answers measures up to the quality criteria, reliability and validity will be tested. The reliability will be tested using Cronbach’s alpha where the average of the coefficients will present if the survey answers measure up to the reliability. Validity will examine what variables that will be dependent and independent.

Thirdly, a contingency table will be conducted in order to see differences between hedonic and utilitarian versus men and women. The contingency table will be read by looking at the percentages of who many hedonic versus utilitarian respondents there are among men and women. The Pearson Chi-square will be looked upon to see if there is any significance in the result.

Fourthly, several tests are needed in order to do a comparative analysis of the atmospherics. The atmospheric variables and most of the questions compared to them are nominal scale (including the dichotomous variables). These were tested by conducting contingency tables. The same type of test was conducted when testing nominal variables and likert scales. The results will be read by looking at the Phi in order to see if there was any significance between for example the atmospherics and wanting to visit the store again among hedonic respondents. Hedonic and utilitarian respondents were tested separately by using “select cases” in SPSS. The significances among the atmospherics and for example wanting to visit the store again will be presented in a table in the data analysis, in order to see the differences between hedonic and utilitarian customers. The significant numbers will be marked by a star-symbol (*). If there is no significant relationship between the atmospherics and for example to visit the store again, the results are less important to show in a table and will instead be described in text.

Finally, the experience variables were likert scale and were mostly tested using a contingency table, since the other variables such as wanting to visit the store again were nominal scale. The contingency table were looked upon and presented in the same fashion as the atmospherics.
Since the experience variables were tested against another likert scale, a Pearson's r test was conducted. The Phi was looked upon to see if there were any relationships between the variables that will be presented using a table. Once again, the hedonic and utilitarian respondents were tested separately using “select cases” in SPSS.

The data collected was tested by using a computer with the program PASW Statistics 18 by SPSS Inc. Since the survey was designed and shared via keysurvey.com, it was possible to download the excel-file containing all respondents’ answers and import it in the SPSS-program.

### 3.10 Operationalization

To be able to measure the terms in the study and form them into questions, terms need to be operationalized. To operationalize the terms means to break them down into measurable concepts and questions that respondents will be able to understand and relate to (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The survey-questions were created for the specific purpose of answering the research question of this study and have not been adapted from any other study. Databases were used to try to find questions from other research that could be adapted to this study, but none were relevant for this study since none of them entailed atmospherics or the other subjects of this survey.

#### Table 1 Operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Key words</th>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Question type and available answers</th>
<th>Information received from questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience Marketing (EM)</td>
<td>Value in experiences comes from intensity and feelings of delight associated with it (Poullson &amp; Kale, 2004).</td>
<td>EM1: How I experienced the store visit as a whole.</td>
<td>Likert scale, 1-5 (1) Very negative, (5) Very positive</td>
<td>If the store environment made respondents happy/delighted or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customers experience the shopping environment differently depending on their shopping motives (Eroglu and Machleit, 1993).</td>
<td>EM2: Were you planning on purchasing anything? (In the store you visited)</td>
<td>Dichotomous variable: Yes/No</td>
<td>Planned purchase =Utilitarian motive. Not planning to purchase anything =Hedonic motive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic and Utilitarian (HU)</td>
<td>Hedonic value results from feelings, fun, fantasies and playing (Bäckström &amp; Johansson, 2006; Holbrook &amp; Hirschman, 1982).</td>
<td>HU1: I visit stores for pleasure, without having a specific errand.</td>
<td>Frequency format: Always / Often / Half of the times / Seldom / Never</td>
<td>Shows if they are usually utilitarian or hedonic shoppers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The techniques retailers use today to create compelling in-store experiences for their customers; (1) Education and knowledge intermediaries (2) Inspiration (3) Innovation (4) Try-out opportunities (5) Stimulating senses (Bäckström and Johansson, 2006).</td>
<td>HU2: I was inspired during my store visit / I learned something about a product during my visit / Something in the store environment surprised me / I had the opportunity to test the products before purchase / My senses were stimulated at the visit (sight, sound, smell, taste, hearing)</td>
<td>Likert scale, 1-5 (1) Disagree (2) Partly disagree (3) Neither (4) Partly agree (5) Fully agree</td>
<td>Shows if they were happy/satisfied with the visit in general. If not happy with these hedonic aspects, this will show that the H was not that important for general satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian motive relates to fulfilling a task, sense of accomplishment, goal to obtain a sought-after goods (Bäckström &amp; Johansson, 2006).</td>
<td>HU3: It was easy to find specific products in the store / It was easy to get through the store / There were accessible aids available like shoehorn or a mirror / There was orderliness in the store / Products were easy to access.</td>
<td>Likert scale, 1-5 (1) Disagree (2) Partly disagree (3) Neither (4) Partly agree (5) Fully agree</td>
<td>If respondents are happy/satisfied with the visit in general, but not happy with these utilitarian aspects, this will show that the U was not that important for the general satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach and Avoidance Behavior (AAB)</td>
<td>Approach behavior results in wanting to stay in the environment, exploring it further. Avoidance-behavior results in wanting to leave the environment (Bitner, 1992).</td>
<td>AAB1: I enjoyed staying in the store</td>
<td>Dichotomous variable: Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes: Positive experience, with possible approach-behavior. No: Negative experience, with possible avoidance-behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Atmospherics (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics (A)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Follow up Question</th>
<th>Nominal Variable</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible elements</strong>&lt;br&gt; consists of decorations, carpeting, point of fixture, while intangible elements could be described as color, music, temperature and scents (Turley &amp; Hoffman, 2002).</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1: Follow up question after “I enjoyed staying in the store”: My opinions about the store environment.</td>
<td>Nominal variable: Yes/No/Don’t know</td>
<td>What atmospherics made the respondents enjoy their visit in the store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Atmospherics Layout & Design (ALD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics Layout &amp; Design (ALD)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Follow up Question</th>
<th>Nominal Scale</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall style expressed through decoration and architecture</strong> (Gottdeiner, 1998).</td>
<td>ALD1: I liked the style of the store / I liked the architecture of the store.</td>
<td>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Store design needs to fill certain factors as having a clean environment</strong> (Bäckström &amp; Johansson, 2006).</td>
<td>ALD2: The store was clean.</td>
<td>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Layout and design includes variables such as floor space and allocation, product groupings, traffic flow, department locations, and allocations within departments</strong> (Turley &amp; Milliman, 2000).</td>
<td>ALD3: The floor space allocation was good / Departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find.</td>
<td>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avoidance behavior comes from negative experiences which results in wanting to leave the environment and never return. Approach behavior results in wanting to return (Bitner, 1992).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Positive store layout experiences = products being available and easy to find. Using signs and information bills (Turley &amp; Milliman, 2000).</strong></th>
<th><strong>ALD4: There were clear signs.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How products are displayed and presented in a store seems to enhance positive consumer experience (Turley &amp; Milliman, 2000).</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALD5: I liked how the products were displayed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When the products are easily available for the customer and are sorted in a range of varieties (Turley &amp; Milliman, 2000).</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALD6: The products were sorted in a logical way.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The physical environment (e.g. floor, lighting and shopping bags) affects customer perception of product quality (Turley &amp; Milliman, 2000).</strong></td>
<td><strong>ALD7: I liked the floor in the store / I liked the lighting in the store.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atmospherics General Interior (AGI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGI1: The store had a comfortable sound level / The store played music that I like / I liked the color theme in the store / I thought it smelled good in the store / I thought the temperature was comfortable / I liked the materials that the store furnishing was made of.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominal scale: Yes/No/Don’t know</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Personal Variables (PV)**

