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Abstract:

The predominating theories on non-product-related attributes stretch only so far to explain why some brands do not manage to succeed on foreign markets where the product needs are essentially similar to their domestic markets. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to cast new light on the theoretical field of non-product-related attributes, by unveiling which non-product-related attributes affect consumer brand preferences on similar markets. This is done by studying consumer expectations on cosmetics brands in general and brand attitudes towards a Finnish cosmetics brand, on the Swedish market.

The results suggest that most of the non-product-related attributes that are covered by predominating theories are still relevant for the formation of consumer preferences, but that new important attributes have also emerged. It was also found that the level of importance varies from attribute to attribute, and that some factors affect consumer preferences more than others. The findings serve as a basis for re-evaluating and expanding the theory of non-product-related attributes, and can help brands to succeed on similar markets.
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1 INTRODUCTION

For the past few decades brands have grown more global, as have their offerings. Global branding was initially ought to ensure consistency, but the rise of a global culture has not managed to lead to shared tastes and values among consumers across the globe. (Holt, Quelch and Taylor, 2004) Instead, standardized products and communications have left consumers confused, which has emerged a search for a regional and local identity (Kasriel-Alexander, 2014). As a response, the marketing world has adopted glocal strategies where brands maintain a global scale on their backstage activities, such as technology, production, and organization, but adapt product features, communication, distribution, and selling techniques to the local consumer tastes. Thereby, the physical product attributes such as ingredients might be the same on different markets, while companies opt to adapt the non-product-related attributes, such as price and packaging in accordance with the local market needs and expectations. (Holt et al, 2004)

Despite the rise of more local consumer needs, geographic segmentation is still based on the assumption that needs and wants are more similar in markets that are either geographically close or similar in language, climate or culture (Kotler, Saunders & Armstrong, 2005, p. 398). Consequently, large markets are subdivided into segments according to specific and unique characteristics, where customers are believed to share a similar set of needs and interests, satisfied by a distinct marketing proposition (Kazmi, 2015). Many times, this leads to splitting markets into segments by regions and paralleling nations that are physically close to each other, for instance assuming that the region of Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark and Iceland, also known as the Nordics, have the same consumer preferences (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 398). In line with this, many internationalization theories too imply that companies achieve best international performance on markets that are psychically close to them (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Magnusson & Boyle, 2009; Nordstrom & Vahlne, 1994), meaning that the foreign market is as similar as possible to the domestic market in terms of culture, business, politics, law and economic environment (Lee, 1998; Nordstrom & Vahlne, 1994). According to these theories, a business should rather easily through regional coordination be able to turn its domestic success into success on a foreign, yet similar market (Nordstrom & Vahlne, 1994).

However, O’Grady and Lane (1996) take a more critical stand and suggest that psychic or geographical closeness does not automatically translate to success. Instead, they find that this may even result in inaccurate assumptions and carelessness (O’Grady & Lane, 1996). For instance, it may seem that consumer preferences in the Nordics are homogenous, but in reality
there are many differences between the countries and the likelihood for succeeding on these markets increases when each market is considered separately (Loyalitic, 2017).

### 1.1 Research Problem

One of the many markets that have grown more global is the cosmetics market, but where consumers are paradoxically seeking for local products that feel personal to them (Cosmetics Europe, n.d). While cosmetics brands work hard trying to meet shifting consumer expectations and increased competition stemming from the industry’s growth (Armoudom & Ben-Shabat, 2012), they are also facing new challenges as the market has become more international than ever (Whitehouse, 2016). Accordingly, Jason Matthews, international regulatory and scientific director at The Body Shop states that brands can have a global assortment of products, but they need to be flexible at a local level in order to satisfy the needs and expectations of consumers in specific markets (Whitehouse, 2016).

With a vast amount of competing brands and new brands being created at a speed of light all over the world (Kastenbaum, 2017), fulfilling functional needs that only revolve around product-related attributes is not enough for differentiating and succeeding, and brands need to look beyond such functional benefits (Aaker & Joachimsthaler, 1999). To exemplify, one can have a look at the Swedish and Finnish cosmetics markets, where the consumers’ product needs are essentially similar. During the past few years both of these markets have seen a health trend where natural ingredients have grown considerably in importance (Euromonitor, 2016a; Euromonitor, 2016b) along with an increased interest for anti-ageing products (US Department of Commerce, 2015). In addition, a considerable share of the consumers in these markets have sensitive skin that is at times burdened by the harsh climate of the Nordic region, making sensitive cosmetics the leading category in both markets. Furthermore, even though the majority of both Swedes and Finns are drawn to products that offer value for money, they are also very conscious of picking the right products for their skin types. (US Department of Commerce, 2015) Consequently, in terms of product-related attributes Finnish and Swedish consumers have very similar preferences, but according to O'Grady and Lane (1996) it would be premature to assume that the markets would due to that behave the same way. Quite appropriately, the lists of the brands competing for the largest shares of the Finnish and Swedish cosmetics markets look very different (Euromonitor, 2016a; Euromonitor, 2016b). As the product-related needs in these markets are essentially similar, an explanation could be found in consumers’ preferences that concern non-product-related attributes.
In line with this, Aaker and Joachimsthaler (1999) suggest that when assessing a brand’s success, one should look beyond product functionality, and focus instead on non-product-related attributes. However, the theories that still today predominate this field are rather dated (see Aaker, 1997; Keller, 1993), and stretch only so far to explain the differences in brand performances on markets that are as similar as the Finnish and Swedish cosmetics markets. Appropriately, in 2006 Keller and Lehmann pointed out that there are areas within brand intangibles, such as non-product-related attributes, that are yet to be researched (Keller & Lehmann, 2006) and in 2016 Keller addressed concern for a lack of research on how brands can stay relevant and successful over times and across different types of consumers. He suggested that the latter is especially challenging given all the ways consumer preferences may differ for instance demographically, geographically, psychologically and behaviorally (Keller, 2016). Thus the authors of this thesis tapped into the challenge of identifying what brand intangibles affect consumer preferences across geographical markets that are similar in regards of product needs.

An investigation of existing literature and a market study about non-product-related attributes on the cosmetics market reinforced the assumption that the current theories on non-product-related attributes should be reviewed and possibly updated. Furthermore, it was found that previous research within the cosmetics market is rather product centered, and regards mostly physical components, ingredients and product functions (see Rastogi, Schouten, de Kruijf & Weijland, 2002; Torben, Risborg & Steen, 2012). Nielsen reports, Euromonitor reports and shopper studies give comprehensive overviews of the sought after product-related attributes, but give little or no information on what kinds of non-product-related attributes consumers consider important. This goes even for previous research in other areas, such as fashion goods (see Lee & Nguyen, 2016), green consumerism (see Schuitema & Groot, 2015) and food (see Lindh & Olsson, 2010; Tirelli & Pilar Martínez-Ruiz, 2014), all in which product-related attributes are somewhat explored and a lesser focus is given to non-product-related attributes.

Consequently, the theory of non-product-related attributes needs to be revisited and elaborated, in order for it to better respond to the rise of local identities in specific geographical markets. The aim of this paper is thereby to understand what non-product-related attributes affect consumer brand preferences on a foreign market, where the consumers’ product needs are essentially similar to the brand’s domestic market. Thus, this study addresses the following research question:

*Which non-product-related attributes affect consumer preferences on similar markets?*
1.2 Purpose

In order to achieve the aim, consumer expectations and brand attitudes are studied with the objective to unveil the non-product-related attributes that affect consumers. To be able to do so, a domestically successful brand will be examined on a foreign similar market, where the brand has not accomplished the same level of performance as on its domestic market.

Lumene, a Finnish cosmetics brand founded in 1970 and the object of this study, has ever since its early years managed to fight the heavy international competition, and prosper on its home market (Lumene, n.d). In 2016 the brand ranked number one in value sales and held 19.9% of the market share within the Skin Care category in Finland (Euromonitor, 2016a). 2016 was also the third year in a row for Lumene to be elected the most valued cosmetics brand in Finland, beating 1005 different local and international brands (Markkinointi & Mainonta and Taloustutkimus Oy, 2016).

Yet somehow Lumene has not managed to translate this success overseas to Sweden, an essentially similar market. Even with the company’s investments in the market (Herrala, 2017) the brand remains a relatively small actor (Euromonitor, 2016b) reaching only a 1.4% share of the Swedish Skin Care market in 2016 (Euromonitor, 2016b). This is interesting due to the country’s very close psychic and geographical distance to Finland. Despite the similar weather conditions, ways of living and values, other international and local brands keep occupying most of the shelf space (Euromonitor, 2016b). Since Lumene’s products should in terms of product features be equally functional for the consumers on the Swedish market as they are on the Finnish market, this research searches explanations for the different brand preferences from non-product-related attributes.

1.3 Definitions

Similar markets - In this thesis the term similar markets is considered as markets that are psychically close, i.e. the foreign market is similar to the domestic market in terms of culture, business, politics, law and economic environment (Lee, 1998; Nordstrom & Vahlne, 1994), and where the consumers have essentially alike product needs.

Cosmetics - The European Union defines cosmetics as any substance or preparation intended to be placed in contact with the various parts of the human body with a view of cleaning them, perfuming them, changing their appearance, correcting body odours, protecting them or keeping them in good condition (Cosmetics Info, 2016). However, for the purpose of this study
cosmetics will refer only to the categories of facial skin care and makeup, as these are Lumene’s main product categories.

1.4 The Swedish cosmetics market

A market study, which the authors conducted about the cosmetics market and factors affecting consumers’ choice of brands, suggests that there may be new, more modern, non-product-related attributes that should be considered when studying brand performance. Firstly, there is an increased concern regarding green and ethical aspects within the cosmetics market worldwide. For instance, Mintel’s research on Global Trends within Personal Care and Beauty for 2018 shows an increased demand for locally produced and sourced everyday items, including cosmetics (Mintel, 2017). More specifically in Sweden, a growing area within the cosmetics market is the engagement for sustainability. Bonnier Magazines & Brands found that three out of four respondents thought it was quite or really important to shop sustainable products when it comes to beauty (Bonnier Magazines & Brands, 2017). Moreover, 45% of Swedish cosmetics consumers reported that they are prepared to pay more or a lot more for sustainable products (Bonnier Magazines & Brands, 2017). Also the awareness about animal testing has increased, and consumers seem to be especially invested in this issue when it concerns beauty products (Russo, 2015). Today’s theories on non-product-related attributes do not cover any green or ethical aspects (see Aaker, 1997; Diamantopoulos et al., 2011; Keller, 1993).

Another aspect of a brand, that is not included in prevalent theories of non-product-related attributes (see Aaker, 1997; Diamantopoulos et al., 2011; Keller, 1993) is the channels in which a brand can be found, seen, interacted with and bought. In the modern world this is of increased concern, as the variety of channels available for brands has grown drastically in numbers (Verhoef, Kannan & Inman, 2015). In the case of the cosmetics market this could be for instance online, in department stores, branded stores, pharmacies, on social medias, through brand ambassadors. It was also found that consumers tend to have their preferences regarding brands’ channels. For instance, 35% of Swedish cosmetics consumers like to try out new products in physical stores (Bonnier Magazine & Brands, 2017), while the share of online cosmetics shoppers in Sweden was a significant 28% in 2017 (E-barometern, 2018). Furthermore, the rise of the Internet has not only increased the channels through which consumers can shop, but also multiplied the amount of available product information at their hands (Zha, Li & Yan, 2013). According to Zha et al. (2013) the information provided by the
brand itself, such as broadcast media and the spontaneous referrals from other consumers in the online environment are likely to have a significant affect consumer behavior.
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter starts with section 2.1 that explains the prevailing theories of non-product-related attributes. Thereafter consumer expectations and brand attitudes, which non-product-related attributes have an effect on, are explained in sections 2.2 and 2.3. The chapter concludes with a summarized analytical framework in section 2.4.

