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Title: E-loyalty: A quantitative study in a high involvement market

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, the relationship between e-trust and e-loyalty, as well as the relationship between convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

Hypotheses:

H1: E-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.
H2: E-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.
H3: Convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

Theory: E-loyalty; e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience

Methodology: Questionnaire

Conclusion: Based on the findings in this study H1, H2 and H3 were all supported.
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1. Introduction

This chapter outlines an introduction to the topic of the study. The chapter includes a background of the topic and a problem discussion that problematizes the area, which leads to the purpose of the study.

1.1 Background

Online retailing has over the past decade become increasingly popular and is according to Chang et al. (2009) a preferred shopping method among many customers. What follows the increasing popularity is however a growing competition for e-retailers and how to convert customers into loyal customers has become more important than ever before (Yulin et al., 2014). Further justification for the need of loyal customers is provided by Flavián et al. (2006) who claim that loyal customers tend to have greater future purchase intentions than regular customers. The increased use of the internet has developed a new economic environment for companies to operate in and some of these companies have started online businesses that consist of transactions between consumers and companies online, which are also called e-commerce (Janson & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2005).

The fact that loyal customers are essential for the survival and profitability of e-businesses is well known (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). E-loyalty has even been suggested to be the most important factor affecting online businesses (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Kassim & Abdullah, 2010). According to Kim et al. (2009) e-loyalty is an important issue in online retailing as more and more companies enter the online market and e-loyalty is defined by Anderson and Srinivasan (2003, p.125) as “the customer’s favourable attitude toward an electronic business resulting in repeat buying behavior”. One commonly mentioned concept in relation to e-loyalty is e-satisfaction (Anderson & Srinivasan 2003; Bresolles et al., 2014; Dina et al., 2004; Taylor & Strutton, 2010). E-satisfaction is the satisfaction a customer experience from earlier purchases from a specific e-retailer (Valvi & Fragkos, 2012). According to Bresolles et al. (2014) e-satisfaction has become an increasingly important factor in the marketing literature. The importance for e-retailers to satisfy customers’ needs by delivering service quality is considered to be as crucial as it is offline (Bresolles et al., 2014).

Furthermore, e-trust is also a concept commonly mentioned in relation to e-loyalty (Chao-Min et al., 2009; Wolfinberger & Gilly, 2003; Pavlou et al., 2007; Ribbink et al., 2004; McKnight et al., 2002) and is described as the customers’ trust in an e-retailer (Valvi & Fragkos, 2012). Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) state that one of the key reasons for the importance of trust online is the perceived level of risk connected with online purchases.
Another concept that has been mentioned in relation to e-loyalty but that has not been researched to the same extent as the two previously mentioned concepts is convenience (Srinivasan et al., 2002; Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Grewal et al. 2004; Seiders et al. 2007). Convenience is according to Kim et al. (2007) service attributes that help customers to easy search for information on a web site. Attributes of a convenient website could e.g. be accessibility of information, simplicity in order to minimize customer effort and easy completion of transactions (Srinivasan et al., 2002). E-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience are all affected by the level of involvement in a purchase (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). When customers purchase a high-involvement product they generally conduct research about the product before the purchase in order to get a understanding of the product. High-involvement purchases are often expensive, durable goods, such as houses or cars. It could also be purchases that are of high relevance for the consumer (Pavlou et al., 2007). Low-involvement purchases generally do not involve the same amount of research and it could e.g. be non-durable products and purchases that usually have low prices, such as noodles (Pavlou et al., 2007).

1.2 Problem discussion

Although plenty of research investigating e-loyalty has been conducted there is a lack of studies on the subject in markets where transactions are less frequent and where customers invest a greater amount of time and effort in their evaluations, such as high involvement markets (Chiou & Pan, 2009; Quester & Ai Lin, 2003). There are reasons to believe that antecedents of e-loyalty influence differently in this type of market. Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) argue that e-satisfaction will have a larger impact on e-loyalty in high involvement markets where transactions are not frequent and where customers are more emotionally involved due to the financial and social risks of a purchase. Furthermore, Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) state that the more money that is involved in a transaction, the more important it is that customers are satisfied with the purchase. Regarding the relationship between high involvement markets and e-trust, Pavlou et al. (2007) state that the higher the customer involvement is in a purchase, the higher the perceived risk and importance of e-trust is for the customer. In contrast to Pavlou et al’s. (2007) findings, Elliot and Speck (2005) claim that e-trust is unaffected by product involvement but that the need for convenience in the form of product information availability becomes more essential in high involvement markets.
The need to acquire and maintain loyal customers is especially important in an e-commerce setting due to the small cost for customers to switch between retailers online and the high costs for companies to acquire new customers (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). Loyal customer’s value is suggested by Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) who state that a loyal customer can be worth up to ten times more than a disloyal customer which explains why even the best designed e-business will fail without loyal customers (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). To generate loyal customers is indeed a challenge for online companies, but the reward of succeeding will be a better position relative to competitors (Koufaris et al., 2002).

Several studies (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Jin et al., 2008) have found a positive relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, which commonly is very strong but not without exceptions as Balabanis et al. (2006) found the relationship to be weak. Should a company fail to satisfy a customer, that same customer is more likely to search for alternatives and choose a competing alternative and also become reluctant to develop a relationship with the dissatisfying company (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). Furthermore, Dina et al. (2004) state that the importance of e-satisfaction lies in its influence on customer’s evaluations of an e-retailer. Even though the satisfaction - loyalty relationship has been thoroughly researched in the traditional marketplace, its relationship and particularly its strength in an e-commerce setting needs to be further researched (Christodoulides & Michaelidou, 2011).

E-trust is, as mentioned, an additional important factor affecting e-loyalty. Several studies (Flavián et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2009) have shown a positive link between e-trust and e-loyalty with some exceptions such as Herington and Weaven (2007) and Jin et al. (2008) who found no significant relationship between the two concepts. Though there is a lack of consensus regarding e-trust’s role in creating e-loyalty, it plays a vital role for customers to use a service or buy a product from e-retailers in the first place as it generally decreases the perceived risk of such activities (Garbarino & Johnson, 1999). E-trust can furthermore be argued to be even more important than trust in the more traditional marketplace where face-to-face interaction often is included as there is no such interaction in e-commerce settings (Urban et al., 2000).

Additional to e-satisfaction and e-trust, convenience is also related to e-loyalty. By e.g. having a website that is easy for customers to use and where product information is easily accessible, customers can have more pleasant experiences shopping which increases the likelihood that the customer will visit the website again (Rahman & Khan, 2014). The
relationship between convenience and e-loyalty is however not as researched as the e-satisfaction and e-trust literature with different studies finding different relationships and in some cases it is even argued to be non-existent (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Christodoulides & Michaelidou, 2011). In contrast to studies that do not find a direct link between convenience and e-loyalty, Rahman and Khan (2014) find a direct link between the two concepts and Grewal et al. (2004) argue that e-retailers need to enhance convenience to develop long-term customer loyalty.

Previous researches show that there are relationships between the mentioned concepts in need of explanation (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Kim et al., 2009; Rahman & Khan, 2014) and lastly Gutierrez et al. (2010) claim that it is necessary to further investigate the influence of product involvement on customers development of e-loyalty.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, the relationship between e-trust and e-loyalty, as well as the relationship between convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.
2. Theoretical framework

The chapter outlines the theoretical framework for the study, which will be used to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

2.1 E-loyalty

According to Kassim & Abdullah (2010) customer loyalty is of great importance for companies to survive. Loyal customers are crucial for companies and these customers are more valuable than a regular customer (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). Zeithaml et al. (1996) also discuss that loyalty involves individual’s intention to spread positive word of mouth (WOM) about a business and repurchase from the firm in the future. According to Keller (1993) loyalty is present when favourable attitudes are leading to repeated buying behaviour. When it comes to retailing on the internet, e-loyalty is a crucial issue and with the technology development where companies enter the online market frequently, e-loyalty also has become more crucial (Kim et al., 2009).

There are several definitions of e-loyalty and Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) define e-loyalty as “the customer’s favourable attitude toward an electronic business resulting in repeat buying behavior” (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003, p. 125). Additional to favourable attitudes and repeat buying behavior, Chang et al. (2009) claim that WOM communication is a measurement of true customer e-loyalty. Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) as well as Chang et al. (2009) argue that due to the accessibility to competitors in the online market it is more crucial to gain loyal customers. Further, e-loyalty can have a positive effect on online businesses profitability due to the establishment of long-term relationships with customers, which as a consequence could lead to the costs of gaining new customers to decrease (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Kim et al., 2009).

In a study by Gutiérrez et al. (2010) it was concluded that the higher the involvement of the customer toward a product, the stronger the repeat purchase intention of the customer. If companies can encourage customers to repurchase a product or service from them it could result in higher profits for the company (Kim et al., 2009). As a consequence, it is according to Kim et al. (2009) important for firms to have knowledge about the various antecedents of e-loyalty. Researchers discuss that there are several antecedents of e-loyalty and bring up e.g. e-satisfaction (Bressolles et al., 2014; Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003), e-trust (Anderson &
Srinivasan, 2003; Kim et al., 2009) and convenience (Grewal et al., 2004; Seiders et al., 2007).

2.2 E-Satisfaction

There are several different definitions of e-satisfaction. In this study, e-satisfaction is defined as “the contentment of the customer with respect to his/her prior purchasing experience with a given electronic commerce firm” (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003, p. 125). The future decisions of a customer, whether or not to continue the relationship with an online retailer, is dependent on if the customer feels satisfied after a purchase or experience (Lin & Chia-Chi, 2009). For instance, satisfaction is described as an overall evaluation of a product or service and whether the product or service is in line with a customer’s expectations (Ofir & Simonson, 2007). In an online retail context, customer expectations can for instance be aspects such as system security and delivery time (Flavián et al., 2006). The expectations are according to Flavián et al. (2006) a key element when it comes to e-satisfaction, but in the long run also on e-loyalty towards a brand or an e-retailer (Ofir & Simonson, 2007).

