

Stockholm School of Economics
MSc Marketing and Media Management
Master thesis 30 credits
Thesis defense: 2013-06-04

Creative Windows – Worth Looking Into

A Quantitative Experiment on Window Displays



Authors: Linn Westerberg & Ulrika Häggarth
Tutors: Sara Rosengren & Fredrik Lange

ABSTRACT

As the retail environment becomes fiercer, increased pressure is put on the different parts of a retail strategy. Standing out in the crowd and being consistent throughout the retail tactics are two ways to increase the chances of keeping the brand visible, and the grip around the consumer intact.

In recent years, window displays have gained attention and respect as a tool to handle these issues. The window display is a communication channel that reaches the customers directly in the street with the ability to enhance their perception towards the brand, and to immediately affect their shopping behavior. However, there are today almost as many different ways of working with window displays as there are retailers. Further, little research has been done within the area of window displays from the academic standpoint, which has led to a knowledge gap about the efficiency of different window display tactics. The purpose of this study is to make this knowledge gap smaller and show the actual effects of window displays.

A quantitative scenario experiment was performed on 1419 customers of a high street brand's membership club, and

complemented with two minor observation studies. Additionally, three visual merchandisers were interviewed and consulted. The manipulation variables were: level of creativity, presence of a price offering, and redesign frequency. Communication effects were investigated in terms of the dependent variables *ability*, *credibility*, *product quality*, *exclusivity*, *entering intention*, and *purchase intention*.

The authors found that (1) a creative window leads to an enhanced brand image and stimulates entering- and purchase intention, (2) redesigning the windows creates similar positive outcomes, (3) hedonic customers are more easily influenced and more attentive to both creativity and redesign frequency, and (4) a price offering displayed in the window does not harm the efficiency of the same, in the short-term.

The findings imply that creative windows are worth looking into for retailers and practitioners, and that investing in a high redesign frequency would give return. What is important to remember, however, is to think of who your customer is and what it is looking at...

Key words: window display, creativity, price offering, redesign frequency, communication effects, brand image, retail strategy, visual merchandising, shopping behavior, hedonic customers, willingness to pay, high street fashion

A SPECIAL THANKS TO:

Our fabulous tutors and first-responders, Sara Rosengren and Fredrik Lange, for fun tutoring sessions and fantastic encouragement

Our dear friend and PhD student Angelica Blom for her support and comprehension of two-way ANOVAs

Visual merchandisers Andreas Diaz-Soliz, JoAnn Tan and Katrine Wallberg for sharing their professional opinions and great experience

Sofia Björkman and Maria Sjöstrand at Brothers/RNB for enabling us to conduct this study and supporting us along the way



NK by JoAnn Tan

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Background	6
1.1.1 The rationale of the window display.....	7
1.1.2 Putting together the window display	10
1.2 Problem area.....	11
1.3 Objective	12
1.4 Expected knowledge contribution	13
1.5 Delimitations.....	14
1.6 Concepts	15
1.7 Disposition.....	17
2. THEORY & HYPOTHESES GENERATION	18
2.1 A strategic view of the retail environment.....	18
2.2 Window displays.....	19
2.3 Creativity	20
2.4 Brand Image.....	21
2.5 Brand Credibility	Fel!Bokmärket är inte definierat.
2.6 Price	23
2.7 Wear-out effect versus wear-in effect.....	24
2.8 Shopping motivations – Utilitarian versus Hedonic	26
2.9 Willingness to pay	27
Hypotheses generation	28
3. METHODOLOGY.....	30
3.1 Choosing the topic.....	30
3.2 Preparatory work	31
3.2.1 Selecting thesis approach and research design.....	31
3.2.2 Selecting the data gathering method	33
3.2.3 Selecting the brand and product category.....	33
3.2.4 Selecting the sample	33
3.2.6 Pre-testing quantitatively and qualitatively	35
3.2.7 Manipulation check.....	38
3.3 Main study	38
3.3.1 Experiment design	38
3.3.2 Experiment variables	39
3.3.3 The survey.....	41
3.3.4 Tools for analyzing.....	42
3.4. Complementary Studies	43
Qualitative field study.....	43
Quantitative observation study	43
3.5 The experiment’s validity and reliability.....	44
3.5.1 Reliability	44
3.5.2 Validity	45
4. RESULTS & ANALYSIS	48
Hypotheses testing.....	48
4.1 Creativity and price’s effect on brand image	48
4.2 Creativity and price’s effect on consumers’ shopping behavior	50
4.3 Redesign frequency’s effect on brand image and consumers’ shopping behavior.....	51
4.4 Redesign frequency’s wear-out versus wear-in effect	53

4.5 Creativity's effect on redesign frequency outcomes.....	54
4.6 Redesign frequency's impact on hedonically driven customers.....	55
4.7 Creativity and Willingness to pay	56
4.8 Summary of hypotheses results	58
4.9 Qualitative observation study	59
5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS.....	60
5.1 Discussion	60
5.1.1 Creativity – Hard-hitting for retailers!	60
5.1.2 The presence of a price offering – not harmful in the short run.....	61
5.1.3 Redesign frequency – Repetition matters!	62
5.1.4 Hedonically-driven customers – easily affected by- and attentive to visual elements	64
5.1.5 Willingness to pay.....	66
5.2 Conclusions.....	67
5.3 Implications	68
5.3.1 Creativity.....	68
5.3.2 Price.....	68
5.3.3 Hedonic versus Utilitarian.....	69
5.3.4 Redesign Frequency.....	69
5.3.5 Willingness to pay.....	70
5.4 Limitations	70
5.5 Future Research.....	71
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIX.....	79

The Table of Tables

Hypotheses	p. 28	H2a.....	p. 49
Research questions & Hypotheses...	p. 29	Live observation 1.....	p. 50
Table 1.....	p. 32	H2b.....	p. 50
Table 2.....	p. 36	Live observation 2.....	p. 50
Table 3.....	p. 36	H3a.....	p. 51
Table 4.....	p. 37	H3b.....	p. 52
Table 5.....	p. 37	H4.....	p. 53
Table 6.....	p. 37	H5.....	p. 53-54
Table 7.....	p. 38	H6a.....	p. 55
Table 8.....	p. 38	H6b.....	p. 55
Table 9.....	p. 42	H7a.....	p. 56
Table 10.....	p. 43	H7b.....	p. 56
H1a.....	p. 48	Summary Hypotheses results	p. 57
H1b.....	p. 49		

1. INTRODUCTION

In this initial part of our paper we will introduce the chosen subject, describe the identified problem area and formulate the thesis objective. Further, the expected knowledge contribution is presented, followed by our delimitations of the topic. To clarify the rest of the paper's content we also describe important concepts/subjects on which the research is based. This chapter ends with the essay's outline and disposition.

1.1 Background

Today, the retail environment has become fiercely competitive and clustered – dense shopping areas where the marketing space is cluttered – which makes it more important than ever to pay attention to all of the elements of the retail mix, including e.g. store design and atmospherics (Mower et al. 2012). The customers' attention span is limited and the crowd as busy as it has ever been. This leads to retailers not only having to struggle to be “unique”, and to stand out and be seen by customers (in a world where that concept is almost per se unfeasible). They also have to struggle with keeping a consistent image and a way of communicating all the way from the ad to the store, to not risk losing the customer on the way. “Conceptualization” of brands and stores is becoming increasingly common in today's “experiences economy” as a result of the need to differentiate and captivate shoppers. (Diamond & Diamond 2007) Perhaps, this is even truer within the fashion industry where the brand image is *everything* (take e.g. the house of Ralph Lauren: “We don't only sell clothes, we are selling a dream and a vision.”; Lauren & Randolph Carter 2007). The store has turned into an additional channel for communication where both internal and external features function as tools for carrying messages. One external feature that has gotten increased acknowledgement in recent years (as seen in e.g. the augmented attention in articles cf. Mower et al. 2012; Oh & Petrie 2011; Davies & Ward 2005) is the window display of the store.

The window display is truly the retailer's most transparent channel of communication to the customer: It is here that the products are exposed, prices are presented, and the retailer's effort put to test. The windows provide retailers with an opportunity to attract passers-by into the store, and it has become an increasingly important “arena” since this is a feature that retailers have direct control over. (Mower et al. 2012) But

this opportunity is attached to a responsibility because if the retailer is caught off guard with an uninspiring and below-average execution, the whole street will know...

What makes window displays such an interesting topic, is that they can be designed and used in various different ways and they *are* used for a diverse range of purposes. Already in the beginning of the 19th century the term “window Sundays” was coined, as the Christmas window displays were revealed two Sundays before Christmas Eve (Projekt Runeberg 1917; Svenska Akademien 1974). This tradition is still held up by the Stockholm department store NK with the spectacular revelation of their whimsical Christmas windows each year, attracting a great amount of curious people. Internationally, there are similar actors epitomizing the great effort in time and money that is put into storefronts, during the holiday season. Famous department stores such as Bloomingdale’s and Macy’s in New York, have become famous for their creative and detailed window displays during Christmas time, and are mandatory sightseeing spots for tourists during the month of December. (Women's Wear Daily)



NK Christmas window from 2011 by JoAnn Tan

1.1.1 The rationale of the window display

As we briefly touched upon, window displays can have different purposes and play different roles in different types of stores. For example, in the Mediterranean countries, where a high number of shoe- and accessory retailers are so called “mom-and-pop” stores, the windows are often used to showcase the whole stock of the

store to passers-by, who will only enter the store if they see something they are interested in. In other types of stores, and in other parts of Europe, the windows instead have the primary function of attracting the customer into the store immediately and not necessarily by showcasing merchandise. Another usage area is to communicate news about the company unrelated to the store itself; the opening of a new store can be communicated in existing stores' window displays to redirect traffic. (Diaz-Soliz 2013)

There are many different window display formats that fit under “traditional store fronts”. Depending on what specific purpose the person in charge has in mind (we’ll come back to this, but it can be different people within the company), brands can use “basic window designs” that allows for many different variations such as: Parallel-to-sidewalk windows, corner windows, open-back windows, windowless windows or



Louis Vuitton, New York, 2008

shadow box windows (Diamond & Diamond 2007). Each version has its own positive and negative characteristic, but always tries to leverage the stores location and arrangement. Open-back windows, for example, have the purpose of showing off the whole store and its merchandise from the outside, at the same time as it includes a conventional window display. Corner windows on the other hand, serve the function of enabling passers-by to converge the store from two directions, which results in increased visibility into the store, and are conversely much sought after (Diamond & Diamond 2007).

The window displays do not, however, only depend on the location and format of the store but also on the retailer itself. When it comes to the fashion industry, there are

signs of differences in how each actor work with window displays depending on what segment they belong to. Luxury brands like Balenciaga and Louis Vuitton often focus on enhancing their exclusive – and to a great degree and for many of us inaccessible – brand image and therefore invest heavily in imaginative and innovative window designs – often towards what could be described as “art” (see pic. on the previous page). Lifestyle brands on the other hand, such as Tommy Hilfiger and Gant, want to communicate an accessible yet “dreamy” lifestyle, which they want you to desire and realize that you actually can obtain (if you buy their clothes). Therefore focus lies on creating displays that reflect a certain setting and atmosphere that isn’t too extravagant. (Diaz-Soliz 2013) Finally, the high-street brands – the lowest fashion segment – tend to invest relatively little in creative visual merchandising and instead put the money on product- and campaign offerings that are communicated in the windows with the goal of driving traffic into the store and “sell!”. (Diaz-Soliz 2013)



Summer window display at H&M, Budapest, 2012

In other words, the level of creativity and the usage of campaign offerings in the windows are often prevalent inversely, when going up or down the retail ladder, as we’ve described above. Unsurprisingly, the higher you climb, the wider becomes the boundaries for what you can do creatively (Wallberg 2013; Tan 2013). The effect is that more and more retailers work with their brands and communication in a way that

“conceptualize” them, and it therefore becomes important that adequate attention is put into to making of the window displays. As an example, the jumpers and skirts would not only be displayed in the windows, but be put into “themed” environments or small worlds that enable a presentation of them that communicates a feeling.

This a a segment-specific issue, but what does not seem to be segment-specific is the frequency that the windows are switched in, the so called “redesign frequency”. Labour and material costs, not to mention the cognitive investment, set the terms of how often new window displays can be created and executed without missing out on return on investment on each of them (Wallberg 2013). Nevertheless, it is an interesting aspect of the window display. And since some retailers seem to make weekly changes while others keep their windows for a whole month, one should ask oneself three questions: (1) How important is it to display new windows as often as, e.g., on a weekly basis, (2) does customers notice the new windows, and (3) if so, what effect does switching the windows seldom/often have on the customers’ perception of the brand?

1.1.2 Putting together the window display

The creating process of a window display – the “value chain” of it, so to speak – looks slightly different depending on where and to whom in the organization it is being delegated. The goal that is being pursued will also depend on this; whether it is to communicate and build the brand, or to drive traffic and sales. If the responsibility for the window lies within the marketing department, usually there is an emphasis on the former outcome, as opposed to if the sales/retail department is in charge. (WDA) The latter could potentially result in lower budget allocations and a lack of connection with the overall marketing strategy as it often ends up way down on the list of priorities (Diaz-Soliz 2013).

Nevertheless, many different people can be involved in the work of window displays such as visual merchandisers, creative directors or people from the strategic marketing team. These actors can be located either internally or externally and usually depends on the size of the company and the perceived importance of maintaining a consistent brand image. The organizations that do not have a visual

merchandise internally would outsource this to external ad agencies or art directors to come up with campaign concepts and display elements. (Diaz-Soliz 2013; Wallberg 2013). This brief description illustrates that there is no established “one way” when it comes to the planning and execution of a window display.

To sum up, there seem to be as many different approaches to the concept of window displays as there are ants in the anthill. The broad function and use of window displays is a result of the fact that it increasingly becomes more of a strategic tool, used to reach overall retail goals. The windows are extensions of the communication efforts that a retailer undertakes, but it can take many forms. Two dimensions that are important to think of when assembling a window are: How “concrete” or “abstract” it should be (in practice: should there be a price offering in the window, and how “creative” should it be), and how often it should be redesigned.

Finally, to enlighten the importance of window displays, we can see that the level of craftsmanship skill that is required to create an efficient window has gotten further acknowledgments through the initiation of competitions that award creative and “out-of-the-box” window display concepts around the world (c.f. In Store Asia; A.R.E Design Awards). This gives an indication that the window display has ascended in priority within the field of marketing and might be something to invest more interest in in the future. But let this thesis give us some more answers!

1.2 Problem area

As we touched upon above, in the background section, the retail environment is more competitive than ever (especially since the introduction of online shops) and from a marketing perspective the environment of communication is extremely cluttered (Rosengren 2008). It is therefore important for retailers to make all elements of their retail mix as efficient as possible to catch the attention of customers better than the competitors.

On top of this, consumers have less time for shopping, and even less time for “window shopping”. Within the general area of marketing, the sender for example only has about 0.037-5.30 seconds to catch the customers’ attention (the time spent

on reading an glossy magazine ad; Milosavljevic & Cerf 2008). For retailers, this would mean that the time they have to catch the consumers' attention in the streets is very short, and consequently well-executed window displays are needed. But what actually works the best? There is a knowledge gap here concerning the existence of actual academic research evidence of the window displays effectiveness, and as previously mentioned, there is no accepted way of dealing with the issue. The lack of theoretical research makes the foundation of decision-making weak. It also results in a lack of adequate knowledge and many retailers do not understand the importance and ability of the window display as a factor that influences customers' shopping behavior. The effort is put on other communication variables that leave the planning of the windows a second priority, resulting in bad execution (Wallberg 2013).

