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1 Introduction

*The first chapter introduces the reader to the subject of this study. The concept of ingredient branding is presented, followed by the problem discussion in the area, the purpose of the study and research questions.*

1.1 Background

According to Kotler (2003) marketing is about choosing what kind of customer’s companies wants and to find their needs and the service areas. Marketing is also about to choose what types of products companies wants to offer and to come up with a price range that match the customer’s demands (Kotler, 2003). Armstrong & Kotler (2011) states that the definition of marketing is to meet peoples need in the most profitable way.

Branding has become an important tool in marketing to be unique and competitive (Keller, 2008). A brand is a name, sign or symbol used to identify products and services. Already in ancient Greece traders hung images of their dealings as indicated on the type of goods they sold. Traders designed symbols that indicated what business the commercial dealer were engaged in, and the logotype that signaled the brands performance was born. In the Middle Ages craftsmen stamped their products to indicate their specialization that led to differentiation and it became more common (de Chernatony et al., 2011). Initially, the brand was used as a tool to differentiate and identify itself. Further on the interest in building a strong brand grew, which helped companies to convey honesty and quality (Fisher & Vallaster, 2008). During the 1800s the demand for products grew and the competition increased. Thanks to the new technologies companies could now start with mass production of packaged products. The package had originally been marked with a name or a serial number that indicated on the products origin. Companies realized that the consumer needed to know the product or the company’s name to ensure future sales (Richardson, 2012).

According to Sagar et al. (2006) a brand is one of the most valuable assets a company owns. Kapferer (2008) states that a brand has an essential importance
for the individualization of a company’s product or service and has a purpose of creating emotional relationships between the customer and the company. If the customer has a strong emotional relationship with the company, trust and credibility increase to the company. This can make it easier for the company to retain existing customer’s and the risk that customer’s choose a competing company decreases (Keller, 2008). Fan (2005) argues that a successful brand provides financial values in either increased sales or higher pricing. Keller (2008) summarize that the main objective of branding is to dominate the market (reducing or eliminating competition), to increase customer loyalty and increase the barriers for other companies to enter the market.

In 1993 Simon & Sullivan argued that many researchers state that brand management is less important in business to business marketing, also known as “B2B marketing”. Quelch (2007) disagree with Simon & Sullivan (1993) and states that it is very important for a B2B company to build a strong brand. Muylle et al. (2012) states that companies in the B2B sector puts a lot of energy and big capital to develop high brand equity. Further on, Quelch (2007) argue that if the B2B brand develop high awareness among their customer’s, customer’s can thereby capture a larger channel of margins and build loyalty that can protect the company against lower-priced competitors.

Branding in the B2B sector can be conducted in a phenomenon called ingredient branding where suppliers produce components that are incorporated into a retailer’s end product (Norris, 1992). According to Ugglag (2001) ingredient branding is one type of brand alliance but unlike another strategy called co-branding, ingredient branding is working in the B2B-market. Co-branding can be defined as “combining two existing brand names to create a composite brand name for a new product” (Helmig et al., 2008). Desai & Keller (2002) argue that there are different types of co-branding, they term a strategy called vertical co-branding. Also referred to as “ingredient branding”, this mean, according to Desai and Keller (2002) that the producers have different value chains. While a horizontal co-branding is characterized by the producers to the same value.
According to Uggla (2001) ingredient branding is a brand alliance between two brands where the ingredient brand is applied to the host brand and acts as an ingredient on the product. The company that use an ingredient brand has no sales at all to the end consumer but despite this manages to build up a demand from them. The brand and its component or raw material is marketed with a major brand information (McCarthy & Norris, 1999). According to Uggla (2001) the host brand is an independent brand, even without an ingredient brand. Further on Uggla (2001) states that ingredient branding can help identify and create quality associations with the aim of creating differentiation and competitiveness from other companies that may have a lower price on their products. A strategy can according to Uggla (2001) be to use an ingredient brand as a guarantor for the host brand. Ingredient brand will be used to enhance and build associations to a host brand (Uggla, 2001). One of the most common examples of ingredient brands is Intel. Intel is a schoolbook example of a successful ingredient brand. Intel has managed to create a demand for the chip manufacturer uses their PC's and even marketing of their products (Quelch, 2007).

Uggla (2004) and Norris (1992) makes a difference between functional and emotional ingredient brands. Functional ingredient brand is when the ingredient brand stands for quality and increase the value of the products functioning. Emotional ingredient brands do not need to bring any functional benefit to the customer. The meaning of emotional ingredient brand is that it should increase the value for the customer emotionally. Ethical brands are a type of emotional brands. The concept of ethics has recently begun to be used more widely and in particular in connection with supplier relationships, consumption and trade (Uggla, 2004; Norris, 1992). With ethically means that someone takes into account and control their behavior and their actions depending on what it has been for the impact on others (Thomas, 2008). Ethical brands have received a boost as a market solution to a range of political, social and ethical issues, and marketing has become more sensitive to ethics and they are expected to act in a morally acceptable way (Sagar et al., 2006). Consumer’s want to make a difference with their consumption (Walz et al., 2014). Today cherish more and more consumers to businesses around the world to take responsibility for applying both a moral and ethical approach. To successfully implement ethical
brands can lead to a company's products have a competitive advantage and differentiate themselves from their competitors (Uggla, 2004).

1.2 Problem Discussion

The reasons that companies build brand alliances such as the ingredient branding strategy is to create new markets, access new markets and expand their customer segments (Kotler & Pfoertsch, 2010). It is largely about distinguishing themselves from their competitors, create competitive advantages, position their brands and expand existing products. To extend a brand beyond its existing core to expand brand equity is brand alliances a good strategy to accomplish (Uggla, 2001). It is important to be well aware of what it means to be part of a brand alliance. Brand alliances means that companies partly releasing control of its brand. This can be seen as a risk for the company when the brand is not completely guided out of the company itself. Thus, it is advantageous for companies to understand the disadvantages and risks associated with the brand alliances (Uggla, 2001; Desai & Keller, 2002; Norris, 1992).

Ingredient branding is not for every supplier and not for every manufacturer (Norris, 1992). Janiszewski & Van Osselaer (2000) and Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) argue that it is extremely important to note that ingredient branding has its risks, and above all that this strategy does not fit all companies or all situations and industries. Ingredient branding can be harmful to both parties in this type of cooperation (Norris, 1992; Uggla, 2003). If the ingredient brand does not have the same quality as the host brand, the host brand can take damage (Desai & Keller, 2002). But what happens if the ingredient brand is known to have much better quality then the host brand, would the consumer be convinced or can the ingredient brand take damage? Uggla (2003) is almost answering this question and states that an ingredient brand can lose the control of its own brand.

Ingredient brand is not an independent brand. It must work with another brand to exist (Uggla, 2001). Thus provider dedicated to the ingredient branding directly dependent on another brand and it is very important to be attractive in the B2B market to even exist. The interesting question is how an ingredient
brand can create demand from the end customer without selling a particular product just a component to the end product. For example, Intel have succeeded with their campaign they launched in 1991 “Intel Inside” that created a demand from the end customer. The customer’s wanted an assurance that the microprocessors in the computers had good quality. The customer’s asked then for Intel Inside. If there were any computer that did not had the Intel Inside logotype customer’s started to ask and wonder, why do not they use Intel chips? Are they using something cheaper, or not as good as Intel? (Quelch, 2007; Kotler & Pfoertsch, 2010). According to Brownell (1994) little research has been conducted to date as to how consumer’s evaluate the end product of an ingredient brand strategy. Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) states that more research can be done in this area of attitudes. There is a research gap that could be filled.

Solomon et al. (2006) define the concept of involvement as a persons perceived relevance of the object based on their inherent needs, values and interests. In this context the word is referenced items to a product, a brand or an advertising a buying situation. According to Vaidyanathan & Aggarwal (2000) products with low consumer involvement have been successful with the ingredient branding strategy. But is it the same with products in the low price segment, for example, would it be the same effect on a product with a high consumer involvement in the low price segment such as a low price car? Here is also a research gap that could be filled. Question you can ask is if this cooperation between the ingredient brand and the host brand change the attitudes at the consumer in the B2C perspective? How much power do the ingredient brand have to change consumer’s attitudes towards the host brand if the host brand is a low price brand? Will the consumer expect higher quality because of the ingredient brand? Can an ingredient brand make the consumer to pay more money for the end product even though the host brand is a low price brand? Or will the ingredient brand instead make people not buying the product because they will think that the product will be too expensive and the attitude towards the low price brand will change in a negative way? These different question will be investigating in this thesis.
1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the thesis is to investigate how consumer’s attitudes are affected by ingredient branding on products in the segment of low price host brands.

1.4 Research Questions

How does an ingredient brand affect consumer’s attitudes on a low price host brand in a positive or a negative way?

How does an ingredient brand affect consumer’s attitudes on high or low involvement products?

1.5 Delimitation

The present study will be delimited to focus groups of consumers. This thesis will collect the data in South of Sweden and considered only young and middle aged (18-50) consumers that have lived in Sweden for at least five years. The respondents of the focus groups will be non-probability and convenience sample because of time and resource perspective.

1.6 Outline of the Study

In the following this study is described in brief as to what is presented at each heading. This for an easy overview of the work to be formed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Represents the basic background information about ingredient branding and attitudes, problem of the area, purpose, delimitations of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Describes what can be found in the literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Comprises a variety of definition and clarification of several methods that has been used in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Investigation</td>
<td>Demonstrates the focus group findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Represents the analysis of focus group findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>The main points of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Implications</td>
<td>Contribution, further research and limitations are discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Theoretical Framework

This chapter represents the literature of ingredient branding, attitude, ABC model and theory of planned behavior.

2.1 Ingredient Branding

2.1.1 Ingredient Branding in a Consumer Behavior Perspective

Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) argues that ingredient branding is to make the invisible visible, for example to make a B2B product available on the business to consumer market, where it gets global recognition. It means creating a brand name for an ingredient or component of a product (Zhang et al., 2013). Ingredient branding involves two logotypes exposed at the same time but they are in different proportion. Concretely this means that the sender has different magnitude (Uggla, 2003).

The meaning of an ingredient brand is that the end customer will experience a higher value (Kotler & Pfoertsch, 2010; Zhang et al., 2013; Norris, 1992). Furthermore, Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) and Desai & Keller (2002) says that any ingredient brands have in common that they help brands become more unique. According Hoeffler & Keller (2003) ingredient branding lead to confusion among customer’s as an ingredient brand may appear in several products in the same category as the differentiation of the different products decreases.

It is in the literature a difference whether it is a manufacturer or supplier who initiated the ingredient branding strategy. The motivation of the manufacturer is about to host the brand develops or modifies an attribute to improve evaluations from consumer’s. In the latter case, it is about brand component forms an alliance with the end product manufacturer’s in an effort to create awareness of the ingredient brand and create a drawing effect and demand (Desai & Keller, 2002; Zhang et al., 2013). Zhang et al. (2013) and Norris (1992) argues further that since the dealer takes the initiative they usually choose an existing well-known ingredient brand and market the fact that the ingredient is part of an end product. Further on states Ghodeswar (2008) Desai & Keller (2002) and Kotler
& Pfoertsch (2010) to ingredient branding increases the value of the finished product and consumers are willing to pay a higher price for this type of product.

Luczak et al. (2007) argue for a framework called In-Branding where the supplier markets its brand to the dealer while they market it in B2C to the end consumer. A similar framework is also used by Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010). Zhang et al. (2013) presents a model in which a main brand procures a component from a supplier, and use this in a final product. The supplier can use In-Branding strategy to increase the awareness to the ingredient brand. Ingredient brand markets itself not only to the final consumer without offering to have a joint advertising programs to encourage corporate brand to label their products with the ingredient brand logo in the end product. The main brand decides how many resources this would add to build up the final awareness of the brand (Zhang et al., 2013).

For the supplier gives an ingredient branding opportunity to communicate product benefits to the final consumer, and thus increase their brand equity (Luczak et al., 2007). Doyle (2001) argue that advertising is a key part of the process of informing the customer about the benefits inherent product and position themselves in the consumer consciousness. Ingredient branding builds goodwill of both the supplier and the retailer (Meenaghan, 1995). How much goodwill a retailer get depends on how much effort it makes on advertising and provider of goodwill is about how much effort he put into the ingredient brand (Zhang et al., 2013).

2.1.2 Ingredient Brandings Affect on the Host Brand
Norris (1992) argue that there is almost always an ingredient brand to earn the most from the cooperation with the host brand. It has advantage of the huge exposure they receive by working with a bigger and stronger brand. Ingredient brand can virtually never be damaged by hosting trade mark may be negative market response. For the host brand is a risk of it being damaged and pulled down the ingredient brand. For the producer of the host brand, it may mean that the ingredient brand takes over the identity and become the main purpose of
consumption. McCarthy & Norris (1999) show in an experiment that the principal mark not always positively influenced by an ingredient brand. The experiment shows that the ingredient brand has a positive impact on the host brand of medium quality in comparison to a main brand of high quality where it is only in some cases prove to have a positive impact. Furthermore, the experiment shows that a major brand of medium quality can improve their competitive advantage by using the ingredient branding. Norris (1992) argues that it is not only worthy brand that can be damaged in cases where the manufacturer prepares cooperation must be well-known ingredient brand to be selective in who they work with. For the ingredient brand, cooperation, however, involve a loss of control (Norris, 1992; Uggla, 2003). Ingredient branding can, however, be beneficial for both parties as long as it is implemented correctly (Luczak et al., 2007).

Ingredient branding can involve large upfront costs that arise when companies want to create awareness among consumer’s (Norris, 1992). Considering this requires a well-functioning cooperation between the host brand and ingredient brand, and this cooperation is expected to be long-term (Norris, 1992; McCarthy & Norris, 1999). Furthermore, states Zhang et al. (2013) that it may take a long time before cooperation brings benefits. On the other hand, the ingredient branding according Meenaghan (1995) to effective marketing and savings, with shared marketing costs. In addition, a collaboration easier access to distribution and higher profit margins (Norris, 1992). Erevelles et al. (2008) points out that collaboration gives improved margins thanks to the company to differentiate its products using the brand name rather than compete with price as the determining factor.

A disadvantage is under (Norris 1992) that upon a successful ingredient branding strategy can be perceived as so good that competitors are after. In contrast to this, Sigue (2012) arguing that in a successful ingredient branding the consumers will require the manufacturer to produce the product with this ingredient, which means that the manufacturer buys large amounts of this ingredient to meet demand. Further believes Sigue (2012) that the five main benefits of ingredient branding are as follows; (1) ownership of intangibles (2) increased purchasing
power in the value chain (3) greater profit margin in relation to the provider's investment in, and with increased demand for the original product (4) stability in customer demand, and (5) beneficial long-term relationship between manufacturers.

Zhang et al. (2013) argues for the following regarding advertising and marketing for an ingredient brand; for the first parts supplier of promotional costs by the dealer only if the profit margin of writing a certain threshold. Second, market vendor not to the final consumer, unless the master brand labels their products with the component mark in the final product.