Variables are for example age, attitude of time and mood (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006).

**PV1: How I felt when entering the store.**
Nominal variable, cross boxes: Happy / Angry / Content / Sad / Calm / Stressed / Annoyed / Alert / Tired / Expectant / Curious / Don't remember / Other

This is related to the mood that could affect the in-store experience

Consumers that are in a good mood tend to evaluate the store positively, whilst consumers that feel worn out or tired may evaluate the store more negatively (Bäckström & Johansson, 2006).

**PV2: How I felt after leaving the store.**
Nominal variable, cross boxes: Happy / Angry / Content / Sad / Calm / Stressed / Annoyed / Alert / Tired / Disappointed / Don't remember / Other

This helps us understand if the mood changed in any way during the store visit

### 3.11 Reliability

Reliability deals with the consistency of measures and is concerned with whether the results of a survey would be the same if the survey was repeated or if the results are affected by random or temporary conditions (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The concept of reliability refers to the measurement method's ability to withstand random errors. A measurement is considered reliable if it has no random errors (Christensen et al., 2001). Stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency are major factors involved when considering if a measure is reliable (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

In order to avoid inter-observer inconsistency the survey did not include open-ended questions. Because the questions in this survey were formed by the authors and thereby had not been tested before by others, the authors conducted several pre-tests. The authors believe that future researchers using a similar population would get similar results as the ones in this study which makes this study reliable.
3.12 Validity

Validity deals with whether the survey measures what it is supposed to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To achieve validity one should reach similar results regardless of the measurement method. For a quantitative measurement to be valid, reliability must also be very good. Reliability is a necessary but not sufficient condition to achieve validity. It is not enough that the method removes random errors because even sophisticated measurements can measure the wrong things (Christensen et al., 2001). Internal validity is concerned with the causality between two or more variables, and if there is a connection between the independent and dependent variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011). External validity is concerned with whether the results from a research can be generalized outside the specific context that the research has been conducted in (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

The main way in which researchers try to generate a representative sample is by probability sampling. The process of random selection largely eliminates bias from the selection of a sample but does not guarantee a representative sample (Ibid). According to Bryman and Bell (2011) even a representative sample is only representative of the population from which the sample was selected, which is why generalizations cannot be made beyond that population.

The authors used convenience sampling and are aware of the fact that the respondents in the survey are not representative of the entire shopping population of Sweden. The aim of this study is not to be able to generalize the results, but to compare hedonic and utilitarian shopping experiences. The utilitarian or hedonic shoppers that participated in this study do not necessarily represent shoppers in other countries, but are however believed to be representative for hedonic and utilitarian shoppers in Sweden.

Ecological validity deals with the question of whether or not the opinions, values, attitudes and knowledge collected in studies are the same as the ones expressed in people’s everyday natural social environment (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The authors asked respondents to remember their reactions and experiences from a recent store visit, instead of intervening in natural situations or creating artificial shopping environments. Although answering questions in a survey may involve a limited ecological validity (Bryman & Bell, 2011), the authors believe the results are more
écologically valid than if the study had been performed in a laboratory or a room for interviews, since it would not be conducted in a natural environment. Answering the survey allows the respondents to relate to a situation in a natural environment.

3.12.1 Pre-testing the survey

Measurement validity or construct validity is concerned with if the term that is designed to measure a concept, correctly reflects that concept (Bryman & Bell, 2005). To prevent misinterpretation and irrelevant questions, the survey questions should be tested in a pilot survey to give the researchers the possibility to reformulate or remove questions (Bryman & Bell, 2005; Christensen et al., 2010). A pilot study preferably consists of a small group of individuals comparable to the population from which the sample is taken. These individuals should not be part of the sample selection for the survey (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

To increase the validity of the survey it was pre-tested in three different ways in different stages of the process. The first draft was sent by email and Facebook to the tutor and a small group of people who were selected based on the probability of a quick response. After the first feedback the researchers altered the layout, the grouping of the age variable, corrected spelling mistakes and rephrased the questions that were unclear to the respondents. A clarification that service and grocery stores were not included in the survey was also added due to the feedback.

To make sure that respondents comprehend the concepts and questions in the survey correctly, a group of fellow students and friends were interviewed and asked to interpret the questions and the used terminology. Those interviewed were selected based on their availability, but also on the basis of age. This is because the researchers wanted to ensure that the questionnaire was equally understandable by different generations. This was done to be absolutely sure that the future respondents understand the questions and react to the answers in a similar way, to increase the validity of the survey.

After the pre-test on the questions and further alterations based on the feedback, a pre-test on the answers was made. The survey questionnaire was sent to a new test group consisting of 10 people who responded to the survey believing that it was the completed questionnaire. These
respondents were not asked to participate in the final survey. The researchers compiled the responses and looked for indications that questions did not measure what they were supposed to.

3.13 Summary
Figure 1: describes the methods chosen for this study.

```
Descriptive purpose

Deductive research approach

Quantitative research strategy

Comparative research design

Survey
```

*Figure 1 Summary of the method chapter*
4. Data analysis

The data analysis is divided into five chapters. First, a descriptive analysis of the respondents will be presented to give an overview of the study. Second, the reliability and validity testing of the data will be described. Third, hedonic and utilitarian motives among men and women will be presented. Fourth, a comparative analysis of the atmospherics in relationship with hedonic and utilitarian shopping motives will be presented in order to see differences between hedonic and utilitarian shoppers. Finally, a comparative analysis of the hedonic and utilitarian experiences in relationship with hedonic and utilitarian shopping motives will be presented.