Previous studies have shown that creative window displays have the potential to affect customers (Mower 2012; Oh Petrie 2012), but creativity often comes with a (higher) price. When higher investments are needed, you want strong evidence of that the odds of getting a positive payoff are low. But this is difficult to measure and within the area of clothing retailers, research on the relations between window displays' and customer shopping behavior are rare and narrow, and does not provide a strong base of evidence (Tan 2013). Further studies are needed to increase the understanding amongst clothing retailers of the potential of their window displays, helping them become stronger in a saturated market.

Creativity and price offerings are concepts that have been previously researched on within the field of marketing. Still, the studies have to a great extent been limited to measure the pay off of creativity versus price offerings in advertisements and commercials. We claim that there is a need to look at this factor within the area of retail strategy – in particular visual merchandising – as well.

1.3 Objective

The main objective of this study is to narrow the knowledge gap concerning window displays' efficiency and to provide retailers, visual merchandisers and academics with a better understanding of window displays' ability to create positive communication effects such as enhanced brand image and shopping behavior. The aim is to clarify

whether the level of creativity, the existence of price offerings and the redesign frequency have any significant effect on these outcomes.

Below, we present our central research questions with connected sub-questions.

- Is a creative window more efficient than a non-creative one?
 - Does the existence of a price offering have an additional effect on the outcome?

- Is a high redesign frequency of the window displays more efficient than a low redesign frequency?
 - Do the outcomes of this also depend on the level of creativity?

- Is there any difference in how efficient a window display is depending on whether the customer is hedonically or utility driven?

1.4 Expected knowledge contribution

This thesis will provide further understanding of the importance of window displays' effect on consumer behavior, for theorists as well as practitioners, such as retailers within the high street segment of the fashion industry. For practitioners, we hope to especially give retail managers a more solid platform to base decisions on and to boost the confidence of all visual merchandisers out there. Little academic research has been done within the field, and retailers commonly rely on visual merchandisers who many times possess more decorative and technical knowledge rather than wider strategic understanding of the affect on shopping behavior (Wallberg 2013). For theorists, this study provides better proof of the window displays affect on consumers – in relation to the specific variables tested. This thesis presents a case that shows the payoff of focusing on creative window displays and frequent redesign. In a narrower sense, this thesis will also provide guidance for the researched brand during their repositioning phase, on how to most efficiently plan their window displays towards their customers.

1.5 Delimitations

Window displays as part of retail strategy is a broad topic with complex correlations and variables affecting the outcome of consumer shopping behavior but are relevant for many different industries. We have chosen to limit the scope of this study to window displays of clothing retailers to delineate the topic to a sound level. This industry is appropriate as a target for the topic since window displays play a very important role for retailers in terms of building their brands, and they make use of creativity in an interesting way that is in line with what we want to research. However, there are many different kinds of clothing retailers and to avoid taking on a too broad topic we chose to further narrow the focus of the analysis down to only the high street segment. This segment is possibly the one with the greatest need for window displays to actually trigger sales. This is due to that they often are located in fashion-cluttered streets where customers go for “pleasure/indulge shopping” where they have the opportunity to attract the customers into the store quickly. We do make a few comparisons between the segments throughout the study however, but with the purpose of clarifying certain issues or statements and will not elaborate on it further. Additionally, we chose to only carry out the study on the customers of one specific brand. The experiment in itself is complex, so to extend it to non-customers as well was found to break the limits of what we are able to accommodate in this thesis. Geographically, the study is delimited to Sweden since this is the market where the brand is active.

We further chose to focus on three main variables to evaluate the window displays’ effect on consumers: Creativity, price offering and frequency of window redesign. These variables can potentially signal whether it is significant for a retail brand to invest in creative window displays or put focus on sales and price offerings, and if investment in more frequent redesign of the window has the sought-after effect on consumer behavior. It should also be noted that the level of creativity has to be looked upon in relative and not absolute terms. What is considered a high level of creativity for a high-street retailer might be considered a standard, low-maintenance window for a lifestyle or luxury brand, which is something that we have come across in our preparatory work. This is the results of everything from budget restraints – and its opposite – to customer expectations of the brand in particular, industry “standards”, or even a case of management or employee interest. This means that when we refer

to a “creative window” in this thesis, it is in terms of creativity in the high street segment. Hence, it might not be seen as creative within other segments.

1.6 Concepts

In this section we will go through and establish a couple of the concepts that we will use further on. We believe that these are important to understand before we move on.

Communication effects: Behaviors and attitudes amongst consumers, in other words “outcomes”, of a communication effort. In this thesis we will look at perceptions of ability, credibility, product quality, exclusivity as well as different brand associations, and finally entering intention, purchase intention and willingness to pay. (Dahlén & Lange 2009)

Consumer shopping behavior: Refers to the unconscious behavior of consumers affected by external stimuli. The term is often explained by the AIDA-model (Awareness, Interest, Desire, Action), which describes the different stages where a brand can influence the consumers’ behaviors. In this study we look at awareness in terms of attention to the window, interest in and desire for the displayed merchandise and actions like entering- and purchase decisions. (Dahlén & Lange 2009)

Creativity: Within advertising the term creativity is defined as “the art of establishing new and meaningful relationships between previously unrelated things in a manner that is relevant, believable and in good taste, but which somehow presents the product in a fresh new light” (El-Murad & West 2004) and we borrow this definition to the window display field since research is limited and is therefore has no tested definition of the concept. Among visual merchandisers there is a common view of what a creative window display could look like. The use of props and creation of a feeling that “speaks to the target group” are two factors that contribute to creativity (Diaz-Soliz 2013; Wallberg 2013).

High street fashion: A segment in the apparel and accessory industry, targeting a broad market with relatively low quality/price ratio. The segment is named by the fact

that these types of retailers often are densely located at main streets of cities with a high amount of customer traffic.

Price offering: Price offering is a discount or “special deal” promoted in or on the window display together with the merchandise in particular. The price offering can be presented and constructed in different ways e.g. “two-for-one”, “50 % discount” or “It’s Father’s day – buy a tie and get 100:- off!” on big cardboard displays, posters or stickers on the window, just to mention a few possible executions. (Diamond & Diamond 2007)

Redesign frequency: When you switch one or all elements in a window. To illustrate a high redesign frequency in this thesis, we refer to window displays where the whole concept is changed.

Retail strategy: Refers to the standardization or adaption of the retail offer, i.e. the plan retailers in particular create which in detail describes how they intend to offer its products to customers and influence their behavior. It might include facilities, layout, image, atmosphere, how one should display and place the products in the store, how to attract attention and how to use for example pricing and signs to affect consumer behavior. (Evans et al. 2008)

Shopping motivation: Refers to what drives the consumer to shop for products. The motive can be either hedonic or utilitarian. We approach this matter closer in our theory section. (Kalcheva & Weitz 2006)

Window display: The storefront facing the street where merchandise is displayed behind glass. The purpose to either build the brand image, often applied by life style- or luxury brands such as Tommy Hilfiger and Luis Vuitton, or to drive traffic into the store and encourage purchases, which is often used by high street retailers such as H&M and ZARA. (Diamond & Diamond 2007)

Note: We will through-out the thesis refer to the term window display as either window or window display.

1.7 Disposition

This thesis consists of five chapters: Introduction, Theory & Hypotheses generation, Methodology, Results & Analysis and Discussion & Conclusions. In the initial chapter an introduction to the topic is given together with a description of the problem area, objective of the study as well as delimitations. The second chapter will provide the reader with a theoretical background which serves as a base for our study, and from the reasoning here, our hypotheses are generated and explained. Subsequently, our method is described in terms of research design, preparatory work, survey/experiment design, main study and the thesis' reliability and validity. In the fourth chapter we present our results derived from the quantitative experiment, and complementary observation studies, followed by an analysis of our findings. The thesis is wrapped up with a discussion of the results followed by conclusions, implications, limitations and finally suggestions for future research on window displays. Lastly, the references used are presented as well as attachments collected into an appendix-section.



NK by JoAnn Tan

2. THEORY & HYPOTHESES GENERATION

In this chapter, previous research within the area of window displays and customer behavior is presented. It begins with a broader view of how window displays fit into the overall retail strategy, followed by a detailed section of how it actually works and descriptions of different variables of consumer attitudes and behaviors. Throughout the text – in suitable places – we will comment on the basic ideas that later leads up to our hypotheses. The chapter ends with a presentation of the generated hypotheses and is wrapped up with a clarification of how these will help us answer our central research questions.

2.1 A strategic view of the retail environment

Atmospherics

As we mentioned in our introduction, the retail environment has become competitive and clustered in such a way that has made it super important to pay attention to each of the elements of the retail mix, including store design and atmospherics (Mower et al. 2012). “Atmospherics are the environmental elements that help create the retail image of a store and set the mood to stimulate sales” (Mower et al. 2012). The retail atmosphere has shown to have a great impact on consumer behavior and there are several factors that contribute to an effective retail environment. According to Berman & Evans (2007) the factors are the following: the exterior, the general interior, the layout/design, POP/decorations and human factors. These should be developed in line with each other and be consistent (Turley & Chebat 2002). Furthermore, they must *together* accomplish the goals associated with the store’s particular image in order to influence customer behavior.

Note: In the following part of this section, we will not focus on all of these factors but rather only on the *external variable* – the one that includes the window display. If you would like to read more about the other factors that make up the retail environment, please read Turley & Chebat (2002).

So, the *exterior variable* includes features such as the *look* and *style* of the building the store is located in, the *size* of the building, *marquees*, availability of *parking spaces*, *the surrounding area*, and last but not least the ***window displays***. Turley &

Milliman (2002) state that this particular feature is very important since exterior cues are what is first seen by a customer. Retailers have great opportunities to influence the customers' shopping behavior by signaling a positive impression with the exterior (Mower et al. 2012). If you don't manage the exterior cues successfully, the rest of the atmospheric variables might lose their positive effect on customer pleasure and behavior (Turley & Milliman 2002). The exterior has to be accepted by the customers before they decide on whether or not they want to experience the rest of the store (Turley and Milliman 2002).

Outcome issues and shopping behaviors

By developing the atmospheric design elements together and strive to keep them consistent, retailers can influence customers' shopping behavior in positive directions. A couple of these outcomes can be *increased sales, approach-avoidance behavior* and *brand image perceptions* (Turley & Chebat 2002). Throughout this study we will focus on the window display's influence on these variables and give further space for discussion around this.

2.2 Window displays

"The windows are the first look a customer gets before she comes into a store". (Klokis 1986). The window display is an atmospheric factor that the retailer is in direct control over, through which it can communicate store information from which customers can make decisions based on (Mower et al. 2012). According to Oh & Petrie (2012) the window allows the retailer to depict a certain image towards the customers by showing off design aesthetics, taste and brand personality. To a customer that has no previous experience with the retailer, a window display tells her what type of store it is and what it is offering. Researchers have found that aesthetically pleasing windows with a theme and warm colors are most successful in pulling customers' attention, by the use of perspective, lighting, and accessories associated with the merchandise (Mower et al. 2012). Furthermore, the same researchers found that sales increase when new products are displayed in the window (Mower et al. 2012).

The size of the window has also proven to be an important factor when it comes to efficiently attracting customers' attention; the bigger display the better results (Edward & Shackley 1992). The explanation, according to the authors, is that a bigger window can encompass more attention-generating elements. Furthermore, research has showed that the mere utilizing of window displays increase sales, in comparison to having no window displays at all. The logic behind this: An attractive display increases the customers' liking of the exterior of the retail environment, which in turn results in higher positive patronage intentions due to increased feelings of pleasure and arousal. (Mower et al. 2012)

Two broad types of window displays have been identified in previous research: **artistic** and **merchandise-focused** windows. There is a need for both types of displays since the retailers not only need to attract their current customers, but also need to create attention beyond the targeted segments. Merchandisers have therefore – in recent years – started to work together with artists to create artistic and creative displays that enable the accomplishment of reaching a broader segment (Mower et al. 2012). An artistic window is characterized by the focus on communicating the stores image by the use of implicit messages that people can interpret while passing by the window. A merchandise-focused window, on the other hand, has the purpose to sell merchandise as quickly as possible by including a straight-forward presentation of the stores' products, at the same time as it attracts traffic by awakening positive store entry intentions (Mower et al. 2012).

2.3 Creativity

Previous research on creativity and what it can signal about a brand towards consumers has largely been done on advertising, within the field of marketing. When investigating the effect of a creative window – and what a creative window signals about a store and a brand – the findings from previous ad studies will be used. Amna Kirmani has conducted several studies on this particular topic and showed in 1990 that *expensive* advertising could function as a signal that the sender has greater confidence and ability than average, thus implicitly implying that the sender also has products with a greater quality than average. Dahlén et al. (2008) showed in a similar way that *creative* advertising indicate a smarter-than-average trait, which was also

found mediating the quality perception of the products, in effect adding to Kirmani's findings that you indeed can use marketing tactics unrelated to the functional aspects of a product to indirectly signal superiority in the same product.

In a study by Ambler & Hollier (2004), the authors show that the perceived extravagance of an advertisement – they call it “waste” – contributes to advertising effectiveness by enhancing its credibility. They hypothesize that excesses in advertising work in a similar way by signaling “brand fitness.” TV advertisements were evaluated online for perceived advertising expense, message, brand familiarity, quality, reliability, and likelihood of choosing. Perceived high advertising expense enhanced the advertisement's persuasiveness significantly, but largely indirectly, by strengthening the perceptions of brand quality. Finally, Kirmani & Wright (1989) showed in a study that campaign elements of which the cost is known, can evoke advertising expense inferences that influence quality predictions.

2.4 Brand Image

One of the key factors that are recognized to influence consumers' decision-making processes is the brand. A brand consists of signals (name, symbols, design, etc.) that help the consumer to identify the products and separate them from the competitors. Brand image can be explained as the overall attitudes, feelings and beliefs that consumers hold towards a particular brand (Clow & Baack 2005), as well as their understanding of the products (Sahbaz & Ciftci 2011). These are formed by the customer's own impressions, which are created from various different sources such as the brand name, product trials, brand reputation and packaging (Sahbaz & Ciftci 2011). Communication is also a critical part of building a solid and powerful brand image (Clow & Baack 2005) and the ad format and content are contributing factors, as are the choice of media channels. Hence, the brand image has to do with emotional impressions as well as aesthetic, and appears in the mind of the consumer by means of the brand associations that they hold in their memories. For the brand image to be successful, these associations must be found positive. (Sahbaz & Ciftci 2011). Further they must also be perceived as credible in order to have the sought-after effect (Leisching et al. 2012), which is why it is vital for companies to nurture the brand's asset of credibility (Blackshaw 2008). The term brand credibility generally

refers to the believability of a brand's intention at a certain time (Erdem & Swait 2004) i.e., that they have the ability and willingness to deliver what they have promised at all times (Leisching et al. 2012).

In this thesis we will capture perceived brand image with these variables: *ability*, *credibility*, *product quality* and *exclusivity*.

After viewing the previous theory just presented, we are led to hypothesizing that a creative window should have the potential to increase positive brand image as well as increased shopping behavior. As Mower et al. state, the exterior has the potential to affect shopping behavior (as a communication tool) and to build brand image according to Sahbaz & Ciftci.

2.6 Price

Price information according to the law

One thing important to mention when talking about window merchandising in Sweden is that all retailers are obligated to follow the law of price information (“Prisinformationslagen 2004:347”), which demands that the consumer receives correct and clear information about products. In terms of window displays, this law means that all products that are showcased in the window have to have a price shown either on the package, shelf etiquette, or on a price list sign. (Konsumentverket) However, the law does not include any restrictions concerning *where* these price signs should be placed in the window or in what size it should be.