2.2 Attitudes

Companies often have messages or associations related to their brand or product that they are trying to communicate to the market. Whether it is conscious or not the consumer takes a position against the brand, which then determines the attitude to the brand (Solomon et al., 2006). According to Solomon et al. (2006) and Lindh (1988) is an attitude a persistent and generalized evaluation of various objects such as people, advertising and products, as well as a habitual inclination to continuously react positively or negatively to this item. Solomon et al. (2006) states the attitudes are something that lasts over time and is considered public when it is determined by more than one event. An attitude is often the result of accumulated experiences of various stimuli, or in other words, the overall perceptions individuals acquire over time on a particular issue or aspect. Attitudes exist, according to the pragmatic doctrine, because it has a function for the individual when the function is determined by the individual's motives. An attitude is its propensity to react in a consistent and predictable way to a stimulus. This also explains why attitudes are always directed towards a stimulus or an object (Solomon et al., 2006).
2.3 ABC Model

Attitudes are feelings or beliefs that individuals have as objects, events, people, etc. that are constantly developed and renewed through interaction with others. (Evans et al., 2008). According to Solomon et al (2006) an attitude is said to have three basic components: affects, behavior and cognition.

Affect (A): Affect is about a person’s feelings toward the attitude object.
Behavior (B): What consumer behavior for when buying an attitude object.
Cognition (C): The faith and values of a consumer for an attitude object.

These three components are included in the ABC model of attitudes, which emphasizes the interrelationship feel, know and do. The ABC model describes the relationship between the three components that create an attitude, knowing, feeling and action. This applies to consumer attitudes to a specific product or service. Attitudes are formed by many different perspectives in this way and have an impact on consumer behavior. It may be, for example, that you want to emulate and imitate another person. The attitude can also be enhanced by your past experience, however, it can also be formed by reward and punishment, depending on the context. The forming of the attitude depends on the order in which the ABC components are consecutive (Solomon et al., 2006). Influence is about how consumers feel about the attitude object. These feelings can be both positive or negative, depending on the individual opinions of the object. (Evans et al., 2008; Solomon et al., 2006). In order to understand customer behavior and their needs so it is according to Shavitt (1989) important to understand the functions of attitudes. Evans et al. (2008) argues that a certain knowledge of an individual’s attitude increases the likelihood that the researcher should be able to understand his or her intended and actual behavior. When it comes to the use of attitudes as a prediction of the behavior there must be an awareness that many other factors can influence this. It may for example be difficult to predict and control, such as social influence and peer pressure (Evans et al., 2008). Michman (1991) argues that attitudes and values is a good basis for segmentation of the market. Through social interactions such as family, friends and school people learn the cultural values. These values have major influence on consumer
attitudes reflected in behavior, which in turn affects the taste, the way we consume and perceive different stimuli (Michman, 1991).

### 2.4 Theory of Planned Behavior

Ajzen (1991) has develop the theory TPB ("The Theory of Planned Behavior"). It is a common theory in many previous studies which studied consumer behavior. According to Ajzen (1991) TPB assumes that people act in a sensible way. People take into account the information that is available and considering then explicitly or implicitly the possible consequences available to their action. An individual’s intent to a particular behavior is the most important factor for immediate action. Intentions are in turn a function of three independent factors; a personal factor, a factor that takes up social influence and a factor that is about control (Ajzen, 1991). “Attitude to behavior” is the personal factor for the individual. It is about the positive or negative assessment that the individual has to implement a specific action. The other factor is called “subjective norm”. It is about the individual’s perception of social pressure to implement or not to implement the behavior. The third key factor is the individual’s sense of self-competence or ability to implement the behavior itself. This factor is called "perceived control over behavior" (Ajzen, 1991).

Ajzen (1991) argues that people generally tend to implement a behavior when they have a positive attitude towards it, when they feel social pressure to implement it and when they believe they have what it takes to do it. Ajzen (1991) assumes that the meaning of these three factors is relative depending on the intention of the question. For example, certain intentions are "perceived control over behavior" more important than "subjective norm". It is also possible that in some situations just need one or two of the factors that explain the intent, while all three are necessary in a different situation. It is at the same time so that the three factors of importance may vary from person to person. As long as the perceived control match reasonably with the actual. Ajzen (1991) argue that factor gives useful information about the expressed intentions. The theory assumes that the factor "perceived control over behavior" has been a motivating role to intentions (Ajzen, 1991).
2.5 Conceptual Framework

Based on literature, the following conceptual framework can be proposed. This research will combine the theory of ingredient branding with the three different basic theories of consumer’s attitudes. The consumer behavior can be defined as a circle around these components.

![Conceptual Framework Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 1 Conceptual Framework*
3. Methodology

This chapter explains the research approach, methods and strategies. In the chapter I will introduce and discuss some different alternatives that I have been chosen from. It may seem unnecessary to describe many different alternatives but I wanted to show in a pedagogic way what opportunities I had. Under the headline “Approach in the study” I will explain what type of method approach I will use and why I decided to use it.

3.1 Ontology

Assumptions about the worlds condition is called ontology, and it is about “what is?” Bryman & Bell (2005) argue that ontology is about what assumptions do people make about the world and how we understand it. In ontology, there are two positions assumptions. Objectivism and constructionism. Bryman & Bell (2005) says that “Objectivist ontology stands for social phenomena and their meanings have an existence independent of social actors”. The ontology can be split into dualistic ontology where man and the world are different from each other, or non-dualistic ontology where man is intertwined with the world. Objectivism are social entities independent of social actors (Bryman & Bell, 2005). While constructivism assumes that the world and humanity are intertwined in complex relationships where the variables are instead influenced by external factors (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

Approach in the study

In this thesis a constructionism ontological perspective was chosen because of attitudes and brand values are something that social actors constantly create. A value of a brand is something that we have created and can be considered as a social construction. This study aims to see the effects of what an ingredient brand can do to consumer’s attitudes towards the end product. That is why a constructionism ontological perspective will be best suited for this research.
3.2 Epistemology

Epistemology is about how knowledge of the world becomes and what can be perceived as knowledge. In epistemology, there are two different approaches, positivism and hermeneutic (Andersson, 1979). Positivism and hermeneutics are two methodological approaches with different ideas about attitude to life and worldview. Positivists have a desire to find general answers to social and physical phenomena. Hermeneutics have instead a perception that people change through different social conditions over time. Positivists have a scientific manner and hermeneutics a social scientific approach. Positivism is based on a scientific ideals and want to explain why things happen. Positivism is objective and want to depict reality. Positivism belongs more to quantitative methods. Hermeneutic based on humanitarian ideals and want to understand why things happen. Hermeneutic is subjective and want to interpret (Bryman & Bell, 2005; Andersson, 1979).

Approach in the study

Hermeneutics was the natural approach for the thesis. This is because hermeneutics mean that humans are influenced by their environment and from that interprets its reality. The basic idea is that emotions convey knowledge. According to Andersson (1979) hermeneutics is about understanding and hermeneutics does not aim to measure anything without using interpretations which his instrument (Starrin & Svensson, 1994). People may have different understanding of the same things because we have different preferences (Andersson, 1979). The essence of hermeneutics is that you see a deeper meaning content than first perceived. In order to achieve the deeper meaningfulness, you should put the interviewee’s meaning in context or in a whole. The process of understanding involves not only the individual part to be adapted to the big picture, but the picture also will be adapted to the part. The interaction that occurs between full and part can be described as the hermeneutic circle. In this thesis the hermeneutic circle has been adapted to gain a deeper understanding in the collection of the empirical data. My preconceptions have played a big part in my interpretation of the empirical material. By looking at what shows through interviews and interpret what it means with the help of the
theories I have chosen, I have been able to get a much deeper understanding of my empirical material. During my earlier studies I have been working with the concepts of ingredient branding before. That is why my preconceptions played a big part in this thesis and because of that I chose to adapt the hermeneutic circle.

3.3 Research Approach

Creswell (2012) states that research approaches includes the steps from broad data assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, interpretation and analysis. Research approaches are the plans and the procedures for the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

3.3.1 Abductive Approach

Bryman & Bell (2011) argue that there are two main approaches to the relationship between theory and data. These are the inductive and deductive method. To gathering new knowledge and collect data these are the two general approaches that scientists can use. The inductive method of research is based however on the collection of current empirical data. Based on observations, the researcher can see the pattern, draw generalizations and conclusions are integrated into the earlier discoveries in order to improve existing theories. Induction is to start from the reality of the study and researcher formulate a theory based on individual cases. The researcher creates during the study goals and ideas about how they want to design the ultimate goal, that is, a new theory (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Bryman & Bell (2011) argue that this strategy is usually associated with a qualitative approach.

In contrast to that, Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) argue that deductive approach draws conclusions through logical reasoning, however these arguments are not being fully truthful with reality. The researcher wants to gather knowledge and facts to confirm or falsify hypotheses that have been created from the existing theoretical framework. Saunders et al. (2009) states that an inductive approach follows a flexible structure and search for understanding of the context of the
research and an understanding of the individual’s perception of a particular event. The different approaches can include elements of each other (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Furthermore, Saunders et al. (2009) argues that it is possible to use them in combination with each other, which in many cases may be advantageous.

The most common approach is the deductive method where you can test existing theories in different contexts (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Hyde, 2000). With deduction means that you have a theory, and by a method proves it. The researcher wants to follow the path that is already proven. The researcher’s position can be strengthened here because the focus of the research is already in an existing theory (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Hyde, 2000). According to Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) the theories that have been used previously can be revised depending on the outcome of the empirical data. Deductive research examines empirical hypotheses which are then confirmed or rejected and can be seen as the most common approach between theory and data (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A deductive approach follows a clear structure and often seek to explain causal relationships between variables (Saunders et al., 2009). The deductive approach is usually associated with a quantitative approach, but just as an inductive approach is associated with a qualitative approach these often depend on what the research will generate. This means that these strategies should only be perceived as a tendency and not as an expression of uniqueness that always applies in all situations (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Hyde, 2000).

**Approach in the study**

Alvesson & Sköldberg (2009) argues that the use of a strategy does not exclude the other. There is a third approach that should be taken into consideration; abduction. Abduction involves the ability to see patterns and connections that may reveal deep structures. Dubois & Gadde (2002) argue that abductive approach is the mixture of deductive and inductive approaches. The outcome of the study is generated from the findings however, according to Alvesson & Sköldberg (2009) theoretical assumptions are taken into account as well. This study combined the approaches of induction and deduction, resulting in an abduction. Because this study is based on existing theory that created the studies operationalization, which is a deductive approach (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This
thesis does not aim to be able to generalize the results, which reflecting the inductive approach (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). In this study the interview questions are derived from already existing theories. It is assumed that it will be possible that the focus group findings can impact the existing theories. The study will still be open to the new unexpected findings that can come from the the interaction of participants in the focus groups. This research aims to get a deeper understanding and to see the patterns and connections that may reveal deep structures, which is typical of the abductive approach (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009).

3.3.2 Qualitative Approach

According to Bryman & Bell (2011) there are three methods to collect the most appropriate data for the researchers to choose: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approach. Hyde (2000) explain that the different between qualitative and quantitative is simply words versus numbers. A quantitative study aims to quantify and is based on a more deductive approach when it comes to the view of theory and research. It looks at the social reality as an external and objective. The meaning with a quantitative research is to be able to generalize the entire population through scientific models. The results emerging from the quantitative research is often described in statistical terms such as numbers and percentages. The researcher’s role is considered as distant and includes a neutral setting of quantitative research process (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Hyde, 2000).

The criticism that quantitative research encountered is that there are limits to its flexibility (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The method is often focused on many devices and therefore lack complexity. The method allegedly also characterized by superficiality, then deeper understanding fails. Quantitative research has also claimed to be governing the collection of data (Jacobsen, 2002).

The qualitative approach aims to gain a deeper understanding of the behavior and the underlying reasons for such behavior (Hyde, 2000). The qualitative research method aims to identify the underlying concept and the relationship between them (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996). A qualitative research
is, compared with a quantitative research, more informal and describes complicating situations. The methods that is usually used for qualitative studies are interviews and focus groups. Investigations of this kind has the ultimate goal to provide deeper understanding and knowledge of the subject studied (Hyde, 2000; Bryman & Bell, 2011). This is by investigating and trying to identify underlying attitudes and behavior among the participants in the study (Creswell, 2009).

Qualitative research approach is built on exploring (Creswell, 2009) and understanding the people from their own frame of references (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). The choice of research method depends on what kind of questions you want to have answers on. Some questions can only be answered with qualitative studies. These issues concern especially people’s experiences of different things or their view of reality (Hyde, 2000; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Qualitative research aims to describe different contexts in which the researcher selects and describes the details of the selected context (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This type of investigation often describes “why” or “how” something is, that describe the process behind why something is a certain way (Hyde, 2000). Further on claims Bryman & Bell (2011) that the researcher role in a qualitative study is more present than a quantitative study. This is because of the relationship between the researcher and the respondent is of great importance as it promotes the understanding of how the respondents perceive their reality (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The criticism against the qualitative method is that it is often very costly, both in terms of time and money (Jacobsen, 2002; Saunders et al., 2009). Qualitative method is difficult to generalize as it often affects a small part of a broad field of research. However, it can lead to hypotheses whose general validity can be examined by other scientists through further studies. Quantitative researchers also believe that qualitative studies tend not to be sufficiently random and controlled in order to prove the actual reality linked to a topic (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011).
Approach in the study

This thesis used a qualitative approach that is based on trying to get the information or opinions that have not come up in previous research. This is something that Bryman & Bell (2011) highlights that is one of the advantages of the method. Analyzes and investigations in this thesis will mainly focus on getting a deep understanding and the result will be formulated in words rather than numbers. The study will not try to generalize an entire population or gather statistics, which means that a quantitative research process is not preferable. In addition, the purpose of the study is exploratory, which according to the theory lends itself to a qualitative approach (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011; Hyde, 2000).

3.4 Research Design

To conduct research and to achieve a result that answers the purpose of the study and research questions, an action plan is required (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This is called research design and it is described as a framework of guidelines for the collection and analysis of data, which guides and controls the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009; Shukla, 2008). The choice of the research design is very important in view of the study’s research questions to be answered (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). If the research design is poorly developed it is a risk that the research questions are answered incorrectly or remain unanswered, which affects the relevance of the study (Shukla, 2008). The research design also contains clear goals that is created on the basis of the research questions. It contains the source of information and describes how the data will be collected and what kind of data the researcher gathering (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Shukla, 2008). Furthermore, Bryman & Bell (2011) states that the types of research design is related to the chosen research method for the study. Ghauri & Gronhaug, (2005) and Yin (2009) states that the choice of design does not mean that there is a specific method to use. However, certain methods tend to be more established in some designs. Research design includes three different types of objects which are classified as exploratory, descriptive,
and causal research designs (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Shukla 2008; Saunders et al., 2009).