One of the important foundations in creating e-satisfaction among users is a website’s product information (Bressolles et al., 2014). This is also in agreement with Bachleda and Selmouni’s findings (2014), who in addition conclude that product information not only has an impact, but the most significant impact on achieving e-satisfaction. Product information refers to how detailed and reliable the product information on a website is as well how easily understood the information is (Cho & Park, 2001). Since high-involvement shoppers look up information regarding their potential purchase to a greater extent compared to low-involvement shoppers, a website’s product information becomes essential for high-involvement shoppers (Elliott & Speck, 2005). Moreover, Kim et al. (2009) discuss that customers shopping online for more expensive and high-involvement products, such as computers, might have inquires more frequently in comparison to customers shopping for everyday products. As a consequence, Kim et al. (2009) argues that highly involved shopper’s e-satisfaction might be extra affected by the degree of online retailers’ responsiveness. Bansal et al. (2004) define responsiveness as an online retailer’s capability to answer to customer’s questions and problems. This is also supported by Parasuraman et al. (2005), who also includes the aspect of how fast an online retailer respond their customers. Moreover, Parasuraman et al. (2005) found that responsiveness has a positive impact on developing e-loyalty towards a website. Based on this information hypothesis 1 was created because e-satisfaction is argued to be positively related to e-loyalty in high involvement markets.
**H1: E-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.**

### 2.3 E-trust

E-trust is defined by (Ribbink et al., 2004, p. 447) as *"the degree of confidence customers have in online exchanges, or in the online exchange channel"*. In order for a customer to venture to make a purchase, McKnight et al. (2002) discuss the importance for a customer to consider a website trustworthy. One of the dimensions leading to e-trust is the security of a website, which implies if the customer perceives the website safe enough to leave personal information such as credit card details and other confidential information (Pavlou et al., 2007; Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003). It can be problematic for customers to foresee whether their monetary information on a website will be properly protected from security breaches (Pavlou et al., 2007). Kim et al. (2009) state that the concerned website therefore should put emphasis on presenting detailed information on how it works when disclosing customers’ personal information. In doing so, customers’ e-trust towards an online retailer can be improved (Kim et al., 2009). Security has according to Safa and Ismail (2013) a key role in creating e-trust amongst customers and online retailers should understand that in order to build e-loyalty, there has to be a former development of e-trust (Kim et al., 2009).

Another dimension leading to e-trust is fulfilment, which involves the degree to which online retailer’s promises concerning order deliveries are fulfilled (Chao-Min et al., 2009). Fulfilment, which sometimes is referred to as reliability, also involves that a website should demonstrate correct product information and keep promises such as price, delivery time, warranties and quality (Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003). Further, Wolfinberger and Gilly (2003) state that customers are especially worried about a company’s order fulfilment when it comes to e-commerce. Kim et al. (2009) found that fulfilment was the most positive and significant dimension in creating e-trust and argued for the importance of making sure that the order fulfilment matched the customer’s expectations. In another study, Bart et al. (2005) also concluded that order fulfilment was a dominant driver of e-trust, especially for website categories with high involvement products.

Reputation is another trust building dimension, which according to McKnight et al. (2002) is the second-hand information of what people think of someone or something. Being told from someone else that interacting with an online retailer was a positive experience can help to ease customer’s perceptions of risk in interacting with the online retailer (McKnight et al.,
Jøsang et al. (2007) state that many online firms e.g. use reputation systems where customers can rate the website. Good ratings can consequently lead to a good reputation for the website, which in turn affects customer’s e-trust (Jøsang et al., 2007). In a study by Jin et al. (2008) it could also be concluded that good reputations of online firms had a positive impact on e-loyalty via e-trust. Based on this information hypothesis 2 was created because e-trust is argued to be positively related to e-loyalty in high involvement markets.

H2: E-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

2.4 Convenience

Convenience is defined by Kim et al. (2007, p. 869) as “the service attributes which help customers search information with ease and with minimal effort”. Because the switching cost for customers is lower in e-commerce settings than in the bricks and mortar setting, a convenient shopping experience becomes even more important for companies to avoid losing customers (Srinivasan et al., 2002; Kim et al., 2007). Srinivasan et al. (2002) further state that important factors for a convenient website is accessibility of information, simplicity to minimize customer effort and fast completion of transactions. The need for these functions on a website is also discussed by Kim et al. (2007) who state that individuals may seek to save time by shopping online since it is a more convenient method as online shoppers usually have limited time to shop. Navigation tools and search engines are necessary tools for e-retailers to include on their websites to provide accessibility of information and reduce customer effort as 30% of customers who can not find the information they desire leave a website without purchasing anything (Srinivasan et al., 2002; Kim et al., 2007; Jung-Hwan et al., 2009). Furthermore, Elliot and Speck (2005) claim that that the need for product information becomes more essential in high involvement markets. Additional to these tools in creating convenience is frequently asked questions (FAQs) that help customers find information in a time saving manner as well as express checkouts to help customers complete faster transactions (Jung-Hwan et al., 2009). The quality of a website is of great importance for e-retailers as it is the only interaction customers have with the e-retailer when shopping online which further stresses the importance for convenience (Palmer & Griffith, 1998). The connection between convenience and e-loyalty is not fully determined as some studies find the relationship between convenience and e-loyalty to be decided by e-satisfaction and some argue that there is a direct link between convenience and e-loyalty (Rahman & Khan, 2014; Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003; Christodoulides & Michaelidou, 2011).
Several researchers propose that there are five different dimensions of convenience and that each dimension affects e-loyalty individually (Seiders et al., 2005; Seiders et al., 2007; Grewal et al., 2004). The first dimension named access convenience involves the extent to which a website is available online, e.g. how easy the site is to load and how prominently displayed it is on search engines (Grewal et al., 2004). This in turn influences decision convenience which includes the amount of time and effort customers put into searching for information prior to a purchase as well as the availability of information and its quality regarding products and competitors. When gathering information about high involvement products, customers usually have a higher convenience threshold, which affects decision convenience. The previously mentioned dimensions are both salient prior to the initiation of the exchange process, two convenience dimensions that come into effect once the exchange process has begun is benefit and transaction convenience (Seiders et al., 2007). Benefit convenience comprehends the service experience for the customer and transaction convenience involves customer’s time spent in remote queues as well as how easy it is for customers to purchase products from a website. The last convenience dimension is post-benefit convenience which comes into effect after the purchase when the e-retailer deals with defective products, service recovery efforts, transaction errors or a customer’s change of mind (Seiders et al., 2005; Seiders et al., 2007; Grewal et al., 2004; Lai et al., 2014). The convenience dimensions that will be investigated in this study are decision convenience and transaction convenience to narrow the study down and make it conductible (Seiders et al., 2007; Grewal et al., 2004; Lai et al., 2014). Based on this information, hypothesis 3 was created because convenience is argued to be positively related to e-loyalty in high involvement markets.

**H3: Convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.**
3. Research model and hypotheses

*Based on the literature review presented in the previous chapter, a research model presenting how the study will be conducted has been developed and will be presented in this chapter. Additional to the research model, the hypotheses that will be tested are also presented.*

3.1 Research model

That there is a relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty has been proposed by several researchers (Anderson & Srinivasan 2003; Kim et al., 2009; Flavián et al., 2006; Grewal et al., 2004). The developed model is based on several studies, e.g. Anderson & Srinivasan (2003), Srinivasan et al. (2002) and Kim et al.’s. (2009) studies regarding antecedents of e-loyalty. The model will be tested in a relatively unexplored context in connection to e-loyalty in the form of a high involvement market, more specifically in the home electronics market. The purpose of testing the model is to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market. The model constitutes the foundation of the operationalization for the study as it explains what will be researched and illustrates that e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience are related to e-loyalty.

The three following hypotheses will be tested to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

*H1: E-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.*

*H2: E-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.*

*H3: Convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.*

The research model explains the relationships that will be researched in a high involvement market in this study and which hypothesis that investigates each specific concept.
4. Methodology

This chapter explains how the study was conducted as well as providing information on how quantitative research methods should be implemented. The chapter describes both the theoretical and practical implementation of this study. Lastly, a summary of the study’s methodology is presented.

4.1 Research approach

Research approach refers to how the study will be conducted and which approach that should be applied depends on the purpose of the paper and the influence of the researcher (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

4.1.1 Deductive vs. inductive research

Generally there are two central approaches to deliberate when conducting research, inductive and deductive (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). The deductive approach is described by Saunders et al. (2009) as the most common view when explaining the correlation between theory and research. By applying a deductive research approach, conclusions are reached by testing already existing theories within the chosen field of research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The theories are tested by formulating hypotheses, based upon the theory, and are either rejected or confirmed based on the collected empirical data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Bryman and Bell (2011) explains that the hypotheses, which are formulated and tested in studies with a deductive approach, intend to further develop the research that already exists. In order to create a broad theoretical base to work from, an extensive review of previous literature and its concepts, theories and hypotheses need to be studied (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The hypotheses must according to Saunders et al. (2009) be well designed in order to be tested empirically and this is done through an operationalization, which makes the theoretical concepts applicable in reality.

The other central approach to consider when conducting research is the inductive approach (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). In contrary to deductive research, Bryman and Bell (2011) state that inductive research puts more emphasis on creating new theories instead of testing already existing ones, which is the case in deductive research. In inductive research, the empirical gathering of data is gained through observations and it is via the observations that new theories can emerge (Saunders et al., 2009). However, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) explain that inductivism has been criticized for whether empirical data from a number of observations can be viewed as scientific. This is because inductivism is not based upon prior
research, but only conclusions drawn from the study's own empirical data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

In this study, a deductive research approach was applied. The hypotheses were created based on already existing theories to find out if the hypotheses should be either accepted or rejected. The results of this study might contribute to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

4.1.2 Quantitative vs. qualitative research

A research’s empirical data can be collected through a quantitative and/or qualitative method (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that the deductive and inductive approaches are associated with either a quantitative research, which more commonly is related to the deductive perspective, or qualitative research, which usually is more associated to the inductive perspective.

A quantitative method is used with the intention to find data that could be generalized and applied to a broad population (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The gathered data should be considered to be measurable and presented in comparable numbers that could be tested with the intent to reach conclusions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Furthermore, quantitative studies are according to Neuman (2003) often used when the researcher is interested in examining causal relationships between variables. Contrary to quantitative research, qualitative research can be seen as a research method that puts more emphasis on words rather than on numbers (Saunders et al., 2009). When conducting a qualitative research, the gathering of empirical data is less formalized compared to quantitative research and is often used when several variables are under investigation with few respondents (Neuman, 2003). Consequently, in qualitative research the respondents can provide more detailed information and focus is more on creating a deep understanding of complex situations (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

This study aimed to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market. Since e-loyalty already is a well-explored subject, a quantitative research that either support or reject the existing theory was seen as most preferable. The results in this study were also intended to be generalized over a large population, which further supported the choice of a quantitative research.
4.2 Research design

A research design is according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) the approach used by the researchers in order to answer the study’s research problem. If a research design is developed in a poor way, it can fail to give proper answers to the investigated research problem (Shukla, 2008). There are according to Saunders et al. (2009) three forms of design, which are common in business related research; exploratory design, descriptive design and explanatory design.