2.1 Non-product-related attributes covered by prevailing theories

According to Romaniuk (2003), it is well known within the marketing world that consumers buy benefits rather than just products. The theory on customer-based brand equity by Keller (1993) takes the same standpoint, suggesting that in addition to function, products also offer symbolic benefits. Keller (1993) defines non-product-related attributes, also known as extrinsic attributes, as external aspects of a product or service that relate to its purchase or consumption. These attributes affect a brand’s symbolic benefits and may also serve as a measure of perceived product quality (Keller, 1993). Aaker and Joachimsthaler (1999) suggest that most successful brands think beyond function and build strong non-product-related attributes that deliver emotional benefits.

Product-related attributes on the contrary focus solely on product and service functionality. They relate to a product’s physical composition or a service’s requirements and are defined as the ingredients necessary for performing the product or service function (Keller, 1993). This kind of narrow focus on just product-related attributes may lead to short-lived and easily copied advantages (Aaker & Joachimsthaler, 1999). Furthermore, Aaker and Joachimsthaler (1999) suggest that brands that only offer a list of product attributes with no symbolic value, give only a little or no incentives for brand loyalty, thus leaving the customer relationships shallow.

This thesis will focus entirely on non-product-related attributes, and especially the four main groups defined by Keller (1993); price, packaging and product appearance, user and usage imagery as well as brand personality, which has later been adopted by Aaker (1997) and can be seen as a development from user and usage imagery. However, country of origin will be considered as a fifth non-product-related attribute, even though it is not included in Keller’s (1993) theory. According to Bertoli and Resciniti (2013) this represents an extrinsic cue that is likely to affect a consumer’s behavior in the same way as for instance price.
2.1.1 Price

The price information of a product or service represents a necessary step in the purchase process but does not typically relate directly to the product performance according to Blattberg and Wisniewski (1989). This is an important attribute that creates clear associations in the minds of consumers, as people generally have strong beliefs about the price and value of a brand and often organize their product and brand category knowledge in terms of the price (Blattberg and Wisniewski, 1989). Further, Keller (1998) also points out that in some product categories the consumer’s might perceive the quality of the product on the basis of its price. The perception of a brand’s price also helps determine whether or not a brand is included in a consumer’s consideration set (Dyson, Farr & Hollis, 1996). Dodds, Monroe & Grewal (1991) explained the link between consumer’s perceived value and brand choice in part by the acceptable price range concept. Buyers generally have a set of prices that are acceptable to pay for a purchase in their consideration set, rather than a single price (Monroe, 1979). Therefore, consumers place a value on the unique aspects of a brand that justifies a higher price in their minds, and are willing to pay a premium for that brand (Keller, 1998).

2.1.2 Packaging and product appearance

Packaging and appearance are also considered attributes that influence a consumer’s purchase and consumption processes, without relating directly to the necessary ingredients for the product’s functionality or performance (Keller, 1993). A brand’s appearance is a source of pleasure (Decker & Trusov, 2010; Petruzellis, 2010; Schoenfelder & Harris, 2004; Veryzer & Hutchinson, 1998) where the value is driven from a consumer’s beliefs about the aesthetic appeal of the brand (Reimann, Zaichkowsky, Neuhaus, Bender & Weber, 2010; Sheng & Teo, 2012; Veryzer, 1993). This provides a reflection of the beauty of the brand design and sensory attributes (Reimann et al., 2010; Sheng & Teo, 2012; Veryzer, 1993). Consequently, a brand’s appearance is a significant differentiating attribute that has the potential to enhance consumer preferences (Reimann et al., 2010) and derive strong symbolic benefits in the mind of the consumer (Chitturi, Raghunathan & Mahajan, 2008; Lee, Ha & Widdows., 2011). In fact, Pine and Gilmore (1998) suggest that themes related to consumer senses, such as color, shape and proportions (Hulten, 2011; Lee et al., 2011; Schmitt, 1999), create the most powerful and memorable experiences.
2.1.3 User and usage imagery

User imagery refers to the image of what type of person uses a specific product or service (Keller, 1993). According to Keller (1993) associations of a typical brand user may be based on for instance demographic factors such as sex, age, race or income or on psychographic factors such as career, possessions, the environment or political institutions. Consumers form favorable attitudes towards brands that possess images most similar to the images they prefer and wish of themselves (Keller, 1993). Consequently, their choice of brand will match their desired self-image, as products can help consumers express themselves (Zinkham & Hong, 1991). In the cosmetics context user imagery could represent the degree to which a consumer perceives the typical users of a specific brand of high status. O’Cass and Frost (2002) have found that there are status-conscious consumers who are likely to be affected by such symbolic characteristics, in order to enhance their self-images.

Usage imagery in its turn refers to the imagery associations that indicate in what type of situations or under what conditions a specific brand’s product or service is used (Keller, 1993). Keller (1993) suggests that the type of usage situation can depend among others on the time of the day, week or year, the location or the level of formality. Within the context of cosmetics, this could for instance be whether a consumer perceives a brand’s products as rather high-end, spa-like experiences or just as daily necessities with no indulgence value. These associations can also derive from past experiences (Keller, 1993). For instance the smell of a sun cream can be strongly associated with vacation or holiday.

2.1.4 Brand personality

User and usage imagery are also likely to produce so called brand personality attributes (Keller, 1995). Plummer (1985) states that brands can be characterized by personality descriptors and that these attributes may also reflect emotions or feelings evoked by the brand. Accordingly, brand personality is a symbolic and emotional attribute (Keller, 1993), which Aaker (1997) defines as a set of human characteristics that can be associated with particular characters, symbols and lifestyles, such as sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication, and ruggedness. Brand personality serves as a self-expressive function and when consumers find a brand with a relatable personality, they will be more willing to invest in that brand (Aaker and Fournier, 1995; Keller, 1998). Brand personalities provide consumers with better comprehension about brand image, which can further affect consumer attitudes, brand preferences and build up relatively lasting behavioral responses, such as brand loyalty (Folse, Netemeyer, & Burton, 2012).
2.1.5 Country of Origin

A fifth non-product-related attribute that is likely to affect consumers’ behavior is a brand’s country of origin. According to research this can affect consumers' brand evaluations and purchase intentions significantly (Mandler, Won & Kim, 2017). Even though there have recently been disputes about country of origin no longer being a major issue for international brands (Usunier, 2006), it is still identified as a driver of product image, perceived quality (Bertoli & Resciniti, 2013) and trust (Jiménez & San Martin, 2014). In fact Diamantopoulos, Schlegelmilch and Paliwawadana (2011) suggest that it needs to be considered as a driver of brand image as well. The image derived from the country of origin is not under the influence of marketers unlike brand or corporate image, and the outcome of its effects may be difficult to estimate (Bertoli & Resciniti, 2013). However, it can have an enormous impact on the effectiveness of the marketing strategies, especially for brands that aim to penetrate foreign markets (Bertoli & Resciniti, 2013). As discussed earlier, the cosmetics market has become more global, but consumers are still looking for local options that feel personal for them (Cosmetics Europe, n.d). Thus, when comparing cosmetics brands in specific geographical markets, it is important to consider their country of origin.

The non-product-related attributes discussed above affect consumers in different ways, two of which are consumer expectations and consumers’ brand attitudes. These in their turn influence consumers’ preferences and choice of brand (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 10 & 30). Hence, the next two sections will define and discuss the concepts of consumer expectations and brand attitudes.

2.2 Non-product-related attributes’ effect on consumer expectations

No matter what innovations brands set in front of consumers and no matter how well they aim to serve them, consumers’ expectations are always likely to accelerate (Meehan, 2015). Consumers are exposed to new information about different brands and products on a daily basis, which builds up expectations on brands and entire product categories. Appropriately, Aaker and Hagerty (1984) propose that consumers maximize their brand expectations based on information search and familiarity with the product category. But what exactly are consumer expectations? In this research expectations will be approached on market-level instead of brand-specific level, as the aim is to find out Swedish consumers’ expectations on cosmetics brands’ non-product-related attributes in general. In order to do this, an overall understanding of non-product-related attributes’ effect on consumer expectations is needed.
Oliver (1980) conceptualizes expectations as beliefs that are connected to anticipations and pre-purchase assumptions of a brand, while the expectancy-disconfirmation approach views consumer expectations as a prediction of a customer’s satisfaction (Oliver, 1980; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1993; Yi, 1993). According to Kotler et al. (2005, p. 465) consumer expectations are based on marketing promises, such as pricing, promotions, product and service quality and brand communication. Also competitor information is believed to affect consumer expectations (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 465). This view is supported by Meyer’s (1981) theory of multi-attribute judgments, which finds that expectations on brand attributes are formed by comparing the attribute levels of competing brands. Woodroff’s (1972) earlier work agrees with this standpoint by suggesting that attribute expectations are based on norms, that are defined by either one or several brands’ performance over time.

Also consumers’ past buying experiences are believed to have an impact on expectations (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 465). These post-satisfaction judgments, also known as adjusted expectations, are updated according to consumers’ consumption experiences (Yi & La, 2002). In other words, after each consumption experience the consumer’s experienced satisfaction influences the expectations in the next repurchase cycle (Ha, John, John & Kim, 2013). Adjusted expectations are also affected by the experiences and opinions of friends and associates (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 465).

Managing and setting consumer expectations is an important task of marketers, which Kotler et al. (2005, p. 465) advise to do with extreme caution. Raising expectations too high is precarious, as consumers are set out for disappointment if the brand does not manage to live up to these expectations. Setting expectations too low may in turn lead to satisfied customers, but fail to attract enough consumers that actually turn into buyers. Thus the challenge for marketers is to find the perfect balance between high and low expectations. (Kotler et al., 2005, pp. 466)

### 2.3 Non-product-related attributes’ effect on brand attitudes

The concept of brand attitudes has been discussed often and repeatedly during the last decades and many have had a view and input on what exactly a consumer’s brand attitude is (De Pelsmacker, Geuens & Van den Bergh, 2007; Oliver, 1997; Percy & Rossiter, 1992; Spears & Singh 2004). Wilkie (1986) defines it as an overall evaluation of a brand, which often forms the basis for a consumer’s behavior. Seen from a customer satisfaction perspective, an attitude is interpreted as a liking or disliking of a brand and is portrayed as a function of expectations (Oliver, 1980; 1997). Eagly and Chaiken’s (1993) definition is well in line with this, as they see...
attitudes as psychological tendencies that signal a degree of favor or disfavor for a brand. Simply put, brand attitudes represent a consumer’s overall feelings towards a brand (Zajonc & Markus, 1982).

Spears and Singh (2004) find brand attitudes to be relatively enduring and point out that they are likely to energize behavior. In other words, the extent to which a consumer has a favorable or disfavorable view of a brand will affect the consumer’s decision to purchase or not to purchase a product. In fact, Percy and Rossiter (1992) state that brand attitude is one of the most important indicators of a consumer’s purchase intentions. Thus, it is very important for marketers to understand consumers’ brand attitudes as they have a strong impact on the brand’s lifespan on the market.

Brand attitudes are a sum of the extent to which consumers think a brand has certain attributes and the extent to which they find these attributes good or bad (Keller, 1993). The attributes consumers base their brand evaluations on can be both product- or non-product-related. Attitudes that stem from product-related attributes are more functional and experiential beliefs, that indicate the perceived quality and satisfaction after a trial of the product (Zeithaml, 1988). Non-product-related attributes, which this study focuses on, in their turn represent much more symbolic benefits (Rossiter & Percy, 1987). Attitudes that are based on non-product-related attributes serve as value-expressive functions that allow individuals to express their self-concepts (Keller, 1993).