**Exploratory design**

An exploratory design is useful when the underlying motives need to be seen and a phenomenon to be investigated in depth (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Shukla, 2008). To clarify a research problem and to create further understanding before developing an approach, an exploratory purpose is appropriate (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009; Shukla, 2008). Saunders et al. (2009) describes that an exploratory study is a valuable tool when the research will provide new insights, that is what happens, why it happens and assessment of various phenomena in new contexts. This form of study is particularly useful if the researcher wants to clarify a deeper understanding of a problem, for example, if the researcher is unsure of the fundamental aspects of the problem and why they exist (Shukla, 2008). Exploratory design is usually conducted to discover new relationships, new ideas, new themes and this kind of design provides a window into customer perceptions, behaviors, and demands (Shukla, 2008; Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2010). Malhotra (2010) argue that this type of design is not based on structured methods and large selection which can derive it to a qualitative approach which makes it very flexible. In order to get a good material for the study, the researcher should advantageously collect data from people who are experts in a particular field in a qualitative way (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2010). Common methods within this structure could be secondary data analyzes, focus groups and case studies (Burns & Bush, 2003).

**Descriptive design**

According to Malhotra (2010) the descriptive research designs task is, as it sounds to describe something, usually a relationship or characteristic of a market or organization. Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) argue that descriptive research design is used when the problem is easy to understand and is well structured. Usually, the researcher should have a clear picture of the problematized phenomenon that should be studied (Saunders et al., 2009). Questions such as what, when, how, who and why go with an investigative purpose is usually to answer (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Descriptive study design is characterized by
clear rules, procedures and structure (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). Shukla (2008) argues that descriptive purposes are generally applicable to quantitative research. Descriptive research is often called the predecessor of the exploratory and explanatory research, where the researcher has the clear advantage if there is a clear picture of the phenomenon before the researcher starts with data collection (Saunders et al., 2009). This includes large amounts of data from market research in order to provide an accurate picture of a given market (Burns & Bush, 2003). It is important that the researcher can draw clear conclusions from the data collected, and can evaluate the data in order to see patterns and relationships (Saunders et al., 2009).

Casual design
According to Malhotra (2010) casual design aims to find evidence of relationships between different variables. In the casual research emphasis is on the study of a situation or a problem to be able to discuss the relationship between the variables of the situation or problem. Furthermore, the data generated are tested statistically to see correlations to create a clearer picture of the relationship between the variables (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011). This is done in particular to determine which variables are dependent and which are independent and to determine the relationship between these (Malhotra, 2010). As well as in the descriptive research design the problem of a causal research design well set and clearly (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2010). Experiments are often used to fulfill the purpose of a study based on an exploratory research design (Malhotra, 2010). To implement this method required, in contrast to the exploratory design time and resources. This method is complicated and the main goal should be to focus on a few main characteristics of the successful implementation of this type of design (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009).

Approach in the study
This thesis applied an exploratory design that is linked with a qualitative approach. Exploratory research design allows a more flexible approach than a causal or descriptive approach thus it is more suitable for studies with an unclear problem. The purpose of the study is not to generalize the results of an entire
population, but to get an idea about what happened and why and expected to provide new insights. The purpose was to collect in-depth information on a given problem area. The methodology required to answer the purpose of the study was a research design that could yield profound and insightful data. The choice was therefore to use the exploratory research design of the study, then the focus of the design is to discover ideas and provide insight into why this could be applied. A descriptive research design was excluded because a structured approach was not considered appropriate to meet the study objective.

3.5 Data Sources

When collecting data, there are two different types of data sources, secondary data and primary data (Aaker et al., 2011; Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). Secondary data is the type of data collected in order to solve a different problem than the current problem that the researcher is working with. The secondary data sources are not only useful for solving problems, but also to better explain and understand the problem (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). Bryman & Bell (2011) states that this is because it can give the researcher the necessary background information that can provide guidance in the study. Secondary data is data that has been collected for a different purpose (Bryman & Bell, 2011). There may be information from an external source, as other people have gathered, but the researcher uses in the study (Jacobsen, 2002; Saunders et al., 2009). The data can provide the necessary background information for the research and provide alternative methods of investigation. Practically the secondary data sources can save money and time for the researcher. However, it requires always that the secondary data will be critically examined in terms of its relevance and reliability (Saunders et al., 2009). Saunders et al. (2009) points out that there is a risk of secondary data may be outdated and therefore useless. Another problem Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) mention is that the information from the secondary data may be irrelevant, since it is collected for other purposes and are not really suitable for the study. Proposal on secondary sources include annual reports, information about the company in newspapers or other media (Christensen et al. 2001).
Primary data can be explained as the data collected by researchers to a specific research object (Aaker et al., 2011; Bryman & Bell, 2011). The information from the primary data source is updated and adapted to the specific purpose (Aaker et al., 2011; Bryman & Bell, 2011; Jacobsen, 2002). The data is dependent on the research problem and the study design and the advantage is that the information is directly adapted for the study (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). According to Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) is the primary data favorable because it can be adapted to the study, and the study provides more customized information. However, the primary data to be costly in terms of time and money, then the process can be extensive (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). The main methods of collecting primary data is according Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) and Jacobsen (2002) observations, questionnaires and interviews.

**Approach in the study**

The study started with gathering relevant information from the existing literature of the phenomenon through secondary data. Secondary data is data that is already available and have been collected by other researchers who may have a different focus than just what is the study’s current problems (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This type of data collection was applied to create an overview of the existing research and to obtain background information in a less time consuming way. Further on, this thesis intends to collect specific data for the purpose of the study and the research question. And that is why this study is based on most primary data as it aims to explore the specific research problems, which are best addressed by information directly from respondents. The primary data was collected from selected representative respondents to get a deep understanding of the underlying attitudes.

**3.6 Research Strategy**

An appropriate research strategy will help the researcher regarding the collection of relevant data and makes it possible to answer research questions (Yin, 2009). Neither strategy is superior or inferior to another, and the important thing is
whether it is possible to answer research questions with the chosen strategy (Saunders et al., 2009). The strategies differ from each other in the sense that the researcher has control over various aspects of the process such as behavior, events and how much focus it is put on current events (Yin, 2009). All these strategies are different ways to collect and analyze empirical material and have their own processes for implementation. To determine which strategy that is best suited to the study, there are three conditions that must be considered: (1) the shape of the research question, (2) the extent of control a researcher has over the actual behavior, and (3) if necessary focus on contemporary events. Based on these three conditions the researcher can then choose what kind of strategy that can be used. There are according to Yin (2009), five different strategies to consider when implementing business research, these are: experimental, survey, archival analysis, historical and case study.

The experimental research methods are implemented when the researcher wants to see the causes of dependence between variables. One hypothesis is tested, and by changing variables hypothesis can be confirmed or denied, and the validity of the hypothesis can be established (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Yin, 2009). The goal with the experimental research strategies is to enable verification, falsification or determine a given hypothesis, which is done by one or more variables changes to determine its effect. Issues such as how and why are expected to be answered with this strategy and focus on current events. When the purpose of the study is to investigate the cause and effect relationship suited this strategy best (Yin, 2009).

The survey or cross-sectional design is a method that use a sample from a population, then the data is collected. Survey is often used when the research requires and aims to collect data that can be presented statistically. The aim is to enable a generalization of a population, this by making a representative sample of the population under study (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Yin, 2009). Based on this statistical conclusion is drawn by the researcher (Yin, 2009). Current events are used and the goal is to answer questions such as what, where, who, how many and how much. This method enables the researcher to ask the same question to
several individuals and the response can thus be compared and used as a measuring instrument (Blaxter et al., 2006).

Archival analysis is an observation of secondary data and investigating archives and documents. The strategy answers the questions what, where, who, how much and how many and focuses on current events and past events (Yin, 2009). This type of data can be both qualitative and quantitative, and may vary subject and interest of the researcher (Blaxter et al., 2006). The strategy is claimed to be best suited for studies that intend to describe events or specific phenomena (Yin, 2009). A form of archival analysis is to do a content analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

In the historical research strategy, data from historical documents such as correspondence, meeting minutes and financial reports (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In this strategy, the human factor into play as people can remember a single situation or experience in different ways depending on who they are. When this method is implemented, it is important to collect data from different individuals to get a true overall picture (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). In this method of analysis is not relevant current events, the focus is instead on past events (Yin, 2009). It is therefore a research strategy where secondary data observed (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005).

In the case studies, the researcher makes an intensive study of a group, person, organization, institution, or an entire culture. The researcher collects relevant information on the current status, past experiences and the environment that may contribute to behavior and individuality of the unit (Creswell, 2012; Gray, 2009). Issues such as how and why to be answered and the focus is on current events. Case studies include many sources, such as interviews, observation and verbal information and is suitable for use if the studied phenomenon is complicated to study outside their normal environment where it is difficult to define concepts and variables (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). This is often an expensive method to use and it can be difficult to draw generalizations in a few cases, and apply it to an entire population (Phophalia, 2010). However, says Yin (2009) that is not the
case, but a case study can instead be analytically generalized meaning that the researcher uses the study's theoretical structure and create by this logic on can be applied to other situations (Yin, 2009). In the case studies, it is very important to be objective to minimize the risk of bias of the researcher (Phophalia, 2010).

Approach in the study
The type of research strategy that is best suited for this study is survey/cross-sectional design. According to Christensen et al. (2001) is Survey the most common research strategy in marketing research. This strategy is advantageous for the study as it usually happens on a more limited group, for example, in the form of focus groups, interviews or questionnaires (Christensen et al., 2001; Bryman & Bell, 2005). Survey are often used to answer questions regarding what, where, when and how (Bryman & Bell, 2005). When the cross-sectional approach provides the opportunity to gather information on a large number of factors, as well as it can provide a large amount of data on a limited number of factors (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Regarded it as appropriate to apply when the study calls for a more in-depth research that requires limitations in data collection. This research strategy is also seen as beneficial for the study when Christensen et al., (2001) believes that it is often less expensive than other research design approaches. The purpose of applying this type of research strategy is to find variations and patterns and conditions of this builds according to Bryman & Bell (2005) on the data collected from various respondents.

3.7 Data Collection Method
There are several methods to collect relevant data in a research and it depends on what kind of study the researcher is doing. Often the choice is based on if there is a quantitative or a qualitative study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It has been previously established that this study is qualitative research. According to Bryman & Bell (2011) there are various data collection methods to choose from when a qualitative approach has been chosen. The main method is interviews, focus groups and observation, where interviews can be divided into structured, semi-structured or unstructured interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2011).
**Observation**

Observations is based on the researcher observations from the behavior of individuals in their natural environment. Observations is most often used when the study requires to investigate how individuals behave as an individual or in a group (Shukla, 2008). According to Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) the method allows the researcher to determine the dynamic behavior more accurately than in interviews, while observation is more useful for collecting behavioral data. Furthermore, the great advantage of observations that researchers can see what people actually do rather than what they say they will do (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005).

**Interview**

In an interview gather information about individual opinions, foundations and values (Lambert et al., 2008). Armstrong et al. (2011) and Lambert et al. (2008) argues that the respondent's personal views, grounds and valuations reached during the interview. By standardizing issues and guidelines for a structured interview increases the validity and reliability (Schmidt & Zimmerman, 2004). Farago et al. (2013) further argues that previous research shows that a structured interview is more valid than an unstructured interview, since it is easier to defend the selection process. Making use of an interview to create knowledge in an area is a unique tool that creates a social dynamic that plays an important role in the respondent's answers. Because an interview is a two-way communication where both parties integrate with each other, formed an impression of these parties (Judge et al., 2000). An interview is controlled by a so-called moderator and it is very important that he can maintain a neutral position during the interview (Lambert et al., 2008).

**Unstructured interview**

Dipboye et al. (2012) argues that an unstructured interview for the respondent may be perceived more comfortable than other interview forms when there is a social interaction in an unstructured environment. In an unstructured interview, the respondent has the opportunity to show personality and flexibility of their answers (Dipboye et al. 2012). Unstructured interviews highlight the positive
response of the respondent (Kohn & Dipboye, 1998). One advantage of the use of unstructured interviews is that the questions asked can be spontaneous as long as they belong to the subject. This means that interview structure creates a greater depth in the study (Doody & Noonan, 2013). Blackman (2002) also argue that an unstructured interview leads to a more personal response than during a structured interview.Britten (1995) argues that the concept of unstructured are misleading as an interview always has some sort of structure that interview questions are based. In an unstructured interview, the researcher uses in an interview guide, which aims to ensure that the questions follow a theme (Holloway & Wheeler, 2010; Ryan et al., 2009). An unstructured interview usually begins with a question that is open, wide, and which is geared towards research. After the first question continues moderator to ask follow-up questions (Holloway & Wheeler, 2010).

**Structured interview**
A structured interview based on each respondent get questions asked in a predetermined sequence (Corbena, 2003). A structured interview follows a schedule (McKenna et al., 2006; Ryan et al., 2009). One advantage of a structured interview, according to Holloway and Wheeler (2010) that it is an effective way to interview with regard to a limited time frame and through the use of this approach reduces the researcher's' subjectivity and bias. Moreover, it becomes easier to analyze and compare the data obtained for the purpose of the study (Holloway & Wheeler, 2010; Berg, 2009).

**Semi-structured interview**
Semi-structured interview, the most common form of interview regarding qualitative research. A semi-structured interview means that the questions are predetermined, where the moderator has the opportunity to go back to the questions which gives the respondent the opportunity to explain and clarify its response (Holloway & Wheeler, 2010). Semi-structured interview is flexible and moderator use of open questions (Ryan et al., 2009) allowing the respondent the opportunity to respond with a more developmental response (Berg, 2009). Just as in an unstructured interview, an interview guide (David & Sutton, 2004; Bridges et al., 2008). During the interview, the moderator option to add probing
follow-up questions, which may contribute to the answers will be more rewarding. During the interview, interesting new areas emerge as the moderator had not counted on. The advantages of a semi-structured interview are then that the new areas to be explored (Gray, 2009). According to Hand (2003) and Deamley (2005) enhancing the validity of the study when the respondents have the opportunity to immerse themselves in the issues and open up to the moderator. A semi-structured interview is flexible because it creates opportunities for the respondent to deepen and develop certain issues (Bryman & Bell, 2005). In this type of research is important to create an understanding of the increasing validity. During an interview, it may appear to the subject matter from the beginning was not relevant, or that the authors did not know. In a semi-structured interview, the moderator can then choose to focus on the new areas during the interview.