The exploratory design is according to Aaker et al. (2010) often used in research when the problem under investigation is not clear and the design is mostly qualitative in nature (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Shukla (2008) states that the exploratory design emphasises on exploring the phenomena exhaustively and therefore requires special researcher skills. Knowledge of how to encode answers as well as analyzing the empirical data can be a challenge when it comes to qualitative studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In contrast to the exploratory design, the explanatory and descriptive designs are commonly conducted with a quantitative approach (Saunders et al., 2009). Bryman and Bell (2011) state that the descriptive research design is used when the aim of the study is clear and well defined. The descriptive approach allows analysis of questions such as what, who, when, where and how concerning a specific situation to be made (Aaker et al., 2010). However, in order to make it possible to answer these questions as well as be successful with a descriptive design in general, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) stress the importance of having a detailed plan on how the study will be executed. This could for example mean that there are set rules about how interviews or questionnaires should be conducted (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The third form of research design is the explanatory design, which is used to investigate the relationship between variables (Saunders et al., 2009). Further Saunders et al (2009) explain that this design has the aim to see the cause and effect between different variables and more specifically which of the variables that cause and which of them that affects.

After choosing either an exploratory, descriptive or explanatory approach, Bryman and Bell (2011) state that a selection of how to gather data is needed. Common in business related research is to use experiments, case studies, comparative studies, longitudinal studies or cross-sectional studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). An experiment is a time consuming research design meaning that an experimental group is exposed to a manipulation with the aim to compare with a control group, which is not exposed to any manipulation (Saunders et al., 2009). Other designs that are time consuming are the longitudinal design and the comparative
design (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Bryman and Bell (2011) explains that the comparative design is executed when the same study is conducted on at least two different cases in order to analyse similarities and differences. Researchers in a longitudinal study are also interested in analyzing differences, but rather differences from the same sample and its change over time (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A case study is another research design and implies in-depth interest in a specific case in order to investigate new theoretical areas (Saunders et al., 2009). Lastly, when using a cross-sectional design, data is gathered at one single time with the aim to generalize results (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Surveys are often used in cross-sectional studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and Saunders et al. (2009) explain that surveys make it possible to collect a large quantity of data from a sizeable population at a low cost.

This study applied an explanatory approach since the aim was to explain the relationship between different concepts. The explanatory research design is usually conducted with a quantitative nature where the results should be quantifiable and generalizable, which also supported the selection of an explanatory approach in this study. Furthermore a cross-sectional design, and more specifically a questionnaire design, was also used in order to collect data since this study had the aim to generalize the results. The data was collected over a period of five days and because the intention of this study was to generalize the results, it was therefore needed to gather a reliable amount of data from a large population.

4.3 Data sources

There are two different sources of data that can be used in order to gather empirical material; primary data and secondary data (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). Bryman and Bell (2011) explain that primary data is always gathered by the researcher and usually with the aim to answer a particular problem within the research. There are various kinds of primary data sources such as focus groups, interviews, surveys, case studies and experiments (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In contrast to primary data, secondary data has already been gathered for another purpose (Saunders et al., 2009). Secondary data can according to Bryman and Bell (2011) be both internal and external. Internal data is gathered by the firm itself and external data is gathered from sources outside the firm, such as newspapers or Internet websites (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

There are both advantages and disadvantages with the different sources of data. Secondary data is less expensive and saves time in comparison to primary data, but since the data already has been collected for another purpose it can be a disadvantage that the data might not be
applicable to the particular research (Shukla, 2008; Saunders et al., 2009). Primary data works the other way around. Since the data is collected for a specific purpose, primary data provides exactly the information the study intends to investigate (Saunders et al., 2009). However, to gather primary data can be both more costly as well as more time consuming compared to the collection of secondary data (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

In this study primary data sources were used. The disadvantages of secondary sources in means of having data that might not be applicable to this study were not an issue as primary data was gathered. The authors wanted to have control over the data generated from the questionnaire and gather information for a specific purpose that could help answer the hypotheses of the study. Thus, a primary data collection was used.

4.4 Research strategy

There are according to Yin (2014) various strategies that can be used in order to collect data and these are archival analysis, experiment, case study, history and survey. When making a choice of what research strategy to use it is important to have in mind what is to be investigated (Saunders et al., 2009). A model including three conditions has been developed by Yin (2014) with the aim to facilitate the choice of strategy. These conditions are type of research questions, the researcher’s need of control over behavioural events and lastly the need of focus on contemporary events (Yin, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research strategy</th>
<th>Form of research question</th>
<th>Requires control over behavioural events</th>
<th>Focuses on contemporary events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.1 Research strategies (Yin, 2014, p. 9)*

After evaluating the model and the theory of the five different research strategies, a suitable strategy was selected. Since this study had the purpose to explain the relationship between e-
satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market, it was seen as appropriate to use a survey. A survey is a strategy that is suitable when the researcher wants to gather data that presents statistical results (Shukla, 2008). The strategy will help the researcher to answer study related questions such as who, what, where, how many and how much (Yin, 2014). Bryman and Bell (2011) explain that surveys are favorable since it is possible to receive large sample sizes and as a consequence being able to generalize the results. However, in order for the results to be generalizable it is crucial that the sample is representative (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Although there are many advantages with surveys, Shukla (2008) argue that since surveys focus on presenting statistical results they may not cover enough thorough information about the respondents.

The reason for using surveys as a research strategy was because the study needed to be investigated during a specific period and without any external influence that could have affected the respondent’s answers. Therefore, there was no need of control over different behavioural events. To further understand this strategy and method, surveys are described more detailed below in the data collection method.

### 4.5 Data collection method

There are different aspects to consider when collecting data. The chosen method should be consistent with the research and moreover, dependent on whether the study is quantitative or qualitative in its approach, different methods are either a less or more suitable choice to apply (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Since this study is of a quantitative nature, qualitative data collection methods were excluded, which are described by Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) as unstructured observations, unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In a quantitative study information is gathered through surveys, structured observations or experiments (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Further, Bryman and Bell (2011) state that surveys are the most suitable way of gathering data when the population is too large for observations. Since this study aimed to generalize the results of a larger population, surveys were used as data collection method.

#### 4.5.1 Surveys

A survey is research method that use a cross-sectional design and in which data are gathered by either structured interviews or by questionnaires (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In both these forms of surveys each individual is asked to answer an identical set of questions in a
prearranged order (Saunders et al., 2009). The major difference between questionnaires and structured interviews is according to Bryman and Bell (2011) that an interviewer needs to be present when it comes to the latter form of survey. Questionnaires are beneficial since they are easy to distribute to a large quantity of respondents and is a fast way of collecting data, especially online questionnaires (Yin, 2014). However, since the interviewer is not present in an online questionnaire, the risk of respondents misunderstanding the questions is higher in comparison to structured interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It is therefore crucial to have understandable questions in order to avoid misinterpretations (Yin, 2014).

In this study, an online questionnaire was used since it is a fast way of gathering data and easy to distribute to a large quantity of respondents. Since there is a high risk of respondents misunderstanding the questions in an online questionnaire, the design of the questionnaire is important.

### 4.5.2 Questionnaire design

An attractive design can make the questionnaire easier to follow and more understandable (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Saunders et al. (2009) discuss that a challenge with questionnaires is to prevent low response rates. When designing the questionnaire it is therefore important to not make it too long, as the respondents might not take the time to complete the questionnaire if it is (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). The questions in a questionnaire should be formulated in a short and concise way (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and in order to avoid misinterpretations it is crucial to not include two questions in one question and not indicate that a question’s certain answer is correct (Patel & Davidson, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). A questionnaire can have both open and/or closed questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, Bryman and Bell (2011) stress the importance of not including too many open questions since respondents commonly find these harder to answer, which in turn can affect the response rate negatively. Saunders et al. (2009) explain that closed questions are advantageous since they can be encoded and numerically analysed. This increases the possibility to statistically compare the differences and relationships between concepts (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Patel and Davidson (2011) state that before the respondents start answering a questionnaire, it is important to briefly explain its purpose. A short introduction to the questionnaires purpose was therefore included in the online questionnaire in this study. Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005) state that before asking questions regarding the actual subject, some background questions needs to be asked with the intention to get some understanding on whom the respondent is.
Therefore, the first question in the first part of the questionnaire concerned if the respondent ever had purchased home electronics online. The explanation of what home electronics is was inspired by Holm et al. (2015) and is as a consequence defined in this study as computers/computer accessories, audio and photo, mobile/tele/gps, gaming consoles, household appliances, personal care appliances and camera/video. If the answer was no, the respondent could not proceed with the questionnaire. If the answer was yes, the respondent could continue to the next question. The subsequent question concerned how often the respondents purchase home electronics online. This question had a nominal scale, which according to Aaker et al. (2010) is a scale that do not have any numerical significance and can as a consequence not be ranked. Lastly, the final question in the first part was an open question where the respondent wrote which website he or she prefers when purchasing home electronics online. This question was asked with the intention to make sure the respondents understood what type of website to think of to ensure the relevance of his/her answers.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market. For these questions a Likert scale was used, which according to Aaker et al. (2010) allows the respondent to rank how much he or she agree with a statement. The scale can be ranked from 1 to 7 where 1 indicates strongly disagree and 7 indicates strongly agree (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The quantitative data gathered through a questionnaire when using a Likert scale enables to compare the differences and relationships between variables (Aaker et al., 2010). The Likert scale was therefore seen as a suitable choice since this study wanted to explain the relationships between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

In the last part of the online questionnaire, questions regarding the respondent’s demography were asked. The reason for including questions regarding demography was to understand the degree to which the results of this study could be generalized. The first question concerned if the respondent was male or female. This question had a dichotomous scale, which according to Bryman and Bell (2011) is a scale that only contains two categories and consequently only has one interval. The second question concerned the respondent’s age. The ages were divided into three different categories; 18-33, 34-49 and 50+. The third and last question concerned the respondent’s occupation, which was divided into five categories; student, employed, unemployed, pensioner and other. For the entire questionnaire, see appendix 1.

In order to create the actual questionnaire the tool Google Drive was used. Google Drive is a
tool to create forms to be distributed over the Internet and it can easily be spread through email. The reason for choosing this tool was because the data in Google Drive is gathered in a spreadsheet that in a simple way can be imported into SPSS, which is a tool used for statistical analysis (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The amount of questions in this study was shortened in order to increase the possibility of respondents completing the questionnaire, but at the same time gather enough data. The authors of this study tried to formulate the questions in a short and concise way as well as avoided including double-barrelled questions in order to avoid misinterpretations. Most of the questions were closed because respondents find these types of questions easier to answer and in addition easier for the researchers to analyse (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Lastly, to attract the respondents to answer the online questionnaire, the authors of this study donated 1 SEK per answered questionnaire to the organization Ung Cancer.

4.5.3 Operationalization

To be able to handle the collected data, the theoretical foundation needs to be defined and related to the data (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). This is the procedure of an operationalization, which makes abstract concepts more quantifiable into practice (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It is according to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) of great importance to design a clear and accurate operationalization that describes how the theory was transformed into more concrete issues that can be studied and measured.