The formation of brand attitudes can happen directly (Bolton & Drew, 1991) or indirectly (Suh & Yi, 2006). For instance, a consumer’s direct experience with a brand or its product can make a consumer develop an attitude on the spot. This is a direct formation of a brand attitude as a consequence of satisfaction (Bolton & Drew, 1991). That is, how well the brand meets the consumer’s expectations. It is also possible that an attitude develops on the basis of indirect experiences (Suh & Yi, 2006). This means that a consumer does not have to have any direct contact with a brand or its products in order to develop an attitude towards it. Indirect brand attitudes are often based on advertising and corporate image (Oliver, 1997). Another indirect channel that has a central role in brand attitude formation is word of mouth (Herold, Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2016). Herold et al. (2016) recognize this as a major source of pre-purchase information that has a considerable effect on consumer behavior. Furthermore, brands should be careful with their choice of communication channels, as consumers’ brand attitudes also depend on their attitudes towards the sources that provide information about the brand (Ha et al., 2013).
Brand attitudes are relatively stable, but they can be changed (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007). However, the formation of new brand attitudes or changing the direction of existing ones takes time and patience, as few consumers change their beliefs overnight. Then again, this is a task that should be given a great deal of attention, as reinforcing already positive and changing negative brand attitudes are some of the most important objectives of marketing and communication activities (De Pelsmacker et al., 2007).

2.4 Analytical framework

Comparing the existing literature on non-product-related attributes with the market study of the Swedish cosmetics market, shows that the prevailing theories on non-product-related attributes (Aaker, 1997; Diamantopoulos et al., 2011; Keller, 1993) need to be revised and updated as new non-product-related may have emerged. Consequently, this research intends to complement the existing theories on non-product-related attributes. In order to do so, consumer expectations and brand attitudes will be used to analyze the consumer preferences regarding non-product-related attributes.
3 METHOD

This chapter starts off by a presentation of the methodology, after which the authors provide a motivation for the choice of markets in section 3.1. The main research method is discussed briefly in 3.2, followed by an operationalization in section 3.3 and a detailed description of the data collection in 3.4. This is followed by a presentation of how the collected data was analyzed in section 3.5. Lastly, in section 3.6 the authors discuss the quality of the study by outlining factors affecting its validity and reliability.

Interpretivist methodology is the main source of influence for this research, as understanding and interpreting of expectations and attitudes of Swedish consumers is in the center of the study. The approach proposes that meanings are constructed by individuals and groups, and are concerned with beliefs, feelings and interpretations of the participants (Williamson, 2002, p. 30). Understanding the consumers was essential to this research, in order to investigate what non-product-related attributes affect consumer preferences on similar markets.

This thesis is both descriptive and exploratory in character. Descriptive as the research aims to give an accurate picture of the non-product-related attributes that affect consumers’ choice of brand in similar markets as well as to describe a situation at hand (Law, 2016). The objective of a descriptive research is to accurately portray a phenomena or situation, and is often characterized by the prior formulation of research questions, pre-planning and structure (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). The research is also exploratory since the approach is a means for seeking new insights and assessing a phenomenon from a new angle (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009, p. 139), which is also relevant for this thesis, as it aims to cast new light on the theory of non-product-related attributes.

3.1 Choice of markets

Finland and Sweden were chosen as the two geographical markets for this study due to their high similarity. The countries are particularly similar in their product needs regarding cosmetics, which is why the cosmetics market was chosen as the focal industry. (US Department of Commerce, 2015) The authors also found that the Finnish cosmetics brand Lumene was an appropriate company for the study as the brand has performed outstandingly well on its home market without being able to replicate the same success on the Swedish market (Euromonitor, 2016a; Euromonitor, 2016b).
3.2 Research method

The main source of data collection chosen for this research was quantitative. This decision was based on the fact that a larger sample size gives better premises for drawing generalizations (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 125) and the lack of resources would not have allowed a sufficient sample size for this, if a solely qualitative method would have been chosen. Thus, a questionnaire was adopted as the appropriate main research strategy, since it allows reaching a large and geographically dispersed sample with scarce resources (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 364). Furthermore, questionnaires are useful in determining people’s attitudes on particular issues (McBurney & White, 2007, p. 265) and they enable researchers to describe a phenomenon (Williamson, 2002, p. 91), which suits the purpose of this research. However, the authors did not completely abandon a qualitative research design. The quantitative research strategy was complemented with qualitative elements, such as a pre-study in a form of interviews. Also, a great deal of the quantitative main research instrument consisted of open questions.

3.3 Operationalization

The questionnaire was planned to obtain information about the Swedish consumers’ overall expectations on cosmetics brands and their brand attitudes towards Lumene, in regards to non-product-related attributes. Questions 1-4 addressed the respondents’ demographics, to confirm their relevance for the sample. The respondents were asked to state their age, gender, nationality and city of residence. The second part of the survey, questions 5-8, included mostly list and rating questions addressing consumers’ general expectations on cosmetics brands. The last part of the questionnaire, questions 9-21, concerned the respondents’ attitudes towards Lumene and included mostly open-ended questions. By learning about the respondents’ relationship to Lumene, the authors aimed to understand how different non-product-related attributes affect brand attitudes towards a brand coming from a similar market. Table 1 presents a more detailed rationale for each of the 21 questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Derived from</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer expectations on cosmetics brands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How important do you find the below factors when purchasing cosmetics products (beyond product functionality and ingredients)?</td>
<td>Kotler et al. (2005) Meyer (1981) Ha et al. (2013)</td>
<td>To be able to measure and compare the importance of different non-product-related attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer attitudes towards the cosmetics brand Lumene</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Do you think Lumene is a cosmetics brand you can trust?</td>
<td>Zajonc &amp; Markus (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To learn whether the respondents would recommend Lumene to a friend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To understand what non-product-related attributes are strong enough to energize a consumer to recommend a brand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Data collection

The thesis data collection process was divided into two stages. First a pre-study in the form of eight brief consumer interviews was conducted, followed by the main data collection method for this research; the questionnaire.

#### 3.4.1 Pre-study

To ensure the quality and gain even deeper insights on the research topic, a qualitative pre-study was performed. The authors conducted semi-structured interviews with eight Swedish female consumers, addressing their expectations and brand attitudes in terms of non-product-related attributes. The obtained insights were used for the construction of the questionnaire, particularly the response alternatives in the list and rating questions. This way the authors could get a feel for the key issues, and be confident that these were addressed in the questionnaire (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 153).

The sample was collected through non-probability convenience sampling. The interviews were conducted in Swedish, the interviewees’ mother tongue, with the purpose of making them feel as comfortable in their answers as possible and to minimize the possibility of losing valuable insights due to language difficulties (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 181).
3.4.2 Questionnaire

The primary research instrument chosen was a self-administrative questionnaire, which requires every respondent to answer the same set of questions in a predetermined order (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 360). A total of 21 questions were listed in the questionnaire, including list questions, rating questions, and open questions. By using different sets of question types the authors were able to avoid loss of validity for certain types of data, such as beliefs and feelings (Malhotra & Birks, 2006). Furthermore, including fixed-response alternatives narrowed down the variability in the results and alleviated the data analysis process (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 375). Furthermore, the open-ended questions granted a combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection, even though questionnaires are most commonly known for collecting only quantitative data (Williamson, p. 91). This allowed the authors to look for key themes and patterns (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 134) without restricting the respondents only to the pre-set answer alternatives or categories (Williamson, 2002, p. 238).

The questionnaire was initially written in English, however, as the sample consisted of Swedish consumers, the questionnaire was translated into Swedish, for the same reasons as the interviews were conducted in Swedish. The authors then translated the questionnaire back into English, which is a translation technique called back-translating, suitable for questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 385). By first writing the questionnaire in English, then in Swedish and then translating it back to English again the authors could also detect and eliminate some problems with the questions. These included spelling mistakes, lexical, idiomatic and experiential differences between the source and the target questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 383) as well as the need for using a simpler and less academic language as some words in the English version were not applicable for the Swedish language. The use of language depended largely on the targeted population, which according to Saunders et al. (2009, p.181) is important to take into consideration when interviewing and conducting questionnaires. Both the original English version and the translated Swedish version can be found in Appendix 1.

3.4.2.1 Population and sample

The population, also known as the entire collection of individuals considered (McBurney & White, 2007), of this research was Swedish female citizens in the age of 16 years and up. The decision to limit the population by gender was based on the fact that the majority of Lumene’s products and marketing efforts are directed towards women.
Probability sampling is most commonly associated with survey-based research techniques and would have been the most suitable sampling technique for drawing generalizations (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 214). However, due to the lack of resources and access to a suitable sampling frame for a random sample, non-probability sampling was chosen instead. This is a completely acceptable technique for the purpose of this thesis, yet it is vital to consider its limitations when analyzing the findings and drawing generalizations (Williamson, 2002, p. 232).

Non-probability sampling is often used to obtain a number of respondents that satisfies the research objective (Williamson, 2002, p. 231). In order to draw generalizations to the whole population with a 90% confidence level and 8% margin of error, this research required at least 106 respondents. Consequently, convenience sampling was used, meaning that the responses were collected where it was easiest to obtain the sample, and the collection continued until the required sample size was reached (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 241).

3.4.2.2 Pilot test

In order to detect any inconveniences in the design of the questionnaire, a pilot study with 8 respondents was ran. Pilot tests help ensure that the respondents will have no problems in answering the questions and that the data can be recorded without problems (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 394). Subsequently, based on the interpretations, opinions and feedback from the respondents of the pilot test, the quality of the questionnaire was improved. Prior to releasing the final questionnaire, it was tested for one last time with a person who has no extensive knowledge about research techniques or the cosmetics industry, to ensure that the questions were easily understood for anyone.

3.4.2.3 Administration

The questionnaire was developed and administered with the online software Google Forms. According to Sue and Ritter (2007, p. 10) online administration is a good option when a sample size is fairly large and widely distributed geographically. Additionally, the anonymity of respondents is maintained through the use of Internet surveys, which might encourage more people to respond.

The questionnaire was released on the 30th of March 2018 and participants were approached via Facebook and online discussion forums accompanying a cover letter and a link to the questionnaire. The aim was to choose channels, which were believed to be popular and heavily
used among the target audience. The questionnaire was then closed on Friday the 6th of April 2018 and the final amount of responses received was 112.

3.5 Data analysis

Data analysis is a process whereby order, structure and meaning is given to the mass of collected data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 150). In order to summarize the data collected from the questionnaire, the authors used descriptive statistics, with Microsoft Excel, IBM SPSS and Google Forms as their analytical tools. This was found to be an appropriate starting point for the analysis, as descriptive statistics is a good tool for gathering ideas and gaining insights for exploratory research (Williamson, 2002, p. 91). Instead of inferential statistics, such as formal statistical hypothesis testing, descriptive statistics tend to use a significant amount of qualitative, verbal data and the discussion of the results can give likely explanations and underlying factors for particular phenomenon (Williamson, 2002, p. 91). According to Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 246) this is also a great way of making theoretical coherence, meaning that the research moves from data to constructs and then onwards to theories, through analysis and categorization.

As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire included a great deal of open questions, which generate qualitative data. Thus, summarizing and categorizing were used for the analysis of the open questions. However, due to the relatively high amount of respondents, the authors could after the process of summarizing and categorizing go on and quantify the qualitative data, meaning that it was converted into numerical codes (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 153) and illustrated in charts and graphs. This is a typical procedure for researches that combine both quantitative and qualitative characteristics (Saunders et al., 2009, p. 153).