**Focus group**

A focus group is an interview form where the researcher bring discussion around issues of selected topic which will then be analyzed (Saunders et al., 2009). Focus group is an effective method when it comes to consumer studies, because it usually results in a qualitative rather than quantitative research. In comparison with the example questionnaire, which the researcher can easily collect and evaluate data, the difference between the aforementioned market research methods to a more profound understanding of consumers and that, in this context, attitudes and perception given. The purpose of the focus group is to create a discussion about the experiences, attitudes and perception regarding the study in question (Powell & Single, 1996). The purpose of a group discussion is to create spontaneous thoughts and ideas with each other. Thomas & Nelson (2001) states that the data is collected from different respondents at the same time. The individual must not miss the opportunity to possibly discuss or develop forward their thoughts (Stokes & Bergin, 2006). According to Wibeck (2010) a focus group can in order to fulfill the purpose be both unstructured and structured depending on the purpose and the research questions. Stokes & Bergin (2006) argue that the focus group is guided by a moderator who as all the questions and lead the discussion further. In the structured or semi-structured interview form the moderator controls the discussion by questions that have been selected
before. The unstructured interview form is freer and the moderator does not have any specific questions that need to be answered (Stokes & Bergin, 2006).

According to Wibeck (2010) the researcher need a structured construction of the issues with different parts to get an effective focus group. Their composition is important for the final result, and it comes to a focus group is right composed and well organized. To participate, it is good if people meet certain key criteria. They will, among other things, have the knowledge, experience and, or interest in the product that will be discussed. It is good if they belong to the target group as the product is aimed at (Threlfall, 1999). A focus group session shall according to Malhotra (2010) last between 60 to 180 minutes depending on the participants to have time to get comfortable in order to give the researcher the deep insight into the topic concerned. It should also be according to Malhotra (2010) contain a minimum of eight and a maximum of twelve respondents while Bryman & Bell (2011) and Ghauri & Grönhaug (2010) advocates that the respondents should not be more than 10 pieces and not fewer than five. Another size of the focus group can lead to less effective than it would have been on the guidelines for the number of respondents followed (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2010).

**Approach in the study**

This thesis used focus groups with semi-structured interviews as data collection method. But it could have worked well with interviews also. But the reason why focus groups were chosen is because the method is an important tool in marketing to get feedback on new products and services before they are launched to a wider audience. The technology makes it, according to Bryman & Bell (2005) enabling the researcher to create an understanding why people think that they do. The likelihood that the answers will be more interesting is larger than the traditional question-answer question, which occur at a regular interview. With the help of the conversation widened perspective on the topic when the participants can present their opinions while the others listen and fill in with their own experiences. This interaction between the participants provide a great depth in the answers to the questions that are illuminated from a variety of perspectives, although few participants. Interviewees also appreciated the frequent participation that the interview offer. Other advantages are that they are
easy and inexpensive to implement, and they can be easily molded to fit current issues.

This thesis used four different focus groups in total. The respondents got to see pictures of five different products, see the Appendix A for the pictures. First the moderator shows the pictures of products without the ingredient brand and the moderator asked questions that is presented in the interview guide after that the respondents got to see the exactly same pictures but with the ingredient brands and then the moderator asked question again. The reason why the focus group was developed in that way was because the moderator wanted to see if there were any changes in the respondent’s attitudes when they got to see the same pictures but with the ingredient brands.

3.8 Choice of Brands

This thesis will focus on five different host brand and five different ingredient brands.

*Host brands:*

- **ICA** - Founded in 1917 is a Swedish company and is one of the Nordic region's leading retail companies. ICA Cook & Eat is their affordable gadgets for the kitchen. Here you will find a wide range of glassware, utensils, kitchen towels, pans, pots and lots of other things that sell under the ICA Cook & Eat brand (ICA, 2016)
- **Hennes & Mauritz, H&M** - Founded in 1947 is a Swedish multinational retail-clothing company that sells clothing for men, women, teenagers and children. The company's business concept is based on fashion and quality at the best price in a sustainable way (H&M, 2016).
- **Eldorado** - Founded in 1969 is a low price trademark for food and household and is owned by Axfood. Eldorado's products are sold in stores of Axfood: Willys, Hemköp, Eurocash and Tempo (Axfood, 2016).
- **Ryanair** - Founded in 1985 is an Irish airline. Ryanair is Europe's largest low cost airlines. The airline has been characterized by its rapid
expansion, a result of the deregulation of the aviation industry in Europe in 1997 and the success of its low-cost business model (Ryanair, 2016).

- Kia - Founded in 1945 is a South Korean automobile manufacturer that sells cars with efficient petrol and diesel engines at a competitive price. Kia was bought in 1998 by Hyundai, and is now part of the Hyundai Motor Group (Kia, 2016).

All of these five brands are marketing themselves as products with a competitive and affordable prices. They are all in the low price segment and that is why they will be a part in the thesis. When it comes to ICA it is important to observe that it is “ICA Cook & Eat” that will be the brand that will be investigated in the thesis. Not ICA as a grocery store. This thesis will also investigate if it is any differences on consumer’s attitudes whether the product is a high or low involvement product. To do this investigation this research need product that is both high and low involvement products. The products that will be used is a fry pan from ICA Cook & Eat, raincoat from H&M, hamburgers from Eldorado, flight from Ryanair and a car from Kia. According to Solomon et al. (2006) a car is a high involvement product and food such as hamburgers is low involvement. Tidwell & Marks (1994) argue that airline should be seen as a high involvement service. When it comes to the fry pan and the raincoat this product will be seen as medium involvement products.

*Ingredient brands:*

- Boeing - Founded in 1916, USA, is the world’s largest aerospace company and leading manufacturer of commercial jetliners and defense, space and security systems (Boeing, 2016)
- Michelin - Founded in 1889, is a tire manufacturer based in Clermont-Ferrand in the Auvergne région of France. It is one of the three largest tire manufacturers in the world (Michelin, 2016).
- Krav - Founded in 1985 Sweden, is an ethical label that indicates that a product is produced on organic basis with high standards of health, climate change and social responsibility (Krav, 2016).
• Teflon - Founded in 1944, trademark by the DuPont concern, is a type of fluoroplastic material and makes a frying pan (which is the most associating it with) very slippery and temperature resistant (Teflon, 2016).

Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) mention Gore-tex, Teflon and Michelin as successful ingredient brands in their book “Ingredient branding, making the invisible visible”. Ugglia (2003) discuss how ethical brands can be regarded as ingredient brands. Krav is Sweden’s most famous eco-label for food (Krav, 2016) and that is why the brand will be part of this thesis. According to Quelch (2007) Boeing started in 2007 to brand their new aircraft 787 the Dreamliner as an ingredient brand and it was very successful. Nippon Airways, an airline from Japan launched the Dreamliner in its advertising as an ingredient to differentiate the company (Quelch, 2007). All five brands were introduced in the pre-study and all respondents recognized them.

3.9 Operationalization

The operationalization of the process is where the terms and concepts will be measurable in the form of a series of activities (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005; Cohen et al., 2011). The operationalization of schedule demonstrates how these should be carried out to empirically determine the level and the definition of a concept. The theoretical concepts turn into measurable variables and then tested in a real environment (Cohen et al., 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). Operationalization of a concept enables a coding of the result and is necessary as it seeks to concepts to be able to relate to the objective reality. An operationalization is crucial for a qualitative survey when the implementation of a focus group requires that all questions are understandable for respondents (Cohen et al., 2011). Eliasson (2010) emphasizes the importance of anchoring the issues of the development of the theory, this study used previous research as the basis for the developed interview questions, which according Ghauri & Grönhaug (2005) makes the theoretical framework provides a more conceptual credibility. By doing this, also increases the authenticity as the
operationalization sure to measure what is supposed to be measured. Below can the operationalization scheme be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Conceptual definition</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of planned behavior</strong></td>
<td>An attitude is often the result of accumulated experiences (Solomon et al, 2006).</td>
<td>It refers to if the consumer has an existing attitude to the host brand and if it is positive or negative.</td>
<td>Solomon et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Q1: Do you recognize the brand? Q2: Have you had the experience of the brand before? Q3: What is your perception of the brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People generally tend to implement a behavior when they have a positive attitude towards it (Ajzen, 1991).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ajzen (1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
<td>Companies often have messages or associations related to their brand or product that they are trying to communicate to the market. Whether it is conscious or not the consumer take a position against the brand, which then determines the attitude to the brand (Solomon et al, 2006).</td>
<td>It refers to whether the consumer think the host brand is a low price and low quality brand or the opposite.</td>
<td>Solomon et al (2006)</td>
<td>Q4: What do you think this product cost? Q5: How do you think the quality is on this product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABC-model</strong></td>
<td>The ABC model describes the relationship between the three components that create an attitude, knowing, feeling and action. This applies to consumer attitudes to a specific product or service (Solomon et al, 2006).</td>
<td>It refers to whether the consumer prefer the product without the ingredient brand or not. And then see if the ingredient brand can convince the consumer to buy the product with the ingredient brand.</td>
<td>Solomon et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Q6: Would you be willing to buy the product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values have major influence on consumer attitudes reflected in behavior, which in turn affects the taste, the way we consume and perceive different stimuli (Michman 1991).</td>
<td>It aims to understand what the consumer think the price range is on the product without the ingredient brand. And then see if the price range will increase when the ingredient brand will be showed.</td>
<td>Michman (1991)</td>
<td>Q7: If yes on Q6, what would you consider to pay for this product?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ingredient Branding combined with Theory of Planned Behavior**

Ingredient branding is to make the invisible visible (Kotler & Pfoertsch, 2010). Companies want to create awareness among consumers, this requires a well-functioning cooperation between the host brand and ingredient brand (Norris, 1992).

People generally tend to implement a behavior when they have a positive attitude towards it (Ajzen, 1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Do you recognize the brands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Have you had the experience of these brands before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>What is your perception of the brands?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ingredient Branding combined with Attitude**

For the supplier gives an ingredient branding opportunity to communicate product benefits to the final consumer, and thus increase their brand equity (Luczak et al. 2007).

Ghodeswar (2008), Desai & Keller (2002) and Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) states that ingredient branding increases the value of the finished product and consumers are willing to pay a higher price for this type of product.

A major brand of medium quality can improve their competitive advantage by using the ingredient branding (McCarthy & Norris, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>If you previously had a worse opinion of the brand, is it different now in this picture? If yes, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>What do you think this product cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>How do you think the quality is on this product?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ingredient Branding combined with ABC Model**

The meaning of an ingredient brand is that the end customer will experience a higher value (Kotler & Pfoertsch, 2010; Zhang et al. 2013; Norris, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Do you believe that the product becomes more valuable as a whole compared with the corresponding picture?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The motivation of the manufacturer is about to host the brand develops or modifies an attribute to improve evaluations from consumers. In the latter case, it is about brand component forms an alliance with the end product manufacturers in an effort to create awareness of the ingredient brand and create a drawing effect and demand (Desai & Keller, 2002; Zhang et al. 2013).


It aims to understand if the consumer can be convinced of the ingredient brand and if the consumers attitudes have changed because of the ingredient brand. Desai & Keller (2002) Zhang et al. (2013) Q15 If you previously would not have been able to imagine buy the product, have you become convinced to buy the product now compared with the corresponding picture?

It refers to whether the consumer can imagine pay more money because of the ingredient brand. Ghodeswar (2008) Desai & Keller (2002) Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) Q16 If yes on Q15, what would you consider to pay for this product?
3.10 Interview Guide

In an interview or focus group, the moderator should create a fluent conversation to encourage respondents to be motivated to feelings and thoughts will shine through (Cohen et al., 2011). Cohen et al. (2011) discusses some important aspects to take into account the implementation of an interview;

- Create interest of the respondent, that he or she is willing to share important information
- Avoid being biased
- Be well prepared so that the conversation can be held liquid
- Ensure that all questions be understood by the respondent

An interview guide reduces the risk that the moderator is biased, which may affect the respondent in their answer. The open questions that respondents answering underpinned by the theoretical basis that has been developed for this study. This means that the empirical data generated will be analyzed against the selected theories. (Patton, 2002). Blumberg et al. (2011) states that an interview guide is a very important part in the interviews, when the purpose of the interviews is to gain knowledge of the respondent's opinions about a specific phenomenon from a broad perspective. The key features of an interview guide are according to Blumberg et al. (2011) that it serves as a checklist to ensure that the interviewer asking the same questions to respondents, so some information will not be forgotten. It increases the ability to compare several qualitative interviews by determine that all questions are asked in the same way. A good starting point in the creation of an interview guide is to ask “what do I want to know or why the phenomenon is interesting? (Blumberg et al., 2011). Myers & Newman (2007) argue that the script in an interview guide should involve: the opening, introduction, key and exploration questions and closing questions. Elliot (2005) argue that twelve should be the maximum number of questions for a focus group. The interview guide can be found in Appendix B.
3.11 Pre-study

Regardless how the study will be done or what type of method the researcher used, the study’s validity need to be in the center (Christensen et al., 2001). Before the interviews will be carried out should the researcher go through the issues critically and ask a friend, colleague or advisor to help. By asking for comments and opinions from this perspective, the researcher can clarify if the questions asked are understandable, have the right level of difficulty, elicit opinions of the respondent and how time consuming issue is (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2005). Although the interview guide is written in accordance with certain guidelines should also be checked in a pre-test to test whether it works in the purpose of the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). According to Christensen et al. (2001) a pre-study is based on the same issues that had been used in a regular interview. This is to determine that the instruments measure what it should be and create security in the use of the instrument. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) is a pre-study in addition to the controlling issues. The pre-study verified what works and what does not in order to increase the study’s validity. Bolton (1993) states that a pre-study enables the researcher to identify questions deficiencies in order to minimize the response error.

Approach in the study

To increase the trustworthiness of this study, a pre-study was done in. In the first step two respondents answered the question just to see if the question was easy to understand and were formulated right. From this, it was discovered that the sequence of the questions was unnatural. In addition, questions were worded in a way that it became difficult for the respondent to answer them. The results were analyzed and the questions were formulated on, additionally changed their order so they were easier to understand. Further on, the pre-study was a focus group with six participants that got to see the pictures that can be found in Appendix A. Thereby, it was noted that the study had a high trustworthiness. The results emerging from the last pre-study was not used as empirical material for the study, because the goal was only to test the instruments stability.
3.12 Sample

In some studies, an entire population is included. However, there are several aspects such as time, size of population and budget that makes it appropriate to choose a sample from a population (Saunders et al., 2009). A sample can be described as a smaller group that will be selected to participate in the study (Malhotra, 2010) in order to represent a population (Holme & Solvang, 1997). The sample can be chosen based on, for example, nation, city, school or company (Bryman & Bell, 2011). According to Curtis et al. (2000) the checklist below should be considered when the selection process shall be implemented:

- The sample strategy must be relevant to the study’s framework and make it possible to provide information that answers the research questions.
- The sample providing detailed information on the current phenomenon.
- The sample is to provide credible descriptions and explanations.
- The researcher must ensure that the relationship between him and the respondent is ethically correct.
- The researcher must ensure that the sampling plan is feasible.