The different definitions of concepts, the factors measured and the items asked in this study were all inspired from well-cited articles with the exception of one item (I act loyal to this website). For each concept, three factors were measured using three items in order to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty.

The definition adopted for e-loyalty was “the customer’s favourable attitude toward an electronic business resulting in repeat buying behavior” (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003, p. 125). The first factor measured to quantify customer’s e-loyalty to an e-retailer they were familiar with was favourable attitude. To measure the behavioural aspect of an attitude, the item “I act loyal to this website” was created to increase the internal reliability of the questionnaire as all observed items in previous research regarding this aspect of favourable attitude were connected to “repeat buying behavior” which was an independent factor in this study. Repeat buying behavior was included as a factor in the questionnaire to measure the last part of e-loyalty’s definition. Additional to favourable attitude and repeat buying
behavior, word of mouth was also a factor measured within e-loyalty to based on its suggested role in creating e-loyalty by Chang et al. (2009).

Anderson and Srinivasan (2003, p. 125) define e-satisfaction as “the contentment of the customer with respect to his/her prior purchasing experience with a given electronic commerce firm” which was the adopted definition for this study. The first factor within e-satisfaction measured was expectations, which according to Flavián et al. (2006) involves customer’s initial expectations created and the results obtained. E-satisfaction is thus dependent on what customers want and what they receive from the e-retailer, which will decide the contentment of the customer with respect to his/her prior purchasing experience with the given e-retailer (Flavián et al., 2006). Product information was the second factor measured as it is argued by Bressolles et al. (2014) and Bachleda and Selmouni’s (2014) to be important in creating e-satisfaction and thus contribute to customer’s contentment. Responsiveness was the third factor measured in connection to e-satisfaction because of its impact in creating e-satisfaction by responding fast to customer’s questions and needs (Parasuraman et al., 2005), thus contributing to customer’s contentment to a prior purchase experience.

Another concept under observation in this study was e-trust, which is defined by Ribbink et al. (2004, p. 447) as “the degree of confidence customers have in online exchanges, or in the online exchange channel”. The first factor measured in e-trust was security which involves among other things if customers perceive a website secure enough to leave personal information such as credit card information to (Pavlou et al., 2007; Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003). By perceiving a website secure, customer’s might in turn have more confidence in online exchanges or in the online exchange channel. Fulfilment was the second factor measured and is connected to e.g. that the product information on web sites should be correct and that websites should keep promises regarding price, delivery time, warranties and quality (Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003). By fulfilling expectations, e-retailers might increase customer’s confidence in online exchanges or in the exchange channel. The final factor included to measure e-trust was website reputation. By having a good reputation, e-retailers might ease the perceptions of risk customers have in interacting with them which might increase the degree of confidence customers have in online exchanges, or in the online exchange channel.

The last concept and its relationship to e-loyalty that was researched in this study was convenience, which was defined as “the service attributes which help customers search
information with ease and with minimal effort” (Kim et al., 2007, p. 869). The first factor measured was user friendliness, which involved customer’s perceptions of how user friendly the site was and if product information was available. The factor intended to capture the “the service attributes which help customers search information with ease” part of the definition. Items regarding ease of use measured the degree to which customers thought it was easy to complete transactions on the website and is also connected to the purpose in the form of minimal effort. The last factor in convenience was customer effort minimizing which measured the service attributes that minimize customer effort such as search engines and organized product categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Inspired by article</th>
<th>Survey question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-loyalty</td>
<td>“The customer’s favourable attitude toward an e-retailer, resulting in repeat purchasing behaviour” (Anderson &amp; Srinivasan, 2003, p. 125).</td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Srinivasan, 2003</td>
<td>4. I believe that this is my favourite retail website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valvi &amp; Fragkos, 2012</td>
<td>5. I like using this website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. I act loyal to this website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chang et al., 2009</td>
<td>7. When I need to make a purchase, this website is often my first choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zithaml, 1996</td>
<td>8. I try to use the website whenever I need to make a purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Srinivasan, 2003</td>
<td>9. I prefer this website when I need to make a purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. I encourage friends and relatives to use the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chang et al., 2009</td>
<td>11. I recommend the website to those who seek my advice about such matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson &amp; Srinivasan, 2003</td>
<td>12. I say positive things about this website to other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zethaml, 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Srinivasan et al., 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-satisfaction</td>
<td>“The contentment of the customer with respect to his/her prior purchasing experience with a given electronic commerce firm” (Anderson &amp; Srinivasan, 2003, p. 125).</td>
<td>Flavián et al., 2006</td>
<td>13. The service I have received from this website pleased my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ofir &amp; Simonson, 2007</td>
<td>14. The way that this website has carried out transactions pleased my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. In general, this website pleased my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachleda &amp; Selmouni, 2014</td>
<td>16. The product information on this website is easy to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bressolles et al., 2014</td>
<td>17. This website gives detailed information about products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cho &amp; Park, 2001</td>
<td>18. The product information on this website is reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim et al., 2009</td>
<td>19. This website is willing to respond to my needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bansal et al., 2004</td>
<td>20. When I have a product related problem, this website shows interest in solving it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parasuraman et al., 2005</td>
<td>21. This website takes care of product related problems quickly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E-trust | “The degree of confidence customers have in online exchanges, or in the online exchange channel” (Ribbink et al., 2004, p. 447). | Pavlou et al., 2007 Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003 Kim et al., 2009 | 22. I feel secure giving out credit card information at this site  
23. I feel safe in my transactions with this website  
24. I feel my privacy is protected on this website  
25. I get what I order from this website  
26. The product is delivered in the time promised by this website  
27. The product that came is represented accurately by the website  
28. This website belongs to a large company that everyone recognizes  
29. This website is well known  
30. This website has a good reputation |
| Convenience | “The service attributes which help customers search information with ease and with minimal effort” (Kim et al., 2007, p. 869). | Seiders et al., 2007 Grewal et al., 2004 Lai et al., 2014 Srinivasan et al., 2002 Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003 Jung-Hwan et al., 2009 | 31. I can quickly find information before I shop to decide if this website has what I’m looking for  
32. I can easily determine prior to shopping whether this website offers what I need  
33. This website is a user-friendly site  
34. This website makes it easy for me to conclude my transaction  
35. I am able to complete my purchase quickly at this website  
36. It takes little time to pay for my purchase at this website  
37. This website’s search engine allows me to find what I want  
38. This site has well-organized product categories  
39. The search function on this web site is easy to use  
40. Gender  
41. Age  
42. Occupation |

Table 4:1 Operationalization (own)

### 4.5.4 Pre-test

A pre-test is performed to generate valuable information on how the study should be designed in order to be as relevant and easy to understand as possible (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Bryman and Bell (2011) explain that the feedback received from a pre-test can help to improve potential deficits before conducting the real study. Pretesting is particularly important when conducting a questionnaire that is self-completing, since there will not be any moderator disposable to answer possible questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A pre-test was therefore conducted with the intention to test if the questions in the questionnaire were easy to understand.
The pre-test occurred in three different steps. The first step involved a tutoring session with Martin Amsteus, senior lecturer at Linnaeus University, which resulted in that some questions were excluded from the questionnaire and some new questions were added. Amsteus was selected since he was believed to be very knowledgeable within the field of marketing. During the second step the updated questionnaire was translated into Swedish (see appendix 2) and further evaluated by Amsteus since he was believed to have good knowledge of English. The reason for translating the questionnaire from English to Swedish was to avoid the risk of the respondents misunderstanding the questions, since the respondents were more familiar with the Swedish language. After the evaluation some minor changes were made. In the third and last step three randomly chosen individuals were asked to answer the questionnaire and provide feedback on what could be clarified. The questionnaire was subsequently seen as completed and ready to be delivered to the respondents.

4.6 Sampling

There are according to Aaker et al. (2010) two different types of studies that can be used when investigating a problem; census study and sample study. In a census study the entire population needs to be studied, which gives a more precise result compared to a sample study. However, a common problem with a census study is the aspect of time and cost it involves (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In a sample study only a segment of the population is chosen to be studied (Aaker et al., 2010; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Aaker et al. (2010) argue that a sample study is more cost- and time efficient in comparison to a census study. The authors of this study therefore chose to conduct a sample study due to potential time- and cost issues in a consensus study.

After choosing a sample study, a decision has to be made on how to sample the population and there are two different sample methods; probability sample or non-probability sample (Esaiasson et al., 2012). In a probability sample all the members of a population has an equal probability to be picked out, while in a non-probability sample specific members of the population have higher probability to be selected than others (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Esaiasson et al. (2012) argue that the results from a probability sample to a larger extent can be generalizable to the whole population, but also that the method is difficult to conduct as well as more time consuming in comparison to a non-probability sample. As a consequence this study used a non-probability sample, mainly because of the lack of time. But also due to the limited opportunity the authors felt they had in reaching out to randomly selected individuals who had purchased home electronics online.
There are according to Bryman and Bell (2011) three types of non-probability sampling; quota sample, convenience sample and snowball sample. The latter is a technique where the researcher selects individuals who are appropriate to the study and then uses these individuals to identify others that are suitable for the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Snowball sampling is a simple and efficient method and the aim is to reach more and more individuals outside the researcher’s familiarity (Esaiasson et al., 2012). This can in turn lead to that the researcher has less control over the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Nevertheless, a snowball sampling was used in this study since it is a convenient and efficient way to reach out to a large number of respondents. The questionnaire was distributed to family and friends through email and Facebook, which then were asked to distribute it further in order to increase the numbers of respondents. In order to increase the control over the sample, questions concerning the respondent’s age, gender and occupation were asked.

4.6.1 Sampling frame

A sampling frame is a framework of characteristics that the respondents should possess in order to be a part of the sample (Patel & Davidson, 2011). Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that a sampling frame should be accurate and extensive, otherwise the derived sample is not considered to be representative of the population.

The first question in the questionnaire determined if the respondent’s answers were relevant for this study or not. The question concerned whether or not the respondent ever had purchased home electronics online. If the answer was no, the respondent was kindly told that this study required individuals who have purchased home electronics online. Moreover, the respondent was also told in the introduction text of the questionnaire that he or she needed to be at least 18 years old in order to participate. The reason for this was because individuals less than 18 years old need parental permission to answer questionnaires and there was no way to ensure that these respondents would have this.

4.6.2 Sampling procedure and sample size

Aaker et al. (2010) state that by using different distribution channels, the risk of sampling bias decreases and the sample becomes more representative of the population. Responses were therefore gathered through three different distribution channels. The first channel was an open event at the social networking website Facebook, in which initially 884 of the author's’ Facebook-friends were invited. The invited friends also had the opportunity to invite other
individuals to the event, which contributed to a snowball effect. In the second channel the questionnaire was published at Media Markt’s, Net on Net’s and Siba’s Facebook pages. The aim was also to publish the questionnaire at Elgiganten’s Facebook page, but due to the company’s policy restrictions this was not possible. The three Facebook pages have in total more than 150 000 followers, but it is hard to say how many individuals that were reached this way. In the third channel the questionnaire was spread via the author's’ family and friends to their different workplaces. The questionnaire was distributed by email to an initial contact that identified others that was seen as suitable for the study, completely without influence of the authors. It is therefore hard to say how many individuals that were reached through this channel.