Price signals

External pricing (price shown on signs/boards/tags) helps shaping an experience between the consumer and the brand, and also works as a reference when the consumer later assesses the overall price level of the brand. But price manipulations can work both against and in favor of a retailer. Price is important since it in certain settings can boost sales, but at the same time it can create dissatisfaction with the customers if it is perceived as incorrect. Previous research has shown that customers often translate price (signs) as signals or symbols, rather than as the actual price of merchandise. (Nordfält 2007) Further, the customers’ perception of the price seems to often be influenced by the overall atmospherics of the specific setting and *the way* the price is exhibited, rather than by the actual price (Nordfält 2007).

Price in relation to quality

It can be very difficult for consumers to see clear differences of quality between brands, and to even detect the level of quality. Instead brands use communication to signal their quality, and more specifically they communicate price. Price can generate both demand – and supply-related quality and can signal either high demand or superior quality. (Gerstner 1985) Price even serves as an indicator of quality to a wider extent than generally believed and this can help to explain consumer behavior (Gabor & Granger 1966). However, studies (Oxenfeldt 1950; Morris and Bronson 1969; Sproles 1977; Riesz 1978, 1979; and Geistfeld 1982) have concluded that the relationship might not be as strong as one might believe, but rather generally weak

and depends on product category. It could also depend on variations across brands. (Gerstner 1985) Diaz-Soliz further indicated that price displays could potentially even harm and diminish a brand (Diaz –Soliz 2013).

By further viewing this section as an extension of the first, we are led to hypothesize that price has a mitigating effect on creative windows' efficiency on brand image and shopping behavior in the context of high street fashion. As both Nordfält and Diaz-Soliz state, price could harm a brand and potentially also create dissatisfaction amongst customers.

2.7 Wear-out effect versus wear-in effect

Today, brands do not only need to focus on creating innovative and eye-catching communication to reach out to their customers, but they also have to think about how often it is reasonable to switch and update the message to keep the efficiency high. During the past decades many studies have been performed on this matter, showing results with clear indication that seldom switched commercials and advertisements have a so called **wear-out effect** with the passage of time (Apple 1984). Wear-out refers to the state where the viewers, after a particular number of repetitions, is no longer significantly affected by the by the ad (Pechman & Stewart 2002). Grass & Wallace (1969) argues that the wear-out effect has an especially negative influence on recall and memory, and it has also been found that both attention and recall reach their peak after about two months if the customers are exposed to the ad not more than 7-12 times, depending on the circumstances. Then they gradually wear-out. They also explain the wear-out effect by the fact that the viewer become increasingly satiated with communication they have seen repeatedly.

What have also been investigated are the relative wear-out rates on communication with different level of efficiency from the starting point (i.e. the release). Communication with low starting-point efficiency showed to have a wear-out effect already from the beginning, while a communication with a high starting-point efficiency actually *increases* in efficiency at first, with a *delayed* wear-out effect (Appel 1984; Pechman & Stewart 2002). As Appel states: “commercials which initially make a vivid impression upon the consumer's memory benefit more from repeat exposure than do commercials which initially do less well”. This leads us in to the

opposite of wear-out effect, the **wear-in effect** (Lehnert et al. 2013). This effect is the one explaining why an ad increases in efficiency in an initial stage. By being exposed repeatedly, customers can increase their attitude towards the communication over a certain period of time and the wear-out effect is delayed. According to Lehnert et al. (2013) ads with high level of creativity have greater potential to create a wear-in effect quickly and increase in brand attitude, and are thus more efficient.

Furthermore, in order to keep the wear-in effect of the ad as high as possible one has to switch it before it reaches its top efficiency. However, to keep the wear-in effect, one can't change between two *too* similar ads since this has proven to hurry up the wear-out effect no matter if the communication is new ("different" here means that the theme could be the same but the use of situations and characters alter). The tactic that has proven to give the best results in terms of campaign attention is when the brand uses as many different commercials as possible since this optimizes the decrease of the wear-out effect (Grass & Wallace 1969). This is also in line with Pechman & Stewart's study where they found that it might be possible to "*forestall most – if not all – of these wear-out effects by periodically switching to another ad as needed*". The prevention is possible through the fact that frequent changes leads to a perception of newness that has proven to have a great effect on customer reaction (Wells et al. 2010) and also on increasing positive brand attitudes (Sheinin et al. 2011). The novelty leads to a feeling of excitement that in turn has an impact on the customers' willingness to investigate the products further. (Sheinin et al. 2011)

Early field studies have further shown that by keeping a high level of message efficiency, one can increase sales efficiency – as long as the ad stays efficient, so does the level of sales. Sales can even be maintained and reinforced under higher exposure levels, even if the message's overall efficiency in terms of attention and recall declines. (Pechman & Stewart 2002)

In sum, to make a campaign as efficient as possible in terms of keeping the wear-in effect going, and to reinforce sales, one should alter between as many different commercials as possible and make sure that these are not too similar.

This leads us to hypothesizing that a high redesign frequency leads to increased brand image through a wear-in effect, and increased shopping behavior as high message efficiency (created by high redesign frequency) has the potential to increase sales according to Pechman & Stewart. Further and more particularly, this also makes us hypothesize that a high redesign frequency leads to an even stronger wear-in effect in creative window displays since these should be initially high in efficiency (based on previous hypothesizing), and to a wear-out effect in non-creative window displays since these should be low in initial efficiency and therefore have a direct decline – in terms of brand image and shopping behavior. Last but not least we also theorize that a creative window increases the effects of both high- and low redesign frequency windows, i.e. regardless the level of frequency, a creative window should always be more efficient.

2.8 Shopping motivations – Utilitarian versus Hedonic

Customers' shopping behavior is a complex phenomenon. It is not only dependent on external factors but also on what internal motives the consumer has. Previous theory proposes that the motivation to approach an environment changes, and can give insight on how a window display affects the customers' willingness to approach a store (Oh & Petrie 2012). Preceding research has recognized two shopping motivational orientations: utilitarian and hedonic (Kalcheva & Weitz 2006). Utilitarian motives refer to customers engaging in shopping out of necessity to get hold of needed products or services. No satisfaction is obtained from the shopping activity itself, but rather the actual fulfillment of the need of the product. Hedonically driven motives, on the other hand, refer to customers engaging in shopping from where satisfaction is obtained from the actual shopping activity. The customer freely chooses him-/herself to go shopping and the action is not driven by a specific need (Kalcheva & Weitz 2006). They rather derive intrinsic rewards and seek out a fulfilling shopping experience (Oh & Petrie 2012). Research has shown that the type of motive in combination with the different type of window display (artistic versus merchandise-focused) has an effect on shopping behavior. For example, when the consumer has a utilitarian motive, the odds of entering a particular store are not dependent on whether the display is artistic or merchandise-focused. (Oh & Petrie 2012)

By looking at this previous theory, we are led to hypothesize that hedonically driven customers are more easily affected by both creativity and high redesign frequency than customers driven by utilitarian motives. This is due to the fact that hedonically driven consumers are more open to external inspiration and to have an experience while shopping, and utilitarian consumers less easy to affect since they are not susceptible to different types of window displays while shopping “on a mission”.

2.9 Willingness to pay

Willingness to pay can be defined as the highest amount of money a customer is prepared to pay for a certain product or service (Koschate-Fischer et al. 2012). It is a function of the *expected* usage value and subsequently affects – in combination of the deliberation prior to the purchase – the actual demand (Wathieu & Bertini 2007). It is critical to estimate the customers’ willingness to pay accurately when formulating the strategy as well as when developing price offerings and tactics (Miller et al. 2011). Research has shown that the response of willingness to pay is dependent on the relative weight that is given on price by the customers in its positive (i.e. as an indicator of product quality) versus negative role (i.e. as a resource to be conserved) – when price is perceived to be having a positive role the customer is willing to pay more (Suk et al. 2012). When the customers are sensitive to quality (which is dependent on the specific market as well as the person in question), i.e. the quality has a great effect on their buying decisions, the willingness to pay increases for high quality products and decreases for low-quality products (Bertini et al. 2012). An accurate estimation of the customer’s willingness to pay can prevent organizations setting too high prices – a price too far above the customer’s initial willingness to pay can be perceived as provocative, resulting in defaulted sales (Wathieu & Bertini 2007).

This last section of theory, leads us to hypothesize that a creative window should result in a higher willingness to pay amongst customers, since we believe (from previous hypothesizing) that creativity leads to increased positive brand image, including product quality, which in turn should increase willingness to pay. Further, we also believe that, as a result, hedonically driven customers should have a higher willingness to pay than utilitarian customers as they are more easily affected by creative windows (also from previous hypothesizing).

Hypotheses generation

By looking at our ideas and theorization derived above from previous theory, we consequently have come up with the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a: A creative (non-creative) window display builds (mitigates) brand image

Hypothesis 1b: A price offering included in the window display mitigates the positive effects of the creative window as seen in 1a

Hypotheses 2a: A creative (non-creative) window display stimulates (has no effect on) consumers' shopping behavior

Hypotheses 2b: A price offering included in the creative window display enhances the positive effects seen in 2a

Hypothesis 3a: A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on brand image

Hypothesis 3b: A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on consumers' shopping behavior

Hypothesis 4: A high redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-in effect – while a low redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-out effect – in terms of brand image and brand attitude

Hypothesis 5: A creative window enhance the outcomes of both high/low redesign frequency windows

Hypothesis 6a: High redesign frequency has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers

Hypothesis 6b: Creativity has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers

Hypothesis 7a: Creativity leads to a higher willingness to pay

Hypothesis 7b: Hedonically driven customers, have a higher willingness to pay than utilitarian customers, when the window display is creative

The hypotheses will serve to answer our research question in the following structure:

Research Question	Hypotheses
<p>Is a creative window more efficient than a non-creative one? - Does the existence of a price offering have an additional effect on the outcome?</p>	<p><i>Hypothesis 1a: A creative (non-creative) window display builds (mitigates) brand image</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 1b: A price offering included in the window display mitigates the positive effects of the creative window as seen in 1a</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 2a: A creative (non-creative) window display stimulates (has no effect on) consumers' shopping behavior</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 2b: A price offering included in the creative window display enhances the positive effects seen in 2a</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 7a: Creativity leads to a higher willingness to pay</i></p>
<p>Is a high redesign frequency of the window displays more efficient than a low redesign frequency? - Do the outcomes of this also depend on the level of creativity?</p>	<p><i>Hypothesis 3a: A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on brand image</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 3b: A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on consumers' shopping behavior</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 4: A high redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-in effect – while a low redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-out effect – in terms of brand image and brand attitude</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 5: A creative window enhance the outcomes of both high/low redesign frequency windows</i></p>
<p>Is there any difference in how efficient a window display is depending on whether the customer is hedonically or utilitarian driven?</p>	<p><i>Hypothesis 6a: High redesign frequency has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 6b: Creativity has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers</i></p> <p><i>Hypothesis 7b: Hedonically driven customers, have a higher willingness to pay than utilitarian customers, when the window display is creative</i></p>

3. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we go through the outline of the experiment by diving in and checking off each important element of it; from choosing the topic of our study to finishing with discussing the study's validity and reliability. In between this, we present the preparatory work we engaged in and give a detailed description of the main study.

3.1 Choosing the topic

What happens when a master thesis team of one student who spent her exchange semester at Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi, taking fashion management classes, and one student with a bachelor degree in retail management is approached with “a possible topic on window displays fit for a master thesis”? Naturally, the two thesis partners make a “high-five” and accept the offer.

“Something at the intersection of fashion and business”, is a job description that both of the authors could – and want to – picture themselves holding sometime in their future careers. Therefore, spending the last semester in school investigating the effects that different kinds of window displays have on consumers' actions and attitudes – very much “at the intersection of fashion and business” – is a delight they know to appreciate.

The brand that called upon their desire to have this topic investigated wanted to know if they got adequate “return on investment” on their window displays. The approach would be to, e.g., compare a time- and effort intensive “creative” window with a less “expensive” and not as creative window. In other words, the authors would not be looking at the monetary input per se, but indirectly in the form of the execution of the window, and contrast this with the outcomes.

And that was how the topic and the authors crossed paths.

3.2 Preparatory work

3.2.1 Selecting thesis approach and research design

Our thesis is made up of three studies: one quantitative experiment – our main study, and two complementary studies: one *qualitative* observation study, and one *quantitative* observation study.

The chosen approach of our main study, the experiment, has a couple of underlying reasons. Firstly, we investigate a subject with the help of acknowledged and previously studied theories and tested measures. In other words, this is not an exploratory study in need of focus group sessions to reach the deeper understanding of it. Secondly, we want to see how consumers react to slightly altered stimuli and hopefully get robust results from this to analyze and discuss. This speaks in favor of conducting a quantitative experiment. (Bryman & Bell 2011)

The purpose with our complementary studies is two-parted. With our qualitative observation study, a field study in which we observe twenty window displays once every week for two or so months, we wanted to get a broad view on how a handful of stores in the Stockholm area managed their windows. The execution of the displays and the frequency with which they switched windows were of our primary interest. Our analysis from this mini-study will be presented last in the “Results & Analysis” chapter.

Our quantitative observation study, however, was done after we had performed and analyzed our main experiment. The purpose here was to put one or two of our findings to test in a real-life setting, so to speak. We will present the results and analysis from this study side-by-side with the relevant hypotheses from our main study (namely, H2a and b). We believe that the three studies are interesting each on their own, but make up an even stronger whole by complementing each other.

Research design

Three variables are used as manipulative stimuli: creativity, price offering and redesign frequency. These are matched and varied in a way that gives us a research design that comprises 24 variations (see table 1, below). As you may see in the table,

eight manipulation cells are “single exposure”, which means that the window display was shown only once. This variant was included to enable to rule out any influence resulting from the respondents having seen two different, or the same window, twice when we looked at other things than redesign frequency.

One window that displayed shirts and another that focused on the “wardrobe classic” – the jacket – were used in order to illustrate a change of the windows (denoted as “S” and “J” in the table below). We return to how the survey was constructed in detail in section “3.3.3 The survey”.

In our pending empirical analysis of this experiment, we merged each two “identical” versions of the manipulation. To clarify, let’s present an example: the window that is *creative, has a price offering, and represents a high redesign frequency* is represented by two surveys. One where the shirt window comes first and one where the jacket window comes first (in the *low redesign frequency* windows, the two surveys have a jacket window followed by a jacket window, and a shirt window followed by a shirt window respectively – illustrating that the windows *haven’t* been changed). After having retrieved the data, each two windows are merged and the benefit that we get out of doing this is that we *minimize the risk that our results will be influenced by the product category*. This is the reason behind the table below looking like a chessboard; the cells were merged pair-wise as shown.

Table 1	Creative		Non-creative	
With a price offering	High rd-f (S)	Low rd-f (S)	High rd-f (S)	Low rd-f (S)
	High rd-f (J)	Low rd-f (J)	High rd-f (J)	Low rd-f (J)
Without a price offering	High rd-f (S)	Low rd-f (S)	High rd-f (S)	Low rd-f (S)
	High rd-f (J)	Low rd-f (J)	High rd-f (J)	Low rd-f (J)
(Single-exposure cells)	Creative, with price (S)	Creative, no price (S)	Non-creative, w/ price (S)	Non-creative, no price (J)
	Creative, with price (J)	Creative, no price (J)	Non-creative, w/ price (J)	Non-creative, no price (J)

*rd-f= redesign frequency; S=shirt; J=jacket

3.2.2 Selecting the data gathering method

We used the research company Qualtrics' online survey tool to collect our data due to its simple structure and generous account benefits through the main account that Stockholm School of Economics has with them (e.g. you are allowed to collect and retrieve up to 5000 responses).