How large the sample should be within a qualitative research to be due, according to Malhotra (2010) on several factors. It depends on the type of study to be conducted, how similar studies have chosen to do, and what resources that are available. There are essentially two ways to make the sample on. These two are the probability and non-probability sample (Ghauri & Grönhaug, 2010). The difference between them is that in a probability sample all parts of the selected population has the same percentage chance of being selected for the sample to be investigated while in a non-probability sample the researcher determines which respondents will take part in the study without random effects. There is, according to Bryman & Bell (2011) three main types of non-probability samples, these three are convenience sampling, snowball sampling and quota sampling.

A convenience sample means that the researcher chooses respondents from the population by selecting respondents who are currently available (Bryman &
Bell, 2011; Malhotra, 2010). With this selection process may, as with all types of non-probability sampling, be difficult to get a fair picture of the entire population. A convenience sample is due to its easy access of finding respondents the choice that are both time consuming and cheaper to implement (Malhotra, 2010).

A quota sample based on the researcher to develop some criteria for the population who may participate in the study and then not randomly choose which ones to attend study based on the criteria requested (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This may for example mean that the researcher asks a researcher asking 100 men, of whom 20 percent will be for 30 years (Malhotra, 2010). The researcher will then select an appropriate amount of respondents who meet the criteria demanded to form the sample (Malhotra, 2010).

A snowball sample means that a respondent who participated in the survey may propose new respondents included in the target group of the researcher (Malhotra, 2010). One problem with the snowball selection is that the selection probability will not be representative of the entire population because it is based on relationships between respondents. (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

**Approach in the study**

This thesis used a non-probability sample basis for those respondents who were elected. The reason for this was because less resources to perform a good probability sample and where to chose to implement a non-probability sample. There is according to Bryman & Bell (2011) three main types of non-probability samples, these three are convenience sampling, snowball selection and quota sampling. Below is a description of the three and the reasons for which the chosen.

To determine respondents in the population that would participate in the study, a convenience sample was chosen. Additionally, Bryman & Bell (2011) to a convenience sample is a selection type that is well suited as an exploratory research design should be applied, which it does in this study.
In this thesis the population were narrowed down to people that have lived in Sweden for more than five years. That is because of the Swedish ingredient brand Krav will be used in the study and if you lived in Sweden for more than five years the likelihood that you recognize Krav will increase. The participant’s demographic information can be found in Appendix C. The respondents were chosen by virtue of my personal network in Växjö. The sample has got an invitation by email, Facebook or by mobile phone, see Appendix D. In total this study were based on 4 focus groups. Focus group number 1 and 4 had five participants each, number 2 and 3 had six participants each. In total this study had 22 participants.

3.13 Data Analysis Method

In a qualitative study the researcher gets quickly a large amount of empirical data that can be difficult to make a good and understandable way to interpret without losing important information (Yin, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2005). Creswell (2012) argue that the data analysis in qualitative research should be developed in stages that breaks data into smaller parts that show common structure and characteristic elements. In order to draw conclusions about the collected data will be examined, categorized in table form tested or combined on. Bryman and Bell (2005) argues that it is important for the researcher to have a structure of the information by finding patterns and themes to organize and analyze the data collected. The process of analyzing qualitative data can be divided into three stages: analytical induction, grounded theory and data reduction (Bryman & Bell, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Bryman & Bell (2005) describes the analytical induction as a method when the researcher seeks a universal declaration by the collection of constant data until there are no cases that do not represent a hypothetical explanation. The researcher continues with the collection of data to any dissenting or negative instances of a phenomenon found. This method was not suitable for this research where no hypothesis prepared.
Grounded theory is when theory has been collected from data during the research process and analyzed in a systematic way. There is a close relationship between data collection, analysis and the resulting theory of this method (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

**Approach in the study**

The most relevant way to analyze the data collected in this study was found to be data reduction. It can be considered as a traditional model of research, where the researcher chooses a theoretical framework and only then applies this model to the phenomenon under study (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The analysis was completed using three steps developed by Miles & Huberman (1994). The first step in data reduction is the collection of data, then transcribed, simplified and encoded material. This should be done immediately after the data is collected (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Data display is the second step. Here are collected the reduced data and placed in an organized and summarized presentation so that conclusions can easily be drawn. Tables and matrices is an effective tool in this step (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The last step of the Miles & Huberman (1994) conclusions and verifying. This is considered the process to highlight patterns, regularities and causal flows in order to end the actual meaning or the reason things are the way they are. In the last step the answer research questions. Miles & Huberman (1994). The theoretical framework for this study was about ingredient branding and attitudes. From this came questions for interviews based on the six concepts that has been divided in the literature review. The data was obtained from the interviews were transcribed and simplified by quotes and information categorized under each concept. Based on operationalization could then be the most important materials for the study’s empirical chapters discerned. This material was finally shared a floating text.

**3.14 Quality Criteria**

Ritchie & Lewis (2003) and Yin (2009) discusses the importance of measuring the quality of research. When measuring the quality discussed the concepts of
validity and reliability, which seeks to determine how strong the credibility and strength of the study. Studies validity measures the degree to which the study measures what it is intended to do and that the reliability of the study measuring instrument stability (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The instrument in this study was tested in a pre-study that was done in three steps. The goal was to test the degree to which the instrument measures what it is designed as a high validity of the study could be created. Since the pre-study was conducted in three stages increased its stability after the corrections were made after each step.

Lincoln & Guba (1985) argues that the quality measures, reliability and validity, used in quantitative research do not apply to qualitative research. They have instead proposed two other basic criteria that should be used in the evaluation of a qualitative study. The criteria are trustworthiness and authenticity, the former includes four sub-criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Trustworthiness

A significant reason why Lincoln & Guba (1985) are reluctant to quantitative quality measures is that they believe that there may be more viable explanations of reality, unlike realism where there is only one absolute truth regarding the social reality of the researcher in to disclose (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Bryman & Bell 2011). If it is possible that a social reality can be described in various ways, it is the credibility of the researcher’s description that determines how acceptable it is to others. To generate reliable results should ensure that research is conducted in accordance with the applicable rules and that the results be reported to those who are part of the social reality that has been studied, in order to be sure that the researcher understands the reality in a correct way (Bryman & Bell 2005). To satisfy this criterion, all the concerned get involved in research for approval before it is published. More often than qualitative research focuses on a small group or individuals with certain common characteristics, this makes it difficult to transfer the results to a different environment.
In order to make an assessment of whether the *transferability* of results is possible, says Lincoln & Guba (1985) to a full statement creates a database with the assessment can be made. To reach the *transferability* criterion will study the process of a very detailed way that documented for other researchers to have the best opportunity to be able to transfer the study to other contexts.

The third sub-criterion is *dependability*, and to assess the research mentioned that an investigative approach is adopted. This means that a complete and accessible account of all the research processes will be created (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Bryman & Bell, 2005). This report will then be subjected to examination by such colleagues, it is appropriate that the examination starts already during the research process. In the review shall quality of the selected procedures and their application be assessed. As this is a demanding task, the method is rarely used (Bryman & Bell, 2005). This criterion will be achieved by including all materials used and clearly explain the choices made and why they were made.

*Confirmation* is the fourth sub-criterion, and means that an inspector determines how far the researcher acted in good faith and did not deliberately let their personal values have affected the performance (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

*Approach in the study*

In order to strengthen the trustworthiness of the study an operationalization schedule was constructed that was tested during the pre-study for the semi-structured interviews in the focus groups. Based on the operationalization scheme an interview guide was applied, which is a short memory list of the areas and issues addressed in the study, in-depth interviews to reduce interviewer effect. The quality of the semi-structured interview questions and trustworthiness increased because of the feedback from the test participants in the pre-study that was considered appropriate. What also strengthens the trustworthiness of the study is that the questions were based on the same concept when they were asked the selected respondents. Then the questions to the respondents were semi-structured, it will be difficult for other researchers to replicate the study because it was held in unstructured forms.
Authenticity

Authenticity means that the study should generate a fair reflection of the opinions that are represented in the population (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Lincoln & Guba (1985) have also in this category formulated five criteria that should bring more general issues relating to research policy implications of authenticity. The criteria related to issues such as the extent to which the study provides an accurate picture of the opinions contained in the study group, if the research will help the participants to arrive at a better understanding of the social situation and the environment they live in. If the study contributes to a clearer picture of how the other group of individuals experiencing things, if it meant that participants can change their situation and if it meant that participants had better opportunities to take the measures required are also questions raised (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Bryman & Bell, 2005).

The torque fair picture, aims to analyze whether the research gives a fair idea of the opinions and perceptions that exist among individuals studied (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Via ontological authenticity gives the survey respondents a better understanding of the environment they are in (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Through educational authenticity, participants will get a better picture of how other individuals perceive the environment they live in (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Catalytic authenticity is aimed at the participants will be able to change their situation (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The final criterion of authenticity tactical authenticity, have the participants have better opportunities to take the necessary measures (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

3.15 Source Criticism

Source criticism can be defined as a collection of methods to find out what is true in a source, or at least what is believable. Source criticism is used to evaluate sources and gain an understanding of the credibility of the source (Thurén, 2005). The following principles should be taken into account in terms of source criticism:
**Authenticity**
The source must be what it claims to be (Thurén, 2005). To ensure that the sources was what it purported to be checked that it had been published in a scientific journal. By using Linnaeus University One Search database and then check that the articles were scientific authors used the database Ulrichsweb.

**Time related**
The longer the time that elapses between an event and the source's story about this event, the less credibility the source has (Thurén, 2005). This thesis has studied Norris (1992) description of the ingredient brand. This source can be considered old, but it is then referred repeatedly in more recent sources such as Sigue, 2012 and Zhang et al. 2013. Therefore, it was regarded as relevant to the study.

**Independent**
The source should not be a copy or an extract from another, but it should be known as a primary source (Thurén, 2005). All articles were reviewed carefully to ensure that there was a copy of another. Since it was ensured that all the articles in the literature review was science by checking them against Ulrichsweb was also noted that the sources were independent.

**Tendency Freedom**
There should not be any reason to suspect that the specific source gives a false picture of the information because of someone’s economic, political, personal or other interests (Thurén, 2005). The articles were reviewed by the authors in an objective manner. The keywords used in the search of scientific articles were: Attitudes, ingredient branding.

**3.16 Ethical Aspects**
In social science research ethical issues can occur at several stages (Yin, 2009). These can involve questions about how the respondents that will be part of the research should be treated and whether there are activities that researchers
should or should not engage in conjunction with the people (Yin, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2005). Ethical rules that usually involve is voluntariness, privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of the persons directly involved in the research have been formulated from a number of professional organizations. Some examples of ethical principle are information requirements, the consent requirement, confidentiality and anonymity requirement, utilization requirement and false pretenses (Yin, 2009).

Approach in the study

The five requirements were followed during the study with the intention to create an ethical examination. The information requirement was achieved by informing the respondents about the purpose of the study and by explaining which items that were included in the study. The consent requirement was followed by inform the respondents that their participation in the focus group was voluntary and that they had the right to cancel the interview when they wanted. All the respondents were anonymous in the thesis in that way the confidentiality and anonymity requirement were reached. To meet the requirement of utilization the information that was gathered about individual respondents only have been used for research purposes. Under investigation the moderator was honest and gave clear information to the respondents to avoid false pretenses. To achieve the ethical aspects all respondents will be named by participant “X” when they are quoted in the empirical investigation just to make sure that the anonymity requirement was fully reached.
### 3.17 Summary of the Research Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research Approach</strong></th>
<th>Abductive Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Design</strong></td>
<td>Exploratory design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Cross Sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Sources</strong></td>
<td>Primary and Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection Method</strong></td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling</strong></td>
<td>Non-probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Data Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Empirical Investigation

This chapter represents the focus groups findings. The different brands will be divided as headline and the theory concepts will be under headline. The chapter shows how the respondents attitudes was before and after the different ingredient brands was added. This is the findings from four focus groups that is put together in one summary for all of them.

4.1 ICA Cook & Eat without Teflon

Theory of planned behavior

When the focus group were asked if they recognize ICA all respondents said yes. Participant X said: “I actually own a fry pan from ICA.” But not all of the respondents knew that ICA have their assortment of home and kitchen products. Participant X put it: “I almost always buy my groceries at Willys and I have not noticed these products at ICA, but I recognize ICA as a brand. Further on, all of the respondents had some kind of experience from ICA before. But the majority had not the experience from ICA Cook & Eat-products. Participant X put it: I usually shop at ICA but not fry pans, just groceries. Two of the respondents had experience from actual products from ICA Cook & Eat and one of them had a fry pan from ICA Cook & Eat. When they were asked about their perception about ICA the majority had a positive attitude against the brand. The participant that owned a fry pan from ICA was satisfied with the product. No one mentioned any bad perception it was just one of the respondents that mention the meet scandal that occurred at the company in 2007. But the same respondents said though that he trusts the company now.

Attitude

When they were asked how much they thought the fry pan from ICA cost all of the respondents thought it cost less than 400kr. The moderator said before the question that participant X that owned a fry pan should wait to answer this question so that they other participants would not be affected by her answer. The different prices that the respondents said was, 99kr, 199kr, 149kr, 299kr, and 399kr. All of them agreed that this fry pan looked cheap. Further on, when they
were asked about the quality of the fry pan the majority of the respondents thought that this was a fry pan with low quality. Participant X said: *I think the quality is much lower if you compare to a fry pan from Tefal Jamie Oliver. This is more IKEA-style low price and low quality.* Participant X stated: *“I think this have medium quality, I think you can find fry pans that have worse quality but this one is absolutely not one of the best.* Participant X said: *You do not have so much expectations on this product, the durability is probably short term also.*

**ABC model**

Regarding if the respondents could imagine to buy the product the majority said no. Participant X said: *“I rather buy a more expensive product that I know I can trust on and that I can use for a longer period. It was just a few respondents that could think of buying the product. Participant X put it: “I could imagine to buy the product, it feels like the fry pan is very affordable and I do not need the fry pans with best quality. Further on when they got the question how much they would pay participant X said: 200kr. No one else said any higher price than 200kr.*

### 4.2 ICA Cook & Eat with Teflon

*Theory of planned behavior with ingredient branding*

When they got the question if they recognized both brands all of the respondents said yes on both Teflon and ICA and they had experience from both Teflon and ICA but none of them did not have an idea what Teflon actually is or what Teflon does to a fry pan, as participant X said: *I thought that Teflon was a brand that made their own fry pans. But now I see that they make material to a lot of different fry pans. At least I know that they have really good quality on their products.* Participant X added: *I am actually not sure what Teflon is or what Teflon does in a fry pan. All I know that it is good to use a Teflon fry pan. When they got the question about their perception against the new brand all respondents had good perception against Teflon as participant X put it: I have a fry pan with Teflon and it is very easy to use it when you are cooking. My mother*
said that I need a good fry pan with Teflon but I thought that Teflon was the name of the fry pan, not a material in the fry pan.