Bryman and Bell (2011) discuss that there is no clear answer on how large a sample should be and the decision regarding the sample size is dependent on several variables such as precision, time and money. However, a reasonable sample size when a researcher is interested in the relationships between variables is according to Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) 50 responses. The authors of this study speculated that approximately 1000 individuals were reached through the event at Facebook after the initial 884 individuals had the chance to invite others. The questionnaire was also spread to family and friends who distributed it further to their co-workers via email. The amount of people reached this way can only be speculated but considering how many the questionnaire was sent out to, 50 individuals reached seemed reasonable. Lastly, the amount of individuals reached through the channel where the questionnaire was published at different companies’ Facebook pages was impossible to answer. In total, it was speculated that at least 1050 individuals were reached by the questionnaire. All in all, 182 individuals answered the questionnaire, which is more than the 50 responses that Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) argue is a prerequisite. The response rate, which according to Bryman and Bell (2011) is the percentage of a sample that agrees to take part in a questionnaire, was consequently 17.33%.

4.7 Data analysis

The collected data from the questionnaire in this study was analysed in SPSS. The following steps for the data analysis was used: Data coding, descriptive statistics, regression analysis, correlation analysis and a reliability analysis.
4.7.1 Data coding

In order to be able to analyse and compare data statistically it is important to code survey answers with numbers to calculate the mean, median and mode (Bryman & Bell, 2011). After the survey was answered by 182 respondents, which was deemed enough to make the study credible. The questions that were asked in a Likert scale had answering options from 1-7 where 1 was strongly disagree and 7 was strongly agree. The respondent’s answers were given the same number in SPSS that they answered on the survey, i.e. if a respondent answered 3 on a question it was coded as 3 in SPSS. Questions regarding gender and age were asked using a nominal scale and were coded differently from the Likert scale questions. Gender was coded as 1=male and 2=female, the age question was divided into three options and coded as follows, 1=18-33 years, 2=34-49 and 3=50+.

4.7.2 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics is the data, which is presenting the population of interest in the study conducted. It is presented in basic forms of statistics and it could e.g. be median, mean, mode frequencies (Nardi, 2003). By doing such statistical calculations the researcher can for example see differences between indicators and items used. These calculations can be put into e.g. tables, diagrams, graphs and pie charts (Malhotra & Birks, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2011). After the data collection the researchers analysed the data in SPSS in order to simplify the analysis of information and the respondents’ answers in each assumption were put together and mean, median and mode was calculated. In order to present data about the demographic distribution pie charts were used. In order to clarify the respondents’ opinions in each assumption in respective subject; e-satisfaction, e-trust, convenience and e-loyalty, the data was conducted in different tables. The standard deviation was also calculated in order to see how the most frequent answers varied from the mean in each item.

4.7.3 Regression analysis

The authors in this study used a linear regression analysis in order to see the relation between the independent and dependent variables (Aaker et al., 2010). A regression analysis shows the effect a independent variable has on a dependent variable. It also measures to what extent a dependent variable explains the variation in a dependent variable (Neuman, 2003). In order to determine how much a dependent variable can be explained by an independent variable, the adjusted R square is used (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008). Another value that often is used in a regression analysis is the beta value, which defines how much an independent variable will
change the dependent variable (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008).

### 4.7.4 Correlation analysis

The researchers conducted a correlation analysis in order to see if the variables had a significant relationship. If the correlation measures over 0.9 the correlation indicates that it measures the same thing (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008). A p-value allows the researcher to determine if the result is significant. A p-value of 0.05 is a common p-value for social science research and means that the level of significance is 95 percent. Therefore, a p-value of at least 95 percent was used in this study (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008).

A technique to measure a relationship between variables is Pearson’s $r$ (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). If the correlation coefficient is close to 1, it indicates that the relationship is strong and if the coefficient is close to zero it indicates that the relationship is weak (Bryman & Bell, 2011). According to Dancey and Reidy (2004) a correlation coefficient below 0.3 indicates a weak relationship and it mean that the items is too diverse not measuring the same thing. Further, a correlation coefficient between 0.3 and 0.9 indicates an existing relationship. However, if the value is over 0.9 it indicates that the items is measuring the same concept (Dancey & Reidy, 2004).

### 4.8 Quality Criteria

According to Bryman and Bell (2011), validity and reliability are the most important quality criteria when conducting the measurement instruments of a study. Validity ensures that the measurement instruments measures what it is supposed to. Reliability is a quality criterion that is connected to the stability of the measurement instrument (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

#### 4.8.1 Reliability

Reliability is described by Bryman and Bell (2011) as the consistency of measuring a specific concept and there are three factors that explain the concept: stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency. Stability refers to if a measure is stable over a certain period of time and by doing that the researcher can be sure that result connected to that measure for a specific sample of respondents not vary (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Internal reliability refers to the issue whether the different questions are related to each other and if the variables are connected to each other. It also concerns if the questions asked are relevant and actually measures what they intend to measure. The inter-observer consistency refers to the issue when
there are two or more observers in a study and where there is risk for subjective judgements (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, in this study only closed question have been asked in the questionnaire, which leads to that subjective judgements have been excluded. In order to decide the internal reliability, Cronbach’s alpha is a commonly used tool (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In order to be able to draw conclusions from the data, a value over 0.7 is preferred (Cortina, 1993). Therefore, all variables, which had a value over 0.7 were determined as reliable.

4.8.2 Validity

Content validity, also called face validity shows if the measure reflects the content in the intended question. Content validity allows the researcher to control that the measurement reflects the concept under investigation (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In order to ensure content validity, one senior lecturer at Linnaeus University within the field of research were given the opportunity to evaluate and critically express his thoughts regarding the operationalization in order to see if the measurement and theoretical concepts was measured in a correct way. Furthermore, a small pre-test was conducted with three respondents in the intended population in order to see if the respondents understood the questions. In this study the measurement instruments had been used in previous research, however it was translated into Swedish, which could have decreased the content validity of the study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Construct validity is according to Bryman and Bell (2011) the level to which an operationalization measures the concept it is supposed to measure. In this study construct validity was established through the operationalization of the investigated concepts and by doing this the researchers ensured that the used data collection instruments was measured in the correct way. However, the construct validity might also have been affected by the translation of the questionnaire and hence it is possible that the construct validity decreased.

External validity is described as the extent to which the result of a study can be generalized beyond the certain research topic (Bryman & Bell, 2011). It is crucial to be aware about the problems of how individuals and organizations are selected to be a part of the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

4.9 Source criticism

Thurén (2013) argue about the importance of critically evaluating a source in order to get an understanding of how reliable the source is. There various principles that can be used with the aim to evaluate a source and Alexanderson (2012) as well as Thurén (2013) identify four of them; trustworthy, time-related, independent and freedom of tendency. In order to be as
trustworthy and independent as possible a source should be primary and not be a copy of another source (Alexanderson, 2012). The information in the source has to be what it is claimed to be and the source should also be time related, which in general means that the older one source is the less reliable it becomes (Thurén, 2013). Lastly, Alexanderson (2012) states that the source should be free of influences that are individual, political or economical.

This study was conducted with regard to the source criticism explained in the paragraph above. The authors in this study put emphasis on that the articles should include an abstract, an introduction, a method, a discussion and a reference list in order to decide the nature of the scientific articles. In addition, all the sources used in this study were controlled through the database Ulrichsweb to ensure that they were peer-reviewed. The majority of the scientific articles used were published during 21st century. However some articles, such as Keller (1993) and Zeithaml et al. (1996), can by the reader be considered to be old. These articles are used to explain loyalty towards a retailer in the traditional marketplace and not specifically in an online context. The articles are in addition well cited and therefore deemed to be relevant for this study. Lastly, the source “E-barometern 2014 årsrapport”, by Holm et al. (2015) is an electronic source and not scientific in its nature. This source was used only for the definition of home electronics.

4.10 Ethical principles

When conducting research there are some ethical principles to take into consideration (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The research should according to Nardi (2003) not harm the participants, either physically or mentally. The research should also not invade on the participant’s right of privacy and the participant should be aware of that he or she is a part of the research as well as what the research is about (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Lastly, Aaker et al. (2010) argue that it is important that the gathered data is used in a way it was initially intended for.

In this quantitative study the above mentioned ethical principles were taken into consideration as much as possible. The questionnaire in this study included an introduction text in which the intention of this study was stated as well as the assurance that the participants would be anonymous. The questionnaire included a few questions, such as age and occupation, which could have been perceived as private and sensitive. However, since the participants were anonymous, the authors believe that this study did not invade on the participant’s right of privacy. In order to take part in this study the participants were needed to click on a link to the online questionnaire themselves, which indicates that the participant was aware of the
participation of the study. Lastly, the authors do not think that any individual in this study has been harmed mentally by participating and can reassure that the collected information was used only for the purpose of this study.

### 4.11 Methodology summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research approach</th>
<th>Deductive</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research design</td>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection method</td>
<td>Online questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Snowball sampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Data coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality criteria</td>
<td>Validity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.2* Methodological summary (own)
5. Results

This chapter presents the data collected through the online questionnaire. Firstly, the distribution of gender, age and occupation is presented, followed by the respondents purchase frequency. Further the average variables as well as the validity and reliability in this study is presented. Lastly, the result from the hypothesis is presented followed by the results from the other explaining information.

5.1 Descriptive information

The figures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 are presenting the distribution of gender, age and occupation of the respondents from the questionnaire. There were in total 182 respondents in this study and out of these, 66% were men and 34% women. 65% of the respondents were in the age group 18-33, 17.5% in the age group 34-49 and 17.5% in the age group 50+. Regarding the occupation of the respondents, 48% were employed, 41% were students, 5.5% were pensioners, 4.5% were unemployed and 1 % other.

![Respondents: Gender](image)

Figure 5.1 Respondents gender (own)
Figure 5.2 Respondents age (own)

Respondents: Age

- 18-33: 65%
- 34-49: 17.5%
- 50+: 17.5%

Figure 5.3 Respondents occupation (own)

Respondents: Occupation

- Employed: 48%
- Students: 41%
- Pensioners: 4.5%
- Unemployed: 1%
- Other: 5.5%
5.1.1 Respondents’ purchase frequency

![Figure 5.4 Respondents: Purchase frequency (own)](image)

The figure 5.4 presents how often the respondents purchase home electronics online. 58% of the respondents purchase home electronics online once a year or less and 34% sometime every sixth month. 7% of the respondents purchase home electronics online sometime every month and 1% each week.