4.1 Descriptive data

The descriptive data will present the response rate and frequency examination of the respondents.

4.1.1 Response examination

The survey was available online for five days and was shared with about 650 people via Facebook and email. With a response of 277 completed surveys answers, this gives the study a response rate of approximately 42.6%. According to Bryman and Bell (2005), there are a lot of published articles with low response rates. If the survey uses convenience sampling, the response rate is said to be less important (Ibid). Even though the response rate is less important for this study since a convenience sample was used, the authors strived to exceed the minimum limit of respondents that was set. This was accomplished by sending personal reminders through private messages on Facebook resulting in an increase of responses. Out of the 277 completed survey answers, 274 survey answers were evaluated as valid. Invalid survey answers contained of one respondent who answered the survey based on a grocery store experience, and two respondents who did not answer all of the questions in the survey. This is because the authors by mistake did not make two questions mandatory, when changing some questions after receiving feedback from the pre-test.
Respondents that were invited to answer the survey, but did not participate could have done this for several reasons. Since the survey was mainly shared via Facebook, it is possible that potential respondents might not have noticed the survey due to not being logged in or having a busy news feed. Chosen participants could also have seen the invite but decided not to answer or to ignore the invitation.

Feedback was received from some of the respondents regarding the way respondents were invited to answer the survey. By inviting respondents to an event, some participants believed that there was a specific time and date for answering the survey. This would then lead them to not answering. However, when this feedback was received, a reminder was sent out to respondents to answer the survey and that there was no specific date or time for doing this.

4.1.2 Frequency examination

According to the results, most respondents are balanced hedonic and utilitarian shoppers (36.9%), meaning that the shopping motives are evenly divided between having an errand and shopping for fun. There were more utilitarian shoppers (32.5%) than hedonic shoppers (30.6%). However, in the respondents latest store visit, 32.1% (88 respondents) visited the store without any specific errand, which means they had hedonic shopping motives, and 67.9% (186 respondents) had an errand in the store which means they had utilitarian shopping motives. As expected by the researchers, most respondents visit retail stores 1-3 times a week (51.1%), or 1-3 times a month (35.7%). A group of 10.2% of the respondents visits stores 4-7 times a week, and 3.3% of the respondents visit retail stores 1-3 times every three months or less. The most recently visited retail store was a fashion store (51.1%). Most of the respondents were state, municipal and/or privately employed (60.9%) or student (21.9%).
Respondents with hedonic shopping motives will from here on be referred as hedonic shoppers, and respondents with utilitarian shopping motives will be referred to as utilitarian shoppers, regardless if the respondents are usually hedonic or utilitarian shoppers.

4.2 Quality criteria

Before conducting the comparative analysis, reliability and validity were examined. Reliability was tested in order to find questions that did not measure up to the criteria, and validity concerned the dependent and independent variables.

4.2.1 Reliability

There are two types of internal consistency reliability: Split-half reliability and Cronbach’s alpha. Cronbach’s alpha is a coefficient alpha that calculates the average of the coefficients from all possible combinations that are split in half. Coefficient alpha ranges from 0 to 1 and it is suggested to have an alpha of 0.7 as a minimum. Lower alpha is sometimes accepted, depending on the research objectives. To measure a particular concept, a minimum of three items should be used and the items used in the test should be positively correlated. An alpha between 0.7 and 0.8 is considered good, 0.8 and 0.9 very good and 0.9 excellent (Hair et al., 2003).

Since the survey included many variables, the authors chose to make two Cronbach’s alpha tests. The first test concerned the atmospheric variables (see Q12 in Appendix 2) and included 15 items. Before testing, the atmospheric variables were changed from a nominal scale into a
dichotomous scale, by recoding the answer *do not know* into a system missing variable, *yes* as 1 and *no* as 0. The alpha result came out as 0.875, which is considered to be a very good alpha. In the item-total statistics, it was shown that deleting items would not affect the alpha result to be anything more or less than *very good*.

The second Cronbach’s alpha test concerned the experience questions in the survey (see Q14 in Appendix 2) and included 10 items with the scale of 1 to 5. The alpha result came out as 0.750, which is considered to be good. Just like the first test, deleting any items would not affect the result to be anything more or less than *good*.

### 4.2.2 Validity

In order to do a test, researchers need to decide which variable comes before the other. It is not possible to claim that the independent variables are prior to the dependent variables when both variables have been collected at the same time. The decisions about what variables are dependent and independent are therefore based on common sense or theoretical ideas, in order to make a conclusion. It is therefore always a risk that the conclusions are false or unfounded. A dependent variable is a variable that is affected causally by another (independent) variable, and an independent variable is a variable that exerts a causal effect on another (dependent) variable (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

Which variables that is dependent and independent depends on what tests that is to be conducted. Since this study contain of several tests, the dependent and independent sometimes varies. First, a test was conducted in order to see if the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers were affected by the atmospherics. This means that the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers were the independent variable, and the atmospherics was the dependent variable, affecting the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers. Secondly, in order to test if the atmospherics affected for example the *enjoyment of staying in the store*, the hedonic shoppers and utilitarian shoppers were selected and tested separately. This means that the *enjoyment of staying in the store* was an independent variable and *atmospherics* were dependent, since the atmospherics could affect the enjoyment of being in the store.
4.2.3 Summary

Both the atmospheric variables and experience variables measured up to the criteria of being reliable and were possible to test in the comparative analysis.

4.3 Hedonic and utilitarian respondents

This test concerned the division of hedonic and utilitarian shopping motives among men and women.

4.3.1 Hedonic and utilitarian motives versus men and women

There were more female respondents (60.6%) than male respondents (39.4%). Out of the female respondents, 34.9% were hedonic and 65.1% utilitarian, and out of the male respondents, 27.8% were hedonic and 72.2% utilitarian. The Pearson Chi-square showed a value of 0.215, which means there is no significant correlation between gender and shopping motive. Among the respondents with hedonic motives, 30.7% bought something and 69.3% did not. Among the respondents with utilitarian motives, 84.9% bought something, while 15.1% did not.

![Figure 3 - Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motives among males and females](image)

4.3.2 Summary

Hedonic shopping motives were higher among the females than males, but there were in general more utilitarian shoppers than hedonic shoppers.
4.4 Comparative analysis of Atmospherics

Five tests were conducted to compare the atmospherics among hedonic and utilitarian shoppers. First, atmospherics in relationship with shopping motive was conducted to see the differences in what the shoppers noticed and liked. Second, atmospherics in relationship with previous visits affected what hedonic and utilitarian shoppers noticed in the environment. Third, the authors looked upon if atmospherics affected the enjoyment of being in the store environment among the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers. Fourth, if the atmospherics affected the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers’ experience of the visit of the store as a whole. Finally, a test was conducted to see if there was any relationship between the atmospherics and wanting to visit the store again.