Attitude with ingredient branding
The participant agreed that their opinion against ICA Cook & Eat have changed when they saw the second picture with Teflon in. As participant X said: *It looks actually more professional now. I don't think so much on the ICA logotype, my focus is more on Teflon now.* Participant X added: *I think Teflon makes ICA’s brand look much stronger.* The respondents had a good perception against ICA in the first picture but all of them agreed that ICA Cook & Eat looked more professional now together with Teflon. When they got the question how much they thought the fry pan costs now with the Teflon logotype. All of the respondents thought that the price increased. The highest price they said in first picture was 400kr. The highest price that came up during this picture was 700kr. As participant X said: *I think this product costs much more now when Teflon is in the picture. It would not surprise me if it costs around 700kr.* Thereafter they got the question about the quality on the product. And all of the respondents agreed and were sure that the quality of the product have increased a lot with Teflon. Participant X put it: *Yes, I am sure that the quality has increased on the fry pan with Teflon and that is why I think that the price has increased also.*

ABC model with ingredient branding
When they got the question whether the product becomes more valuable for them all of them agreed that the fry pan have become more valuable because of Teflon. And the reason why as all the respondents agreed is that the quality on the fry pan increase. Participant X said: *The fry pan became more valuable for me as a customer when I see the Teflon logotype. Now it is not just a fry pan from ICA, now I can say that it is a Teflon pan.* Thereafter they got the question whether how much they could imagine to pay for the fry pan. All of the respondents agreed that the fry pan costs more because of Teflon but the majority would not pay so much more money for the product. As participant X put it: *I would maybe pay around 100-200kr more for the fry pan now. But I think it costs much more.* It was just participant X and X that could pay more than the double of the price that they said in first picture.
4.3 Hennes & Mauritz without Gore-tex

Theory of planned behavior

When they were asked if they recognize H&M all of the respondents said yes and all of them had some experience before. Further on, when they got the question about their perception of the brand they had many different answers. Participant X put it: I try to avoid shopping at H&M, I have read much about child labor at H&M and that's why I do not like to shop there. Participant X said: I think H&M is a brand that is cheap and you can find very nice clothes to a very good price. Thereupon Participant X added: In general, my perception against the brand is good but sometimes I want to buy clothes that is more sustainable that I you can have for a longer time. According to me, H&M is not a brand that I characterize as a brand with high quality.

Attitude

When they were asked how much they thought the raincoat from H&M cost none of them thought more than 400kr. Participant X put it: I think this costs around 400kr, as we discussed before H&M is known to have a low price on their products so it would surprise me if it costs more than 400kr. Thereafter they were asked about the quality on the raincoat and all of them agreed that this raincoat has not good quality at all. Participant X said: As we talked about before H&M is a brand with very affordable price. But you get what you pay for, and that's why I think this have very low quality. Participant X said: It looks nice and I like the design but I don't think the quality is so good, probably not good against water at all, more fashion oriented.

ABC model

Regarding if the respondents could imagine to buy the raincoat it was just only two respondents that could imagine buying the raincoat. Participant X stated: If I am looking for a raincoat I would not go to H&M. I would go to a store with brands with more quality. Participant X agreed and added: You really want a raincoat to have good quality if you compare to a t-shirt. And that is why I would not buy it because I do not trust the quality from H&M. When they got the question how much they would pay for the product the highest price they said
was 100kr. Participant X said: *If I saw this raincoat for 100kr and if I actually need one I maybe should have buy it, but I'm not sure.*

### 4.4 Hennes & Mauritz with Gore-tex

*Theory of planned behavior with ingredient branding*

When the group was asked if they recognize the brands all of them said yes. But majority was not sure if they had experience from Gore-tex before. The majority of the respondents thought that they had worn something from Gore-tex before but they were not sure. At least all of them knew what kind of brand it is. When they were asked about their perception against the brand all of them said that Gore-tex is a brand that stands for very high quality. Quality was the word that all of the respondents highlighted. As participant X said: *The first thing I think of when I see that logotype is quality and waterproof clothes.*

*Attitude with ingredient branding*

When they got the question whether their opinion against the raincoat has changes now in the second picture the respondents thought that the coat looked to have a better function. Participant X said: *If I would have seen this raincoat with Gore-tex in a H&M store I would have been very surprised at first. Then I would have been happy that H&M have started to sell clothes with good quality which I do not think they are doing right now.* Participant X continued: *I do not associate H&M with clothes that is sustainable but if I had seen this in the store my opinion would have change.* Participant X added: *I would have trust the raincoat for 100% even though it is from H&M.* Thereafter they got the question about the price and they all thought the raincoat had become much more expensive because of the Gore-tex logotype. Participant X said: *I would not be surprised if the price has increased with around 1000kr. I said before around 400kr but the price has changed a lot maybe to 1400kr.* Further on, they got the question about the quality of the product and as they discussed earlier all of them thought that the quality has increased extremely much.
ABC model with ingredient branding

When the question whether the value of the product compared to first picture came, the whole group agreed that value of the coat have increased. As Participant X put it: *This could have been my jacket for the entire life. I mean that you do not buy a raincoat many times in your life. You buy one that is for long term and that is why I can see this raincoat as my lifetime coat when the Gore-tex logotype is in the picture.* Participant X agreed: *If the raincoat would have been without the Gore-tex logotype I would have seen it as a temporary coat and I do not see a temporary raincoat some anything valuable product for me. But now I see it as a long term product and then the value increased for me.*

When they got the question whether they could imagine buying the product now they majority thought that they could. The quality perspective was the contributing factor. Some of the respondents said that the fashion aspect also could convince them to buy the coat. Participant X said: *If the coat has good quality and it looks good I would for sure consider to buy this product.* In the first picture without Gore-tex it was two of the respondents that could imagine buying the coat from H&M. One of them said: *I am actually not sure if I would buy this now, I think I will look for a raincoat that is very simple and temporary, the money aspect is important for me now.*

### 4.5 Eldorado without Krav

*Theory of planned behavior*

When they were asked if they recognize Eldorado all of the respondents said yes and all of them had some experience before. Further on when they got the question about their perception of the brand all the respondents agreed that this is a low price brand. Participant X said: *I have not a good perception against Eldorado at all, it is very cheap and that could be good for sure, but their products feel so unreal, more fabric made and unhealthier.* Participant X added: *Sometimes it feels to cheap to be true, I can wonder what it is in their products that make it so cheap.* Participant X said: *I like this brand, I am a student so I prefer to buy cheap groceries.* Participant X agreed and elaborated: *It depends on what products you are looking for. I buy coffee filters from Eldorado, because*
I think it is a product that have same quality. But I would not buy chicken from Eldorado.

**Attitude**

When they were asked how much they thought the hamburgers from Eldorado costs, the highest price that the respondents said was 40kr. Participant X put it: *It is hard to know what hamburger costs, but I think for sure this one of the cheapest on the market. Eldorado’s products are usually the cheapest products on the market. Spontaneously I think this costs around 40kr.* Further on, they were asked about the quality on the hamburgers and all of the respondents agreed that the meat does not have good quality at all. None of the respondents thought that the quality is better if you compare to other brands. As participant X stated: *You get what you pay for. And the meat is probably from Ireland or Denmark, not from Sweden at least what I think.*

**ABC model**

Regarding if the respondents could imagine to buy Eldorado’s hamburger the respondents had different views. Participant X put it: *No, I would never buy this hamburgers, I always buy meat that I know is from Sweden. And I am sure that this is not meat from Sweden. It should be ecological also, it is very important for me.* The rest of the respondents agreed with participant X that it is important that the meat should be Swedish and ecological. Participant X added: *I actually does not look at the brand of the meat. I look after a Swedish flag or an ecological brand such as Krav but I don't see any of these brand now so that's why I would not by the hamburgers.* It was just participant X and X that disagreed and they said: *I could buy this, when I go shopping, the price is an important factor for me.* When they thereafter got the question how much they would pay for the product the highest price that come up was 30kr. Participant X said: *It is hard to say but if it is not ecological meat I would not pay more than 30kr.*
4.6 Eldorado with Krav

Theory of planned behavior with ingredient branding

When they first got the question if they recognize the brands all of them said yes on both Krav and Eldorado. And they all had some experience from Krav. When they were asked about their perception against the brand all of them thought that Krav stands for something good. But the majority did not know exact what Krav is, only that it is something positive. Some of them said that it has something to do with the environment. And how they grow fruits and with transportation of the food. All of the respondents agreed that Krav is something good and positive.

Attitude with ingredient branding

When the question whether the price have change in this picture the majority of the respondents thought that the price has increased. As participant X said: Now I think that the price has increased, it is always more expensive when it is ecological. Participant X added: I can not think of a product that would be cheaper because of Krav, they will always be more expensive. When I compare the both picture I think for sure that the one with Krav is much more expensive. All of the respondents agreed. The highest price that they thought the hamburgers had increased with was 60kr. When they got the question whether the quality have change in this picture all of them thought that the meat would have better quality with Krav. Participant X said: As I said before it is very important for me that the meat is ecological because of the quality and I trust Krav very much.

ABC model with ingredient branding

When the question whether the value of the product increased compared to the first picture came, the majority of the group said no, with the motivation that Eldorado is a brand that is so strongly associated with budget products and even though Krav is in the picture the value of the product would be the same. Some of them disagreed and said that the value of the product increased when Krav is in the picture. As participant X put it: It feels good to buy this product now because of Krav. The value has increased for me. Thereafter they were asked if they could imagine to buy the hamburgers and here there was disagreement. The
majority had change their opinion to a more positive change of buying the hamburgers with the motivation that it feels good to buy products with Krav. But there were some respondents that changed their mind and said that they would not buy the hamburger because of Krav. Participant X put it: *If I should be honest I do not look for products that are marked with Krav, and it only a price issue. I take for guarantee that the products with Krav always are more expensive and that is why I do not rather buy these products.* When the price question came the the highest price the respondents said was 60kr compared without Krav that was 30kr.

**4.7 Ryanair without Boeing**

*Theory of planned behavior*

All of the respondents recognize Ryanair and the majority had an experience of the company before. When they got the question about their perception against the brand the first thing they said was that it is a low price brand. Participant X said: *They try to push the price down on everything possible, staff and working environment for example. And you need to pay extra for everything, bags and other stuff.* Participant X continued: *Ryanair is not service minded and that is my perception, I think it is important to be service minded in the airline business.* Participant X said: *If you compare Ryanair with another low price airline such as Norwegian it feels like Norwegian is much more service minded than Ryanair, that is why I prefer Norwegian if it is possible to choose between them.* The respondents had a bad perception against Ryanair in general, the only positive thing they mention was the affordable price they have. Participant X put it: *They have good price on their flights but they have often their flights to airports that is not the main airport of the city. Example here in Sweden where they have their base at Skavsta outside Stockholm.*

*Attitude*

When they were asked how much they thought a regular one-way flight ticket from Stockholm to London costs the highest price they said was 600kr. Participant X said: *I think you can find the cheapest ticket at Ryanair for sure.*
And I have hard to believe that the cheapest ticket cost more than 600kr. But then you will travel from airports that is far from central Stockholm and central London. When they got the question whether the quality of the airline all of the respondents agreed with each other that Ryanair stands for low quality and low service. Participant X said: *It is not comfortable to fly with Ryanair. You have very less space for your legs if you compare with other airlines and it feels like the airplane is not that modern if you compare with Norwegian where you will have Wi-Fi on the flight.*

**ABC model**

Regarding if the respondents could imagine to fly with Ryanair all of them said yes. Participant X said: *Even though I said a lot of things that I do not like with Ryanair the cheap price is still convincing me to fly with them. You get what you pay for and I know before that the service will probably not be as good compare to another airline that is more expensive.* Thereafter they got the question how much they would pay for a flight between Stockholm and London they agreed with each other and said: *If a find a flight that is cheaper than Ryanair I would have traveled with them instead. It is hard to say an exact amount but Ryanair should be the cheapest option.*

### 4.8 Ryanair with Boeing

**Theory of planned behavior with ingredient branding**

When they got the question if the recognize the brand the majority said yes. There were some of the respondents that had heard the word Boeing but never seen the logotype before. And the majority had some experience from Boeing before. As participant X said: *When the captain of the airplane welcomes you to the flight they usually say for example, this Boeing 737 will take us to London.*

When they got the question about their perception against the brand the majority did not have any specific perception. Some the respondents talked about that Boeing produce big aircrafts, they mention the Jumbo Jet and that the president of USA is travelling with a Boeing Jumbo Jet. They did not say anything negative about Boeing.
Attitude with ingredient branding

When they got the question whether their opinion against Ryanair have change in this picture they all agreed that Ryanair is still a low price airline that is not service minded. Participant X said: *Ryanair has a very strong position as a low price brand and Boeing is not a Brand that can make me to change my opinion, Ryanair is an airline that is not service minded.* All of the respondents agreed

When the question whether the price have change in this picture none of them thought that the price had changed. The discussion was about that Ryanair is to strong low price brand that Boeing does not affect their opinions about the price and the quality.

ABC model with ingredient branding

Regarding if the respondents could imagine fly with Ryanair they all answered the same as they did in first picture. There were no differences even though they got to see the Boeing logotype.

4.9 Kia without Michelin

Theory of planned behavior

All of the respondents recognize Kia but not all of them had experience from them before. There were just three of the respondents that have travelled with a Kia and one of them that actually ha drove a Kia. Thereafter they got the question about their perception against the brand some of them had no perception at all. Participant X said: *I am not interested in cars at all, so that is why it is hard for me to have a perception. I just recognize the name and logotype.* Participant X continued: *Same for me, I do not have any perception against Kia, because I am not interested in a car.* The other respondents had different perceptions. Participant X put it: *I have a feeling that Kia is a reliable car brand. A regular car, not that remarkable and fancy.* Participant X agreed and added: *Kia is a low price brand if you compare to Mercedes, BMW and Volvo. I am very interested in cars and from perspective you get a good car to a very good price.*
Attitude

When they were asked how much they thought the car on picture cost the respondents that did not have any perception against the brand had hard to say any price. They put it: *I have no idea what a car cost, I am not that interested and I don't own a car.* The other in the group started to discuss some amounts. Participant X said: *I think this costs around 100 000kr which is very cheap if you compare to a similar car from BMW, Mercedes or Audi.* The highest price they said was 100 000kr. They all agreed that Kia is a low price car. When they got the question about the quality of the brand all of the respondents agreed and thought that Kia is not a car brand that stands for high quality if you compare to other brands. Participant X said: *I don't think you buy a Kia because of the quality, I think you buy a Kia because of the affordable price they have on their cars. You get a pretty good car for a price. If it is the quality that is the most important aspect for you then you probably buy a more expensive car example Mercedes or a BMW.* All of the respondents agreed on what participant X said.