3.2.3 Selecting the brand and product category

As we mentioned in the previous section, that concerned how we came about in our choosing of topic for our master thesis, we were approached with a topic. In other words, the brand and product category that we used in our experiment were pre-selected, which means that we did not have to spend time on considering pros and cons between product categories, for example.

The brand and product category used as objects of investigation in this thesis were *Brothers* and men's apparel. *Brothers* gave us input on what aspects of a window display that are important and interesting for a retailer, and also hands-on help by letting us choose stimuli for the experiment from their image database.

Even if our topic and test category were established from the start, we have thought about the study's application on other categories. We do, however, come to the conclusion that the apparel industry probably is the most interesting one to study in terms of window displays, as this industry utilizes windows to a considerably greater degree than other product categories (which becomes apparent quite quickly when you take a stroll through a city). There are also different uses of a window for apparel stores; whether you want to build traffic into the store or build your brand, there are different tactics that can be applied. We will go into more detail on this in our theory section.

3.2.4 Selecting the sample

As a sample for our experiment we used the member's club of the researched brand *Brothers*. It consists of 105 000 active customers (have made a purchase within the last six months) and 102 000 inactive customers, 15 % are women. We put a filter on to only include members who have made at least three purchases from *Brothers*

during the past six months, and end up with a sample base of 11 370 people. Our sample method was in other words a *non-probability purposive sampling* (Bryman & Bell 2011).

Given our choice of sample, we are looking at people who can be categorized as consumers of the brand, as they hold a membership card and have been active at least once in the previous year. As we want to investigate how important the window display is for current customers of a brand in various regards, this sample is very apt for the study. We do, however, think that contrasting customers against non-customers would make for an interesting study – and will return to this in the final parts of this thesis when we discuss future research.

With our already fairly extensive research design of 24 cells, we concluded that for this paper, it is the importance (or insignificance) and influence of our chosen stimuli on *existing customer's* action and attitudes that we are interested in investigating. Consequently, we believe that for this purpose, our sample is adequate.

To make sure that the female answers in the study (only 5.9 percent) would not interfere with the responses and give skewed result, we checked if there was a significant difference between the outcomes with and without women included in the sample. The women were however spread evenly among the groups and the results were not significantly different between any groups or variables.

3.2.5 Developing the experiment stimuli/window display test pictures

The two original sample pictures for our scenario experiment were selected together with the visual merchandiser of our chosen brand, Katrine Wallberg. In order to realistically simulate a high and low redesign frequency in our experiment, we settled on a “shirt window”, which was used during a campaign period last fall, and a “jacket window” that was displayed this spring.

The photographed window displays had previously been designed and put together by the visual merchandiser in collaboration with the company’s hired advertising agency. Thanks to these being photographed in “layers” and built in the computer software Photoshop, we could get all the different versions of the windows that we

needed. That is: the “uncreative” window, showing only the clothes and the “creative” window in which props and background images are added – for both the shirt and the jacket window. These were both varied with and without a promotion sign attached to the window (for all the test windows that we used, see appx 1).

3.2.6 Pre-testing quantitatively and qualitatively

Pre-test 1: qualitative

Before running the quantitative pre-test, we consulted “expert judges” to make qualitative evaluations regarding the high/low creativity manipulation, which is one of three recognized ways of evaluating whether something is creative or not. This “evaluation method” comes from the advertising world and the two other ways, just for the record, are (1) to ask the consumers – which we have used as you will see below – and (2) to look at what advertisements that are winning prizes in ad and PR contests (Rosengren 2013).

Our three expert judges were a visual merchandiser from Gant, Andreas Diaz-Soliz, JoAnn Tan, who runs her own business under the same name, and Katrine Wallberg, visual merchandiser at *Brothers*. Mr. Diaz-Soliz gave his opinion on creativity in window displays in general where he stressed the importance of always having the brand – its customer and its positioning – in mind. If the window is relevant for the target group while being “artistic” or well crafted, then it can be seen as being creative. But it also has to be evaluated in the context of the brand’s positioning; is it a luxury, lifestyle or high-street brand? Well, expectations will be raised depending on this. Some quotes from Mr. Diaz-Soliz when he looked at the two creative versions of our window’s were: “it is a more complete concept”, “there is an image in the background showing a lifestyle”, “it is relevant for their target group”, “you can relate to [the characters in the window]”, “you get the feeling of where these people are heading” (Diaz-Soliz 2013).

Pre-test 2: quantitative

After getting the qualitative evaluation, we then moved on with the second pre-test to see that our different manipulations would work in the way we intend (i.e. that the creative window would be perceived as significantly more creative than the non-

creative window). We started off by doing this face-to-face with people in Solna Centrum (a small to average-sized galleria located in Solna), but realized that as we had the respondents answer “publicly” in front of us, it almost made them nervous and scared to hurt our feelings (in particular the first question “is this window creative” led to the respondent think both once or twice, glancing over at us – trying to read our expressions, perhaps – before answering). We couldn’t determine *if* the face-to-face responses were biased or not, but felt that a switch to collecting our responses online was a reasonable action to take.

Two of our three manipulation variables were tested in our pretest: creativity and the visibility of the price offering. The creativity parameter was tested because of the above-mentioned reason, and since the price signs appear in slightly different manners in our shirt and jacket windows respectively, we wanted to test the executions. In bold, yellow letters the words “KOSTYM 1995:-“ can be read on the glass in front of the jackets, whereas it in front of the shirts a panel hangs that says “SECRET WASH POPLIN SHIRT – 2 för 899:-“. We wanted to make sure that both of these campaign offerings would be visible for our respondents later on. The third manipulation variable, redesign frequency, was included as a manipulation check in the main study.

We have summarized our pretest sample in table 2.

Table 2	JACKET				SHIRT			
	Creative		Non-creative		Creative		Non-creative	
	Price	No price	Price	No price	Price	No price	Price	No price
n	20	21	24	21	21	24	20	22

Below, we present the results from this pre-test in separate tables, starting with “creativity” (see appx 2 for the full pretest survey). In short, we want our creative windows to be perceived as significantly more creative than our non-creative windows. We have eight different windows that can be coupled up in pairs (“creative, no price, shirt” with “non-creative, with price, shirt”, and so on), – but before looking at them individually, we accumulate all the creative and non-creative windows (irrespective of product type and presence of a price offering). Table 3 shows that

there indeed is a significant difference concerning the perception of creativity-level between the windows.

Table 3	Creative	Non-creative	P-value
Mean	3,87	3,00	0,000***

Next, we look at the shirt and jacket windows individually (summarized in table 4) to get a feeling for if they differ in any way in respect to their perceived creativity. As we can see, there is no issue with the jacket window. The shirt window, however, scores lower in general, and there is no significant difference between its creative and non-creative window. Yet, we choose to move on with the windows we have got, and base this decision on three reasons. Firstly, the windows have been selected with the help of an expert in the matter, and we have had them judged and evaluated by another expert. Secondly, the mean values correspond with our aim, and the creative shirt window does at least not have a lower score than the non-creative jacket window. Thirdly, the number of respondents in this pretest is a mere 20+ per group. While there is less “heavy” requirements for pretests in terms of this, we believe that we would have gotten a significant difference here, should we have had a bigger sample. We will follow this up in the main study by including a manipulation check (which we report on below).

Table 4	Creative	Non-creative	P-value
Jacket	4,75	3,48	0,013*
Shirt	3,30	3,17	0,784

The price manipulation (price versus no price) is pretty straightforward and seems to have come through as we wished (table 5).

Table 5	Price	No Price	P-value
Mean	1,06	1,94	0,000***

*In our analysis, the question “did you see a price offering in the window?” the responses “yes” and “no” were denoted with “1” and “2” respectively.

3.2.7 Manipulation check

While we're at it, we might just present the manipulation check from the main study. We included the item "this window is creative", and on a scale from one to seven ("I do not agree at all" to "I agree completely") the respondents answered as following:

Table 6	Creative	Non-creative	P-value
Jacket	4,10	3,24	0,000***
Shirt	3,77	3,40	0,013*

Satisfyingly, we can see that that both differences are significant on the creativity dimension, which confirms that we can follow through with our plan and lump the two variations together – shirt plus jacket – without having to have any qualms about it.

We run another t-test after having accumulated the groups and get a significant difference at p-value 0,000 between the creative and the non-creative group.

Table 7	Creative	Non-creative	P-value
Mean	4,07	3,56	0,000***

We did not include a manipulation check on price/no price; we know from the pre-test that both signs are visible. But we did check our third, yet untested, manipulation: The redesign frequency. We asked if "this store changes window displays" seldom or often, on a seven-point Likert scale. The scores in table 8 (with a p-value of 0,000) confirm that this manipulation works in the way its intended to.

Table 8	Low redesign frequency	High redesign frequency	P-value
Mean	3,27	4,62	0,000***

3.3 Main study

3.3.1 Experiment design

The experiment design is 2x2x2 with the manipulations being: low versus high level of creativity, with and without price offering, and low versus high redesign frequency.

We made one survey with five blocks: (1) introduction, (2) manipulation, (3) window-related questions, (4) brand-related questions and (5) consumer-related questions. The manipulation block had 24 different versions, each made up of a combination of the stimuli presented above (flip back to page 32 to see the visual presentation of this again).

Further, the manipulation block had two main “looks”; one with windows displayed twice, and one where the respondent only got to see one window (see appx 3 for both survey looks). The two-window surveys had a “mini-battery” of questions after the display of the first window, which the one-window surveys did not. The group of five questions returned again after the second picture, the reason being the desire to catch immediate attitudes and to be able to apply the redesign element. From that point and onwards, all of the surveys looked the same.

3.3.2 Experiment variables

Here are the dependent variables that we will investigate. The variables are established and previously tested multiple-item measures, apart from the variable *willingness-to-pay*, which is a numeric variable. Seven-point Likert scales were used for the multi-item measures for two reasons. First, we believe that seven points ranging from “do not agree at all” to “agree completely” is a scale length that would be possible to grasp for the respondents, not being too long. Second, we wanted to have an uneven points scale in order for indifferent or ambivalent respondents to opt for the right-in-the-middle answer “4”. All of the multi-item measures had Cronbach’s alphas above 0,7 and were therefore made into indexes. Three variables have two values, which is due to them appearing twice in some of the surveys (after the first and the second exposure in our low/high redesign frequency surveys).

Attitude towards the window display

The attitude towards the window was captured with the three-item measure “the window display is good/positive/favorable”. The measure is borrowed and adapted from Dahlén & Lange 2009. This was one of the variables appearing twice in some of the surveys, and the Cronbach’s alphas for them were 0,949 and 0,953.

Brand attitude

Brand attitude – defined as “consumers’ overall evaluation of a brand” (Mitchell & Olson 1981) – was captured with the same measure as the one just mentioned. Its Cronbach’s alpha was 0,926.

Ability

To capture the respondents’ perception of the brand ability, we used a measure from Dahlén et al. (2008). “I perceive the company as smart”, “The company will probably launch good products in the future”, and “I experience that the company is good at solving consumers’ problems”. Cronbach’s alpha was 0,846.

Credibility

Our *credibility* measure comes from Kirmani (1997) and consists of: “I think the company is credible”, “I think the company is competent”, “I think the company is honest”, and “I think the company are confident about the quality of their products”. They rated 0,944 in the Cronbach’s alpha test.

Product quality

“The company has products of high quality”, “The company’s products are better than average”, and “The company put a lot of time into details”
0,856

Exclusivity

We call one measure “exclusivity”. This is a measure that we put together ourselves unintentionally because we wanted to look at a couple of brand associations, namely these: expensive, interesting, sophisticated and trendy. When we were about to start analyzing, we checked if they would be fit for an index, which they were – the Cronbach’s alpha was 0,867.

Entering intention and Purchase intention

To capture the purchase intention, we used a measure from Dahlén & Lange 2009. The three items are: “I want to try on the clothes in the window”, “I want to buy the clothes in the window”, and “There is a high probability that I will buy one of the items displayed in the window”. Cronbach’s alpha was 0,933 and 0,940.

We adapted the purchase intention measure to capture the entering intention. The three items are: “The window as a whole makes me want to enter the store”, “The products displayed in the window makes me want to enter the store”, and “There is a high probability that I will enter the store”. Cronbach’s alpha was 0,944 and 0,944.

Shopping motivations: “Idea shopping”

In a couple of our hypotheses, we look at our sample in terms of their “typical” shopping behavior and contrast the “hedonic shoppers” against the “utilitarian shoppers”. For this, we’ve used the three-item measure called “idea shopping” by Arnold & Reynolds (2003). The measure is made up of “I shop to keep myself up to date with new trends”, “I shop to keep myself up to date with new fashion”, and “I shop to see what new products are available”.

Cronbach’s alpha was 0,880. In our hypothesis testing we divided the respondents between the ones that rated low and high respectively (1-3 and 5-7 on the seven-point scale).

Window associations: “enjoyable” and “problem-solving”

We used associations from Voss et al. (2003) to investigate the respondents’ perceptions of the windows, whether they would see them as “enjoyable” or “problem-solving” (the full list of the 14 associations can be seen in the survey in appx 3). Voss et al. use the words “hedonic” and “utilitarian”, but in order to not risk mixing up these measures with the “hedonic” and “utilitarian” segments from Arnold & Reynolds (2003) that we will be looking at in a couple of hypotheses, we named these “enjoyable” and “problem-solving”. Cronbach’s alpha was 0,959 and 0,939, respectively.

3.3.3 The survey

The data in the main study was collected between April 4 and April 8, and is based on the responses from 1419 people of the brand’s membership club. The average age of the sample is 40,49 (median: 41; min/max: 17/74) years, the distribution between women (84) and men (1335) is 5,9/94,1 and the response rate was 90

percent. The high response rate, we believe, is due to the survey being sent out as a membership email by the brand itself, and apart from it being well-designed and true to the graphic identity of the brand (appx 4), it also announced the sweepstake of five gift vouchers à 500 Swedish kronor. One should never underestimate the effects of giveaways. Additionally, both email and survey were designed in Swedish in order to eliminate linguistic misunderstandings and to lower a probable perceived barrier to partake in the survey.

Table 9 below – we know, it’s pretty busy, but bear with us – shows the number of respondents in each group when we break them down on all three manipulation variables. As we test our hypotheses, we will primarily look at main effects, which means that we will run t-tests with creative against non-creative and low redesign frequency against high redesign frequency. We do however also run two-way ANOVAs (e.g. in 1b and 2b) to see if there are any interaction effects between the level of creativity and the presence of a price offering or redesign frequency, which means that we for that purpose look at the subgroups, so to speak (as seen in the table).

Table 9	Creative						Non-creative					
n	703						716					
	Price			No price			Price			No price		
n	347			356			355			361		
	Singel-window	Low	High	Singel-window	Low	High	Singel-window	Low	High	Singel-window	Low	High
n	122	111	125	117	112	118	122	113	127	121	109	125

3.3.4 Tools for analyzing

We used the computer software SPSS Statistics to analyze our data in both the pretest and our main study. In terms of significance level, we have chosen to accept all statistical results showing a 10 % significance level. These results were marked with one asterisk (* for $p < 0,1$); significance levels above this – at p-values below 0,05 and 0,01, respectively – were marked with two and three asterisks (** and ***).

Our selection of SPSS runs includes: independent samples t-tests, paired samples t-tests, and two-way ANOVAs. We have investigated main effects between two groups with simple t-tests, and possible interaction effects with two-way ANOVAs.