4.4.1 Atmospherics and shopping motive

There were no significant relationships between what hedonic or utilitarian shoppers thought about the different atmospherics in their latest store visit. There were however patterns in what hedonic and utilitarian shoppers had opinions about or not.

4.4.1.1 Atmospherics with most yes/no answers

Respondents with hedonic shopping motives mostly had opinions on following atmospherics; *departments, fittings rooms and cash register were easy to find* (97.7%), *I liked the style of the store* (96.5%), and *the floor space allocation was good* (95.5%). Among utilitarian respondents, most atmospherics that received a yes or no-answers were; *the store was clean* (94.6%), *the floor space allocation was good* (94.6%), *the products were presented in a logic way* (92.5%), *I liked the style of the store* (92.4%), and *departments, fitting rooms and cash registers were easy to find* (91.9%).

In general, respondents mostly answered yes or no to atmospherics such as; *I liked the style of the store* (94.9%), *the environment was clean* (94.2%), *departments, fitting rooms and cash registers were easy to find* (93.8%), *the store had a comfortable sound level* (91.2%), and *I thought the temperature was comfortable* (90.9%).
4.4.1.2 Atmospherics with least yes/no answers

The atmospherics that respondents had least opinions about, meaning the atmospherics with most “do not know” answers were; the flooring (44%), the scent in the store (53.6%), and the material of the store interior (58.4%). When comparing the atmospherics that respondents answered yes or no to, hedonic consumers had a higher response rate, which means that utilitarian shoppers answered “do not know” to atmospheric statements more than hedonic shoppers did.

4.4.1.3 Most liked and disliked atmospherics

The most liked atmospherics by all respondents were the style of the store, the cleanliness of the store, if departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find, the sound level, and the temperature. Amongst the most disliked atmospherics were the signs in the store, the architecture of the store, and the floor allocation of the store. Table 2 and Table 3 illustrate the differences in most liked and disliked atmospherics.

Table 2
The amount of percent liking the atmospherics within the two consumer groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Hedonic shoppers</th>
<th>Utilitarian shoppers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style of store</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of store</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments, fitting rooms and cash register was easy to find</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound level</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
The amount of percent disliking the atmospherics within the two consumer groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Hedonic shoppers</th>
<th>Utilitarian shoppers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space allocation</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Atmospherics and if the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers had visited the store before

This test was conducted in order to see if the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers remembered more if they had visited the store before, assuming that do not know means that they did not remember. Among the hedonic shoppers that had not been in the store prior to their store visit, everyone answered yes or no on if they liked the following atmospherics; the style of the store, the floor allocation of the store, the sound level, and if departments, fitting rooms and cash register was easy to find.

The hedonic shoppers that had not visited the store before had more yes and no answers on 10 out of 15 atmospherics (indicating that they remembered more atmospheric variables), than the hedonic shoppers that had visited the store before. The hedonic shopper that had visited the store before liked 13 out of 15 atmospherics more than the hedonic shopper that had not visited the store before. There were however only one atmospheric that showed a statistically significant relationship between if the hedonic shopper had visited the store before and what they thought about the atmospherics, which was; products were logically sorted (0.038).

The utilitarian shopper that had visited the store before answered yes or no more than the utilitarian shopper that had not visited the store before (14 out of 15 times). The utilitarian shopper that had visited the store before liked the atmospherics more than the utilitarian shopper that had not visited the store before (13 out of 15 times). There were four atmospherics with statistically significant relationship between if the utilitarian shopper had visited the store before and what they thought about the atmospherics, which were; clear signs (0.050), how products were presented (0.001), store color scheme (0.018), and store scent (0.030).

4.4.3 Atmospherics and if hedonic and utilitarian shoppers liked being in the store

As the authors expected, the contingency table showed a pattern that both hedonic and utilitarian shoppers who enjoyed staying in the store, also liked all of the store atmospherics more than the respondents that did not enjoy staying in the store, and vice versa. Table 4 shows which atmospheric variables that are connected with the liking or disliking of staying in the store among hedonic and utilitarian shoppers.
Table 4
The relationship between atmospherics and the liking or disliking of staying in the store.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The style</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The store architecture</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cleanliness of the store</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.009 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of space</td>
<td>0.019 *</td>
<td>0.001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find</td>
<td>0.049 *</td>
<td>0.003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear signs</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.011 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product presentation</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products logically sorted</td>
<td>0.028 *</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store flooring</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound level</td>
<td>0.001 *</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store lighting</td>
<td>0.009 *</td>
<td>0.007 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store color theme</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store scent</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.018 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store temperature</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material of interior</td>
<td>0.032 *</td>
<td>0.003 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

4.4.4 Atmospherics and the experience of the visit as a whole

Among hedonic shoppers, the relationship between the style of the store and how the respondents experience the visit as a whole was highly significant (0.002). There were also statistical significance between what the hedonic respondents thought of the visit as a whole and the presentation of the products (0.007) and the color scheme of the store (0.002).

Among the utilitarian shoppers, there was a statistical significance between most (12 out of 15) atmospherics and how the respondents experienced the visit as a whole. Table 5 presents the variables that were significant among hedonic and utilitarian shoppers.
Table 5
What atmospherics affects the experience of the visit as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The style</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>* 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The store architecture</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>* 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cleanliness of the store</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>* 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of space</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>* 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>* 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear signs</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product presentation</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>* 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products logically sorted</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>* 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store flooring</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound level</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>* 0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store lighting</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>* 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store color theme</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>* 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store scent</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>* 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store temperature</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material of interior</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>* 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

4.4.5 Atmospherics and if respondents would like to visit store again.

The hedonic shoppers that did not want to visit the store again, 85.7% thought the store was clean. These hedonic shoppers thought of the following atmospherics as bad: style (71.4%); signs (71.4%); how the products were presented (85.7%); and the lighting (71.4%). Among the hedonic shoppers that would like to visit the store again thought of the following atmospherics as good: style (84.0%); that the store was clean (84.0%); that the departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find (80.2%); that the sound level was good (84.0%); and that the temperature was good (84.0%).

The utilitarian shoppers that did not want to visit the store again, 85.7% of them thought the store was clean. Among the utilitarian shoppers that did not want to visit again, they thought the
following atmospherics were bad: architecture (72.7%); allocation of space (90.9%); how the products were presented (81.8%). Among the utilitarian shoppers that would like to visit the store again, they thought the following atmospherics were good: the style of the store (80.6%); that the store was clean (86.9%); that the temperature was good (83.4%); that departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find (75.4%); how the products were presented (72.0%); the sound level in the shop (76.6%); the lighting of the store (74.3%).