ABC model

Regarding if the respondents could imagine to buy a Kia all of them said no. Participant X put it: *I would rather pay a little more money and get a better car. I like German cars also.* Participant X said: *It is my partner that take this decision what kind of car we should have. I am so uninterested and I don't know anything about that.* The reason that they mention why the respondents could not imagine buying the car was that you can find better cars, the quality perspective and price perspective. Participant X ended the discussion and said: *If I could get the car for around 50000kr I would have considered buy the car, and especially if good winter tires was inclusive the price.*

4.10 Kia with Michelin

*Theory of planned behavior with ingredient branding*

When they got to see the last picture all of them recognized Michelin. And they had some experience from the brand before, they had for example seen Michelins TV commercials, and they had seen their logotype ”Michelin man”
before. When they were asked about their perception against the brand all of the respondents had a positive perception against the brand. As participant X said: *I have seen their commercials on TV and they look professional and I get the feeling that they have very good tires.*

**Attitude with ingredient branding**

When they got the question whether their perception if the price and quality of Kia change together with Michelin some of the respondents said that Kia looked more professional now with the other logotype. Participant X said: *If I would have seen Kia with Michelin I would have thought that Kia is a better car and I think that the price increase if you compare with Kia’s own tires. I also think that the quality is much better now with Michelin. But I really do not know, it just feels like that.* Almost all of the respondents agreed and thought that price and quality increased in this picture. Participant X said: *I do not think that the quality increase so much, I mean if you buy a brand new car I would had the expectation that the quality on the car is good even though that the car does not have Michelin tires.*

**ABC model with ingredient branding**

When they came to the last question if the car became more valuable for them with Michelin all of them thought that Michelin strength the car. Participant X said: *When you buy a car I think you as a customer put down a lot of thinking before you actually are paying. I think Michelin tires is a big plus for you and maybe it makes your decision easier if you are choosing between a car without any famous brand that makes tires. Although the participant thought that the car would become more valuable with Michelin they thought that if you buy a new car you have high expectations that the car would have good quality even without Michelin.*
5 Analysis

This chapter represents the analysis of the focus groups findings by taking into consideration the theoretical framework. Below are the empirical results of this study interpreted and discussed. The purpose of this chapter is to try and clarify the detected variations and patterns.

5.1 Theory of Planned Behavior

According to Solomon (2006) an attitude is often the result of accumulated experiences. Whether the consumer recognize the brand or not the consumer take a position against the brand and this position can be positive or negative. According to the findings all of the respondents recognize the five different host brands ICA, H&M, Eldorado, Ryanair and Kia. Ajzen (1991) states that people act in a sensible way. People take into account the information that is available and considering then explicitly or implicitly the possible consequences available to their action. When it comes to ICA the respondents had a good perception against the stores. But when it comes to the kitchen products, that some of the respondents did not knew that ICA has in their product of Cook & Eat their perception was not positive if you compare to groceries in the store.

Regarding H&M, the respondents had different perceptions. In the findings some of the respondents discussed about H&M and child labor. One of the respondents refused to buy clothes from H&M just because of the bad condition for the children that the respondent had read about. This can be connected to Ajzen (1991) who states that people act in a sensible way and account the information that is available. Also according to the findings the respondents mention that H&M have unsustainable clothes and some of them rather buy clothes that is more sustainable and long term focusing. This is also consistent with the theory from Ajzen (1991). The positive perception against H&M was most focusing on the affordable price.

When it comes to Eldorado all of the respondents had a bad perception against the brand. They had a very strong perception that Eldorado’s is a budget brand.
with bad quality in their products. As Solomon (2006) states an attitude is a persistent and generalized evaluation of various objects such as people, advertising and products. The empirical findings are consistent with Solomon (2006) regarding Eldorado’s advertising to be a budget brand. The respondents had the same perception against Ryanair. These two host brands had so strong indication of budget brands and they have succeeded with their message in their communication to the customer. As mention before Solomon (2006) argue that an attitude is a results of accumulated experiences, it is in line with the experience that all of the respondents had from both Eldorado and Ryanair. In the findings the respondents said that you get what you pay for in Eldorado’s and Ryanair’s case. That means that the customers do not have any higher expectation from the brands.

When it comes to Kia there were just a few of the respondents that had any real experience of the car. The other had seen the logotype but they did not know what kind of brand it is. The majority of the respondents did not have any perception of the brand at all. According to Ajzen (1991) subjective norm is about the individual's perception of social pressure to implement or not to implement the behavior. This is consistent with the findings when there was just one participant that actually has driven a Kia. The participant said in the focus group that Kia is low price car if you compare to Mercedes and BMW. The other respondents that did not had any perception got influenced of social pressure that Ajzen (1991) argue about.

5.2 Theory of Planned Behavior with Ingredient Branding

According to Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) the meaning with ingredient branding is to make the invisible visible. The five different ingredient brands that were used in this research had not equal brand awareness according to the findings or as Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) maybe would have said, they were some brand that were more visible.
In the case of Teflon, all of the respondents had heard about Teflon and they had good perception against the brand. In this research Teflon is a very visible ingredient brand consistent with the theory from Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010). Norris (1992) argue that a well-functioning cooperation between the host brand and ingredient brand creates awareness among customers. This is not consistent with the findings about Teflon, because there were some of the respondents that thought Teflon was a brand name of fry pans and not a material to fry pans. If the ingredient brand has to big awareness that customer thinks the ingredient brand is the brand for the end products this can according to Norris (1992) hurt the host brand and can create misunderstanding from the customers. In the case with ICA Cook & Eat and Teflon this is a typical example when the ingredient brand could take to much space and the customer does not relate what the real host brand is. Gore-tex had a very good brand awareness as Teflon, the difference was that none of the respondents thought that Gore-tex is brand name of a raincoat. The respondents knew that Gore-tex is a material for the raincoats. Gore-tex is according to the findings a very visible ingredient brand as Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) mention in the literature.

When it comes to Krav the respondents had good perception against the brand and they thought that the brand stands for something good in the products. Krav is an ethical brand that is an insurance that the products you buy is ecological. Krav does not add something touchable to the end product. In the findings the respondents did not knew exactly what Krav does to a product. Ajzen (1991) argue that people generally tend to implement a behavior when they have a positive attitude towards it. The theory from Ajzen (1991) can be connected with the respondent’s perception against Krav in this research, as the respondents could not explain exactly what Krav is but still had the positive perception. Krav is also a visible ingredient brand but not in the same way as Teflon and Gore-tex according to the findings.

Boeing was the most invisible ingredient brand according to the findings. There were many of the respondents that never had heard about the brand or seen the logotype. That is why some of the respondent did not have any specific perception against Boeing. In the focus group one of the participant mention the
Jumbo Jet and Air Force One, the aircraft the president of USA is traveling with. Ajzen (1991) argue as mention before about positive attitudes can implement a behavior. In this case were the respondents did not notice the ingredient brand it is problematic to link the findings with the theory from Ajzen (1991).

Michelin was the brand that was most visible according to findings. All of the respondents recognize their classic logotype and they had seen their TV commercials. According to the findings, Michelin is the brand that is marketing the most directly to the end customer. The other brands do not market themselves in the same way that Michelin is doing. Even though the brand awareness was highest on Michelin the respondents did not had a better perception compared to Krav, Gore-tex or Teflon. Krav, Teflon and Gore-tex does not communicate to the end customer in the same extension as Michelin. However, according to the findings the respondents had a better perception to all of these three brands compared to Michelin. A reason could be that Michelin has more competitors with strong brand equity. Example, Goodyear, Nokian and Continental.

**General discussion**

Brands have several important and widely recognized features for consumers. Among other things, it helps the consumer to identify the origin of the product, creating symbolic value for the consumer, reducing the consumer perceived risk, reduce consumer costs related to the search of the product and serves as a sign of quality. Also an ingredient brand can have similar function for consumers. The ingredient brand has an important role as an information source. Through the customer can connect the brand to information about the product can be used as trademark reference point. The consumer can therefore more easily orient themselves in the market and thus facilitated electoral situation. Once a consumer has selected product facilitates brand choice in the event of repurchase, which reduces transaction costs. For the consumer can an ingredient brand be both cost- and time-saving. An ingredient brand acts as a stimulus when consumers evaluate a product and its quality. Ingredient brand can sometimes act as a shortcut for consumers to judge the quality of a product. This shortcut is based on consumers judge the product based on brand reputation, instead of assessing the product on the basis of its actual characteristics. However, this
assumes that the brand is known for the consumer. positively associated brand generates a higher perceived quality even if the brand normally associated with low quality or low prices. A brand with positive connotations thus proving the consumer’s view of the quality of the product.

5.3 Attitude

Solomon (2006) states that companies often have messages or associations related to their brand or product that they are trying to communicate to the market. The five hosts brands in this research have messages that they want to communicate to customers. These messages or associations were perceived in the focus groups. ICA Cook & Eat try to communicate on their website and in the stores that they sell affordable products with high quality. According to the findings the respondents thought that the fry pan from ICA Cook & Eat looked very affordable and cheap. However, according to the findings the perceived quality on the fry pan was not high, even though ICA tries to communicate that the fry pan has high quality. ICA Cook & Eat has succeeded to communicate that they have affordable price on their products but not with high quality.

H&M are communicating on their website that they offer fashion and quality at the best price. According to the findings, the company are good in communicating that they have affordable prices on their product. All of the respondents thought that the raincoats from H&M looked affordable and cheap. But when it comes to the quality on the raincoats they all thought that they have low quality. H&M are not successful in communicating their quality perspective to the customers according to the focus groups. However, in the focus groups the respondents mentioned about the fashion oriented style H&M have on their coats.

If you look at Eldorado’s webpage they communicate that the “good products do not cost more, as long as they are purchased in a smart way”. As Solomon (2006) states that companies often have messages or associations related to their brand, Eldorado’s messages is to offering attractive low-priced products for all
who want to buy cheap products with good quality. According to the findings Eldorado has succeeded in communicating that they are a low-price brand. However, the messages that they offering products with good quality has not been reached by the customer at all. The findings showed that respondents had no expectation at all from Eldorado’s products.

Ryanair communicate on their website that they offer cheap flights to Europe. According to the findings Ryanair's message has reached the customer about their cheap flights. Ryanair and Eldorado were the two brands that according to the findings have the clearest message about their low-price offers. However, Ryanair and Eldorado were also the brands that the respondents had less expectation from. When the questions about quality and service were discussed in the focus groups the respondents were confident that Ryanair has low quality and low service on their flights. On the company’s website they communicate that they are focusing on safety, punctuality, environmental awareness and perfect baggage handling. This message that Solomon (2006) discuss about has not reached the customer.

Kia communicate on their website that they are characterized by the design, quality, safety, low fuel consumption, efficient petrol and diesel engines at a competitive price. Kia is not focusing on the low price in their communication if you compare to Ryanair and Eldorado were the low price is the superior important message. Kia mention some arguments why the car is a reliable car and then in the end they are mention the competitive price. Ryanair and Eldorado mention the price directly and then some few arguments why they are reliable. According to the findings Kia is a car in the low price segment. However, the respondents concluded that you get a good car for a good price, which means that the respondents had more expectation of the brand if you compare with Eldorado and Ryanair.
5.4 Attitude with Ingredient Branding

Luczak et al. (2007) argue that an ingredient brand can communicate the benefits of the product to the end customer and that can increase the brand equity for the end product. This statement is in line with findings regarding ICA Cook & Eat together with Teflon in. The respondents argued that ICA looked more professional when Teflon was added. However, in the focus groups it came up that the some of the respondents actually do not focus so much on the ICA logotype when Teflon was added and that they would thought more that Teflon is the brand name of the fry pan. This is consistent with the previous research from Norris (1992) where he states that the ingredient brand earns the most from the cooperation with the host brand. Desai & Keller (2002) argue that consumers are willing to pay more money because of the ingredient brand that increase the value for the product. This previous research is consistent with the findings where it appeared that the respondents thought that the fry pan costs much more money with the motivation that Teflon was on the picture. This is also in line with Ghodeswar (2008) where he also states that the consumers are willing to pay more money because of the ingredient brand. McCarthy & Norris (1999) argue that a major medium quality or lower quality brand can improve competitive advantage by using the ingredient branding. According to the findings customer’s attitudes towards the quality increased a lot when Teflon was added in the picture. This is inline with previous research of McCarthy & Norris (1999).

When Gore-tex was added to the raincoats from H&M the consumer’s perception against the raincoats was significantly better according to the findings. The Gore-tex logotype made the consumer think that H&M is more focusing on sustainable clothes and that H&M would be more trustable. This is consistent with Luczak et al. (2007) previous research that an ingredient brand can communicate the benefits of the product to the end consumer and that can increase the brand equity for the end product. Gore-tex made the consumers to think that the raincoat would cost much more money. The respondents came up with the price had increased with around 1000kr when the Gore-tex logotype was added. This is inline with the research from Desai & Keller (2002) and
Ghodeswar (2008). Gore-tex was the ingredient brand that had the most influence on the customer's attitudes against the quality compared to the other ingredient brands. It means that Gore-tex affect the consumer’s attitudes against the quality and it is inline with the theory from McCarthy & Norris (1999).

When Krav was added together with Eldorado the customer’s attitudes did not change markedly into a more positive aspect. It was just few of the respondents who felt that Krav changed the perception against Eldorado to a more positive view. Eldorado is so strongly communicating that they are a budget brand and Krav had too less power to change the customer’s attitudes against the host brand. In the literature Norris (1992) states that ingredient branding is not for every supplier and not for every manufacturer. This example with Eldorado and Krav could according to the findings be inline with the statement form Norris (1992). When it comes to the price question it was the same as for Teflon and Gore-tex. According to the findings Krav makes a product to become much more expensive. This was seen as a disadvantage. Janiszewski & Van Osselaer (2000) argue that ingredient branding has its risk and the strategy does not fit all companies or all situations and industries. In the price perspective the theory from Janiszewski & Van Osselaer (2000) is consistent with the findings. However, from the quality perspective McCarthy & Norris (1999) theory is consistent with the findings. There were no doubts that Krav increase the quality on the hamburgers.

As mention before Boeing was the most invisible ingredient brand according to the findings. It was noticeable when the consumers were asked if their perception against Ryanair had change when Boeing is added. The consumer’s attitude had not changed at all. Ryanair is a very strong low-price brand and Boeing has too less power and to low brand equity to change the consumer’s attitudes whether Ryanair is service minded or has good quality on their flights. This example is also not inline with Ghodeswar (2008) & Desai & Keller (2002) that have showed in their research that the consumer is willing to pay more money for the end product when an ingredient brand is added.
As mentioned before, Michelin was the brand that was most visible. According to the findings, Michelin made Kia look more professional. This is consistent with the research from Luczak et al. (2007) where they state that ingredient branding communicates the benefits with the products to the end customer. In the case of Michelin together with Kia, Ghodeswar (2008) & Desai & Keller (2002) theories that the end customer is willing to pay more money is also confirmed by the majority of the respondents. However, another interesting thought that were mention in the focus groups was the expectation from a new car. As some of the respondents felt that expectation of the quality on a new car is good even though that the car does not have Michelin tires. This inline with Solomon et al. (2006) when they argue that an attitude is the result of accumulated experiences.