3.4. Complementary Studies

Qualitative field study

The field study, in which we kept an eye and took notes on twenty different window displays in the city center, was an ongoing activity during the whole spring semester. Each Friday, we went on our little “window tour”, but took an additional walk here and there in order to not miss out on information (e.g. that the redesign of the windows could take place on Mondays as well as on Thursdays). The purpose of the study was to analyze and “check” whether we could identify any inconsistencies with the outcomes of our main study and to enable deeper understanding of brands’ window redesign frequency.

Quantitative observation study

The observation study was performed on a busy Sunday May 5th outside four stores in the Stockholm city center. The stores were: Dressmann, *Brothers*, Solo and H&M. They were chosen on the basis of (1) their respective window displays (we wanted four windows to each represent manipulations based on the two dimensions *creativity* and *campaign offering/price*), and (2) their all being part of the same segment within the fashion industry (i.e. the high-street segment). Table 10 shows which manipulation that each store represented, with the total number of observed passers-by in brackets. The results from this mini-study will be presented in conjunction with related hypotheses, namely 2a and b, to complement our findings from the main study. The purpose was to see if we could identify similar patterns between the observation study and the main study to check if the outcome of the simulated experiment was in line with what happens in a real-life setting – which we believe could strengthen the credibility of our results.

Table 10	Price	No price
Creative	Brothers (n=154)	Solo (n=112)
Non-creative	Dressmann (n=137)	H&M (n=180)

3.5 The experiment's validity and reliability

3.5.1 Reliability

According to Bryman & Bell (2011) *reliability* concerns issues touching upon the consistency of measures and whether or not the result of a study is repeatable. This issue is an especially important concern in quantitative researches. Furthermore, reliability can be viewed in terms of primary and secondary sources.

To collect deeper information of the topic we interviewed three visual merchandisers working within the industry as primary sources. The information collected is found to be very high as they all have long experiences within the area of visual merchandising. Mr. Diaz-Soliz is currently working for one of the leading clothing brands in Sweden and proved to have great strategic knowledge within the area, complemented by international experience. Ms. Wallberg is employed with the researched brand and has provided us with information specifically important for the study of their target group. Ms. Tan works as a visual merchandiser consultant on a project-basis for both Swedish and international businesses, and has proved to be outstanding when it comes to creating highly imaginative and creative window displays. As secondary sources we have mainly used well-cited articles within the researched topic. However, since previous research is limited within this field, we have also stretched our search to publications of the broader area of marketing and consumer behavior. A majority of the articles and books that have been used are well-cited and we therefore find the reliability of the secondary sources to be high.

When it comes to the execution of the experiment, we looked at previous studies to find questions of measurement that have already been used and established as indicators to increase the internal reliability of the study. Internal reliability refers to multiple-indicator measures that make sure the respondents' answers correlate properly across various questions (Bryman & Bell 2011). We chose the questions that would serve the purpose of testing the concepts of our study the best, both in terms of making it as easy as possible for the respondents to understand, and to get as accurate answers as possible. Since our experiment was carried out in Swedish the measures were translated from English. This was done carefully and is therefore not considered to decrease the reliability and quality of the responses. The multiple-

item measures were then made into indexes – as we've previously gone through – which further supports the internal reliability of the study.

To make sure that the perception of our main variables, creativity and price offering, would be consistent in the experiment we checked the stability over time (stability over time increases reliability; Bryman & Bell 2011) by performing two pre-test. It was important for the study that a higher level of creativity was perceived in “high creativity windows” in relation to “low creativity windows, and that the respondents would pay attention to whether a price offering was displayed or not. The pre-test was performed in one quantitative and one qualitative trial, both of whom gave positive indications and together increased the reliability of our main study. The main study was later carried out online, which we found to be the best way to collect honest answers. As mentioned previously in this chapter we initially performed pre-test 1 in a real life setting with somewhat deprived/skewed results, and found that online based tests would work better to our advantage, and in turn increase the study's reliability.

3.5.2 Validity

Validity refers to the integrity of the research results and whether the measurements used actually capture the concept it is intended to do. Validity can be divided into internal- and external validity (Bryman & Bell 2011).

Internal Validity

Internal validity concerns the issue of causality and whether the independent variables (in this thesis; creativity, price offering and redesign frequency) are responsible for the results' variations, or if any external factors have influenced the outcome (Bryman & Bell 2011).

The fact that the survey was carried out online (and anonymously), enabled the respondents to answer when it was most appropriate, which decreases the risk of possible external influences such as peer-pressure and stressful situations.

By developing the experiment pictures in a “multiple-layer structure” we could make sure that the window displays were shown in the exact same way in all versions of the survey (which posted the exact same questions and information in all versions), only leaving the independent variables of the window to differ. To further minimize the risk of external factors, we reversed the sequence of the pictures in the different survey versions (described in the section “research design”) to make sure that any skewed answers, as a result of interference by the product categories in the pictures, were eliminated. When later inserting the results in SPSS, we could conclude that the independent variables had a significant affect on the responses, indicating a high overall internal validity. (The use of multiple-indicator measures mentioned previously also contributes to increase the internal validity of our study; Bryman & Bell 2011)

External validity

External validity relates to the issue of whether or not the study’s results can be generalized into other areas above and beyond the context of the research (Bryman & Bell 2011). This concerns for example the use of a representative sample, or how far the result can be extended into other categories or industries.

As our study is performed on a specific brand and the sample consists of that brand’s membership customers, the overall results can be generalized to similar brands in the same category (high street fashion) and with similar target market. The great number of responses in our experiment results in a study that is highly representative of the sample and can be generalized into the wider market of high street retailers, which contributes to increasing the external validity. To stretch the results even further could however be somewhat misrepresentative since the different segments of the market works under dissimilar conditions in terms of window displays, and target different groups of consumers.

Neither can we argue that the result can be generalized into other product categories, and external validity is therefore not extended to this aspect. The fashion market has unique structures and conditions, which might not be similar in other industries. Further research is needed to investigate this closer.

Nevertheless, from a geographical perspective, we believe that the results can be generalized to a certain extent. Similar countries such as the other Northern countries, which have similar shopping behavior and product demands, are reckoned as possible markets for generalization. Still, the generalization is limited to similar brands with similar target groups.

The artificial simulation created in the experiment is also believed to be valid as a representation for a real-life situation, since it is an accepted way of conducting this kind of study. Other examples of similar studies are Mower et al.'s (2012) study on the influence of landscaping and window displays, and Oh & Petrie's (2012) article on window displays' influence on entering decisions.



NK by JoAnn Tan

4. RESULTS & ANALYSIS

In this chapter we present the results from the experiment and determine whether each hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Each part ends with a further analysis of the results. In conjunction with hypothesis 2a and b, the findings from the quantitative observation study is presented and analysed. At the end of the chapter a summary of the hypotheses' results can be found. But before we move on with chapter 5 and the discussion of the results and conclusions, we present our main findings from our qualitative observation study of twenty fashion window displays.

Hypotheses testing

The following sections elaborate on each set of hypotheses; 1) creativity and price's effect on brand image, their effect on 2) shopping behavior, 3) redesign frequency's effect on brand image and shopping behavior, 4) redesign frequency's wear-out versus wear-in effect, 5) creativity's effect on redesign frequency outcomes, 6) redesign frequency's impact on hedonically driven customers, 7) price in relation to quality and 8) creativity and willingness to pay. The outline follows the structure of the hypotheses generation of the theory section.

4.1 Creativity and price's effect on brand image

To test hypotheses 1a and 1b we looked at the dependent variables *ability*, *credibility*, *product quality* and *exclusivity* in terms of the brand and the brand associations indexed into "*problem solving*" and "*enjoyable*". More specifically we tested if a creative window display led to significantly higher values for these variables than a non-creative window. T-tests were conducted.

As we can see in the table below all dependent variables show significantly different mean values between the creative and the non-creative window. We see that the mean values for *exclusivity* are among the lowest in the group at the same time showing a significant difference between the two windows. Taking into account that the researched brand is in the high street segment of clothing retailers, could possibly be one explanation to the – in this context – lower mean values. The brand is *per se* not exclusive. However, at the same time, it is interesting to see that the

creative window display creates a feeling of exclusivity, relative to the non-creative window, as the mean difference is significant with the p-value at 0,003.

For the three variables *ability*, *credibility* and *product quality*, we can see that they generally have a quite high score already for the non-creative window display (which gives us a clue that the brand equity in general is good), but even these are further enhanced by the creative window display as the p-values show (0,032; 0,016; 0,073). The final two, *problem solving* and *enjoyable*, also showed to be enhanced by creativity with the p-values: 0,003 respectively 0,002. To sum up: hypothesis 1a is accepted.

H1a	Creative	Non-creative	p-value
Ability	5,23	5,06	0,032*
Credibility	5,56	5,37	0,016*
Product quality	5,30	5,16	0,073*
Exclusivity	4,85	4,60	0,003**
Problem solving	4,56	4,37	0,002**
Enjoyable	4,42	4,06	0,000***

HYPOTHESIS 1A: ACCEPTED

In hypothesis 1b, we investigate the creative window one step further to see if there are any interaction effects between *creativity* and *price*. Based on the theory that a price campaigns could signal “budget” rather than “quality”, we hypothesize that a campaign offering displayed in the creative window will hurt the brand image that the creative window managed to build (as we’ve just seen).

When we look at our results, it does however become clear that the price offering does *not* significantly damage the perception of the brand’s *ability*, *credibility*, *exclusivity*, *problem solving* or *enjoyable*. The performed two-way ANOVA on these variables gives us the p-values 0,13; 0,156; 0,156; 0,676 and 0,790, and hence slams the door for any possible interaction effects.

H1b	Creative		p-value
	No price	With price	
Ability	5,23	5,12	0,130
Credibility	5,56	5,49	0,156
Product quality	5,30	5,18	0,156
Exclusivity	4,85	4,79	0,821
Problem solving	4,58	4,55	0,676
Enjoyable	4,44	4,40	0,790

HYPOTHESIS 1B: REJECTED

4.2 Creativity and price's effect on consumers' shopping behavior

To test hypotheses 2a and 2b we looked at the dependent variables *entering intention* and *purchase intention*. We believe that (1) the creative window will have a greater effect on increasing shopping behavior than the non-creative window, and (2) that the presence of a price offering will enhance this effect further.

As the results below show, the creative window is significantly better at stimulating both entering intention and purchase intention. The p-value for entering intention is 0,001, while the p-value for purchase intention is 0,003. These results are straightforward in that the creative window – the display with more elements, more things to look at, and perhaps with a more intriguing set-up – ignite an interest and a curiosity for what the store behind could possibly hold. Nevertheless, it *is* interesting and pleasing to see that two important aspects for the retailer, the intention to enter the store and to purchase something from the store, can be so easily stimulated by including creative elements in the window. The first part of our second hypothesis is accepted.

H2a	Creative	Non-creative	p-value
	Entering intention	4,39	
Purchase intention	4,07	3,83	0,003**

HYPOTHESIS 2a: ACCEPTED

Our live observation complement these findings (see table below) by showing that the creative window was significantly more effective in terms of converting passers-by to “window-shoppers” and to make them enter the store, than the non-creative window (at p-values 0,052 and 0,018).

Live observation 1	Passed	Looked	Entered
Creative	200 (100 %)	73 (36,5 %)	17 (8,5 %)
Non-creative	200 (100 %)	53 (26,5 %)	6 (3 %)
P-value	-	0,052*	0,018*

For hypothesis 2b, we believe that adding a price offering to the creative window will stimulate entering and purchase intention further. Our results, however, show no significance in this matter. Hence, displaying a price offering does not seem to have an immediate, positive effect, on entering- and purchase intention on the creative window. Consequently, the hypothesis is rejected.

H2b	Creative		p-value
	No price	With price	
Entering intention	4,39	4,40	0,992
Purchase intention	4,03	3,11	0,556

HYPOTHESIS 2b: REJECTED

Similar to these findings, we didn't get any significant results on the interaction effects between creativity and price in our observation study (p-values at 0,130 and 0,518).

Live observation 2		Passed	Looked	Entered
Creative	Price	100	31 %	10 %
	No price	100	42 %	7 %
Non-creative	Price	100	28 %	3 %
	No price	100	25 %	3 %
P-value	-	-	0,130	0,518

4.3 Redesign frequency's effect on brand image and consumers' shopping behavior

To test hypothesis 3a, we looked at the dependent variables *ability*, *credibility*, *product quality*, *exclusivity* and *brand attitude* and the mean differences between the high and low redesign frequency windows. Hypothesis b is constructed the same way with the slight alteration that we here look at the behavioural dimension, represented by *entering intention* and *purchase intention*, instead of the attitudinal dimension. To sum up hypotheses 3a and b, we believe that a high redesign frequency have a positive effect on both brand image and shopping behavior.

Regarding 3a, we conclude that *product quality*, *exclusivity* and *brand attitude* increases significantly, with p-values at 0,025; 0,004 and 0,035, with the higher frequency of redesigning windows. *Ability* and *credibility* however, did not show any significant results, as seen below in the table. We believe that this might be due to customers being able to draw conclusions like “the clothes from last week’s window are perhaps sold out, which has to mean that the products must be good and that people must like the brand”. The perception of the brand as exclusive is another possible conclusion that the consumer can reach, since this variable is significantly higher for the “high-frequency” manipulation as well.

The seemingly insignificant results of the variables *ability* and *credibility*, implies that a retailer who switches its windows often is not perceived as possessing a greater ability or as more credible than a retailer that keeps their window in longer cycles. When trying to understand this result, we touch upon one of the limitations with our experiment (we will come back to this when we wrap up this thesis): our decision to only look at two variations of the manipulation “redesign frequency”. There is a possibility that a test of another variation (e.g. where the windows are changed every week for five weeks in one case, and zero times in the other) could show a difference between the perceptions of ability and credibility than they would produce respectively.

With three out of five variables being in line with our hypothesis, hypothesis 3a is partly accepted.

H3a	Redesign frequency		p-value
	Low	High	
Ability	5,06	5,15	0,155
Credibility	5,42	5,20	0,195
Product quality	5,12	5,27	0,025*
Exclusivity	4,65	5,06	0,004**
Brand attitude	5,73	5,87	0,035*

HYPOTHESIS 3a: PARTLY ACCEPTED

Moving on to hypothesis 3b, we get proof from the table below that redesign frequency have a clear effect on shopping *behavior*. Both entering intention and purchase intention are significant at p-values 0,000. It seems that when a window

display is switched, with the practical implication that new products are displayed, this create a desire to enter the store, and to purchase something from the store. Perhaps via inferences like “oh, the store showcase new products since last week, maybe they have received a batch of new merchandise – I have to check it out!”. Hypothesis 3b is accepted.

H3b	Redesign frequency		p-value
	Low	High	
Entering intention	3,87	4,45	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,57	4,17	0,000***

HYPOTHESIS 3b: ACCEPTED

4.4 Redesign frequency’s wear-out versus wear-in effect

To test hypothesis 4 we looked at the variables *creativity*, *attitude towards the window*, *entering intention* and *purchase intention* with the purpose to see if a high redesign frequency has a positive effect on these, and similarly if a low redesign frequency has a negative effect. We call the positive effect a “wear-in effect”, in line with Lehnert et al. (2013) , and the negative effect a “wear-out effect”, as seen in the study of Pechman and Stewart (2002)

When looking at the high redesign frequency group, we can see that there is a wear-in effect on the four current variables, all having a p-value at 0,000. This means that switching the window often leads to a higher perception of creativity (and creativity in turn leads to a better image as we saw in H1a), more positive attitude towards the window and greater shopping intentions during the two-week period that was tested.

Low redesign frequency, however, did not have a wear-out effect on the dependent variables, as we believed it would have, but rather a weak sign of increased efficiency (not as strong as for high redesign frequency windows though). This might be due to the fact that efficiency increases in the initial stage (wear-in effect), but decreases after reaching its “top-effect” (discussed further later on).