Among hedonic and utilitarian shoppers, Table 6 presents connections were significant between atmospherics and if they would like to visit the store again:

Table 6
What atmospherics that has a significant relationship with wanting to visit the store again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The style</td>
<td>0.000   *</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architecture</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.013 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The store was clean</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of space</td>
<td>0.019   *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product presentation</td>
<td>0.000   *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flooring</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.035 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sound level</td>
<td>0.029   *</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lighting</td>
<td>0.000   *</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color scheme</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.008 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material of the interior</td>
<td>0.030  *</td>
<td>0.002 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

4.4.6 Conclusion

There was no statistical significance between what the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers thought of the atmospherics in general. However, when looking a bit deeper, within the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers groups, there was a relation between atmospherics and how it affected the enjoyment of staying in the store, the experience of the visit as a whole and if the respondents would like to visit the store again. Regarding if the respondents had visited the store before, a
pattern was seen in how many atmospherics the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers had an opinion about.

4.5 Comparative analysis of experiences

Six tests were conducted in order to see how experiences affected the hedonic and utilitarian consumers. First, a test was conducted to see if there were any connection between the experience in the store and what shopping motives the respondents had. The second test concerned what the respondents experienced in their visit and if this had any relationship with visiting the store before. Third test shows if there is any relationship between the experiences and the liking to be in the store. Fourth test presents if the experiences are connected to the experience of the visit as a whole. Fifth test shows the relationship between experiences and wanting to visit the store again. Finally, a test was conducted to see if the liking to be in the store contributed to wanting to visit the store again.

4.5.1 Experiences among hedonic and utilitarian shoppers

There were two significant correlations between hedonic and utilitarian shopping motive and what the respondents experienced in their latest store visit, which were if it was possible to test products in the store (0.049), and if there was accessible help tools (0.042).

4.5.2 If experience was affected by a previous store visit

There were three significant correlations among the respondents with hedonic shopping motives and if they had visited the store before. First something in the store environment surprised me (0.020), secondly there were accessible help tools (0.048), and lastly the products were accessible (0.001). There were no significant values among the respondents with utilitarian shopping motives.

4.5.3 Experience and the liking or disliking to be in the store

This test was conducted in order to see if there was any connection between the hedonic and utilitarian experience and the liking or disliking being in the store. Table 7 presents the statistical significances between the variables.
Table 7  
*Experiences that contribute to the enjoyment of being in the store.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was inspired during the store visit</td>
<td>0.031 *</td>
<td>0.004 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned something about a product</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.044 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to find specific products</td>
<td>0.042 *</td>
<td>0.026 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get around in the store</td>
<td>0.021 *</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There store was orderly</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products were accessible</td>
<td>0.029 *</td>
<td>0.002 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

4.5.4 Experiences and the liking or disliking of the experience as a whole

This test was conducted in order to see if there was any correlation with what the respondents experienced in the store and how they liked the store visit as a whole. The variables were both likert scale, in which a bivariate correlation analysis was made. The test results showed that in 8 out of 10 cases, there is a correlation between what hedonic and utilitarian shoppers experience and what they thought about the shopping experience as a whole.

Table 8  
*Experiences and the liking or disliking of the experience as a whole.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was inspired during the store visit</td>
<td>0.001 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned something about a product</td>
<td>0.007 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something in the store environment surprised me</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was possible to test products in the store</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or several of my senses was positively stimulated</td>
<td>0.005 *</td>
<td>0.001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to find specific products</td>
<td>0.019 *</td>
<td>0.000 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were accessible help tools

There were no correlation between any hedonic experiences and wanting to visit or not visit the store again among the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers. However, one utilitarian experience had a correlation with wanting or not wanting to visit the store again: *The store was orderly*. Among the utilitarian shoppers, four out of five utilitarian variables was correlated with wanting or not wanting to visit the store again.

### Table 9

What experiences that is connected to wanting or not wanting to visit the store again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to find specific products</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get around in the store</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The store was orderly</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products were accessible</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

### 4.5.5 Liked to be in the store and wanting to visit the store again

Among the respondents with hedonic shopping motives, 100% of the respondents that liked to be in the store would like to visit the store again. The hedonic shoppers that did not like to be in the store, 46.2% would like to visit the store again. The Pearson Chi-square test showed a value of 0.000, which means there is a high significance between liking to be in the store and wanting to visit the store again.

Among the respondents with utilitarian shopping motives, 98.1% of the respondents that liked to be in the store would like to visit the store again. The utilitarian shoppers that did not like to be
in the store, 71.4% would like to visit the store again. The Pearson Chi-square test showed a value of 0.000, which means there is a high significance between liking to be in the store and wanting to visit the store again.

Table 10

*How many of the hedonic and utilitarian shoppers that would like to visit the store again.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Want to visit the store again</th>
<th>Hedonic</th>
<th>Utilitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liked to be in the store</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not like to be in the store</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.7 Summary

The utilitarian experiences had more effect on both hedonic and utilitarian shoppers than hedonic experiences. There were more statistical significances among the utilitarian shoppers regarding the experiences, than the hedonic shoppers and experiences.
5. Discussion

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings in this study, as well as the limitations. The results from the study is discussed and related to the previous findings presented in the literature review.

The respondents that answered yes or no to an atmospheric question are in this study regarded as having remembered that atmospheric since having an opinion about it. Since the atmospheric is remembered, it has contributed to the consumers store experience. If the respondents answered do not know, it could mean they did not notice or have forgotten the atmospheric, but it could also mean that they simply did not have an opinion about that specific atmospheric.

5.1 Atmospherics as a whole

Researchers (Babin & Dardin, 1995; Bitner, 1992; Turley & Chebat, 2002; Turley & Milliman, 2000) found that different consumers were affected differently by atmospherics. However, no significance was found between liking atmospherics and being a hedonic or utilitarian consumer in this study, which indicates that there are no specific atmospherics that are liked more by hedonic or utilitarian consumers. The least remembered atmospherics were flooring, scent and material. Some stores may not have a specific scent and this might lead to respondents answering do not know. Many studies have focused on scent having an effect on shopping behavior, and the same goes for materials (Turley & Milliman, 2000). Since it is not always obvious what materials the store environment is made up of, materials may be difficult to notice. This could be an explanation for materials being one of the atmospherics least noticed by respondents, even though according to Kerfoot et al. (2003) the materials used in a store are closely connected with what is aesthetically pleasing.