3.6 Quality of Study

To make sure the research is credible and of quality, attention has to be given to the validity and reliability of the research. Validity is about how well the study captures the reality of what was studied (Saunders et al., 2009, p.157) i.e. how well the research answers the questions it is supposed to. Validity in this research was assured by conducting a pre-study as well as pretesting the questionnaire before sharing it online, assuring that the questions were both understood by consumers as well as addressing the research question. This shows how well a measurement actually represents the construct components (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Further,
quality of the study was ensured by providing open-ended questions, with the objective to avoid the loss of information the respondents wanted to provide.

Additionally, there are some limitations to using a questionnaire as a research instrument. Firstly, with a questionnaire it is difficult to control rival explanations, or the possibility that some intervening variable rather than the variable under consideration may have produced the results observed (Williamson, 2002, p.94). Moreover, some claim that self-reported data should be questioned, since there is a tendency in human nature to present oneself to others in a positive light (Williamson, 2002, p. 94). In other words, some respondents might have given answers of how they think they are or how they want to be, rather than answering honestly of how they really think and act. Respondents may also in some situations feel that the questions are too vague or unclear and that some answer options are not suitable (Williamson, 2002, p. 92). Due to this, respondents may be unable or unwilling to give specific information. Due to these limitations, the authors kept a critical mind and were careful not to claim more than what the collected data could support.

As stated earlier, the authors conducted the questionnaire in Swedish, which is the respondents’ mother tongue. While this eliminates many problems caused by language difficulties, it is important to note that back-translating has its disadvantages as well. Words and meanings can be experienced differently (Saunders et al. 2009, p. 383), which makes translations vulnerable for misinterpretations. In order to minimize this effect, the authors had three native Swedish speakers and three proficient English speakers see through the translations. Additionally, a pilot study was ran by eight respondents.

It should also be mentioned that even though the questionnaire was ought to study non-product-related attributes, due to the open-ended questions the respondents could not be prohibited from mentioning product-related attributes as well. However, all the data regarding product-related attributes was disregarded when interpreting and analyzing the results.

Reliability, in its turn, can be seen as how well a study is cleared from errors and to which extent the data collection techniques or analysis procedures will yield consistent findings (Saunders et al., 2009, p.156). As this research addresses a specific market, namely the cosmetics market, some predefined answer alternatives in the questionnaire might not be suitable for all markets. This goes also for the chosen brand Lumene, which would be needed to be replaced with a brand from the specific industry under study. Thereby some small changes to the questionnaire need to be done if the research is replicated on other markets beside the cosmetics. In terms of interpreting the results, the theoretical framework of this thesis was used
both for structuring and interpreting the questionnaire, and can be used on other researches as well in order to analyze from a similar perspective.
4 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

In this section, the authors present the empirical data collected during the primary research. The findings are divided in three main sections; demographics of the respondents in section 4.1, general expectations on cosmetics brands in section 4.2 and attitudes towards the cosmetics brand Lumene in section 4.3. The results from the questionnaire are presented in text and figures.

4.1 Demographics of the respondents

Questions 1-4 were provided in order to determine the demographics of the participants. In total 119 people answered the questionnaire. Seven respondents were scrapped due to wrong gender or nationality for the sample, which left the authors with 112 usable and relevant respondents. Thus, all the 112 usable respondents were of Swedish nationality. 37,5 % of the respondents reported an age between 16-25, 41,1% answered 26-35, making them account together for 78,6 % of the answers. 20,5 % answered that they are 36 or older. Figure 1 below shows the age variation of the 112 respondents.

![Figure 1 The age of the respondents](image)

4.2 Consumer expectations on cosmetics brands

The second part of the questionnaire, including questions 5-8, addressed the respondents’ expectations on cosmetics brands within cosmetics. Here the authors used a mix of different question set-ups, including closed- and open-ended questions.
4.2.1 Reasons for choosing a cosmetics brand

Firstly, in question 5 the respondents were asked what makes them choose a cosmetics brand (excluding alternatives addressing product function and ingredients). With twelve different options to choose from, and the chance to choose one or more options, good brand reputation was clearly most important with 78.6%. Price and campaigns were listed as important to 57.1% while appealing appearance was central to 50.0%. Sufficient product information was important to 43.8% and availability in for instance department stores, online retailers and chain stores, was listed as important to 38.4%, as was ethical values. Having sustainable values was important for 25.9%, and the fact that one can identify oneself with a brand was picked by 21.4% of the respondents while 24.1% think it is important that a brand has transparency in its work. The online presence of a brand was important to 18.8%. None of the respondents choose the alternative ‘None of the above’. Table 2 shows the above results.

Table 2 Reasons for choosing a cosmetics brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The brand has a good reputation</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price and campaigns</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing appearance (e.g. logo, design)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient product information</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability (e.g. available in well-known department stores,</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical values (e.g. does no animal testing, good working</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable values</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brand has transparency in its work (e.g. openness about</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good customer service</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can identify yourself with the brand (e.g. young, sporty,</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online presence (e.g. active on social medias, own website)</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Reasons for not choosing a cosmetics brand

The respondents were then asked to pick one or more reasons for why they would not buy or choose a cosmetics brand (these alternatives also excluded alternatives addressing product function and ingredients). The majority of the respondents, 78.6% reported that they would not pick a brand with poor brand reputation and 59.8% reported that a too high or low price would affect their choice. 52.7%, said that if the brand would have unethical processes, such as animal testing they would not buy the brand’s products, while unsustainable methods was chosen as a decisive factor by 42.0% of the respondents. 51.8% reported that they would not choose a brand due to a lack of sufficient product information. Table 3, on the next page, illustrates the above data together with the rest of the results.
4.2.3 The importance of non-product-related attributes for choosing cosmetics brands

In question number 7 the respondents were asked to rate the importance of the non-product-related attributes provided by the authors. The scale was as follows; not important at all (1), of little importance (2), fairly important (3), very important (4), and decisive (5).

Table 4 that the most important non-product-related attribute for the respondents were available product information, with a mean of 3,46 on a scale from one to five. The second most important attribute was recommendations (mean 3,40) and third cruelty free (mean 3,39). Attributes that also were rated with a mean over 3 included price (mean 3,26) and user friendly packaging (mean 3,12). The rest of the results can be found in Table 3, and Appendix 2 provides more detailed tables with the results for each alternative separately.

Table 4 The importance of non-product-related attributes
Lastly, the open-ended question 8 gave the respondents a chance to tell freely if there are any other factors that might affect their brand selection. However, no same answer was provided twice, and thus the results can be found in Appendix 2, Question 8.

4.3 Consumer attitudes towards the cosmetics brand Lumene

The third section of the questionnaire was divided into two parts. Question 9, which was the only question in the first part inquired whether the respondents knew the cosmetics brand Lumene. For those who replied that they are not familiar with Lumene, the questionnaire came to an end. Others continued to the second part of the third section, which was designed to address the respondents’ attitudes towards Lumene as a brand. Only 4.5% of the respondents answered that they did not know Lumene, leaving a 107 (95.5%) respondents to answer the last part of the questionnaire.

4.3.1 Reasons for buying Lumene’s products

The 107 respondents who continued to question 10 were then asked if they had ever bought any products from Lumene, whereby 71.0% answered yes and 29.0% answered no. This was followed by question 11, an open-ended question to elaborate on why they had, or had not purchased Lumene’s products. Recommendations were mentioned 22 times as the reason for buying Lumene’s products. Price-related reasons were mentioned 16 times, including statements such as good price, value for money and the products being on campaign. Just wanting to try something new was mentioned 12 times and reviews and online reviews was written nine times as a reason for buying Lumene products.

The fact that the respondents had heard good about the brand, i.e. good brand reputation was reported six times. Nice and appealing design was mentioned four times and that Lumene has a nice and good marketing was mentioned twice. The answers included some ethical factors as well; four respondents mentioned the fact that Lumene’s products are not tested on animals and three mentioned the brand’s environmental focus. Also country of origin was reported four times, and these answers addressed the importance of the brand’s origin in either Finland or the Nordics. Availability was a reason for four of the respondents. Four respondents wrote that they did not remembered, one reason being that it was such a long time ago they bought a Lumene product. The above reasonings are shown in Table 5, and reasons that were mentioned only once are found in Appendix 3, Question 11.
4.3.2 Reasons for not buying Lumene's products

The main reason for the 31 respondents who said they had not bought Lumene’s products was the fact that they prefer other brands (mentioned 15 times), shown in Table 6. Other reasons included that Lumene had not caught their eye yet, which was mentioned four times, and that the respondents had not seen or heard enough about the brand, which was mentioned three times. It was also mentioned twice that the respondent had not felt the need to try Lumene’s products, and one respondent reported her uncertainty about the brand’s policy regarding animal testing. One respondent left a blank answer and the reasons mentioned only once can be found in Appendix 2, Question 12.

Table 6 Reasons for not buying Lumene's products

4.3.3 Lumene a preferred brand

In question 13, the 107 respondents were asked whether Lumene is one of their preferred brands. 72.0% answered no and 28.0% yes.
Most of the reasons for Lumene being a preferred brand were price-related (mentioned nine times), referring to good price and getting value for money. The brand’s natural and Nordic concept was mentioned four times and appealing design three. The word fresh was mentioned three times as well. These reasons are shown in Table 7. Reasons that were mentioned only once can be found in Appendix 3, Question 14a.

Table 7  Reasons for Lumene being a preferred brand (mentioned over two times)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price-related</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracted by the brand's concept</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes the design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product-related attributes were mentioned as many as 20 times, including good for my skin, good products, good results etc.

The reasons for Lumene not being a preferred brand are in its turn shown in Table 8. The reason that was mentioned most frequently, by 19 respondents, was that the respondents use other brands that they are satisfied with or loyal to. However, one of the 19 respondents addressed their interest in and willingness to try Lumene’s products.

Seven of the respondents reported that they do not find Lumene to be an attractive brand and four admitted that they do not have enough knowledge about the brand. Four respondents had not bought or tried Lumene’s products, and another four wrote that they had some, but not enough of experience of the brand and its products to call it one of their preferred bands. Here again, one of the respondents who had never tried the Lumene’s products communicated their eagerness to do so. A too high price point was mentioned two times. Reasons that were mentioned only once can be found in Appendix 3, Question 14b. Seven respondents answered that hey do not know, while two answers were left blank.
### Table 8  Reasons for Lumene not being a preferred brand (mentioned over two times)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High price</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough knowledge about the brand</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not bought</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tried enough</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never tried</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing brand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses other brands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.4  Words associated with Lumene

The next question, number 15, was open-ended and the respondents were asked to write three words that they associated with Lumene. Some respondents wrote three, some two and some just one.

The most mentioned associations were both related to the brand’s origin. Firstly, Finnish was mentioned 23 times, by the 107 respondents, and right after came Nordic, brought up by 18 respondents. Also Scandinavian was an association that eight responses indicated. Another association that stood out was Lumene’s perceived trustworthiness, which was mentioned by as many as 16 respondents. Right after came value for money with 15 referrals, fresh with 12 referrals and good ingredients/products with 10 referrals. Words mentioned six or more times can be found in Table 9, while words referred to two to five times are displayed in Table 10.

### Table 9  Words mentioned over six times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple/Easy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough knowledge about</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not bought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tried enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never tried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing brand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses other brands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The words and associations that were only mentioned once are listed in Appendix 3, Question 15. Lastly, five respondents did not write any associating words.

### 4.3.5 The brand image of Lumene

In question 16, out of the 107 respondents 80.4% reported that they have a positive brand image of Lumene, while 19.6% stated the contrary. This was followed by an open question where the respondents were asked to indicate why, or why not do they have a positive brand image of Lumene.