The hypothesis is partly accepted as the wear-in effect was correct but the wear-out effect showed to instead be faulty.

H4	Low redesign frequency		
	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value
Creativity	3,47	3,42	0,174
Attitude towards the window	4,02	4,14	0,008**
Entering intention	3,65	3,87	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,27	3,57	0,000***
	High redesign frequency		
	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value
Creativity	3,66	4,15	0,000***
Attitude towards the window	4,22	4,85	0,000***
Entering intention	3,72	4,45	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,31	4,17	0,000***

HYPOTHESIS 4: PARTLY ACCEPTED

(low redesign frequency showed to have a "wear-in effect", as opposed to the wear-in effect that we hypothesized about)

4.5 Creativity's effect on redesign frequency outcomes

To test hypothesis 5 we looked at the dependent variables *creativity*, *attitude towards the window*, *entering intention* and *purchase intention* and compared them between creative versus non-creative windows. We believe that a creative window will enhance the results of these variables in terms of possible wear-in effects in both low- and high redesign frequency windows.

For windows displays with high redesign frequency the results showed that creative windows actually have a greater impact on the wear-in effect in comparison to non-creative. Creative windows increased the variables with 0,76 on average, while non-creative windows increased with 0,60 on average.

H5	High redesign frequency					
	Creative			Non-creative		
	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value
Creativity	3,81	4,33	0,000	3,52	3,99	0,000***
Attitude towards the window	4,29	4,98	0,000	4,16	4,71	0,000***
Entering intention	3,76	4,57	0,000	3,67	4,33	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,29	4,30	0,000	3,33	4,04	0,000***

Next, when it comes to window displays with low redesign frequency no significant difference of enhanced wear-out effect could be detected. Instead we could see an opposite effect, where non-creative window displays showed to increase in attitude towards the window, entering intention and purchase intention when repeatedly displayed. This possibly indicates that merchandise-focused windows (not focused on creativity), increasingly fulfil its purpose over a longer period of time, when the customers get the chance to view the window several times, even if it is relatively inefficient. Non-creative windows showed to increase on average with 0,22 in value for the three variables, while creative windows only increased on average with 0,1.

H5	Low redesign frequency					
	Creative			Non-creative		
	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value	After first exposure	After second exposure	p-value
Creativity	3,79	3,63	0,002	3,15	3,21	0,202
Attitude towards the window	4,20	4,26	0,351	3,83	4,02	0,007**
Entering intention	3,79	3,99	0,002	3,51	3,74	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,37	3,67	0,000	3,17	3,47	0,000***

The hypothesis is partly accepted (LOW is not significant)

4.6 Redesign frequency's impact on hedonically driven customers

To test hypothesis 6a-b we divided our sample between respondents who had answered high versus low (high: 5-7 low 1-3) on questions regarding the shopping motivation called "idea shopping". To investigate both impacts we looked at the dependent variables *brand attitude*, *exclusivity*, *entering intention* and *purchase intention* but first their relation to a high level of redesign frequency, and then their relation to a high level of creativity.

The results of hypothesis 6a showed, as seen in the table below, that hedonically driven customers were more affected by a high redesign frequency than utilitarian customers. The p-values were 0,000 on all dependent variables. We believe that high frequency has a greater impact on hedonically driven customers because have not decided beforehand what to buy, and can therefore be more influenced by new window designs and new trends. The hypothesis is accepted.

H6a	High redesign frequency		p-value
	Utilitarian	Hedonic	
Brand attitude	5,58	6,13	0,002**
Exclusivity	4,58	5,08	0,000***
Entering intention	3,79	4,69	0,000***
Purchase intention	3,47	4,42	0,000***

HYPOTHESIS 6a: ACCEPTED

After testing creativity's effect on hedonically driven customers (6b), we could conclude from the results below that all variables were significant at p-value 0,000. This means that hedonically driven customers have a higher brand attitude and perception of exclusivity, as well as more extensive shopping behavior in terms of entering- and purchase intention. This could be due to that this group is more attentive to the design factors of the window and therefore more susceptible to a higher level of creativity. The hypothesis is accepted.

H6b	Creative		p-value
	Hedonic	Utilitarian	
Brand attitude	6,07	5,54	0,000***
Exclusivity	5,02	4,54	0,000***
Entering intention	4,68	3,93	0,002**
Purchase intention	4,32	3,60	0,002**

HYPOTHESIS 6b: ACCEPTED

4.7 Creativity and Willingness to pay

To test hypothesis 7a, concerning creativity's effect on willingness to pay, we looked at creative versus non-creative window displays and the price the customers were willing to pay for a shirt shown later in the survey and the difference between their means. Further, for hypothesis 7b, we tested the difference between hedonic versus utilitarian customers on the *willingness to pay* variable.

The results showed no significance in different willingness to pay, however the mean of the creative window was 487 SEK, while only 475 SEK in the non-creative. This indicates that creativity do have an affect on the willingness to pay.

The hypothesis is rejected.

H7a			
	Creative	Non-creative	p-value
Willingness-to-pay	487,00	475,00	0,240

HYPOTHESIS 7a: REJECTED

The results of hypothesis 7b showed that hedonically driven costumers were willing to pay 496 SEK, and utilitarian customers 459 SEK, a difference which is significant at p-value 0,000. We believe that this is caused by the fact that hedonically driven customers are more influenced by window displays during shopping situations and have a higher chance of noticing the design, and therefore reacts greater on a higher level of creativity. Further, these people are to a greater extent out shopping to treat themselves and therefore may not be as price sensitive. The hypothesis is accepted.

H7b	Creative		
	Hedonic	Utilitarian	p-value
Willingness-to-pay	496,00	459,00	0,000***

HYPOTHESIS 7b: ACCEPTED

4.8 Summary of hypotheses results

Hypothesis	
H1a) A creative (non-creative) window display builds (mitigates) brand image	ACCEPTED
H1b) A price offering included in the window display mitigates the positive effects of the creative window as seen in 1a	REJECTED
H2a) A creative (non-creative) window display stimulates (has no effect on) consumers' shopping behavior	ACCEPTED
H2b) A price offering included in the creative window display enhances the positive effects seen in 2a	REJECTED
H3a) A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on brand image	ACCEPTED
H3b) A high redesign frequency of the window display has a positive effect on consumers' shopping behavior	ACCEPTED
H4) A high redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-in effect – while a low redesign frequency of the window display creates a wear-out effect – in terms of brand image and brand attitude	PARTLY ACCEPTED
H5) A creative window enhances the outcomes of both high/low redesign frequency windows	PARTLY ACCEPTED
H6a) High redesign frequency has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers	ACCEPTED
H6b) Creativity has a greater, positive, impact on hedonically driven customers	ACCEPTED
H7a) Creativity leads to a higher willingness to pay	REJECTED
H7b) Hedonically driven customers, have a higher willingness to pay than utilitarian customers, when the window display is creative	ACCEPTED

4.9 Qualitative observation study

These are our main findings from the field study in which we observed twenty window displays in the Stockholm area during a period of three months.

Different levels of creativity A variation of ways in which different companies choose to put together "unusual" windows could be observed. Window displays stand out with the help of cheap tricks or with details of lush and extravagant touch.

The redesign frequency varied between stores H&M exposed its strong financial muscles by having extremely well-designed and thought-through windows in the flagship store that were switched on the same frequency-basis as the smaller, and less "extravagant" windows (e.g. a large LCD-screen was put up for only the two weeks that H&M's Beckham collection was launched).

Changing the complete window display or just a few details Some stores chose to only switch one or two items on the mannequins while keeping the overall concept of the display. This tactic was more frequently represented by the smaller, niche stores (Whyred, Our Legacy and The Local Firm, to name three).

Consistency or not in the retail chains' windows The clothing chains that we observed had somewhat different strategies when it came to keeping the consistency among the stores. H&M had slightly different windows for three of the stores that we observed, perhaps trying to communicate variances in each store's orientation.

Which day to dedicate the redesigning of the windows Not only did we discover that this varies from store to store, but also from week to week for each store. Sometimes, the redesigning occurred on a Monday, but other weeks, it happened on the Thursday. We speculate that on the eve of big campaign rollouts, the windows would preferably be switched. Further, since a lot of campaigns are planned to start on, or just before, the weekend/Friday, Thursday would be the day of redesign. The same goes for when the campaigns finally end (often on Sundays) where then Mondays become an important day for the stores redesign.



5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

In the following section, we will begin with a discussion of the results generated from the study. The discussion is followed by a section of implications that elaborate on the actual importance of the results on practitioners. Next, the limitations of the study are enlightened and the chapter finishes off with a discussion around possible future research.

5.1 Discussion

5.1.1 Creativity – Hard-hitting for retailers!

Our first, solid result that we presented above was that some level of creativity in the window display has a significant impact on both attitudinal and behavioral aspects; all of our brand image variables and shopping behavior variables were significantly higher for the creative window than for the non-creative display. If we go back to the characteristics that our interviewed visual merchandisers used to describe “creativity”, they all talked about “creating a feeling, an atmosphere”, “visualizing a lifestyle” and “communicating so that the viewer gets an idea of what kind of personality the window is built to reflect”. There are numerous ways to convey a put-together concept: the use of props, including (for a shop window) unusual elements such as different innovative hanging techniques and images, are three examples. In other words, there are plenty of not-too-costly ways to ramp up the window, even if it, in reality, is no ceiling as to how much money that can be put into the making of a fabulous display (as seen during Christmas, e.g.).

Adding to this, we saw various ways to be creative and still keep the integrity of the brand intact during our window display field search. The humorous and engaging street brand WE translated their philosophy and the image they strive to convey into

busy, color bursting windows where everything from sneakers to headphones to apparel lied, hanged, stood on shelves. Another window that, along the lines of our expert judges, could be described as “creative” was designer brand Acne’s windows. While the windows were scaled-down and “simple”, they contained those kinds of interesting elements that together transmitted that cool, calm and collected feeling that the brand conveys in its clothes.

Additionally, our live observation also supported the notion that a creative window is more effective in stimulating shopping behavior, than a non-creative window. Significantly more people looked and entered the stores with the creative windows.

5.1.2 The presence of a price offering – not harmful in the short run

When it comes to the effect the presence of a price offering in the window has on perceptions of brand image and shopping behaviors, our results showed that there in fact were no systematic effects here. The brand image was not hurt significantly, and shopping intentions were not enhanced significantly (p-values for the variables *ability*, *credibility*, *exclusivity*, *entering intention* and *purchase intention* were all above 0,100). Already when going through the theory on price’s effect on quality perceptions, we could detect different standpoints within previous research. Therefore, these results could be expected.

We’ve already presented our analysis of these results in sections 4.1 and 4.2, but if we widen our sight and at the same time act “advocatus diaboli” against ourselves, we arrive at two possible explanations for our results: the timeframe and our sample.

Maybe, if we had extended the timeframe in our manipulations – to perhaps four weeks – the brand image would have been hurt as a result of every week promoting campaign offerings. In the long-term, the brand gets diluted by continuingly communicating on price. (Kort et al. 2006) And since our sample consisted of existing and active customers, we’re speculating if perhaps they are somewhat immune to price offerings – whether in terms of harming perceptions of brand image or stimulating entering intention.

Our live observation support our findings here in the sense that there were no significant interaction effects between creativity and price – a price offering in the window did not stimulate entrance behavior to a larger degree, significantly, than the windows with no price.

5.1.3 Redesign frequency – Repetition matters!

After having tested several different outcomes of switching window displays often versus seldom, we can conclude that a higher frequency could lead to positive results for retailers. The first question we wanted to answer was if the frequency alone could affect the brand image and the results showed that, yes, in part, it can. The customers perceived the product quality higher, the exclusivity higher and increased their window attitude. Since an often switched window allow for more products to be shown, people might perceive that the retailer sell more clothes and that the items in the window sells out and is replaced with new ones. It could also be due to that the investment made in the window is greater when switching often, resulting in a perception of that the retailer has more money and provide the market with more superior clothing.

The variables concerning the customers' belief of what the brand actually is able to deliver (ability and credibility) showed to not be significant in this situation. Since our study is performed on devoted band customers it could be that the respondents already have a somewhat opinion of what the brand stands for and can deliver, and are therefore not affected by the redesign in that way. The study is also done during a two-week period, which might be too short of a time to capture a change in these variables. Ability and credibility are after all factors that customers build an opinion of during a longer period of time and after many exposures of communication, information, reputation and product testing. Product quality and exclusivity are in comparison “visual” variables, that the customers can create an opinion around after only a few exposures.

Moving on to how the frequency could affect shopping behavior, we could after our analysis clearly see that both the customers' entering intention and purchase intention increased. This is very interesting since an investment in a faster switching

of window displays could really pay off by an increased amount of store visitors and purchases. When a customer passes by a window often, it might be believed to be more interesting and catches the attention better. We also believe that this is connected to the previous results of the brand image variables – where increased perception of product quality and exclusivity possibly led to a higher willingness to take the next step into the store and look and touch the merchandise, and in turn to buy it.

What we also could conclude from testing the level of redesign frequency, is that repeated exposures of a window have positive effects on the customers, irrespective of there being new props in the window or the same design as last time. For high frequency windows all the variables tested showed to be highly affected by the switching. This effect is a result of a successfully maintained “wear-in effect”, as seen in the theory section. These results are what we would have expected, but what was more interesting was the results deriving from the analysis of low redesign frequency windows. At first, we believed that the repeated exposures of the same window would have a wear-out effect and decrease the values of the tested variables. But rather it showed to have an opposite effect and increased with an initial wear-in effect. In line with the theory (Lehnert et al. 2013), this could be due to an initial efficiency where the window actually needs/gets more time to reach its top efficiency, and not start its decline until later on.

As already mentioned, our study only investigated the effect over a two-week period, and the results we got might be different when applying the test on a longer period of time. As both interviewed visual merchandisers mentioned, one month is an accepted time for a campaign, with some changes in props and products every once a week. This is also quite in line with theory (Grass & Wallace 1969), which says that communication reaches its top efficiency after two months and 7-12 exposures. If the customers pass by a window more often, which might be quite valid in this situation (on their way to work daily etc.), the efficiency is reached faster (in one month). It has also been concluded in previous theory that switching the windows can prevent this wear-out effect, and if a campaign runs for one month it seems very reasonable to switch props and products once every week. So, to test a possible wear-out effect it would take a study that comprises a longer period of time. In the short term, however,

our results can imply that retailers, who don't have much money to invest in redesign of window displays, might reach a positive effect anyways, and keep it relatively high by only switching certain products or adding "cheaper" props.

Up until now, we have focused on the redesign frequency as a single explaining variable. But what happened when we added creativity as a second possible source of impact? Well, in high redesign frequency window displays creativity clearly showed to enhance the wear-in effect we found previously. This is in line with our first findings of creativity – that it increases efficiency– and it therefore should be realistic that it has an "on-top" increase on frequency efficiency as well. However, in low redesign frequency window displays the results were more difficult to read. Non-creative windows actually proved to have a stronger wear-in effect than creative windows! This means that creative windows are not perceived as much different between two exposures, opposite to the change of the perceptions of non-creative ones. It is difficult to analyse this phenomenon but we think this might be due to that non-creative windows put more focus on merchandise sales as such. To communicate a "sales-message" might take longer time than the "image-message" of creative windows. The effects of merchandised focused windows seems to not be reached until after several exposures, which would explain that there was a greater change between first and second exposure of a non-creative window, than between first and second exposure of a creative window that reaches efficiency right away.