When it comes to statements about liking atmospherics, hedonic consumers were in majority over utilitarian in answering yes or no instead of do not know. This indicates that the store visit was more memorable to hedonic consumers, which supports Eroglu and Machleit’s (1993) findings that utilitarian consumers pay less attention than hedonic consumers to aspects of the
store environment that does not help them achieve their goal (Ibid). This means that utilitarian consumers in this study do not care or pay as much attention to the environment as consumers with hedonic shopping motives.

Bäckström & Johansson (2006) propose that to provide a high utilitarian value, the store needs to be tidy and clean, which was one of the atmospherics with the highest percentage of yes or no-answers for utilitarian customers in this study, meaning that this was something that utilitarian consumers noticed and/or had a strong opinion about.

5.2 Previous store visits

Hedonic and utilitarian shoppers that had visited the store before liked the atmospherics more. Since the store has been visited by the same respondent before, this indicates an approach behavior that could possibly be caused by pleasing atmospherics in the store environment. If the shopper had visited the store before, it could also indicate that the more they visit a store, the more they come to like the store environment. This could mean that if the respondent visits the store more often, he or she could become less picky about it. The case could also be that the respondent visits the store because he or she has to.

5.3 Liking or disliking being in the store environment

This study found that if hedonic consumers liked to be in the store or not was related to if the departments, fitting rooms and cash registers were easy to find and that the store provided clear signs, which could be related to information seeking. This indicates that the hedonic consumers are more engaged in trying to find his or her way around the store, which supports the study of Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) that state that hedonic customers are engaged in information seeking. In general, for both customer groups, the flooring and the temperature were the only variables that were not significant for liking to be in the store. This could be because these atmospherics are taken for granted in case there is nothing particularly odd with them, as for example, a very high temperature, or uncomfortable or slippery floor. The number of atmospherics that significantly contributed to if utilitarian customers liked or disliked to be in the store, are more than those that contribute to the hedonic customers positive store visit. This could
mean that other things in the store are of importance for the hedonic customer, such as the products or the personnel.

Both hedonic and utilitarian customers had strong opinions on the style of the store in this study, and significance was found between the style of the store and if hedonic customers liked their stay in the store or not. Since both hedonic and utilitarian shoppers seemed to pay attention to the atmospherics, this could have to do with the store style being a big part of the store environment and is something that permeates the entire store, making it easier to assimilate. However, several more atmospherics were significant for if a utilitarian consumer liked to be in the store or not. These findings does not support the Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) study in which it was suggested that attractive decor and in-store merchandising should be important for attracting hedonic customers.

Eroglu and Machleit (1993) also claim that utilitarian consumers are less satisfied with the store environment, compared to hedonic consumers. In this study, several atmospherics were significant for if a utilitarian consumer liked to be in the store or not. The results also indicated that utilitarian consumers had more atmospherics that were significant for the total store experience than hedonic, which could mean that utilitarian consumers are a bit more demanding.

5.4 Wanting to visit the store again

Positive evaluation of store atmospherics was positively correlated with liking to be in the store. Respondents that rated the store atmospherics negatively did not like to be in the store, which supports Bitner’s (1992) and Donovan and Rossiter’s (1982) suggestions on that a positive atmosphere leads to approach behavior and negative store atmosphere leads to avoidance behavior.

Utilitarian consumers had more atmospherics with significance between the atmospherics and wanting to visit the store again. Amongst these were the architecture, cleanliness, color scheme, and the flooring. However, flooring was not significant for liking to be in the store.
5.5 Experiences

To be inspired by the store visit, that the store was in order, and that products were easy to find, mattered for creating a positive experience for both hedonic and utilitarian customers. This is positively related to Bäckström & Johansson’s (2006) findings that how products are displayed and presented seems to enhance the consumer experience (Ibid). However, hedonic shoppers valued more than utilitarian that it was easy to get around the store, while utilitarian customers wanted to learn something about a product, which was one of the techniques used by retailers to enhance consumer experience in the Bäckström and Johansson (2006) study. Poulsson and Kale (2004) argue that managers, in order to create a positive consumer experience, should present a mixture of relevance, novelty, surprise, learning and engagement, which was also found in this study to positively affect experiences of both shopper types. All hedonic and utilitarian values, except the possibility to test the products, were important for the creation of positive store experiences. In Bäckström and Johansson’s (2006) study, letting consumers try products was part of how retailers tried to manage experiences for customers, which in this study, did not contribute to a positive store experience. Retailers in Bäckström and Johansson’s study also used techniques to inspire and stimulate consumer senses and provide them with product knowledge. According to this study these types of techniques highly affected the in-store experience for both utilitarian and hedonic customers.

For hedonic customers, it was important that the store was orderly, if they were to visit again, when for utilitarian customers, it was required more from the store experience, such as accessible products, easy to find products, and easy to get around in the store as well as the store being orderly.

5.6 Summary

Table 11 and Table 12 show the important atmospherics and experiences for hedonic compared to utilitarian customers. Hedonic is represented with the number 1, utilitarian is represented with the number 2, and if there is significance for both hedonic and utilitarian customers, this is represented with the number 3.
### Table 11
What atmospherics that has a significant relationship with one or several of the situations among hedonic (1), utilitarian (2) or both (3) customer types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atmospherics</th>
<th>Had visited the store before</th>
<th>Liked being in the store</th>
<th>Experienced the store as a whole</th>
<th>Want to visit the store again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments, etc., easy to find</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products logically sorted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material of the interior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12
What experiences that has a significant relationship with one or several of the situations among hedonic (1), utilitarian (2) or both (3) customer types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Had visited the store before</th>
<th>Liked being in the store</th>
<th>Experienced the store as a whole</th>
<th>Want to visit the store again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was inspired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned something</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something surprised me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was possible to test products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senses positively stimulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to find specific products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to get around</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible help tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store was orderly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products were accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusions

In order to create a positive consumer experience it is important that the customer gets inspired, that he or she feels that the store is orderly, that products are accessible. It is also important that the consumer feels that he or she has learned something, has been positively surprised, that there are accessible help tools, and that it is easy to find specific products. Consumers also want to have their senses stimulated in some way in order to have a positive store experience.

The most important atmospherics for creating consumer experiences was found to be the style of the store, the presentation of the products and the color theme of the store. These atmospherics affects both the experience of the visit as a whole and the liking or disliking of being in the store. The style of the store was an important variable, since it always noticed by customers. If the consumers like the atmospherics, he or she will also revisit the store. Customers that have visited the store before will also like the atmospheric more than the customer who visits the store for the first time.