**General discussion**

One of the most important features for the consumer is probably the security of a well-known brand inspires, the guarantee function is of great importance. A product with a strong brand does not necessarily ensure high quality, however, a consistent quality. Any brand loyalty consumers based on satisfaction of customer needs. Through the brand’s guarantee function does it work also as a risk reducer. This applies mainly in the purchase of products or services that are subject to risks of economic, social and physical nature. A well-known and established brand can reduce consumer’s perceived risk. Nevertheless, as the brand is an information and identity carriers for the brand owner can it was an image of the creator to the consumer. The information that reaches the consumer is both emotional and rational character which gives the brand a symbolic significance. The brand image may be important for the consumer’s self-image and the image that consumers want convey to others.

**5.5 ABC Model**

Solomon et al. (2006) argue that the consumer’s attitudes to a specific product or service can be described with the ABC model. This model describes the knowing, feeling and action that the customers have before the purchase is confirmed. According to the findings the reason why the majority of the
respondents did not want to buy the fry pan from ICA Cook & Eat was due to the sustainability and quality perspective. ICA Cook & Eat have not succeeded in communicating that the fry pan has long durability. However, the few of the respondents that could imagine to buy the fry pan was with the motivation the price would not be higher than 200kr. Michman (1991) argue that values have major influence on consumer attitudes reflected in behavior. This is inline with the respondents that could imagine buying the fry pan. Regarding the raincoat from H&M, the consumers had the same motivation why they could not imagine buying the product as in the case with ICA. The sustainability and quality perspective was the reason why all of the respondents except two could not imaging to buy the raincoat. This is also inline with Michman (1991). The highest price the consumer would pay for the raincoat was 100kr. Michman (1991) argue that values affect and have influence on the way we consume and perceive different stimuli. In this case the consumer has perceived value was affected by H&M as a low-price brand.

When it comes to Eldorado’s hamburgers according to the findings the consumer’s attitudes that Eldorado is so strongly related to a budget brand influenced the customer’s attitudes to a very negative view towards the hamburgers. The three components in the ABC model that Solomon et al. (2006) discuss about, affect, behavior and cognition can be related when the respondents said that the reason they could not imagine buying the hamburgers was because of that the meat probably not is from Sweden and that they miss a sign that the meat is ecological. The customer’s attitudes against Kia can be related almost in the same way as for Eldorado. According to the findings the consumer wants a car that they have more knowledge about and a car that you can trust. They rather pay more money to get a car that you can rely on. When it comes to Ryanair the respondents had, as mention before negative perception against the airline. Anyway, all of the respondents could imagine to fly with Ryanair. As Michman (1991) mention, values have major influence on consumer attitudes reflected in behavior, which in turn affects the taste, the way we consume and perceive different stimuli. This is consistent regarding the price aspects for Ryanair. The value the customer sees in Ryanair is the cheap price and not the quality.
5.6 ABC Model with Ingredient Branding

In the literature, Zhang et al. (2013) and Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) states that the meaning of an ingredient brand is that the end customer will experience a higher value. According to the findings regarding ICA together with Teflon the respondents said that the fry pan became more valuable when Teflon was added. It was discussed in the focus groups that the fry pan became a Teflon fry pan instead of an ICA fry pan. This is inline with the literature. Ghodeswar (2008) argues that an ingredient brand can make consumers to pay more money for the end product. This is consistent with the finding about ICA and Teflon where the respondents were willing to pay more money for the fry pan. The reason why the respondents could imagine pay more for the product was because Teflon makes the customers attitudes against the quality more positive. Desai & Keller (2002) and Zhang et al. (2013) argue that the cooperation between the host brand and the ingredient brand can create a drawing effect and demand from the end customer. This theory is consistent with the findings.

According to the findings Gore-tex was the ingredient brand that increased the value of the host brand most compared to the other ingredient brands. Gore-tex made the consumer to imagine that the raincoat from H&M could be their jacket for the entire life as one of the respondent said in the focus groups. As Zhang et al. (2013) and Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) theory that the experienced value would be higher when an ingredient brand is added this is inline with the finding of H&M and Gore-tex. Gore-tex changed the consumer attitudes in a considerably more positive way regarding the quality of the raincoat and that is consistent with the theory from Desai & Keller (2002). Regarding how Gore-tex influenced the consumer’s willingness to buy the majority got convinced by the ingredient brand and this is consistent with Zhang et al. (2013) who states that an ingredient brand can create demand from the end customer. However, it was some of the respondents that changed their mind when they saw the Gore-tex logotype, and the reason was that they thought the price would increase too much. This way of what the customer think can be consistent with Norris (1992) research that ingredient branding is not suitable for all cooperation’s.
When it comes to Krav added to Eldorado the consumer’s attitudes did not change in the same way as in Teflon and Eldorado’s case. The majority of the respondents thought that Eldorado’s brand is so strongly associated with budget products and even though Krav was added the value of the product did not increase according to the findings. Hoeffler & Keller (2003) argue that an ingredient brand can lead to confusion among customers as an ingredient brand may appear in several products in the same category. This can be consistent with the findings when Krav put their brand on many different products. However, there were just a few respondents that thought that the products value increased when Krav came in the picture. With the motivation that it would feel good to buy the product just because of Krav. This is also inline with Zhang et al. (2013) who states that an ingredient brand can create demand from the end customer. The most interesting argue that came up in the findings was when some of the respondents said that they avoid products with Krav due to the price question. The consumer mean that Krav always make the products more expensive. Norris (1992) argue that. For the host brand is a risk of it being damaged and pulled down by the ingredient brand. For the producer of the host brand, it may mean that the ingredient brand takes over the identity and become the main purpose of consumption. This is consistent with the findings when the consumer avoids Krav just because of the price question.

When Boeing was added to Ryanair the consumer’s attitude did not change at all. Ryanair is a very strong budget brand and Boeing had no power to change any attitudes. This was not inline with Zhang et al. (2013) who states that an ingredient brand can create demand from the end customer. However, even though that the consumer had very negative attitudes against Ryanair all of the respondents could imagine travel with them according to the findings. In the case of Michelin, the findings were consistent with theory from Zhang et al. (2013) and Kotler & Pfoertsch (2010) which states that the experienced value would be higher when an ingredient brand is added. The respondents thought that Michelin strength Kia's brand. But when it comes to whether the consumer would be convinced by Michelin to buy a Kia the respondents thought that Michelin would be a plus if you are choosing between a car without any other brand tires this
could be inline with Zhang et al. (2013) who states that an ingredient brand can create demand from the end customer.

General discussion
A successful brand is a valuable asset. In addition to the features previously described means the brand is also an added value for the company. The consumer’s choice of brand is determined by the products added value. The added value is an expression for the difference in meaning between the ingredient brand and the generic product, or in other words the added value that the consumer is willing to pay extra for. The added value must be relevant relative to a generic product and competitive in comparison with other branded products. The added value, which is based in consumer brand association, will create brand preferences that will lead to brand loyalty. This value can be called brand equity and does not have a clear definition but can be seen as the added value with which a brand endows a product. This means that the product is marketed under a certain brand or activity associated with a particular corporate identity, should generate greater cash flows than would have occurred without the brand or corporate identity. This expression can be discussed from both the host brand and the consumer point of view, on the basis that the ingredient brand creates value for the consumer, this contributes to creating value for the host brand. A company can get access to a brand equity by building it yourself, buy it or borrow it.
6. Conclusion

This chapter presents the study’s conclusion, based on the analysis in the previous chapter. The study aims to explore how customer’s attitudes are affected by ingredient branding on products in the segment of low price brands.

Based on the analyze that have been done this research shows that there is no doubt that ingredient branding can change consumer’s attitudes both in a positive and negative way on products in the segment of low price host brands. This research shows that an ingredient brand change consumers attitudes against the price of the end product. When an ingredient brand is added the consumer are expecting that the price increase. The only example in this research that did not showed this was Ryanair combined with Boeing which shows that the effect on consumer attitudes can be different whether how strong indication of a low price brand the host brand has. Further on, the effect depends whether how strong brand awareness and brand equity the ingredient brand has. One reason for this success is certainly the fact that they are known for a large part of the public. An ingredient brand is not very useful if no one has heard of it or are aware of its position. However, different opinions are encountered regarding whether the consumers are willing to pay more money for the end product when an ingredient brand is added. The five ingredient brands in this thesis had different effect on consumer’s attitudes. In the case with Eldorado combined with Krav the empirical findings highlight that some consumers try to avoid Krav with the motivation that they know the product will be more expensive just when they see the brand. This is how an ingredient brand can change consumer’s attitudes in a negative way. The reason why the consumer’s expected the price on the end product to increase was the quality perspective. This research shows that when an ingredient brand is added the consumer’s attitude against the quality will be more positive and they expect the end product to have better quality. Gore-tex and Teflon were the two brands that change the participant’s attitude towards the quality of the end product in the most positive way. They were also the two brands that made the consumers attitudes towards the price increase most. One interesting conclusion that can be drawn is that an ingredient brand can make the
consumer’s negative attitudes towards the host brand to be positive. A bad perception of the host brand can be developed to a good due to the ingredient brand.

The conclusion that can be drawn regarding how consumer’s attitudes are affected by an ingredient brand on high involvement products is that when it comes to high involvement products for example a new car the consumers are expecting that the car already has good tires. It is though a big plus if the car has Michelin but they are anyway expecting that the car should have good quality with or without the ingredient brand. High involvement products is when the consumer are putting a lot of time and effort and compare products and then pay a lot of money. An ingredient brand has very low effect on consumer’s attitudes even though the high involvement product is a low price brand. When it comes to low involvement products an ingredient brand has very strong effect. The attitudes against price and quality change more to a positive way due to the consumer has no expectation from the low involvement product compared to the high involvement product.

The answer of the question that is the title of this thesis “Is the invisible really invisible?” is no. The invisible is not invisible. The invisible or the ingredient brand have much power to change consumer’s attitudes. The invisible can affect consumers to buy, to pay more and even not to buy the end product.
7. Research Implications

This chapter presents the theoretical and practical implications that this research contributed with. This chapter gives the reader information on how the study should be applied in practice and in theory, as well as recommendations for further research.

7.1 Theoretical Implications

In any type of research, the goal is, more or less, to bring something to the bank of knowledge that already exists in the subject. Regarding the theoretical aspects this study contributes how consumer’s attitudes are affected by ingredient branding. This thesis has combined the theories of attitudes with ingredient branding. “Theory of planned behavior”, “Attitude” and “ABC model” is the three main concepts that have been combined with theory of Ingredient Branding. To connect these concepts with ingredient branding is one main thing that this thesis has contributed with in the theoretical perspective. Regarding whether how ingredient branding affect consumer’s attitudes this research contributes with data that is consistent with some existing theories. This thesis has also contributed with new theory how ingredient brand affect consumer’s attitude on low price brands.

7.2 Practical Implications

The practical implications that this research have contributed with is most focusing on whether it is possible to add an ingredient brand on low price host brands. By taking part of this study, companies active in the business to business sector can see this as a guide book how consumer’s attitudes towards the end product can change due to the ingredient brand. On the other hand, companies that are active in business to consumer sector and have suppliers this thesis can give an insight how important it is to have a supplier with a strong brand that their customers recognize and trust. There are several reasons for the host brand to acquire a strong ingredient brand, not least to defend the price and market
share. When margins are low is a strong ingredient brand a great way to assert their right to take a good price. For brands that challenge it can be a great way to take shares.

7.3 Limitations

As the purpose of this study is to investigate how consumer’s attitudes are affected by ingredient branding on products in the segment of low price products, has a qualitative approach been beneficial because it has facilitated the ability to create understanding of the respondent’s thoughts and attitudes towards the brands. This choice of research approach has to some extent limited the study’s results.

This qualitative study facilitated the development to create understanding for the respondent’s view, also contributed to the ability to get a generalizable results ceased, that because the study was limited to a small sample. The fact that the study based its sample on a non-probability sample means that results can not fully reflect the population but only provide an indication of what the actual outcome may be. Despite the study’s conclusion is based on a result of a relatively small number of respondent’s perceptions, for with them a useful theoretical framework and an empirical basis that can be generalized in further research. The study was based on four focus groups, due to the time and resources. In this research, the half of the respondents were students at Linnaeus University. This can be seen as a limitation due to that students maybe have a lower purchasing power.

7.4 Further Research

Since the topic for this study is relatively unexplored comes here some proposals for further research in this area. This thesis used a qualitative approach with focus groups as data collection method. For further research it would be interesting to use a quantitative approach with a survey as data collection method. An interesting research could have been done by sending out a survey
with pictures of products without ingredient brands and ask about attitudes and then send out a survey with the same pictures but with ingredient brands. This way the researcher could generalize the results. To use other examples of brands would of course be a proposal for further research. Another proposal for further research is to focusing on products within the segment of high price products, such as luxury brand. Example, if an ingredient has the same effect on a luxury brand. Would it have any effect on consumer’s attitudes when a Gore-tex logotype is added on a jacket from the luxury brand Gucci? This research has focusing on the B2C perspective. Another research could have been done by looking on the connection between the ingredient brand and the host brand. To look at the risk and opportunity for the both brands and come up with a strategy how to make the cooperation so successful as possible.
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9 Appendix

9.1 Appendix A Choice of Brands
## 9.3 Appendix B Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Welcome speech, presentation, introduce the participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Q1 Do you recognize the brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures without ingredient brand</td>
<td>Q2 Have you had the experience of the brand before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 What is your perception of the brand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 What do you think this product cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5 How do you think the quality is on this product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6 Would you be willing to buy the product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q7 What would you consider to pay for this product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Q8 Do you recognize the brands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures with ingredient brand</td>
<td>Q9 Have you had the experience of brands before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10 What is your perception of the brands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11 If you previously had a worse opinion, is it different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12 What do you think this product cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13 How do you think the quality is on this product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q14 Do you believe that the product becomes more valuable as a whole compared with the corresponding picture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15 If you previously would not have been able to imagine buy the product, have you become convinced to buy the product now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16 What would you consider to pay for this product?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9.3 Appendix C Focus Group Participant’s Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group 1</th>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>Participant 2</th>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Saleswoman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group 2</th>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>Participant 2</th>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
<th>Participant 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Sportswoman</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Sportsman</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td>Masseur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group 3</th>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>Participant 2</th>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
<th>Participant 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group 4</th>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>Participant 2</th>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Web Designer</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>Politician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.4 Appendix D Focus Groups Invitation

Focus Group Invitation

Dear Participant,

I am now writing my master’s thesis and I am conducting a project about branding and attitudes. I ask you to join my focus group where we discuss about your attitudes towards different brands. The only requirement is that you have lived in Sweden for at least five years and like fika.

Please feel very welcome to help me with my research the following dates at Linnaeus University. The exact location will be announced.

April 18 (10.00-11.00)
April 20 (10.00-11.00)
April 21 (17.00-18.00)
April 27 (17.00-18.00)

Please let me know which date would suit you the best.

Best regards
Jakob Steinstö