5.1.4 Hedonically-driven customers – easily affected by- and attentive to visual elements

Since customers can be divided into two groups of shoppers with different motivational drives; hedonic and utilitarian, we wanted to investigate if window displays could have any different outcomes on these. After having divided our respondents into these two groups we looked at how the different explaining variables affected them and discovered a very straightforward result – hedonically driven customers were clearly more positively affected by increased creativity level and higher redesign frequency.

Hedonically driven customer are after all shopper who likes to treat themselves and purchase items on impulse, which means that they look more into window displays to

find information about brands and their products to get ideas and to be inspired. High creativity levels showed to increase hedonics positive brand association/attitude as well as their shopping behavior. Hedonically driven customers seem to pay more attention to window designs, and therefore notice features that increase the perception of for example ability and credibility. The greater attention span also might lead to increased awareness of the products in the window, which result in a stronger willingness to investigate the store further and in turn maybe make a purchase.

The same pattern could be noticed for high redesign frequency, and the reason is believed to be the same as for creativity – a greater awareness of the redesign resulting in a more positive perception about the window and its products as well as increased entering and purchase intention. By changing window displays often, retailers enable visibility of more products and can create a possible impression of quicker sellouts, which attract hedonic shoppers. The customers will get the impression that the products are popular and must be of high quality and therefore increase their desire for the merchandise.

The discussion above could also be the source of the last interesting finding we derived from our analysis of hedonic shoppers – their higher willingness to pay for the displayed merchandise (shirt). The higher perception of quality, and higher demand for the products could logically be an explanation for their higher acceptance of the price. Further, the “treat yourself” aspect of hedonic shopping, might allow for a somewhat higher price acceptance and this group is in turn not as price sensitive as the utilitarian.

Yet, a retailer most likely has a mix of hedonically and utilitarian driven shoppers in their customer base, and they have to adapt the window displays to attract both types *or* complement a window display that focuses on hedonic shoppers with another type of communication targeting utilitarian shoppers.

Additional finding

One think that we also noticed from our analysis, that is very interesting, is that men to a large extent seem to be hedonically driven shoppers (60,3%). Previous research have argued that men have a different way of shopping in comparison to women, and

that they most often shop only when they have a need to, and never to look for new products or trends. This kind of research, where males have to answer to questions concerning a “female activity” could possibly give skewed and unreal results (as the researched brands’ employees also stated during our initial meeting). However, our survey included measurements of shopping motivations, which was not *that* straightforward and might have enabled more honest answers. Because our result showed that males actually have a great tendency to shop “like women”, on a more spontaneous basis.

5.1.5 Willingness to pay

Unlike our previous assumptions concerning willingness to pay, the results showed that the customers were quite difficult to influence. The willingness to pay does not change when altering creativity. From theory we can understand that willingness to pay is somewhat related to the perception of quality of a brand, but in this case this does not seem to hold true (even though the mean was slightly higher for creative windows).

Creativity showed to clearly influence the perception of quality in a positive way, and you might therefore think that it would result in the customers wanting to pay more for the products displayed. However, the customers of the researched brand are after all (somewhat) loyal consumers returning to the store frequently which could mean that they probably already have a good perception of the price level of the products and cannot be “tricked” into paying more. The insignificant increase in willingness to pay could potentially be greater if the study would have been performed on random consumers instead of actual customer to the brand.

What was also interesting was that the actual willingness to pay was lower than the real price of the shirt. To not disappoint the customers with products that are much more expensive than expected, the brand might have to consider carefully how to price its products in relation to the *customers’* quality perception, or trying to increase the perception of quality etc., to increase willingness to pay.

5.2 Conclusions

The aim of this study has been to provide a better understanding of how creativity, redesign frequency and the existence of price offerings affect the efficiency of window displays. By using a quantitative research design, we created a “shopping simulation” that would help reach the objective of the thesis, and more specifically answer our central research questions. Below, we sum up our findings of the study, and answer each question.

- *Is a creative window more efficient than a non-creative one?*
 - *Does the existence of a price offering have an additional effect on the outcome?*

The results of our study show that creative window displays are clearly more efficient in terms of both affecting brand image and consumer shopping behavior in a positive direction. On all variables tested, the respondents' answers were higher on the creative windows than the non-creative ones. They perceived the brand to have e.g. higher ability, credibility and product quality, and at the same time they had higher intentions to both enter the store and to make a purchase. The findings of the study further suggest that price does not have any significant effect on the efficiency of the window displays – regardless if the window is creative or not. This was not in line with our initial hypothesis.

- *Is a high redesign frequency of the window displays more efficient than a low redesign frequency?*
 - *Do the outcomes of this also depend on the level of creativity?*

The results we got from the hypotheses that answer this question, showed to give quite varied responses. Window displays with high redesign frequency showed to be more efficient when it comes to the perception of product quality, exclusivity and attitude towards the window, but not for credibility and ability – the variables that concerns if the brand actually is trusted when it comes to delivering its offering. Further, these windows showed to have a greater impact on shopping behavior, and increased both store entering- and purchase intention. We have also been able to conclude that high redesign frequency leads to a maintained “wear-in” effect”, which means that the values increased between the first and second exposure of the window and the efficiency kept high. However, this effect was also detected when the redesign frequency was low. In final, when adding the creativity variable, we could

conclude that a high redesign frequency in combination with creativity could be the optimal suggestion for retailers. But we also saw that even if the creativity was low, the effects were still positive and retailers could therefore reach a wear-in effect even if the window is not very innovative.

- *Is there any difference in how efficient a window display is depending on whether the customer is hedonically or utility-driven?*

The findings showed to be very clear in the case of how the effects differed between hedonic and utilitarian customers. Hedonic consumers are more easily affected by both creativity and higher redesign frequency, showing a more positive perception of brand image and increased shopping behavior. This could be the result of many different things, but most likely it is due to hedonic shoppers' tendency to shop more on impulse and to treat themselves or others, and therefore they become more receptive to window displays as a source of ideas and inspiration.

5.3 Implications

5.3.1 Creativity

A creative window is more efficient in terms of stimulating shopping behavior, and leads to more positive brand image perceptions, than a non-creative window. We would like to emphasize the possibilities that these results bring – this is good news to retailers! And one important part of these good news is that the manipulations that we used in our experiment to represent the creative windows were no “Salvador Dalís” – or, to use a more suiting reference, “JoAnn Tans”. They were not overly creative, but just *more* creative than the non-creative displays. An implication of that is that a retailer can create positive results with relatively small measures. To borrow a few key words from the visual merchandisers that we interviewed, it's about *creating a feeling, building a fuller concept, and to be relevant for the customer.*

5.3.2 Price

Price offerings neither harm nor stimulate existing consumers. If however a large part of your customer base is consisting of non-loyal – or if you're looking to attract new customers – a price offering in the window might have an effect in terms of

stimulating an entrance behavior. This is not a result that we have seen in our experiment, since we've been studying (somewhat) loyal customers, but it is a conclusion that we've touched upon when discussing the non-significant result that we got on our price-manipulation in terms of increasing entering intention. An important aspect of this is of course that displaying a price offering in the window does not harm the brand image that the loyal customers have – on a short-term basis at least – but potentially have a positive effect on non-loyal (if we can agree that we can rule out the risk of scaring anyone off). A final thing to remember is the potential disadvantages that a too-frequent use of price offerings might have on the brand on a long-term basis.

5.3.3 Hedonic versus Utilitarian

It should be very important for retailers to understand different customers' behaviors and needs, in order to optimize their window displays as a communication tool and to stimulate action! If you know that eighty percent of your customers are utilitarian shoppers, it might not be worthwhile investing in creative and frequently switched window displays – and the other way around. Quickly, we also want to mention the importance of understanding the issue of the skewed results that males seem to give when it comes to shopping behavior. If the main target customers are men, you might believe in the existence of certain behaviour, which at the end of the day might be incorrect. This aspect could therefore be very interesting to investigate further in.

5.3.4 Redesign Frequency

It could be very valuable, especially for a high street brand, to know that by switching windows more often they could increase the customers' perception of the brands quality and superiority as well as increase the brand image and shopping behavior. By offering products that are perceived to have a high quality but at a good price, many customers can walk away satisfied. Since the investment in higher redesign frequency could really pay off, it is very important to measure the increase of visitors and shoppers in the store to enable understanding amongst the managers who might not be that marketing oriented, but rather have a focus on sales and more easily collected measurements. Nevertheless, not all retailers can afford a high redesign frequency but our research shows that you may be able to reach positive outcomes

anyway. By understanding how long a window design can be efficient, stores can maximize its use and switch certain elements of a window at the right time, maintaining the wear-in for a longer period of time. The optimal choice does not have to be super expensive, it is a matter of making priorities of having creative versus non-creative windows and keeping track of the different outcomes – do they need a quick effect on customers suitable for windows that are not passed by that often, or is a cheaper window that takes longer to reach its top efficiency sufficient? This is up to retailers to research and strategically plan according to their own unique situation.

5.3.5 Willingness to pay

Since the respondents showed to be difficult to influence when it comes to willingness to pay, and that their price perception was lower than the actual price of the shirt, retailers must consider their pricing more carefully. By having too high prices in relation to the customers' willingness to pay, retailers might lose customers due to the dissatisfaction that this may result in. Retailers could be able to increase the customers' perceptions by means such as communicating e.g. better quality in their overall marketing efforts.

5.4 Limitations

When we inspect our own study with a critic's glasses, we come to the conclusion that a couple of factors in the experiment could possibly be seen as "limiting". Firstly, we used the existing brand *Brothers*, hence the window displays that were tested displayed male merchandise. This has already been discussed in our methodology section – we did not choose the brand, rather it was the other way around – but one could still speculate what results we would have gotten should we have researched a unisex brand.

Secondly, the researched brand is part of the corporate group *RNB*, which due to financial troubles have been negatively reported on during the last couple of months. Regardless of the loyalty of the respondents, they can well have been affected by this negative publicity, and in turn replied in accordance to that in the experiment.

Thirdly, the manipulations could have been varied in more levels than the ones we used (e.g. four levels of creativity) in order to get a bigger picture. Unfortunately, time constrains and page limitations put a stop to this.

For our mini-observation study, there are also a few factors that we consider are suited to bring up in this section. Firstly, the four stores that we chose to observe were of course made so subjectively. But, we did consider a handful of stores and made our final decision after careful consideration regarding (1) the brands' positioning and target consumer (which we wanted to be similar), and (2) their entrances (placed directly after the window in order for us to be able to draw conclusions about the windows' impact on the consumers' behavior).

Furthermore, we there is the risk that we during our observation session missed one or two people who passed us by on the street, as well as missed some hard-to-spot consumer glances at the windows. Nonetheless, we took every action possible to minimize risks like these (e.g. by making sure we were standing close enough to observe the passers-by, but not too close to disturb the "natural setting").

5.5 Future Research

This study has widened the research done on visual merchandising and more specifically of window displays. It is among the first studies to investigate the actual impact of creativity-, redesign frequency- and price offering dimensions academically. As previously mentioned, this area of study has only been scratched upon the surface, and it therefore exists a great opportunity for deeper examination and exploration in the future for all the hungry researchers out there!

The focus of the study was put on a specific brand's customers meaning that the results were based on respondents with already established brand knowledge. Looking at a sample consisting of non-customers could therefore further develop future research. Since retailers has the need to attract and affect both current customers and potential customers, it is important to investigate how each group reacts to changes of different variables of window displays.

Continuing to talk about the sample, it could also be interesting to look at women and men separately to investigate whether there are any differences between how the genders react and behave. As we concluded in our analysis, there seem to be a greater similarity between men and women's shopping behavior than previously argued in theory. We only touched upon this matter but believe that this is a very current and potentially important matter to look deeper into.

Further, the study only takes a two-week period into account when looking at the effects of the respondents (due to time and space limitations), which could be extended with the purpose to investigate long-term effects of window displays. As seen in previous theory, there could be different outcomes depending on where on the "time-line" you are when it comes to communication. What works well in the short term might depreciate in the long term, and retailers could benefit from understanding how to balance the planning of both shorter and longer time frames.

Last but not least, it would be interesting to do a similar study on the topic but with a qualitatively research approach. This would enable a closer look at the customers' reactions and behaviors, and one could move deeper into the subject and further investigate what really makes the customers tick. By using e.g. eye tracking, a better understanding can be created of what variables in exact the customers react to, and by also extending the investigation *into* the store a more detailed analysis of shopping behavior outcomes can be done.

REFERENCES

- Ambler, T. and Hollier, A. E. (2004). "The Waste in Advertising Is the Part That Works", *Journal of Advertising Research*, December, pp. 375-389
- Appel, V. (1984?). "On Advertising Wear Out", *Journal of Advertising Research*, pp.42-44
- Baker, J., Levy, M. and Grewal, D. (1992). "An Experimental Approach to Making Retail Store Environmental Decisions", *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 68 (4) pp. 445-460
- Bertini, M., Wathieu, L. and Iyengar, S. S. (2012). "The Discriminating Consumer: Product Proliferation and Willingness to Pay for Quality", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 69, pp. 39-49
- Blackshaw, P. (2008). "The Six Drivers of Brand Credibility", *Marketing Management - New Media*, Maj-June pp. 51-54
- Clow, K. E. and Baack, D. (2005). "Brand Image", *Concise Encyclopedia of Advertising*, pp. 19-20
- Edelson, S. and Palmieri, J. E. (2012). "N.Y Stores Light Up, *WWD: Women's Wear Daily*, vol. 204 (104)
- Edward, S. and Shackley, M. (1992), "Measuring the Effectiveness of Retail Window Displays as an Element of the Marketing Mix", *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 11, pp. 193-202
- Erdem, T., Swait, J. (2004), "Brand Credibility, Brand Consideration, and Choice", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol.31, June, pp. 191-198
- Erdem, T., Swait, J. and Valenzuela, A. (2006), "Brands as Signals: A Cross-Country Validation Study", *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 70, January, pp. 34-49
- Evans, J., Mavondo, F. T. and Bridson, K. (2008). "Psychic Distance: Antecedents, Retail Strategy Implications, and Performance Outcomes", *Journal of International Marketing*, vol. 16 (2), pp. 32-63
- Dahlén, M., Fiberg, L. and Nilsson, E. (2009), "LONG LIVE CREATIVE MEDIA CHOICE", *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 38 (2), pp. 121-129
- Dahlén, M., Rosengren, S. and Törn, F. (2008), "Advertising Creativity Matters", *Journal of Advertising Research*, September, pp. 392-403
- Davies, B. J. and Ward, P. (2005), "Exploring the connections between visual merchandising and retail branding: An application of facet theory", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, vol. 33, (7), pp. 505-513