The most popular reasons for having a positive brand image were good brand reputation (mentioned 12 times) and appealing design (mentioned 11 times). Price-related attributes were mentioned eight times, mainly stating value for money. The country of origin (Nordic and Scandinavian) was mentioned six times as a reason for having a positive brand image, while trustworthiness was mentioned five times including some statements related to the country of origin. Also Lumene’s brand communication was mentioned six times as a reason for a positive brand image.

Quite okay or okay were written four times (with no further explanation) while recommendations were mentioned twice. Cruelty freeness and trendy were also mentioned two times as reasons for having a positive brand image of Lumene. Not having formed an opinion yet was mentioned twice as well as that the respondents did not really know. The reasons that were mentioned at least twice are shown in Table 11, and the reasons mentioned only once can be found in Appendix 3, Question 17a. Two respondents left the question blank.
Out of the 19.6% who did not have a positive brand image of Lumene, the most popular reasons were price-related, including opinions about a cheap brand image. Also lack of sufficient brand knowledge was mentioned by three respondents. Not enough experience with the brand, the brand does not stand out, unappealing communication, bland and boring were all mentioned twice each. The reasonings for a negative brand image about Lumene are illustrated in Table 12 (see next page), while the reasons that were mentioned only once are outlined in Appendix 3, Question 17b. Also, some product features were mentioned, resulting in ignoring of five answers. One respondent left the question blank.

### Table 12 Reasons for not having a positive brand image of Lumene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price-related</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of brand knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough experience with the brand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not attracted by the brand's communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not pop out from the mass</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3.6 Lumene as a trusted brand

Next, in question 18, the 107 respondents were asked whether they perceive Lumene as a brand they can trust. A majority of 75.5% answered yes, while the remaining 24.3% reported no.
Lumene’s good brand reputation was the main reasoning for trusting the brand, mentioned by 16 respondents. The country of origin was also shown to be one of the main reasons, mentioned 12 times, including statements such as Finnish, Nordic, Scandinavian and local. Also trustworthy was mentioned four times, while being a known brand received three mentions. The transparency of Lumene was given twice as a reason to trust the brand, as were sustainability and the size of the brand as well. Two respondents also wrote that they do not have any reasons not to trust Lumene. All these answers are shown in Table 13. Eight respondents could not motivate why and five respondents left the field blank. Reasons that were mentioned only once are found in Appendix 3, Question 19a.

**Table 13  Reasons for trusting Lumene as a brand (mentioned over two times)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand reputation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known brand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have a reason not to trust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason stated the most for not trusting (see Table 14) Lumene was that the respondents did not have enough knowledge about the brand. Another reason, which was indicated three times was that the respondents had not tried Lumene’s products and thus did not think they could answer yes, and similarly not having tested enough products was written once. Feeling that Lumene is more of a B-class brand was written twice as was dull.

**Table 14  Reasons for not trusting Lumene as a brand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of brand knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never tried</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that Lumene is a Finnish brand was also perceived as a negative thing by one respondent, and thus given as a reason for not trusting the brand. Other reasons that were mentioned only once can be found in Appendix 3, Question 19b. Furthermore, five respondents...
could not motivate why they do not trust Lumene as a brand, and one respondent left a blank answer.

4.3.7 Recommending Lumene or not and the reasons behind the choice

The final questions for those 107 who answered that they are familiar with Lumene was whether they would recommend Lumene to others or not. Subsequently, the respondents were asked to motivate their answers. 60.7% stated that they would be comfortable recommending the brand to a friend, while 39.3% reported that they would not do so. 

Product-related attributes were the major reason for recommending Lumene, with a total of 41 referrals. However, as the focus of this research is on non-product-related attributes, this is not considered in Table 15. Price-related features, such as good price and value for money were the second most popular reasonings with 8 mentions. Good brand reputation was indicated by four respondents, and the fact that the brand does not conduct animal testing and appealing design were brought up twice each. Reasons mentioned once are found in Appendix 3, Question 21a. Three respondents could not motivate their answers and six respondents left the field blank.

Table 15 Reasons for recommending Lumene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price-related</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty free</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other side, 20 respondents indicated that they could not recommend Lumene to anyone else, since they have not used or tried their products themselves. Also too little knowledge about Lumene was mentioned six times. These reasons are shown in Table 16. Things mentioned only once for not recommending Lumene can be found in Appendix 3, Question 21b. Two respondents could not motivate their answers and one respondent left the question blank.
Table 16 Reasons for not recommending Lumene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not use or have tried the brand's products</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of brand knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses other brands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing reasons for not recommending Lumene](chart)
5 ANALYSIS

In this chapter the results from the questionnaire will be interpreted and analyzed with the help of the Analytical framework provided in section 2.4. Thereby, looking into the respondents’ expectations on cosmetics brands and their attitudes towards Lumene will help unveil what non-product-related attributes affect consumer brand preferences. Section 5.1 discusses the non-product-related attributes that are already covered by prevailing theories, while section 5.2 digs deeper into the new non-product-related attributes detected in this study.

5.1 Non-product-related-attributes covered by prevailing theories

In addition to unveiling new non-product-related attributes that have emerged, the authors also assessed the relevance of the non-product-related attributes that are already established in theory. These were included in the questionnaire with the intention of evaluating their effect on consumer preferences on similar markets.

5.1.1 Price

The results of the questionnaire proved that price is still a highly relevant non-product-related attribute, scoring as the fourth most important attribute in question 7. As few as 14.3% of the respondents stated that price has only a little or no importance to them (see Appendix 2, Table 1). Furthermore, the respondents did not only show the importance of price in list questions where price was one of the predetermined alternatives, but also in the open-ended questions, where price-related statements were brought up from the respondents’ own initiative. For Lumene, price was stated as one of the top-reasons both for purchasing and recommending the brand, indicating the attribute’s relevance in consumers’ minds. Thus, the findings confirm that pricing is still one of the major attributes that affect consumer expectations, just as Kotler et al. (2005, p. 465) suggest.

However, it was found that price can be perceived very individually, and just as Blattenberg and Wisniewski (1989) state, the beliefs that concern the price and value of a brand tend to be rather strong. For instance, while some perceived Lumene as too expensive, others found the brand to be cheap. Furthermore, being cheap was perceived as a positive thing by part of the respondents, while the other part showcased cheapness as a negative attribute. Perceiving cheap price as negative is coherent with Keller’s (1998) argument that price is an indicator of perceived quality, which in this case means that in some of the respondents’ minds cheapness equals low
quality. However in general, the results indicate that Swedish consumers appreciate brands that offer good value for money, which is also in line with the findings of US Department of Commerce (2015).

5.1.2 Packaging and appearance

Appealing packaging and overall appearance were also found to affect consumers’ brand preferences, in line with what Reimann et al. (2010) propose. Just as price, this attribute gained attention both in closed and open-ended questions of the questionnaire. For instance in question 17, Lumene’s design was referred to as one of the major reasons for consumers’ positive brand image. This confirms that appearance has a strong impact on symbolic beliefs (Chitturi et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2011) as well as attitudes. Also, Swedish consumers’ positive references about Lumene’s design could result from the high similarity between the Finnish and Swedish markets, thus indicating that preferences regarding packaging and appearance in similar markets can be rather alike.

However, the findings also indicate that design is not as important of an attribute as price. It was interesting to find that exactly half of the respondents reported that appearance is one of the attributes they consider when choosing a brand, but in question 6, when asked what attributes would make them leave a brand out of their consideration set, only 27.7% reported unappealing appearance. Thus, it can be concluded that an appealing design is preferable, but not necessarily decisive.

User friendliness of the packaging on the other hand rated as the fifth most important attribute in question 7. However, as this attribute connects less with the aesthetic appeal and appearance of a brand and more with the usage situation and perceived experience, this attribute will be discussed more elaborately under usage imagery.

5.1.3 User and usage imagery

It was very clear from the findings that recommendations and word of mouth have a strong effect on Swedish consumers’ expectations, brand attitudes and purchase behavior, just as Herold et al. (2016) have previously noted. This is a vital part of user imagery, as it refers to encouragement from friends, family or influencers to try out a product or a brand. Thus, the findings from the questionnaire speak loud and clear for the importance of user imagery. The attribute ranked second highest in question 7, where the respondents were asked to rate the importance of different non-product-related attributes. Out of the 80% who found
recommendation at least fairly important, nearly 20% stated that recommendations are actually
decisive for them in order to even consider a brand (see Appendix 2, Table 4). Also, as many as
40% reported that they would not choose a brand that they or their friends are not familiar with.
This is in line with Aaker and Hagerty (1984), who propose that consumers maximize their
brand expectations according to familiarity. Recommendations were also the single most
referred to reason for buying Lumene’s products, as it was brought up by 22 respondents in an
open ended question. The importance of recommendations was also brought up already in the
interviews prior to the questionnaire.

According to O’Cass and Frost (2002), user imagery is also a means for enhancing one’s self-
image. As already discussed regarding price, some of the respondents perceived Lumene as a
cheap and not a very luxurious brand. Even though only a minority held this opinion, it is
important to consider, since from a user imagery point of view such classification can have a
very negative impact on status-conscious consumers.

When it comes to usage imagery, the results indicate that many Swedish consumers have their
routines and preferred brands. While it is a great opportunity for brands to exploit consumer
loyalty, it is also a challenge in terms of winning over new customers. Especially as a rather
small player on a foreign market, such as Lumene in Sweden, it can get harder to break in and
grow successful when consumers show reluctance to switch brands. Appropriately, a great deal
of respondents stated that they have not purchased Lumene’s products since they use other
brands and have not felt the need to try anything new. One way of tackling this problem could
be careful management of consumer expectations, which Oliver (1980) proposes to affect
consumers’ anticipations and pre-purchase assumptions. Thus raising expectations high enough,
through the right marketing promises Kotler et al. (2005, pp. 465) could motivate consumers to
shift brands.

As mentioned earlier, the results from the questionnaire also communicate the importance of
user friendly packaging. This attribute has a direct impact on the consumption experience, as it
connects strongly with the usage situation. Ha et al. (2013) pinpoint the relevance of such post-
satisfaction judgments, stating that each positive consumption experience is likely to raise a
consumer’s expectations and further increase the likelihood of a repurchase. Thus, with user
friendly packaging a brand has the opportunity to create a positive association in consumers’
minds, which could further help accelerate success on a foreign market.
5.1.4 Brand personality

The findings suggest that brand personality has a rather low importance, as only one out of five respondents stated that being able to identify oneself with a brand would affect their brand choice. This indicates that brand personality might not be one of the major non-product-related attributes affecting consumer brand preferences. This was also shown in answers addressing attitudes towards Lumene, as brand personality traits were not mentioned too often.

One explanation for this could lie in today’s large assortments and increased availability of all kinds of products and brands. With a huge variety of brands at our hands, the likelihood of finding a suiting brand increases, thus less concern needs to be placed on searching for relatable brand personalities. Also, many large brands have extremely broad assortments that address a number of different needs and lifestyles. For instance in the cosmetics industry, one brand’s assortment can range from 50+ anti-aging needs to products that meet the needs of active and sporty people to products for all ages and lifestyles. Thereby, consumers may find almost anything they need from just one brand and thereby do not have to think about whether they can relate to the brand’s personality or not.

5.1.5 Country of Origin

As mentioned in the frame of reference, the importance of a brand’s country of origin has lately been under dispute by academics. In line with this, the findings regarding this attribute are rather mixed. Firstly, the questionnaire results showed that nearly 70% of the respondents find a brand’s country of origin to be of little or no importance when choosing between cosmetics brands (see Appendix 2, Table 5). Consequently, the attribute scored the second lowest in question 7 where the respondents were asked to rate the importance of 13 different non-product-related attributes. Also the country of production was also found to be of rather low concern with over 60% of the respondents finding it of little or no importance.