5.1.2 Average variables

The tables below are presenting the mean of the respondent’s answers to the questions regarding their e-loyalty, e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience towards an online retailer of home electronics. There is one table per variable and the values of mean, median and mode are shown for each specific variable. The values are based on the answers of 182 respondents on a scale from 1-7, where 1 indicates strongly disagree and 7 indicates strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-loyalty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1 E-loyalty (own)*

The table 5.1 presents the respondent’s answers to the questions regarding e-loyalty toward an online retailer of home electronics. The result is showing that the respondents on average are loyal with a mean of 4.261 a median of 5 and a mode of 6.
Table 5.2 E-satisfaction (own)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 5.2 presents the respondents answers to the questions regarding their e-satisfaction toward an online retailer of home electronics. The result is showing that the respondents on average are satisfied with a mean of 5.046, a median of 5 and a mode of 6.

Table 5.3 E-trust (own)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 5.3 presents the respondents answers to the questions regarding their e-trust toward an online retailer of home electronics. The result is showing that the respondents on average have a high e-trust with a mean of 5.617, a median of 6 and a mode of 7.

Table 5.4 Convenience (own)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 5.4 presents the respondents answers to the questions regarding the convenience of an online retailer of home electronics. The result is showing that the respondents on average find the website to be convenient with a mean of 5.405, a median of 6 and a mode of 6.
### Table 5.5 Mean & Standard deviation (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-loyalty in average</td>
<td>4.261</td>
<td>1.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-satisfaction in average</td>
<td>5.046</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-trust in average</td>
<td>5.617</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience in average</td>
<td>5.405</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 5.5 presents a summation of the average values as well as the standard deviation for each variable. The standard deviation is showing how much each answer on average differed from the mean of the variable. E-loyalty has a deviation of 1.559, e-satisfaction 1.137, e-trust 1.063 and convenience 1.102.

### 5.2 Reliability and Validity

#### 5.2.1 Reliability

A reliability test was carried out in order to ensure that the questions in the questionnaire corresponded with the measured concept. This study aimed at having a Cronbach’s alpha of at least 0.7 for each variable since it according to Cortina (1993) would demonstrate an acceptable reliability. Table 5.6 presents the Cronbach’s alpha value for each variable as well as the amount of questions that were used to measure the variables. At least three items on each variable was asked to measure e-loyalty, e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience, which is the minimum amount when measuring variables. All of the variables in this study had a Cronbach’s alpha of at least 0.7 and were therefore considered to be reliable.

### Table 5.6 Reliability test (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>E-loyalty</th>
<th>E-satisfaction</th>
<th>E-trust</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Validity test - Correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-loyalty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-trust</strong></td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience</strong></td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Correlation analysis (own)

Table 5.7 presents the correlation between the variables in this study. None of the variables had a correlated value of above .741, which can be identified by the value of Pearson Correlation. Nolan and Heinzen (2008) argue that the correlation value should not be over 0.9, thus it can be confirmed that e-loyalty, e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience does not measure the same theoretical field. The P-value, which can be identified by the value on Sig. (1-tailed), was .000 for all the variables and this indicates a significance of over 95 % for all variables.

5.3 Hypothesis testing

In this section H1, H2 and H3 are tested and a regression analysis was conducted in order to analyse the hypothesis. The important criteria to be fulfilled for the hypotheses to be supported are that they have a positive B value and significance below 0.05.

5.3.1 Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.741 a</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>1.04944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Hypothesis 1 (own)

Table 5.8 presents the result of hypothesis 1. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing how much of the dependent variable e-loyalty can be explained by the independent
variable e-satisfaction in percentage. The adjusted R square is shows that 54.7% of e-loyalty can be explained by e-satisfaction.

Table 5.9 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-satisfaction. The value of B in the table shows that when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by 1.016. In order to reject H0, the significance, which is presented in the last column of the table should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-satisfaction is .000, which implies that e-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market and that the relationship is statistically significant, hence H1 was supported.

### 5.3.2 Hypothesis 2

Table 5.10 presents the result of hypothesis 2. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing how much of the dependent variable e-loyalty can be explained by the independent variable e-trust in percentage. The adjusted R Square shows that 29.2% of e-loyalty can be explained by e-trust.

### Table 5.9 Regression analysis hypothesis 1 (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.866</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>-2.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-satisfaction</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>14.817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.10 Regression analysis hypothesis 2 (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.544*</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.31221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.11 Regression analysis hypothesis 2 (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-trust</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>8.692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-trust. The value of B in the table shows that when the level of e-trust increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .797. In order to reject H0, the significance that is presented in the last column of the table should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-trust is .000, which implies that e-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market and that the relationship is statistically significant, hence H2 was supported.

### 5.3.3 Hypothesis 3

Table 5.12 presents the result of hypothesis 3. The value of the adjusted R square in the table shows how much of the dependent variable e-loyalty can be explained by the independent variable convenience in percentage. The adjusted R square is showing that 40.5% of e-loyalty can be explained by convenience. The independent variable convenience is therefore positively related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>1.20301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.12 Regression analysis hypothesis 3 (own)*

Table 5.13 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable convenience. The value of B in the table shows that when the level of convenience increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .903. In order to reject H0, the significance, which is presented in the last column of the table should have a value under 0.05. The significance for convenience is .000, which implies that convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market and that the relationship is statistically significant, hence H3 was supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>-1.386</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>11.138</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.13 Regression analysis hypothesis 3 (own)*
5.4 Other explaining information

Regression analyses of e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience were conducted in relation to the respondent’s age and gender in order to strengthen the results and to see if they could be generalized over a larger population.

5.4.1 Differences between genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference in e-satisfaction between genders</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.768&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.97675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.692&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>1.19794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14 E-satisfaction between genders (own)

Table 5.14 presents how the independent variable e-satisfaction is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market among the genders. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by e-satisfaction in percentage. The adjusted R Square shows that 58.7% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-satisfaction among men and 46.9% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-satisfaction among women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-satisfaction between genders</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>13.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (Constant)</td>
<td>-0.903</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female E-satisfaction</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>7.353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 E-satisfaction between genders (own)

Table 5.15 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-satisfaction and the differences of that relationship among genders. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1, e-
loyalty increases by 1.012 among men. Among women, e-loyalty increases by 1.027 when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance which is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-satisfaction is .000 for both men and women. This implies that the results of H1 can be generalized to both men and women.

Table 5.16 E-trust between genders (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference in e-trust between genders</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>1.24908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>1.44918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16 presents how the independent variable e-trust is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market among the genders. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by e-trust in percentage. Adjusted R Square is showing that 32.5 % of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-trust among men and 22.3 % of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-trust among women.

Table 5.17-trust between genders (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-trust between genders</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>E-trust</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.495</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>-.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-trust</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>4.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-trust and the differences of that relationship among genders. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of e-trust increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .781 among men. Among women, e-loyalty increases by .838 when the level of e-trust
increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance that is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-trust is .000 for both men and women. This implies that the results of H2 can be generalized to both men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference in convenience between genders</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.708b</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>1.07801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.506b</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>1.43005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18 Convenience between genders (own)

Table 5.18 presents how the independent variable convenience is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market among genders. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by convenience in percentage. The adjusted R square is showing that 49.7% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by convenience among men and 24.4% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by convenience among women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convenience between genders</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant) Male</td>
<td>-.828</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>10.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant) Female</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>4.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 Convenience between genders (own)

Table 5.19 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable convenience and the differences of that relationship among genders. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of convenience increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .948 among men. Among women, e-loyalty increases by .797 when the level of convenience increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance which is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The
significance of convenience is .000 for both men and women. This implies that the results of H3 can be generalized to both men and women.

5.4.2 Differences between age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-satisfaction Respondents age</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.96365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-49</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.81562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>1.29287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20 E-satisfaction in different age groups (own)

Table 5.20 presents how the independent variable e-satisfaction is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market within the different age groups. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by e-satisfaction in percentage. The adjusted R square is showing that 53.6% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-satisfaction in the age group 18-33 and 48.2% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-satisfaction in the age group 34-49. In the age group 50+, 49.6% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-satisfaction Regression analysis of independent variable e-satisfaction</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>-1.089</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-satisfaction</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>11.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-49</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>5.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1.877</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>-1.615</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>5.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.21 E-satisfaction in different age groups (own)
Table 5.21 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-satisfaction and the differences of that relationship between the different age groups. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .888 in the age group 18-33. In the age group 34-49, e-loyalty increases by .985 when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1 and in the age group 50+, e-loyalty increases by 1.199 when the level of e-satisfaction increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance that is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-satisfaction is 0.000 for all three age groups. This implies that the results of H1 can be generalized to all the age groups included in this study.

Table 5.22 E-trust in different age groups (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-trust</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>.561b</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>1,17645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-49</td>
<td>.596b</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.92570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>.545b</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1,55150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22 presents how the independent variable e-trust is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market within the different age groups. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by e-trust in percentage. The adjusted R square is showing that 30.9% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-trust in the age group 18-33 and 33.3% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-trust in the age group 34-49. In the age group 50+, 27.3% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by e-trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-trust</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-trust</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>7.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-49</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.23 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable e-trust and the differences of that relationship between the different age groups. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of e-trust increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by 0.672 in the age group 18-33. In the age group 34-49, e-loyalty increases by 1.045 when the level of e-trust increases by 1 and in the age group 50+, e-loyalty increases by 1.085 when the level of e-trust increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance that is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The significance of e-trust is .000 for two out of three age groups, in the age group 50+, the significance is .001. This implies that the results of H2 can be generalized to all of the age groups included in this study.

Table 5.24 presents how the independent variable convenience is related to the dependent variable e-loyalty in a high involvement market within the different age groups. The value of the adjusted R square in the table is showing the extent to which e-loyalty can be explained by convenience in percentage. The adjusted R square is showing that 43.4% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by convenience in the age group 18-33 and 50.5% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by convenience in the age group 34-49. In the age group 50+, 25.1% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market can be explained by convenience.
### Table 5.25 Convenience in different age groups (own)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>-1.710</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.25 presents the relationship between the dependent variable e-loyalty and the independent variable convenience and the differences of that relationship between the age groups. The value of B in the table is showing that when the level of convenience increases by 1, e-loyalty increases by .790 in the age group 18-33. In the age group 34-49, e-loyalty increases by .925 when the level of convenience increases by 1 and in the age group 50+, e-loyalty increases by 1.101 when the level of convenience increases by 1. In order to support the hypotheses in this study, the significance that is presented in the last column of the table, should have a value under 0.05. The significance for convenience is .000 for two out of three age groups, in the age group 50+, the significance is .002. This implies that the results of H3 can be generalized to all of the age groups included in this study.
6. Discussion

This chapter consist of a discussion regarding the results from the online questionnaire in relation to the hypothesis. The discussion is connected the purpose of the study as well as the theory in the literature review.