The style of the store, the allocation of floor space, that departments, fittings rooms and cash register are easy to find, that the products are presented in an interesting way, and that there is a liking of the material and lighting in the store affects the consumers liking of the store visit.

6.1 Academic implications

This study has contributed to an understanding on which atmospheric and experience variables that affects hedonic versus utilitarian shoppers. It is described which atmospheric variables that are liked among hedonic versus utilitarian customers depending on if they have visited the store before. It also described which atmospherics that are connected with the liking and disliking of being in the store, which atmospherics that affects the experience of the visit as a whole and which atmospherics that is connected to wanting to visit or not to visit the store again. Regarding the experiences, this study describes which hedonic and utilitarian experiences that are important for hedonic versus utilitarian shoppers. It is also tested if the hedonic and utilitarian experiences are connected with previous visits, the liking to be in the store, the store visit as a whole and
wanting to visit the store again, among the hedonic versus utilitarian shoppers. This study could therefore function as an understanding to what specific atmospherics or experiences that are connected to hedonic versus utilitarian shoppers, when shaping retail store environment.

6.2 Managerial implications

Atmospherics play an important role in forming positive consumer experiences and to manage these in an effective way should create a positive outcome in the shape of profits and returning customers for retailers. The following atmospherics; style of the store, allocation of floor space, departments fitting rooms and cash register, presentation of products, color scheme, store lighting, and material in the store should be focused on by managers because they are significant for the creation of positive in store experiences for both utilitarian and hedonic customers. Depending on the type of store or products sold managers might know if their customer base mainly consists of one or the other customer type and could therefore customize the atmospherics to best fit the needs and wants of that type. If the store has a hedonic target group, focus should lie on store style, floor space allocation, presentation of products, sound level, lighting and material of the interior. If the target group mainly consists of utilitarian customers, focus should be on architecture, having a clean store, floor space allocation, presentation of products, flooring, color scheme of store and the material of the interior. Even though all atmospherics are not proven to be significant for creating a positive store experience, they should still be managed since they contribute to the impression of the store as a whole.

Today, retail managers focus on providing hedonic values for customers, although this study showed that retailers should focus on providing utilitarian values for customers, since this study showed that utilitarian values effect experiences more.

6.3 Limitations

There was a difference in the number of hedonic and utilitarian shoppers, where 88 respondents were hedonic and 186 were utilitarian. This might affect the study in a way that when hedonic and utilitarian shoppers are compared, there are not as many hedonic representatives. The study was also only conducted in Sweden, which makes it hard to generalize the results among other
countries. Further research need to be tested in other cultures in order to enhance the generalization of our findings.

Three questions in the survey were not included in the data analysis. Two of the questions consisted of check-boxes. This made these questions difficult to test. This was discovered after the completion of the survey. This resulted in not being able to test if mood affected the store experience and if their mood was changed during the store visit. The third question concerned the music and was not included since the authors were not able to test it in the same manner as the other atmospherics. The authors do not believe that the removal of this question has affected the results of this study in a significant way.

6.4 Further research

This study found that if the customer had visited the store before, he or she would like the store atmospherics more than the consumer that had not visited the store prior to the visit. It could be interesting for retailers to know how consumers that frequently visit the store are affected by atmospherics in comparison to consumers that visit the store for the first time.

There was not a specific store type investigated in this study and there could be differences in how atmospherics in different store types affect consumers. Different kinds of stores could be more hedonic or utilitarian-oriented for example, depending on the products or the target group. Therefore the authors suggest further research on different kinds of store types and their effect on consumer behavior.

Authors believe that an observational study should be conducted with observations in actual store environments in order to observe real reactions to atmospherics and other variables that affect store experiences. By doing this, it should be possible to see how all atmospherics correlate in creating an experience for the consumer. It could also be of interest to investigate the effects that in-store variables have on a subconscious level, because it is possible that these variables affect hedonic and utilitarian customers differently.
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Appendix 1 – The Survey

Enkät om butiksmiljöns påverkan

Hej!
Vi är tre studenter vid Linneuniversitetet i Växjö som skriver vår kandidatuppsats i marknadsföring. Genom denna enkät vill vi undersöka kunders upplevelser av butiksmiljöer.

Enkäten avser ej livsmedelsbutiker.

Enkäten tar cirka 5-10 minuter och alla svar är fullständigt anonyma.

Tack på förhand för din medverkan!
Med Vaxjöliga Hälsningar
Sara, Mia & Tajana.

1. Jag är:
   - Man
   - Kvinna

2. Min ålder är:
   - Yngre än 20
   - 20-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60-69
   - Äldre än 70

3. Min huvudsakliga sysselsättning.
   - Privat, Statligt eller Kommunalt anställd
   - Egenföretagare
   - Pensionerad
   - Studerande
   - Föräldraläger
   - Arbetssökande
   - Annet:

4. Så här ofta besöker Jag butiker, Gäller ej livsmedelsbutiker.
   - 4-7 gånger i veckan
   - 1-3 gånger i veckan
   - 1-3 gånger i månaden
   - 1-3 gånger i halvåret
   - 1-3 gånger om året
   - Mer sällan än en gång om året
5. Jag besöker butiker för nöjes skull, utan att ha ett specifikt ärende.
- Alltid
- Ofta
- Hälften av gångerna
- Sällan
- Aldrig

Följande påståenden kommer att handla om ditt senaste butiksbesök.
OBS! Enkäten avser ej livsmedelsbutiker eller service utförd av personal.

- Modebutik (kläder, skor, accessoarer)
- Teknikbutik
- Inredningsbutik
- Hobbybutik
- Byggvaruhus
- Leksaksaffär
- Biltillbehörbutik
- Bokhandel
- Sportbutik
- Musikaffär
- Blomsterhandel
- Kosmetika- eller Hudvårds-butik
- Second Hand-butik
- Annot

7. Jag har besökt butiken tidigare.
- Ja
- Nej

8. Jag hade planerat att handla något.
- Ja
- Nej

- Ja
- Nej

- Glad
- Arg
- Nöjd
- Ledesn
- Lugn
- Stressad
- Irriterad
- Piga
- Trott
- Nyfiken
- Förväntansfull
- Kommer inte ihåg
- Annat