However, the results also showed that there are clear associations between the perceptions of a brand and its country of origin in the consumers’ minds. The findings suggest that the country or the region a brand originates from, seems to have a very memorable place in consumer minds. In question 15, where the respondents were asked to describe Lumene with three words, Finnish, Nordic and Scandinavian were mentioned 49 times in total, out of which only one respondent referred to Finnishness as a negative thing. Thus, being a rather local brand was found to be a positive factor by the majority, confirming the consumers’ desire for brands with a regional or local identity (Kasriel-Alexander, 2014). The country of origin is also known to have
an impact on perceived trustworthiness of a brand (Jiménez & San Martín, 2014), which is in line with the findings from the questionnaire. 75.5% of the respondents reported that they find Lumene a trustworthy brand, and the second highest ranking reasoning for this was the brand’s country of origin. This indicates that Finnishness is perceived well among the Swedish consumers, likely due to the high similarity, and sense of locality between the two markets.

To conclude, the findings regarding the country of origin’s effect on a brand’s success on a similar market are slightly conflicting. On one hand, the results point that the attribute does not have a very high effect on consumer expectations or a decisive impact on consumers’ choice of brand. On the other hand, it seems that a rather local country of origin has the potential to influence brand attitudes positively and increase consumer trust. Thus, just as the topic is disputed by academics, it seems that also consumers struggle to determine the level of importance of this attribute. It is also possible that the effects of the country of origin on consumer expectations and brand attitudes are rather subconscious, and thus hard for the consumers to identify.

5.2 New non-product-related attributes

Just as the market study and the pre-study predicted, the findings from the questionnaire showed evidence of new non-product-related attributes, that are not covered by prevailing theories, affecting consumer preferences. Below, these findings are grouped in categories and analyzed.

5.2.1 Brand reputation

Brand reputation came out to be an attribute that affects consumer expectations and brand choices very strongly. In question 5, nearly 80% of the respondents admitted they prefer good brand reputation while choosing between cosmetics brands. This finding was consistent as it was further confirmed in question 6, where nearly 80% reported that they would not even consider purchasing products from a brand that has a poor brand reputation. The importance of good brand reputation stood out in the open questions about brand attitudes as well. For instance, it was a popular answer for questions 11 and 17, where respondents were asked to elaborate why they had bought Lumene’s products and why they had a positive impression of the brand. Thus, brands should aim to set up high expectations regarding brand reputation in order to attract consumers. However, as Kotler et al. (2005, p. 466) state, brands have to be careful not to set expectations too high, meaning that they should always be able to live up to their reputation. Consumers have the tendency to grow high brand expectations on brands that
deliver well (Meehan, 2015), thus setting consumers out for a disappointment could be a tough blow for a brand’s reputation.

However, a brand reputation is not a simple, straightforward matter. Characterized as a widespread opinion or belief about something, it can be a highly multidimensional concept, affected by a number of factors. For instance recommendations can have a central role in the formation of brand reputation. Thus it is not surprising that in addition to brand reputation, the findings from the questionnaire also communicate the important role of recommendations on consumer preferences. Just as recommendations, user imagery has also the potential to affect brand reputation. As the concept is highly symbolic, the image that consumers have of a brand’s users easily mirrors on the brand itself as well (Keller, 1993). In addition, the questions of ethical and sustainable values are very likely to have an impact on a brand’s reputation. Appropriately, the market study showed that such attributes have grown in importance, and the findings from the questionnaire further underpin their relevance. These attributes and their effect on brand reputation will be discussed further below.

5.2.2 Ethical and sustainable values

Just as brand reputation, ethical and sustainable values are rather broad concepts and include a number of different factors. In this research ethical factors were referred to as fair treatment of animals and people, such as cruelty freeness and good working conditions, while sustainable factors were referred to as acts of environmental friendliness. Even though both ethical and sustainable factors were found at least fairly important by roughly 60% of the respondents (see Appendix 2, Table 7 and Table 8), a brand’s ethicality showed out to be of higher importance than its sustainability. Accordingly, approximately 25% reported to consider sustainable values when choosing a brand, compared to nearly 40% who reported they consider ethical factors. Also, when the respondents were asked to rank the importance of 13 different attributes, cruelty freeness reached the third place, while environmental friendliness scored the sixth place on the same list. Thus, it is clear that a brand’s ethicality weighs slightly more in the consumers’ minds.

The findings also show that if a brand is proven to be unethical or unsustainable, these attributes start all of the sudden weigh more heavily on consumer expectations and brand choices. Accordingly, over 50% of the respondents reported that unethical practices would make them leave a brand out from their consideration set, while over 40% reported the same about unsustainable practices. This was also addressed in attitudes towards Lumene, for instance when
A respondent reported she had never bought the brand’s products due to her uncertainty about their cruelty freeness. Thereby, a negative light on these attributes will have a higher impact on the consumers, which is also likely to affect the brand reputation negatively. From a user imagery point of view, it is not surprising that consumers wish not to be associated with a brand that many perceive as unethical or unsustainable, as brands are means for self-expression (Keller, 1993; Zinkham & Hong, 1991). Also, brand attitudes are often based on corporate image (Oliver, 1997), which is highly connected to a brands’ ethical and sustainable activities.

As stated by Meehan (2015), consumers develop high expectations on brands when they get used to the brand delivering on a certain level. This goes even for ethical and sustainable factors, that can easily be taken for granted by consumers and may seem less concerning when a brand has never struggled in the area. Thus, if a brand that is generally perceived as ethical and sustainable would run into trouble in this area, consumers would be likely to feel let down and having their expectations unmet (Kotler et al., 2005, pp. 466). This feeling of disappointment could reinforce the already negative effect of being unethical or unsustainable even further. Consequently, when a brand gets caught doing something unethical or unsustainable, consumers are likely to start caring more about the ethical and sustainable attributes than they otherwise would.

To conclude, both ethical and sustainable attributes affect consumers’ brand preferences. However, the impact seems especially heavy when a brand is perceived to neglect these areas, meaning that a great deal of consumers would not even consider purchasing products from a brand with unethical or unsustainable processes. Also, the findings show that ethical values, such as cruelty freeness, are of slightly higher importance than sustainable values, such as environmental friendliness.

**5.2.3 Transparency and product information**

How transparent a brand is, meaning how open they are about their processes and credible they are in their communication, also mirrors a brands ethicality. While the results show that the respondents are not too concerned about transparency in brand communication, they seem very keen on transparency about product information. In fact, over 50% of the respondents stated that they would not consider buying a brand’s products if there was no sufficient amount of product information. Also, availability of product information scored highest in question 7, where the respondents were asked to rank the importance of different non-product-related attributes.
This suggests that today’s consumers are rather keen on knowing exactly what they buy, and fond to be informed about the ingredients used in their products. Just as Zha et al. (2013) suggest, this could be explained by today’s access to an enormous amount of information allowed by the Internet. Consumers are getting increasingly used to leaning on both branded product information and reviews from other consumers found online (Zha et al., 2013), and the unavailability of such information could arouse suspicion. Also, as online retailing grows, it seems like consumers have become increasingly independent, meaning that they have to be self-sufficient in order to find product information due to the unavailability of sales personnel. Thus, consumers do an increasing amount of their shopping based solely on the information they find online.

Also country laws and regulations are likely to affect consumers’ attitudes towards this attribute. Some countries require stricter reporting about product information than others, which is likely to further affect consumer preferences. In countries such as Finland and Sweden, which are both relatively regulated, consumers may be used to brands being very detailed in their product information, making it easier for brands to meet consumers expectations. Thus, consumer preferences regarding transparency and product information could be rather similar in geographical markets that are psychically close to each other, meaning that they are also rather similar in their laws and regulations (Lee, 1998; Nordstrom & Vahlne, 1994).

A great part of Lumene’s brand communication is openness and being informative about their natural ingredients. This transparency is likely to have an effect on the brand’s perceived trustworthiness, which according to the findings is rather high. Over 75% reported that they trust Lumene as a brand, and when the respondents were asked to describe Lumene freely, trustworthy was one of the top associations. Thereby Lumene seems to have understood the importance of transparency and informativity towards consumers, and has managed to turn it into one of their core strengths.

5.2.4 Customer service

The findings regarding consumer preferences on customer service show some mixed results. In questions 5 and 6 only approximately 20% reported that good customer service affected their brand selection, and that only 30% would not consider buying a brand’s products due to poor service. Thus, it was surprising to learn that as many as 60% of the respondents rated competent sales representatives as at least fairly important (see Appendix 2, Table 9).
As touched upon earlier, this could stem from the fact that the increased amount of online shopping has made consumers less dependent on the assistance of customer service. Also, it is possible that all the available product information online may be replacing parts of traditional customer service activities, and in fact decreases the experienced importance of customer service today. However, once consumers encounter with sales representatives, their competence and professionalism is found important and has even the potential to affect consumers’ choice of brand. According to Ha et al. (2013), this can even affect the consumer’s future preferences, as past buying experiences are believed to affect the likelihood of a purchase in the next purchase cycle. The importance of competent sales representatives can also be connected to the great importance of product information, discussed earlier. Since consumers value sufficient product information highly, it is logical that knowledgeable personnel is also of importance. Competent sales representatives are also likely to give a more trustworthy picture of the brand.

5.2.5 Availability and retail channels

As today’s market does not only consist of physical stores but also e-commerce, the consumers of today have more possible ways for acquiring their products than ever before. Thereby it is not surprising that the results suggest that only one out of five consumers think that finding their cosmetics brands in their preferred store is of importance. Easy availability on the other hand was reported to affect two out of five respondent’s choice of brand.

If a consumer today cannot find their desired product in their preferred retail channel, the chance is that they can find it through some other retailer is rather high. This is much affected by the opportunities provided by the Internet. Consumers do not only go online for information about products and their availability, but also for the incredibly broad assortments allowed by online retailing, often with worldwide shipping conditions as a plus. Also price comparison is made easier online, which based on the respondents’ rather high price sensitivity can be reasoned to be a positive thing. Consumers’ have also a tendency to build their expectations on competitor information (Kotler et al., 2005, p. 465) and comparing the attribute levels of competing brands (Meyer, 1981) which makes it is important for brands to be as available as their competition and to consider their retail channels accordingly, in order to meet consumer expectations. However, according to Ha et al. (2013) brand should be careful when picking the channels through which they interact with consumers, as they are likely to reflect on the brand’s image and thus affect consumers’ brand attitudes.
Moreover, the results show that shelf placement and placement in stores are also of rather low importance when consumers choose brands. This indicates that consumers either do their shopping online, where they can find their products by word search, or that they most often know where to their products in a physical store and thus do not have to think about the placement. On the other hand, for consumers who are more sporadic or are looking for something new, the placement both in the store as well on the shelves might play a more crucial role. Consequently, a few respondents reported that they knew the brand Lumene, but have not purchased the brand’s products due to the brands invisibility and absence at retailers.

5.2.6 The brand’s size and owner

On today’s cosmetics market there are a lot of so-called umbrella brands, which are big companies that own several brands, such as L’Oréal owning Maybelline and Lancome. According to this research, neither the owner nor the size of a brand plays an important role on consumers’ brand preferences. The nearly 10% of the respondents who found these attributes very important or even decisive, could be consumers who are especially interested in cosmetics, and have more knowledge about brands’ backgrounds and structures. Also, for these consumers having a negative impression of the parent brand, such as L’Oréal, could further damage the affiliated brands, such as Maybelline and Lancome.
6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this final chapter, the authors conclude their key findings in section 6.1. This is followed by section 6.2 which outlines the different parties that can make use of and apply the results from this study. Section 6.3 suggests directions for future research and lastly, in section 6.4 the authors take a more critical stand and present the limitations of the study.