6.1 Discussion e-loyalty

The results of this research shows that the respondent’s level of e-loyalty on average was low toward the e-retailer they had in mind when answering the questionnaire compared to the three related variable’s mean scores. It is however important to note that despite e-loyalty’s relatively low score, the respondents had a score over 4 on average which means that they were loyal, even if just slightly to the website in mind. There are several potential explanations for this relatively low score, the small cost for customers to switch e-retailer mentioned by Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) could be a possible explanation. The frequency of purchases of high-involvement products could also be an influential aspect affecting e-loyalty. To elaborate, when customers plan to purchase high-involvement products they usually spend more time searching for information to make sure they are satisfied with the purchase as there is often a lot of money involved in the purchase (Pavlou et al., 2007; Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003). The extent of this pre-purchase research among customers could be another possible challenge in building e-loyalty for e-retailers and an explanation for the low e-loyalty value in high involvement markets. This because even if customers find what they need on their preferred website they might move on to other websites regardless because of the social and financial risks of purchasing high-involvement products (Anderson & Srinivasan, 2003).

6.1 Discussion hypothesis 1

H1: E-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

Prior to conducting the research it was hypothesised that e-satisfaction is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market. The B-value of 1.016 indicates that the relationship is positive and statistically significant with a p value under 0.05, which means that H1 was supported. These findings show that when e-satisfaction increases, e-loyalty increases by an even larger amount. The positive relationship between the two concepts is in line with the findings of e.g. Lin and Chia-Chi (2009) and Kim et al. (2009) who both discuss the importance of e-satisfaction in creating e-loyalty. The adjusted r square indicates that 54.7%
of e-loyalty can be explained by e-satisfaction in a high involvement market, and the remaining percent by other factors.

Out of the three concepts related to e-loyalty investigated in this research, e-satisfaction had the strongest relation to e-loyalty, which is in line with the findings of e.g. Jin et al. (2008) who found a strong positive relationship between the two concepts. Anderson and Srinivasan (2003) stress the importance of e-satisfaction by claiming that if companies fail to satisfy, customers are likely to take their business elsewhere and become reluctant to develop a relationship with the company, prohibiting the development of e-loyalty. The strength of the relationship observed in this study can also be connected to the low switching costs for customers to switch websites in the e-commerce setting. Should an e-retailer fail to satisfy a customer it takes little time to switch website and e-loyalty might as a result not develop. The strong relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty suggests that e-retailers can generate e-satisfaction by fulfilling customers expectations, provide detailed product information and be responsive to customer’s needs and wants.

6.2 Discussion hypothesis 2

H2: E-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

Prior to conducting this research it was hypothesized that e-trust is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market. The adjusted R square showed that 29.2% of e-loyalty can be explained by e-trust in a high involvement market which was the weakest relationship observed in this study. The B-value of .797 shows that the relationship is positive and it was statistically significant with a p-value under 0.05, as a result, H2 was supported. The relatively low B score of e-trust compared to e-satisfaction shows that e-trust does not have as large of an impact in creating e-loyalty.

The findings regarding the positive relationship between e-loyalty and e-trust is in line with e.g. Flavián et al.’s. (2006) and Kim et al.’s. (2009) findings. There are several potential reasons why e-trust had the weakest relationship to e-loyalty but none that can be stated with certainty based on this study’s results. Chung et al. (2009) discuss the increasing popularity of e-retailing and a result of this could be that customers trust e-retailers to a greater extent nowadays than previously. Another aspect that could have influenced the results was that the respondents in this study were asked to think of a website they were familiar with when purchasing home electronics online. If they are familiar with the website it might be a well known website that they already trust but might not be loyal to for other reasons. It is however
important to note that even if e-trust had the weakest relationship to e-loyalty observed in this study, the relationship was still strong as it explained nearly 30% of e-loyalty in a high involvement market. According to Garbarino & Johnson (1999), e-trust is an important aspect in creating e-loyalty as it plays a vital role for customers to make a first time purchase of a product or service from an e-retailer which is the starting point of e-loyalty. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that e-trust scored highest on the questionnaire and the relationship is low because the respondents were barely loyal to the websites they had in mind which indicates that security, fulfilment and the website’s reputation are very important aspects in creating e-trust.

6.3 Discussion hypothesis 3

H3: Convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market.

Prior to conducting this research it was hypothesized that convenience is positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market. The B-value of .903 for convenience shows that its relationship to e-loyalty is positive and its p-value was lower than 0.05 and thus statistically significant, which means that H3 was supported. The adjusted R square of convenience indicated that 40.5% of e-loyalty could be explained by convenience in a high involvement market. These findings are contradictory to Srinivasan et al. (2002) who found no significant relationship between convenience and e-loyalty.

Out of the three relationships that was researched in this study, the relationship between convenience and e-loyalty was the most unexplored. The results of this study are in line with Rahman and Khan’s (2014) study in which they find a significant relationship between convenience and e-loyalty as well. The strength of the relationship was however stronger than expected. A possible explanation is provided by Kim et al. (2007) who state that individuals who shop online may do so to save time. A convenient website would reduce the time and effort needed from customers, which might lead to the same customer using the website again, resulting in e-loyalty. An unexpected observation is that the relationship between convenience and e-loyalty was least significant in the age group 50+ (0.02). The observation is unexpected because it can be assumed that this age group is the least comfortable and familiar with e-retailers of the age groups included in this study. The results indicate that e-retailers need to make their webpages user friendly, customer effort minimizing and allow for easy completion of transactions.
6.4 Discussion genders

Among the 182 respondents, 34% (61) were women and 66% (121) were men. A regression analysis was conducted in order to understand the degree to which the results of this study are generalizable and to provide a basis for future research.

The results when comparing men and women in respect to the concepts showed that e-satisfaction played a bigger role in creating e-loyalty for men than for women. The relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty were positive for both genders and the relationships were also both statistically significant. This means that the results of H1 can be generalized to larger populations of both genders but to a larger extent among men than women based on the gender distribution of the respondents (for all hypotheses).

E-trust explained more of e-loyalty among men than women and the relationship between these concepts were both positive as well as statistically significant. This means that the results of H2 can be generalized to larger populations for both genders.

Regarding convenience and its relationship to e-loyalty among genders, it explained e-loyalty to a greater extent among men than women and both of the relationships were positive and statistically significant. This means that H3 can be generalized to larger populations for both genders.

The fact that all three concepts explained e-loyalty to a greater extent among men than women suggests that these concepts are more relevant for e-retailers with men as their target group. It is important to note that all concepts were positively related to e-loyalty among women as well but that there might be more influential concepts in creating e-loyalty, what concepts are more influential is however based on the results of study impossible to say.

6.5 Discussion age groups and occupation

The majority of respondents (65%) in this research were between the ages of 18-33 and the rest of the respondents were between the ages of 34-49 and 50+ with 17.5% of respondents in each category respectively.

In all the age groups, the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty were all positive and statistically significant. This suggests that the findings of this study is not limited to any particular age group but it would be preferable to replicate the study with more respondents between the ages 34-49 and 50+ to ensure the generalizability to this age group.
The occupation of the respondents was not seen as an issue in generalizing the results as it was perceived to be representative for a larger population.
7. Conclusion

The conclusion of the study is presented in this chapter, where the purpose of the study is answered.

The findings of this study suggest that e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience are all positively related to e-loyalty in a high involvement market and hence H1, H2 and H3 are supported. E-satisfaction showed to have the strongest relationship to e-loyalty, convenience the second strongest relationship to e-loyalty and e-trust the weakest relationship to e-loyalty. In a high involvement market, e-satisfaction is considered to explain 54.7% of e-loyalty, e-trust is considered to explain 29.2% of e-loyalty and 40.5% of e-loyalty can be explained by convenience in a high involvement market. With a mean above 4 on all variables, the respondents in this study were considered to be loyal and satisfied to the e-retailer as well as trusting and finding their website convenient to use.

The significance for the independent variables e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience were all 0.000, which implies that the results are statistically significant and can, with caution for women and individuals older than 33 years, be generalized over a larger population. After conducting a regression analysis based on the different genders and age groups, the hypotheses were supported with these moderating variables as well, which contributed to the study’s degree of generalization.
8. Implications, limitations and future research

This chapter presents implications, both theoretical and managerial, which were developed from the findings in this study. Furthermore, the limitations of this study as well suggestions for future research are presented.

8.1 Theoretical implications

The largest theoretical implication of this study is that it attempts to fill the theoretical gap regarding e-loyalty in high involvement markets, in which there is a lack of research. The study’s findings suggest that e.g. Anderson and Srinivasan’s (2003) statement that the more money is involved in a purchase, the more important e-satisfaction is in creating e-loyalty, is true due to the strong relationship observed. Despite the relatively low scores of e-trust in this study compared to e-satisfaction and convenience it can not be said that it does not play a big part in creating e-loyalty as it explained a great deal of e-loyalty and had a strong relationship to e-loyalty as well. The most unexplored of the three concepts investigated in this research was convenience and its direct relationship to e-loyalty was un-assessed to a large extent as many studies had previously investigated its indirect relationship to e-loyalty by measuring it in relation to e-satisfaction. The findings of this study was contradictory to e.g. Anderson and Srinivasan’s (2003) study who found no direct relationship between convenience and e-loyalty as the relationship between the two concepts showed to be even stronger than e-trust’s relationship to e-loyalty. The positive relationship between convenience and e-loyalty was not only contradictory to previous research but also in line with the findings of Rahman and Khan (2014). To summarize the theoretical implications, this study explains e-satisfaction, e-trust and convenience’s relationship to e-loyalty respectively and provides a framework for future research to make the findings more generalizable.

8.2 Managerial implications

The managerial implications of this study are that it suggest what e-retailers need to focus on to generate e-loyalty in high involvement, e-commerce settings. An example of an implication that perhaps was not well known previously would be the higher importance of a website being convenient in creating e-loyalty than a trustworthy website. It also confirms previous research suggesting the importance of e-satisfaction and e-trust’s role in creating e-loyalty. The findings should be taken into strongest consideration, but not exclusively, for e-retailers targeting customers between the ages of 18-33 and preferably men because of the higher level generalizability to these demographic groups.
8.3 Limitations

Although the findings of this study have offered contributing implications, both theoretical and managerial, it has a few limitations. In this research all the respondents had at some point purchased home electronics online, which was a prerequisite in order to proceed with the questionnaire. The result may perhaps have been different if this study had included respondents that never had purchased home electronics online and as a consequence affected the relationship between the three factors and e-loyalty in a high involvement market. Another limitation related to this study concerns whether or not the result can be applied within other areas of high involvement markets. This study only covers the home electronics market and in not the complete theoretical area of high involvement markets, thus generalizability to other high involvement industries should be made with caution.