11. Mina åsikter om butikens miljö.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Jag tyckte om butikens stil.</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nej</th>
<th>Vet ej</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Jag tyckte om butikens arkitektur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Butiken var ren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Det var bra fördelning av ytor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Avdelningarna, provhytter och kassa var lätt att hitta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jag tyckte om hur produkterna var presenterade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Det var behaglig ljudnivå i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jag tyckte om belysningen i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jag tyckte att det lukade gott i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Jag tyckte om materialen som butiksinredningen bestod av.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Ja
- Nej
- Vet ej
- Det spelades ingen musik
13. Vid butiksbesöket upplevde jag något av följande.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uttryck</th>
<th>Instämmer inte alls</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis inte</th>
<th>Varken eller</th>
<th>Instämmer delvis</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jag blev inspirerad under butiksbesöket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vid besöket lärde jag mig något om en produkt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Något som jag besökte överraskade mig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Det fanns möjlighet att testa produkterna i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ett eller flera av mina sinnen blev positivt stimulerade under besöket (syn, smak, hörsel, känsel, lukt).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Det var lätt att hitta specifika produkter i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Det var lätt att ta sig fram i butiken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Glad
- Arg
- Nojd
- Leden
- Lugn
- Stressed
- Irriterad
- Pigg
- Trott
- Besviken
- Kommer inte ihåg
- Annat

15. Jag tyckte om att vistas i butiken.

- Ja
- Nej


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uttryck</th>
<th>1 Mycket negativt</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Mycket positivt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Jag skulle gärna besöka butiken igen.

- Ja
- Nej

Klicka på "submit" för att slutföra in dina svar och avsluta ankieten.
Appendix 2 - Survey in English

Note: This is not the SPSS coding of the survey answers, but the survey questions (Q) and answers (A) translated into English, so all readers of this study can easily understand the material.

Introduction text:

Hello!

We are three students at Linnaeus University in Växjö who are writing our bachelor thesis in marketing. With this survey we want to examine customers' perceptions of retail environments.

The questionnaire does not concern grocery stores.

The survey takes about 5-10 minutes to complete and all responses are completely anonymous. Do not hesitate to contact us with any questions: uppsats@ladymiah.se

Thanks in advance for your participation

Best regards
Sara, Miah & Tajana

Q1 [Gender]

A1 = male
A2 = female

Q2 [Age]

A1 = younger than 20
A2 = 20-29
A3 = 30-39
A4 = 40-49
A5 = 50-59
A6 = 60-69
A7 = older than 70

Q3 [Occupation]

A1 = state, municipal, privately employed
A2 = self-employed
A3 = retired
A4 = student
A5 = parental leave
A6 = unemployed
A7 = other

Q4 [Shop visit frequency]

A1 = 4-7 times a week
A2 = 1-3 times a week
A3 = 1-3 times a month
A4 = 1-3 times every half hear
A5 = 1-3 times a year
A6 = more seldom than once a year

Q5 [I visit shops for fun, without any specific errand]
A1 = always
A2 = often
A3 = half the times
A4 = seldom
A5 = never

Q6 [Text: Following statements will be about your latest store visit.
NOTE! The questionnaire does not concern grocery stores and service performed by personnel]

Q7 [Latest visited shop]
A1 = fashion store
A2 = electronic store
A3 = interior design store
A4 = DIY store
A5 = home improvement store
A6 = toy store
A7 = car part store
A8 = book store
A9 = sports store
A10 = music store
A11 = florist
A12 = make-up or skin-care store
A13 = second hand store
A14 = other

Q8 [I have visited the store before]
A1 = yes
A2 = no

Q9 [I had planned to buy something in the store]
A1 = yes
A2 = no

Q10 [I bought something]
A1 = yes
A2 = no

Q11 [My feeling when I entered the store]
A1 = happy
A2 = angry
A3 = satisfied
A4 = sad
A5 = calm
A6 = stressed
A7 = irritated
A8 = alert
A9 = tired
A10 = curious
A11 = expectant
A12 = do not remember
A13 = other

Q12 [My opinions about the store environment]

Q12a1 [I liked the style of the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a2 [I liked the architecture of the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a3 [The store was clean]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a4 [The store had good space allocation]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a5 [Departments, fitting rooms and cash register were easy to find]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a6 [There were clear signs in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a7 [I liked how the products were presented]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a8 [Products were sorted in a logical way]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
A3 = do not know

Q12a9 [I liked the floor in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a10 [There was a good sound level in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a11 [I liked the lighting in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a12 [I liked the color scheme in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a13 [I thought the store had a nice scent]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a14 [I thought the temperature in the store was good]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q12a15 [I liked the material of the interior in the store]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know

Q13 [The shop played music that I liked]
   A1 = yes
   A2 = no
   A3 = do not know
   A4 = no music was played

Q14 [During my latest shop visit, I experienced:]

Q14a1 [I was inspired during the store visit]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
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Q14a2 [I learned something about a product during my visit]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a3 [Something in the store environment surprised me]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a4 [It was possible to try products in the store]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a5 [One or several of my senses were positively stimulated during my visit]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a6 [It was easy to find specific products in the store]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a7 [It was easy to get through the store]
   A1 = fully disagree
   A2 = partly disagree
   A3 = either way
   A4 = partly agree
   A5 = fully agree

Q14a8 [There were accessible aids available in the store]
   A1 = fully disagree
A2 = partly disagree  
A3 = either way  
A4 = partly agree  
A5 = fully agree  

**Q14a9** [There were orderliness in the store]  
A1 = fully disagree  
A2 = partly disagree  
A3 = either way  
A4 = partly agree  
A5 = fully agree  

**Q14a10** [Products were easy to access]  
A1 = fully disagree  
A2 = partly disagree  
A3 = either way  
A4 = partly agree  
A5 = fully agree  

**Q15** [My feeling when I left the store]  
A1 = happy  
A2 = angry  
A3 = satisfied  
A4 = sad  
A5 = calm  
A6 = stressed  
A7 = irritated  
A8 = alert  
A9 = tired  
A10 = disappointed  
A11 = do not remember  
A12 = other  

**Q16** [I enjoyed staying in the store]  
A1 = yes  
A2 = no  

**Q17** [How I experienced the store visit as a whole]  
A1 = very negative  
A2  
A3  
A4  
A5 = very positive  

**Q18** [I would like to visit the store again]  
A1 = yes  
A2 = no
Linnaeus University – a firm focus on quality and competence

On 1 January 2010 Växjö University and the University of Kalmar merged to form Linnaeus University. This new university is the product of a will to improve the quality, enhance the appeal and boost the development potential of teaching and research, at the same time as it plays a prominent role in working closely together with local society. Linnaeus University offers an attractive knowledge environment characterised by high quality and a competitive portfolio of skills.

Linnaeus University is a modern, international university with the emphasis on the desire for knowledge, creative thinking and practical innovations. For us, the focus is on proximity to our students, but also on the world around us and the future ahead.
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