6.1 Conclusions

Today’s market looks different than it did a few decades ago and the findings of this research indicate that there are more non-product-related attributes that affect consumer brand preferences, than what Keller (1995) & Aaker (1997) suggest. Brands that are establishing themselves on foreign similar markets should not take success for granted solely based on similar product needs, but should study carefully consumer preferences regarding non-product-related attributes on the foreign market. Consequently, addressing the non-product-related attributes found important in this research may help brands to better respond to consumer preferences on similar markets where standing out only by product attributes may be challenging.

Even though the results of this study unveil new non-product-related attributes, it is also clear that the previously defined non-product-related attributes are still relevant. However, the level of importance might differ from attribute to attribute. Firstly, price continues to be a highly relevant non-product-related attribute, affecting both consumer expectations and brand attitudes. However as shown in the data collected, price is perceived very individually by the Swedish consumers. Also user and usage imagery were proven to be very important when it comes to brand preferences. User imagery is shown to be particularly affected by recommendations, while the results regarding usage imagery show that Swedish consumers are rather fond to their routines. A brand’s packaging and appearance do also still affect consumers’ choice of brand, but not as heavily as the aforementioned. This attribute was found to be more preferable than actually decisive, meaning that not many consumers would leave a brand out of their consideration set only due to unappealing design. The results regarding the country of origin attribute are less straightforward. The data collected reported that the attribute has only little importance for consumers’ brand expectations and selection, but a very strong impact on brand attitudes, indicating that the attribute’s effects may be rather subconscious. Lastly, brand personality was found to be of relatively low importance.
The non-product-related attributes that were found to be highly relevant for consumers’ brand preferences, but that are not yet covered by any theories are brand reputation and product information. The findings indicate that brand reputation has a major effect on brand selection, but that the attribute is of rather complex nature as it can be affected considerably by other attributes, such as recommendations, user imagery and ethical factors. Availability and sufficiency of product information was also found to have a remarkable influence on brand preferences, results indicating that half of the Swedish female consumers would turn to another brand if a brand could not deliver on this attribute. Another new non-product-related attributes that have a strong impact on consumer preferences are a brand’s ethical and sustainable values. These were however found to have the strongest impact when negative, meaning that consumers tend rather to avoid brands that lack ethicality and sustainability, than to find brands that that are highly ethical and sustainable.

The non-product-related attributes that do not have the majority’s votes, but do however affect a considerable deal of consumers’ preferences and expectations are customer service and a brand’s availability. The fact that customer service is not among the most important attributes could be a result of today’s more independent consumers and that many tasks previously handled by customer service are now substituted by the information and functions available on the Internet. However, the results show that when consumers are in need of assistance, competent sales representatives still have an important role. Furthermore, while a brand’s retail channels showed to be of rather low importance, availability in its turn was found to have a considerable effect on consumer preferences. In other words, this means that as long as the consumers easily can find the products either in physical or online stores, the name on the retailer does not affect them too much.

Lastly, the attributes that were found to be of little importance, in addition to retail channels, are transparency and the owner and the size of a brand. Even though transparency can also be connected to product information, it was in this research referred to more as organizational transparency, which did not cause much concern within the respondents. Also, the owner and the size of the brand, which are also rather organizational attributes, had very little effect on the consumers’ preferences.

To conclude, the results indicate that many consumers have their habits and are prone to choosing the same brands over and over again. However, consumers seem particularly sensitive to price, recommendations, brand reputation and product information, making these the non-
product-related attributes with the most potential to shift consumer preferences on similar markets.

6.2 Implications

The findings of this research provide both theoretical implications for the academic audience and managerial implications for brands and companies, Lumene in particular.

6.2.1 Theoretical implications

This research contributes to the academic audience by taking an up-to-date stand on the theory of non-product-related attributes, that aims to understand how different attributes can affect consumer brand preferences. While Keller’s (1993) and Aaker’s (1997) theories are still applicable, these need expansion and development in order to be relevant in the modern world. Furthermore, non-product-related attributes have not been studied in the context of similar markets, where the product needs are essentially the similar, and thus non-product-related attributes have the potential to differentiate a brand from the competition. Even though the research is conducted on the cosmetics market, most of the findings can be generalized for theory and serve as guidance for a more holistic view of the relevant non-product-related attributes of today.

6.2.2 Managerial implications

Companies pursuing improved performance in similar markets are the third parties that can apply the findings of this research. The marketing departments can make use of the information when planning which non-product-related attributes their brand should call attention to for the best possible response from the consumers on a similar market. As this study shows that some attributes are more important than others, the recommendation would be to first address the attributes of higher importance and thereafter the attributes that are of less importance. Companies operating within the cosmetics industry may find the results of this study particularly valuable.

Other industries might also find the findings applicable. However, companies operating in industries outside the cosmetics should also look into their particular market, in order to detect more market-specific non-product-related attributes that may not be found in this study. More generally speaking, all brands on all markets should keep up with market trends, and aim to understand how these may influence consumer preferences, expectations and brand attitudes. By
doing so, brands can adjust their non-product-related attributes accordingly for improved performance.

6.2.2.1 Managerial implications for Lumene

This research has some specific implications for the cosmetics brand Lumene. Firstly, it is found that the brand should emphasize having a clear price strategy on the Swedish market, as the consumers are rather price sensitive. Secondly, since the majority of the consumers would switch brands due to negative word-of-mouth or recommendations, Lumene needs to consider their brand reputation carefully. It is also advised that the brand communicates their cruelty freeness more elaborately, as this is highly valued by the Swedish consumers.

In general, Lumene should aim for increased visibility and recognition in Sweden, for instance through increased brand communication or retail channels, as many consumers reported that they have not enough knowledge about the brand. As product information turned out be one of the most important non-product-related attributes, this is of high importance. Lastly, Lumene should maintain the Nordic approach to their branding, as the attribute clearly stood out positively and seemed memorable in the consumers’ minds.

6.3 Future research

There are many possibilities for future research to either complement or to be based on this study. Firstly, the authors recommend researchers within the field of non-product-related attributes to complement this study with alternative research methods. For instance, inferential statistics and formal hypothesis testing could be used for testing and measuring the findings of this research. The authors also suggest purely qualitative research approaches, such as focus groups, in depth interviews and observations in order to obtain an even deeper understanding and more detailed insights for the topic.

The study conducted should also be tested in other industries and between other similar markets including other brands. This could help detect non-product-related that are not covered in this study, while it would also allow measuring the importance of this study’s non-product-related attributes in other industries and countries. In addition, conducting a research that includes a mix of industries would provide useful insight for cross-category brands and give a more comprehensive picture of relevant non-product-related attributes, without being industry-specific.
Furthermore, many of the non-product-related attributes found important in this research are rather multidimensional and potentially causal with other attributes, and thus call for additional research. For instance, brand reputation and ethical values can be affected by many other factors, and even differ in meaning from industry to industry. Thus, deeper attribute-specific research is also one suggestion for future research.

Lastly, as times change, market trends shift and consumer preferences develop, this research should be conducted periodically, in order to update the findings and detect any new non-product-related attributes that may emerge.

### 6.4 Limitations

The main limitation of this research is the lack of access to a sampling frame for probability sampling. This would have increased the generalizability of the results, as the whole population would have been better represented. Thus, it is important to consider that in this research the age groups of 16-35 years are the most represented, which could have interfered with the results. Further, gathering data over a longer time period would also have been beneficial for the study, which would have allowed a more comprehensive mixed method approach, combining data from both a questionnaire and for instance in depth interviews.

It also has to be noted that this research was conducted on one specific market, the cosmetics market, which is why some of the results may not be applicable for other industries. For instance, some of the predetermined answer options in the questionnaire were rather specific for the cosmetics market. Thus, the findings are thereby likely to be most accurate for the cosmetics market as some non-product-related attributes vary from industry to industry.

For this research, the most vital limitation is the bounded ability to conduct generalizations to a broader population as a result of non-probability sampling. Also, due to the lack of random selection, there is a risk that the population is not well represented (Sue & Ritter, 2007). Access to a probability sampling frame would have decreased this limitation. Now it is important to consider that in this research the age groups of 16-35 years are the most represented, which could have interfered with the results. Further, gathering data over a longer time period would also have been beneficial for the study, which would have allowed a more comprehensive mixed method approach, combining data from both a questionnaire and for instance in depth interviews.
It also has to be noted that this research was conducted on one specific market, the cosmetics market, which is why some of the results may not be applicable for other industries. For instance, some of the predetermined answer options in the questionnaire were rather specific for the cosmetics market. Thus, the findings are thereby likely to be most accurate for the cosmetics market as some non-product-related attributes vary from industry to industry.
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Study of Swedish consumers’ expectations and attitudes on cosmetics brands

Hi,

Thank you for taking time to read this before answering the questionnaire.

We are two students from Uppsala University writing our Master thesis about Swedish consumers and their expectations and attitudes on cosmetics brands. In this study, cosmetics brands refer to brands within facial skin care and makeup. A brand is a name, symbol or sign, e.g. L’Oréal and Nivea. This study will therefore not place questions regarding cosmetics products’ functionality or ingredients.

The questionnaire takes approximately 3-5 minutes to answer and we are looking for Swedish female respondents in the age of 16 years and up. Your answers will be handled with confidentiality and all the answers will be aggregated and treated anonymously.

Thank you for taking time to answer our questionnaire, and please contact us on one of the email addresses below if you want any additional information or have any questions.

Kind regards,

Jutta Hedlund (jutta.hedlund.6381@student.uu.se)
Karla Mattero (karla.mattero.4677@student.uu.se)

*Obligatory

1. Age *
   - 16-25
   - 26-35
   - 36-45
   - 46-55
   - 56-65
   - 66+
   - I wish not to answer

2. Gender *
   - Female
   - Male
   - I wish not to answer

3. Nationality *
   - Swedish
   - Other:

4. City of residence *
General expectations on cosmetics brands (within facial skin care and makeup)

5. What makes you choose a cosmetics brand (beyond product functionality and ingredients)? Choose one or several alternatives.*

- Appealing appearance (e.g. logo, design)
- You can identify yourself with the brand (e.g. young, sporty, trendy)
- The brand has a good reputation
- The brand has transparency in its work (e.g. openness about business processes, credible communication)

- Sufficient product information
- Sustainable values (e.g. environmentally friendly, certificates such as Fairtrade)
- Ethical values (e.g. does no animal testing, good working conditions)
- Good customer service
- Price and campaigns
- Availability (e.g. available in well-known department stores, online stores)
- Online presence (e.g. active on social medias, own website)
- None of the above
- Other:

6. What would make you NOT choose a cosmetics brand (beyond product functionality and ingredients)? Choose one or several alternatives.*

- Unappealing appearance (e.g. logo, design)
- You can NOT identify with the brand (e.g. young, sporty, trendy)
- The brand has a poor reputation
- Unsustainable processes (e.g. does not consider impact on the environment)
- Unethical processes (e.g. animal testing, poor working conditions)
- Insufficient product information
- Unknown brand (e.g. neither you or your friends have experience of the brand)
- Poor customer service
- Price too low / high
- The brand is unavailable at your preferred stores or retailers

- None of the above

- Other:
7. How important do you find the below factors when purchasing cosmetics products (beyond product functionality and ingredients)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User friendly packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations (e.g. from friends, family, influencers such as bloggers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand’s country of origin (e.g. Sweden, France, region such as Scandinavia or Asia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of production (e.g. Sweden, China or a region such as Scandinavia, Europe, Asia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The brand does no animal testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent personnel who represent and sell the brand at retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer (e.g. Åhlens, Kicks, Lyko.se, OoB, ICA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf placement and store placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available product information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size and the owner of the brand (e.g. L’Oréal owning Lancome and Maybelline, or an entrepreneur who owns a brand, such as Isabella Löwengrip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Are there any other factors you consider important?
Attitudes towards the cosmetics brand Lumene

9. Are you familiar with the brand Lumene? *
   
   [ ] Yes  Continue to question 10.
   [ ] No  The questionnaire comes to an end.