In this study a snowball sampling was used, which resulted in lack of control over the sample and hence the ability to generalize the results. Questions concerning the respondent’s age, gender and occupation were therefore asked in order to increase the control over the sample. Since snowball sampling is a technique where individuals identify others that are suitable for the study, this sampling technique led to complications when determining a precise response rate. In total, it was estimated that at least 1200 individuals were reached by the questionnaire. However, this was just a speculation and another sampling technique or distribution channel could have facilitated a more accurate estimate of the response rate.

8.4 Future research

This study set out to explain the relationship between e-satisfaction and e-loyalty, e-trust and e-loyalty as well as convenience and e-loyalty in a high involvement market. Since this study only covers the home electronics market, the authors recommend other researchers to conduct research within additional industries connected to high involvement markets such as the car industry for example. This could help to draw more accurate conclusions regarding the complete theoretical area of e-loyalty in high involvement markets. Based on the result of this study, future research could also conduct a case study for a specific company in order to help the company on a corporate level regarding how to get loyal customers online in a high involvement market. The result from this study can function as a guide in order to see what factors that have the strongest relationship towards e-loyalty in a high involvement market.
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Appendix 1

Hej! Vi är tre studenter på Linnéuniversitetet i Växjö som genomför vår kandidatuppsats och nu vill vi gärna ha din hjälp för att komma fram till en slutsats i vår studie. I den här enkäten ber vi dig besvara frågor som rör dina köp av hemelektronik på Internet. Dina svar kommer behandlas helt anonymt och du måste vara 18 år eller äldre för att svara på enkäten. Om du har några frågor kring enkäten eller vår studie är du välkommen att kontakta jj222hw@student.lnu.se.

Enkäten tar cirka 5 minuter att fylla i och som tack för din medverkan kommer vi för varje besvarad enkät skänka 1 kr till Ung Cancer, tack på förhand!

Med vänliga hälsningar,
Joakim Jörgensen, Ruben Grönevik & Pontus Sandberg

*Obligatorisk

**Har du någon gång köpt hemelektronik online?** (Datorer/datortillbehör, ljud och bild, mobil/tele/gps, spelkonsoler, elektroniska hushållsapparater, personvård/hälsa, kameror/videokameror, vitvaror) *

Ja
Nej (Om svaret är nej, tack för din medverkan men tyvärr kräver undersökningen personer som har handlat hemelektronik online)

**Hur ofta handlar du hemelektronik online?** *

Varje vecka
Någon gång i månaden
Någon gång i halvåret
Någon gång om året eller mer sällan

**Tänk på en websida du är bekant med vid köp av hemelektronik online.** *

Vilken websida tänker du på?

Vänligen besvara följande frågor med den ovanstående websidan i åtanke.

Här nedan presenteras ett antal påståenden, var vänlig läs varje påstående noggrant och kryssa i det alternativ som stämmer bäst överens för dig på en skala från 1 - 7. Svarsalternativ 1 = stämmer inte alls och 7 = stämmer helt.

**Jag anser att detta är min favoritwebsida att handla på.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag gillar att använda denna websidan.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag beter mig lojalt mot denna websidan.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**När jag behöver göra ett köp är denna websidan ofta mitt förstaval.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag försöker använda denna websidan när jag behöver göra ett köp.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag föredrar denna websidan när jag behöver göra ett köp.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag uppmuntrar mina bekanta att använda denna websidan.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag rekommenderar denna websidan till de som frågar mig om råd.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt

**Jag säger positiva saker om denna websidan till andra personer.** *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Stämmer inte alls  Stämmer helt
Servicen jag fått på denna websidan har uppfyllt mina förväntningar. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sättet denna websidan har utfört transaktioner har uppfyllt mina förväntningar. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Över lag uppfyller denna websidan mina förväntningar. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produktinformationen på denna websidan är enkel att förstå. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denna websidan ger detaljerad information om produkter. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produktinformationen på denna websidan är pålitlig. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denna websidan är villig att uppfylla mina behov. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

När jag har ett produktrelaterat problem så visar denna websidan ett intresse att lösa det. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denna websidan tar hand om produktrelaterade problem snabbt. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jag känner mig trygg att ge ut kontokortsinformation till denna websidan. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jag känner mig trygg i mina transaktioner på denna websidan. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stämmer inte alls</td>
<td>Stämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jag anser att min integritet är skyddad på denna websidan. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Jag får vad jag beställer från denna websidan. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Produkten levereras på den tid som lovas av denna websidan. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Den produkten som mottogs var korrekt presenterad av denna websidan. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Denna websidan är ett stort företag som alla känner igen. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Denna websidan är välkänd. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Denna websidan har ett bra rykte. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Innan jag handlar kan jag snabbt hitta information om denna websidan har vad jag söker. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Jag kan snabbt bedöma innan jag handlar om denna websidan erbjuder vad jag behöver. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt

Denna websidan är användarvänlig. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls Stämmer helt
Denna websidan gör det enkelt för mig att slutföra min transaktion. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Jag kan snabbt utföra mitt köp på denna websidan. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Det går fort för mig att betala för det jag ska köpa på denna websida. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Denna websidans sökfunktion hjälper mig att hitta det jag söker. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Denna websidan har välorganiserade produktkategorier. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Sökfunktionen på denna websidan är hjälpsam. *

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Stämmer inte alls    Stämmer helt

Kön *

☐ Man
☐ Kvinna

Ålder *

☐ 13-33
☐ 34-49
☐ 50+

Sysselsättning *

☐ Student
☐ Arbetar
☐ Arbetslös
☐ Pensionär
☐ Annat

Tack för din medverkan!
### Appendix 2

**Eloyalty**

1. I believe that this is my favourite retail website.
   
   Translation: Jag anser att detta är min favoritwebsida att handla på.

2. I like using this website.
   
   Translation: Jag gillar att använda denna websidan.

3. I act loyal to this website.
   
   Translation: Jag beter mig lojalt mot denna websidan.

4. When I need to make a purchase, this website is often my first choice.
   
   Translation: När jag behöver göra ett köp är denna websidan ofta mitt förstaval.

5. I try to use this website whenever I need to make a purchase.
   
   Translation: Jag försöker använda denna websidan när jag behöver göra ett köp.

6. I prefer this website when I need to make a purchase.
   
   Translation: Jag föredrar denna websidan när jag behöver göra ett köp.

7. I encourage my relatives to use this website.
   
   Translation: Jag uppmuntrar mina bekanta att använda denna websidan.

8. I recommend this website to those who seek my advice about such matters.
   
   Translation: Jag rekommenderar denna websidan till de som frågar mig om råd.

9. I say positive things about this website to other people.
   
   Translation: Jag säger positiva saker om denna websidan till andra personer.

**E-satisfaction**

10. The service I have received from this website pleased my expectations.

    Translation: Servicen jag fått på denna websidan har uppfyllt mina förväntningar.

11. The way that this website has carried out transactions pleased my expectations.

    Translation: Sättet denna websidan har utfört transaktioner har uppfyllt mina förväntningar.

12. In general, this website pleased my expectations.

    Translation: Över lag uppfyller denna websidan mina förväntningar.

13. The product information on this website is easy to understand.

    Translation: Produktinformationen på denna websidan är enkel att förstå.

14. This website gives detailed information about products.

    Translation: Denna websidan ger detaljerad information om produkter.

15. The product information on this website is reliable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Translation:</strong> Produktinformationen på denna websidan är pålitlig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. This website is willing to respond to my needs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong> Denna websidan är villig att uppfylla mina behov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. When I have a product related problem, this website shows interest in solving it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong> När jag har ett produktrelaterat problem så visar denna websidan ett intresse att lösa det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. This website takes care of product related problems quickly.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong> Denna websidan tar hand om produktrelaterade problem snabbt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-trust**

| **19. I feel secure giving out credit card information at this site.** |
| **Translation:** Jag känner mig trygg att ge ut kontokortsinformation till denna websidan. |
| **20. I feel safe in my transactions with this website.** |
| **Translation:** Jag känner mig trygg i mina transaktioner på denna websidan. |
| **21. I feel my privacy is protected on this website.** |
| **Translation:** Jag anser att min integritet är skyddad på denna websidan. |
| **22. I get what I order from this website.** |
| **Translation:** Jag får vad jag beställer från denna websidan. |
| **23. The product is delivered in the time promised by this website.** |
| **Translation:** Produkten levereras på den tid som lovas av denna websidan. |
| **24. The product that came was presented accurately by this website.** |
| **Translation:** Den produkten som mottogs var korrekt presenterad av denna websidan. |
| **25. This website is a large company that everyone recognizes.** |
| **Translation:** Denna websidan är ett stort företag som alla känner igen. |
| **26. This website is well known.** |
| **Translation:** Denna websidan är välkänd. |
| **27. This website has a good reputation.** |
| **Translation:** Denna websidan har ett bra rykte. |

**Convenience**

| **28. I can quickly find information before I shop to decide if this website has what I’m looking for.** |
| **Translation:** Innan jag handlar kan jag snabbt hitta information om denna websidan har vad jag söker. |
| **29. I can easily determine prior to shopping whether this website will offer what I need.** |
| **Translation:** Jag kan snabbt bedöma innan jag handlar om denna websidan erbjuder vad jag behöver. |
30. This website is a user-friendly site.
   Translation: Denna websidan är användarvänlig.

31. This website makes it easy for me to conclude my transaction.
   Translation: Denna websidan gör det enkelt för mig att slutföra min transaktion.

32. I am able to complete my purchase quickly at this website.
   Translation: Jag kan snabbt utföra mitt köp på denna websidan.

33. It takes little time to pay for my purchase at this website.
   Translation: Det går fort för mig att betala för det jag ska köpa på denna websida.

34. This website's search engine allows me to find what I want.
   Translation: Denna websidans sökfunktion hjälper mig att hitta det jag söker.

35. This website has well-organized product categories.
   Translation: Denna websidan har välorganiserade produktkategorier.

36. The search function on this website is helpful.
   Translation: Sökfunktionen på denna websidan är hjälpsam.

**Control questions**

37. Have you ever purchased home electronics online?
   Translation: Har du någon gång köpt hemelektronik online?

38. How often do you purchase home electronics online?
   Translation: Hur ofta handlar du hemelektronik online?

39. Think of a website you are familiar with when buying home electronics online. What website are you thinking of?
   Translation: Tänk på en websida du är bekant med vid köp av hemelektronik online. Vilken websida tänker du på?

**Demographics**

40. Gender.
   Translation: Kön.

41. Age.
   Translation: Ålder.

42. Occupation
   Translation: Sysselsättning.