10. Have you ever purchased Lumene’s products? *
    
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No

11. If yes, why did you decide to purchase Lumene’s products (beyond product functionality and ingredients)? If you answered no, write N/A (=not applicable). *

12. If no, why have you not purchased Lumene’s products (beyond product functionality and ingredients)? If you answered yes, write N/A (=not applicable). *

13. Is Lumene one of your preferred cosmetics brands? *
    
    [ ] Yes
    [ ] No

14. Why/Why not? *

15. Describe Lumene with 3 words *
16. Do you have a positive impression about Lumene as a cosmetics brand? *

- Yes
- No

17. Why/Why not? *

18. Do you think Lumene is a cosmetics brand you can trust? *

- Yes
- No

19. Why/Why not? *

20. Would you recommend Lumene to a friend? *

- Yes
- No

21. Why/Why not? *
APPENDIX 1  B QUESTIONNAIRE IN SWEDISH

Undersökning av svenska konsumenters attityder och förväntningar på skönhetsvarumärken

Hej,

Tack för att du tar dig tid att läsa detta före du deltar i undersökningen.


Undersökningen tar ungefär 3-5 minuter att svara på och vi söker efter svenska kvinnliga respondenter från 16 år och upp. Dina svar kommer att hanteras konfidentiellt och alla svar kommer att föras samman och behandlas anonymt.


Vänliga hälsningar,

Jutta Hedlund (jutta.hedlund.6381@student.uu.se)
Karla Mattero (karla.mattero.4877@student.uu.se)

*Obligatorisk

1. Ålder *
   Markera endast en oval.
   - 16-25
   - 26-35
   - 36-45
   - 46-55
   - 56-65
   - 66+
   - Vill inte svara

2. Känd *
   Markera endast en oval.
   - Kvinna
   - Man
   - Vill inte svara

3. Nationalitet *
   Markera endast en oval.
   - Svensk
   - Övrigt:

4. Bostadsort *
Generella förväntningar på skönhetsvarumärken (inom ansiktsvård & smink)

5. Vad får dig att välja ett skönhetsvarumärke (utöver produktfunktion och ingredienser)? Välj ett eller flera alternativ. *

Markera alla som gäller.

☐ Tilltalande utseende (t.ex. logotyp, design)
☐ Du kan identifiera dig med varumärket (t.ex. ungdomlig, sportig, trendig)
☐ Varumärket har ett gott rykte
☐ Varumärket har transparens i sitt arbete (t.ex. öppenhet om företagsprocesser, är trovärdig i sin kommunikation)
☐ Tillräcklig produktinformation
☐ Hållbara värden (t.ex. miljövänlig, certifieringar så som ECO CERT och Fairtrade)
☐ Etiska värden (t.ex. testar inte produkterna på djur, bra arbetsförhållanden)
☐ Bra kundservice
☐ Pris och kampanjer
☐ Tillgänglighet (t.ex. finns i välkända varuhus, nätbutiker och butikskedjor)
☐ Online närvaro (t.ex. aktiva på sociala medier, egen hemsida)
☐ Inget av de ovanstående
☐ Övrigt:

6. Vad skulle få dig att INTE välja ett skönhetsvarumärke (utöver produktfunktion och ingredienser)? Välj ett eller flera alternativ. *

Markera alla som gäller.

☐ Utseendet tilltalar mig inte (t.ex. logotyp, design)
☐ Du kan INTE identifiera dig med varumärket (t.ex. ungdomlig, sportig, trendig)
☐ Varumärket har dåligt rykte
☐ Ohållbara metoder (t.ex. tänker inte på sin inverkan på miljön och världen)
☐ Oetiska processer (t.ex. testar på djur, dåliga arbetsförhållanden)
☐ Bristande produktinformation
☐ Okänd varumärke (t.ex. varken du eller dina vänner har erfarenhet av varumärket)
☐ Dålig kundservice
☐ Pris för lågt / högt
☐ Varumärket kan inte hittas i butiker eller hos återförsäljare där jag föredrar att handla mina skönhetsvarumärken
☐ Inget av de ovanstående
☐ Övrigt:
7. Hur viktigt anser du nedan vara vid köp av skönhetsprodukter (utöver produktfunktion och ingredienser)?

Markera endast en oval per rad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inte alls viktigt</th>
<th>Av liten betydelse</th>
<th>Ganska viktigt</th>
<th>Väldigt viktigt</th>
<th>Avgörande</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pris Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avståndsvänlig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Förpackning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekommendationer (t.ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>från vänner, familj,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influencers såsom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bloggare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varumärkets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ursprungsländ (t.ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sverige, Frankrike,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kommer från ett område</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som Skandinavien eller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asien)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produktionsland (t.ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produceras i Sverige,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Kina eller i ett område</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som Skandinavien, Europa, Asien)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varumärket testar inte sina produkter på djur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miljövänlighet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunskap och professionell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal som representerar varumärket i butikerna / säljer produkterna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Återförsäljare (t.ex. finns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hos Ahlens, Kicks, Lyko.se,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖoB, ICA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyllplacering och placering i butik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillgänglig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produktinformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varumärkets storlek och eventuell ägare (t.ex. L’Oréal äger Lancome och Maybelline, entreprenör som äger sitt egna varumärke så som Isabella Löwengrip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Finns det några andra saker du anser vara viktiga?
Attityder till skönhetsvarumärket Lumene

   Markera endast en oval.
   ☐ Ja       Fortsätt till frågan 10.
   ☐ Nej      Sluta fylla i det här formuläret.

10. Har du någon gång köpt Lumenes produkter? *
    Markera endast en oval.
    ☐ Ja
    ☐ Nej

11. Om ja, varför bestämde du dig för att köpa Lumenes produkter (utöver produktfunktion och ingredienser)? Om du svarade nej skriv N/A (=inte tillämplig). *

12. Om nej, varför har du inte köpt Lumenes produkter (utöver produktfunktion och ingredienser)? Om du svarade ja skriv N/A (=inte tillämplig). *

13. Är Lumene ett av dina föredragna skönhetsvarumärken? *
    Markera endast en oval.
    ☐ Ja
    ☐ Nej

14. Varför/Varför inte? *

15. Beskriv Lumene med 3 ord *
16. Har du ett positivt intryck av Lumene som skönhetsvarumärke? *
   
   Markera endast en oval.
   
   [ ] Ja
   [ ] Nej

17. Varför/varför inte? *

18. Anser du att Lumene är ett skönhetsvarumärke du kan lita på? *
   
   Markera endast en oval.
   
   [ ] Ja
   [ ] Nej

19. Varför/varför inte? *

20. Skulle du rekommendera Lumene till en vän? *
   
   Markera endast en oval.
   
   [ ] Ja
   [ ] Nej

21. Varför/varför inte? *
APPENDIX 2  THE IMPORTANCE OF NON-PRODUCT-RELATED ATTRIBUTES

Table 1 Price

Table 2 Design

Table 3 User-friendly packaging

Table 4 Recommendations
### Table 5 Country of origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 Production country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production Country</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 Cruelty free

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty Free</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8 Environmental friendly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Decisive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Friendly</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9 Competent sales representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competent sales representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,4%</td>
<td>23,2%</td>
<td>29,5%</td>
<td>25,9%</td>
<td>8,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10 Retailers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retailers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11 Shelf placement and placement in store</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelf placement and placement in store</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12 Available product information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available product information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 The brand’s size and owner

Question 8

- Comparison tests
- Brand reputation
- Reliable online reviews
- Before and after pictures
- Credible and honest communication and commercials
APPENDIX 3  ASSOCIATIONS MENTIONED ONCE

Question 11
Reasons mentioned only once for buying Lumene’s products:

• Used the brand since childhood
• Simplicity
• Freshness
• Product information
• Broad assortment
• Perceived as credible
• The brand feels reliable

Question 12
Reasons mentioned only once for not buying Lumene’s products:

• Product claims that sound too good to be true
• Bad reviews
• No relevant influencers have promoted/used the product
• Poor previous design, that has left a feeling that the brand is of low quality
• Recently discovered Lumene, and has not had the time to buy it yet
• Don’t know

Question 14a
Reasons mentioned only once for having Lumene as a preferred brand:

• Good brand
• No animal testing
• Brand reputation
• Trustworthiness
• Ethical
• Locally produced
• No wild colors
• One gets what one expects

**Question 14b**

Reasons mentioned only once for not having Lumene as a preferred brand:

• Uncertainty about animal-testing
• Not enough colors in the makeup assortment
• It is not used by any friends or family
• Too much generic advertising
• Being sold in sections with other brands that are classified as less appreciated
• Not being exposed to the brand in a while
• Bad reviews
• The brand feels old
• Not a luxury brand
• Just recently discovered Lumene

**Question 15**

Word associations that were mentioned only once are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>expensive</th>
<th>known</th>
<th>no hazardous substances</th>
<th>plain</th>
<th>stylish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a bit unknown facial cream known brand not luxurious popular television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average flat locally produced not my cup of tea price varies trendy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic generic long-lasting not as visible renewed underestimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty gentle low-quality not too expensive responsible uninteresting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blonde glow mascarina ok quality for the money retail product tested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blueberry good smell (not too much) moisturizing old-fashioned satisfied user-friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classic grown up neutral older should be good well-sent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concealed Iceland now perfumed smelted oker wide range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elegant innovative nice pharmacy spoken of a lot works sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17a**

Reasons mentioned only once for having a positive impression about Lumene as a brand:

• Environmentally friendly and
• Natural
• Well-known
• Neutral
• Wide range assortment
• Availability
• Heavy focus on the Finnish nature,
• Skin-friendly brand and
• Availability in pharmacies
• Transparent
• Reviews

**Question 17b**
Reasons mentioned only once for not having a positive impression about Lumene as a brand:
• Simple
• Finnish
• Colorless
• Uninteresting
• Ordinary
• Not appealing

**Question 19a**
Reasons mentioned only once for trusting Lumene as a brand:
• Good
• Based on recommendations,
• Been on the market for a long time
• Accountability
• Simple
• Easy to find good information about
• Natural and fresh
• Clean
• Stable
• Safe
• You know what you get
• The brand gives that impression
• It feels like Lumene puts more resources on creating quality products than on glamorous marketing
• Think so
• Feels like it
• I hope so

**Question 19b**

Reasons mentioned only once for not trusting Lumene as a brand:

• Not being able to buy the brand at high-end retailers,
• Uncertainty about animal testing,
• The products not being ecological,
• Aggressive marketing and the brand being
• Colorless
• I do not trust any beauty brands
• Finnish brand

**Question 21a**

Reasons mentioned only once for recommending Lumene to a friend:

• Recommendations from others
• Environmental friendliness

**Question 21b**

Reasons mentioned only once for not recommending Lumene to a friend:

• Finnish
• Bad recommendations
• I don’t know how Lumene works with the environment
• Uncertainty about animal testing
• Health/allergies
• An in-between brand
• A budget brand
• I don’t have a close enough relationship with Lumene
• I don’t ever recommend products to others