- Donovan, R. J. and Rossiter, J. R. (1982), "Store Atmosphere: An environmental Psychology Approach", *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 58 (1), pp. 34-57
- Duncan, S. (1995), "Signalling Price Image Using Advertised Prices", *Marketing Science*, vol. 14 (2), pp. 166-188
- El-Murad, J. and West, D. C. (2004), "The Definition and Measurement of Creativity: What Do We Know?", *Journal of Advertising research*, vol. 44 (2), pp. 188-201.
- Gabor, A. and Granger, C. W. J. (1966), "Price as an Indicator of Quality: Report on an Enquiry", *Economica*, February, pp. 43-70
- Gerstner, E. (1985), "Do Higher Prices Signal Higher Quality?", *Journal of Marketing Research*, May, pp. 209-15
- Grass, R. C. and Wallace, W. H. (1969), "Satiation Effect of TV Commercials", *Journal of Advertising Research*, vol. 9 (3), pp.3-8
- Johnson, L. B. (2007), "Visual Merchandising and Your Store's Brand Image", *Reed Business Information/jckonline.com*, pp. 32-35
- Kaltcheva, V. D. and Weitz, B. A. (2006), "When Should a Retailer Create an Exciting Store Environment?", *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 70, January, pp. 107-118
- Kirmani, A. (1997), "Advertising Repetition as a Signal of Quality: If It's Advertised So Much, Something Must Be Wrong", *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 26 (3), pp. 77-86
- Kirmani, A. and Rao, A. R. (2000), "No Pain, No Gain: A Critical Review of the Literature on Signaling Unobservable Product Quality", *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 64, April, pp. 66-79
- Kirmani, A. and Wright, P. (1989), "Money Talks: Perceived Advertising Expense and Expected Product Quality", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 16, pp. 344-353
- Klokis, H. (1986). "Store windows: dynamic first impressions", *Chain Store Age Executive*, vol. 62, pp. 108–109
- Kort, P. M. Caulkins, J. P., Hartl, R. F. and Feichtinger, G. (2006). "Brand image and brand dilution in the fashion industry", *Automatica (Journal of IFAC)*, vol. 42, pp. 1363-1370
- Koshate-Fisher, N., Stefan, I. V. and Hoyer, W. D. (2012), "Willingness to Pay for Cause-Related Marketing: The Impact of Donation Amount and Moderating Effects", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 69, pp. 910-927
- Lehnert, K., Till, B. D. and Carlson, B. D. (2013). "Advertising creativity and repetition Recall, wearout and wearin effects", *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 32 (2), pp. 211-231

- Leisching, A., Geigenmüller, A. and Enke, M. (2012). "Brands You Can Rely on! An empirical investigation of brand credibility in services", *Schmalenbach Business Review*, January, pp. 44-58
- Miller, K. M., Hofstetter, R., Krohmer, H. and Zhang, Z. J. (2011). "How Should Consumers' Willingness to Pay Be Measured? An Empirical Comparison of State-of-the-Art Approaches", *Journal of Marketing Research*", vol. 67, pp. 172-184
- Milosavljevic, M. and Cerf, M (2008). "First attention then intention", *International Journal of Advertising*, vol. 27 (3), pp. 381-398
- Mitchell, A.A. and Olson, J.C. (1981), "Are product attribute beliefs the only mediator of advertising effects on brand attitude?", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18, August, pp. 318-32.
- Mitchell, L. (2012). "Best Visual merchandising Programs", *DDI Magazine*, September, pp. 42-46
- Mower, J. M., Kim, M. and Childs, M. L. (2012), "Exterior atmospherics and consumer behavior: Influence of landscaping and window display", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, vol. 16 (4), pp. 442-453
- Oh, H. and Petrie, J. (2012). "How do storefront window displays influence entering decisions of clothing stores?", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, vol. 19, pp. 27-35
- Olson, J. C. and Mitchell, A. A. (1981). "Are Product Attribute Beliefs the Only Mediator of Advertising Effects on Brand Attitude?", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 28, pp. 318-332
- Padilla, C. and Eastlick, M. A. (2009), "Exploring urban retailing and CBD revitalization strategies", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, vol. 37 (1) pp. 7-23
- Pechman, C. and Stewart, D. W. (2002), "Advertising Repetition: A Critical Review of Wearin and Wearout", *Reviews of selected Areas* pp.285-329
- Russell, J.A.,Pratt,G.1(980)."A description of the affective quality attributed to environments", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 38, February, pp. 311-322
- Sahbaz, P. R. and Ciftci, C. (2011), "The Effects of Brand Image on Consumers' Choice", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, vol. 2 (20) pp. 227-238
- Sen, S., Block, L. G. and Chandran, S. (2002), " Window displays and consumer shopping decisions", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, vol. 9, pp. 277-290

Sheinin, D. A., Varki, S. and Ashley, C. (2011). "The Differential Effect of Ad Novelty and Message Usefulness on Brand Judgments", *Journal of Advertising*, vol. 40 (3), pp. 5-17

Shockely, J., Roth, A. V. and Fredendall, L. D. (2011), "An Information-Processing Approach for Evaluating In-Store Retail Operational Design Strategies", *Decision Science Journal*, vol. 42 (3), pp. 619-653

Suk, K., Lee, J. and Lichtensteint, D. R. (2012). "The Influence of Price Presentation Order on Consumer Choice", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 69, pp. 708-717

Turley, L. W. and Chebat, J-C. (2002)," Linking Retail Strategy Atmospheric Design and Shopping Behaviour", *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 18, pp. 125-144

Turley, L. W. and Milliman, R. E. (2000), "Atmospheric Effects on Shopping Behavior: A Review of the Experimental Evidence", *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 49, pp. 193-211

Wathieu, L. and Bertini, M. (2007). "Price as a Stimulus to Think: The Case for Willful Overpricing", *Marketing Science*, vol. 26 (1), pp. 118-129

Wells, J. D., Campbell, D. E., Valacich, J. S. and Featherman, M. (2010). "The Effect of Perceived Novelty on the Adoption of Information Technology Innovations: A Risk/Reward Perspective", *Decision Science Journal*, vol. 41 (4), pp. 813-843

Zeithaml, V. (1988), "Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end and synthesis of evidence", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 (3), pp. 2-22

Survey measurement references

Arnold, M. J. and Reynolds. K. E. (2003). "Hedonic shopping motivations", *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 79, pp. 77-95.

Babin, B. J, Darden, W. R. and Griffin, M. (1994). "Work and/or Fun: Measuring Hedonic and Utilitarian Shopping Value", *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 20, pp. 644-656.

Voss, K. E., Spangenberg, E. R and Grohmann, B. (2003). "Measuring the Hedonic and Utilitarian Dimensions of Consumer Attitude", *Journal of Marketing Research*", vol. 60, pp. 310-320.

Books and special sources

Berman, B. & Evans, J. R. (2007), "*Retail Management: A Strategic Approach*", New York: Pearson Education. 10th edition

Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2011), "*Business and Research Methods*", New York: Oxford University Press. 3rd edition

Dahlén, M. and Lange, F. (2009), "*Optimal Marknadskommunikation*", Malmö: Liber AB. 2nd edition

Diamond, J. and Diamond, E. (2007), "*Contemporary Visual Merchandising and Environmental Design*", New Jersey: Pearson Prentices Hall. 4th edition

Lauren, R and Randolph Carter, M (2007), "*Ralph Lauren*", New York: Rizzoli International Publications. 1st edition

Nordfält, J. (2007), "*Marknadsföring i Butik*", Malmö: Liber AB. 1st edition

Rosengren, S. (2008), "*Facing clutter- On Message Competition in Marketing Communications* ", Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D Stockholm School of Economics

Web Sources

A.R.E Design Awards, (2013). Available at:
http://aredesignawards.com/awards_winners_dyn.cfm?year=2013# [2013-04-04]

In Store Asia, (2013). Available at:
http://www.instoreasia.org/winners_2013.html [2013-04-04]

Konsumentverket – Prisinformationlagen, (2013). Available at:
<http://www.konsumentverket.se/lagar--regler/lagar/prisinformationslagen/> [2013-04-04]

Projekt Runeberg: Nordisk familjebok (1917). Available at:
<http://runeberg.org/nfce/0673.html> [2013-05-14]

Svenska Akademien - SAOB (1974). Available at:
<http://g3.spraakdata.gu.se/saob/show.phtml?filenr=1/254/123.html#SKYLT-SÖNDAG> [2013-05-14]

WDA, (2012). Available at:
<http://www.wda.gov.sg/content/dam/wda/pdf/PressRelease/03092012/Factsheet%20for%20the%20Visual%20Merchandising%20Competition.pdf> [2013-03-20]

and:

http://www.wda.gov.sg/content/wdaweb/L209-001About-Us/L219-PressReleases/03_Sep_2012.html [2013-03-20]

Interviews

Andreas Diaz-Soliz, Visual Merchandiser Gant, Sweden [2013-03-22]

JoAnn Tan, Creative Director NK, founder of JoAnn Tan Studio, Sweden [2013-04-30]

Katrine Wallberg, Visual Merchandiser Brothers & Sisters/RNB, Sweden [2013-03-14]

Tutor sessions

Sara Rosengren, Senior research fellow, Center for Consumer Marketing, Stockholm School of Economics [2013-02-22]

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: test windows



Non-creative without price



Non-creative with price



Creative without price



Creative with price



Non-creative without price



Non-creative with price



Creative without price



Creative with price

Appendix 3: Main experiment surveys

Survey 1

Hej och tack för att du väljer att delta i den här undersökningen. Som tack för din medverkan lottar vi ut fem presentkort à 500 kronor (för detta kommer du att i slutet av den här enkäten ges möjlighet att fylla i din mejladress).

Du kommer att få läsa ett kort scenario och se en bild. Sätt dig in i scenariot så gott det går, titta en stund på bilden och besvara sedan de efterföljande frågorna.

Kom ihåg att alla svar registreras anonymt och att dina svar är till störst hjälp när de reflekterar dina personliga åsikter och tankar.

Det är helg och du strosar runt på stan. Du går förbi och ser det här skyltfönstret (visas på nästa sida).

[test window 1/2]

Några frågor om skyltfönstret du just sett:

Det här skyltfönstret är

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Kreativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Säljande	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever Brothers skyltfönster som

Dåligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bra
Negativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Positivt
Ofördelaktigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fördelaktigt

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag får lust att prova kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag får lust att köpa kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att köpa något av plaggen i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers skyltfönster som helhet får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Produkterna i Brothers skyltfönster får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever att...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers har lagt ned mycket tid i utförandet av skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers har investerat mycket pengar i skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

En vecka senare är du återigen nere på stan för att göra ett par ärenden. Du går förbi butiken igen och får se följande skyltfönster:

[test window 2/2]

Några frågor om skyltfönstret du just sett:

Det här skyltfönstret är

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Kreativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Säljande	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever Brothers skyltfönster som

Dåligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bra
Negativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Positivt
Ofördelaktigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fördelaktigt

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag får lust att prova kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag får lust att köpa kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att köpa något av plaggen i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers skyltfönster som helhet får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Produkterna i Brothers skyltfönster får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever att...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers har lagt ned mycket tid i utförandet av skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers har investerat mycket pengar i skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever att...

	Sällan	2	3	4	5	6	Ofta
den här butiken byter skyltfönster...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Produkterna som visas i Brothers skyltfönster upplever jag som...

Billiga	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Dyra
Ointressanta	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Intressanta
Enkla	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Sofistikerade
Omoderna	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Trendiga

Brothers skyltfönster...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Stämmer in på min uppfattning av varumärket Brothers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Brothers skyltfönster är...

Ineffektivt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Effektivt
Ohjälpsamt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Hjälpsamt
Ej funktionellt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Funktionellt
Ej nödvändigt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Nödvändigt
Opraktiskt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Praktiskt
Oanvändbart	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Användbart
Orimligt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Rimligt
Ej problemlösande	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Problemlösande
Tråkigt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Kul
Trist	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Spännande
Lamt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Förtjusande
Icke njutbart	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Njutbart
Otrevligt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Trevligt
Ej lekfullt	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Lekfullt
Ej roande	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Roande
Skapar inte någon känsla	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Skapar en känsla

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers produkter som prisvärda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag behöver mycket mer information om Brothers innan jag kan tänka mig att gå in i butiken.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
För att förstå vad Brothers är för ett varumärke skulle jag behöva veta mer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag vet inte hur bra Brothers kommer att vara förrän jag har köpt det.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag vet vad jag får när jag köper något från Brothers och detta spar tid åt mig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers ger mig det jag vill ha och detta spar tid och ansträngning åt mig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Nu, några frågor om hur du ser på Brothers som varumärke.

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers som smart.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers kommer sannolikt att komma ut med bra produkter i framtiden.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag upplever att Brothers är bra på att lösa konsumenters problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers har produkter av hög kvalitet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers produkter är bättre än genomsnittet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers ägnar stor uppmärksamhet åt detaljer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers som intressant.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag vill köpa produkterna som visas i Brothers skyltfönster.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever varumärket Brothers som...

Dåligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bra
Negativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Positivt
Ofördelaktigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fördelaktigt

Jag upplever att Brothers...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Är trovärdigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Är kompetent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Är ärligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Har förtroende för sina produkters kvalitet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Den här skjortan syntes i fönstret:



Hur mycket skulle du vara beredd att betala för den? (svara i kronor)

Hur mycket tror du att den kostar? (svara i kronor)

Till sist, ett par frågor om dig som konsument.

	Stämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Stämmer helt
Jag shoppar oftast under reor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag tycker om att leta efter rabatter när jag shoppar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag tycker om att leta efter riktiga fynd när jag shoppar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag shoppar för att...

	Stämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Stämmer helt
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hålla mig uppdaterad på trender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hålla mig uppdaterad på nytt mode	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Se vilka nya produkter som är tillgängliga	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

En genomsnittlig månad besöker jag klädbutiker... (svara i uppskattat antal gånger)

Jag besöker Brothers butiker...

	Aldrig när jag går på stan	2	3	4	5	6	Varje gång jag går på stan
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

En genomsnittlig månad lägger jag ungefär _____ kronor på kläder:

En genomsnittlig månad lägger jag ungefär _____ kronor på kläder från Brothers:

Jag är:

Kvinna Man

Min ålder är:

Min e-mailadress är (för att vara med i utlottningen av presentkortet):

Survey 2

Hej och tack för att du väljer att delta i den här undersökningen. Som tack för din medverkan lottar vi ut fem presentkort à 500 kronor (för detta kommer du att i slutet av den här enkäten ges möjlighet att fylla i din mejladress).

Du kommer att få läsa ett kort scenario och se en bild. Sätt dig in i scenariot så gott det går, titta en stund på bilden och besvara sedan de efterföljande frågorna.

Kom ihåg att alla svar registreras anonymt och att dina svar är till störst hjälp när de reflekterar dina personliga åsikter och tankar.

Det är helg och du strosar runt på stan. Du går förbi och ser det här skyltfönstret (visas på nästa sida).

[test window 1/1]

Några frågor om skyltfönstret du just sett:

Det här skyltfönstret är

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Kreativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Säljande	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever Brothers skyltfönster som

Dåligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bra
Negativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Positivt
Ofördelaktigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fördelaktigt

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag får lust att prova kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag får lust att köpa kläderna i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att köpa något av plaggen i Brothers skyltfönster	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers skyltfönster som helhet får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Produkterna i Brothers skyltfönster får mig att vilja gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det är sannolikt att jag kommer att gå in i butiken	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever att...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Brothers har lagt ned mycket tid i utförandet av skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers har investerat mycket pengar i skyltfönstret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever att...

	Sällan	2	3	4	5	6	Ofta
den här butiken byter skyltfönster...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Produkterna som visas i Brothers skyltfönster upplever jag som...

Billiga	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Dyra	
Ointressanta	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Intressanta
Enkla	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sofistikerade
Omoderna	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Trendiga

Brothers skyltfönster...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Stämmer in på min uppfattning av varumärket Brothers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Brothers skyltfönster är...

Ineffektivt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Effektivt	
Ohjälpsamt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hjälpsamt
Ej funktionellt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Funktionellt
Ej nödvändigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Nödvändigt
Opraktiskt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Praktiskt
Oanvändbart	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Användbart
Orimligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Rimligt
Ej problemlösande	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Problemlösande
Tråkigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Kul
Trist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Spännande
Lamt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Förtjusande
Icke njutbart	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Njutbart
Otrevligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Trevligt
Ej lekfullt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Lekfullt
Ej roande	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Roande
Skapar inte någon känsla	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Skapar en känsla

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers produkter som prisvärda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag behöver mycket mer information om Brothers innan jag kan tänka mig att gå in i butiken.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
För att förstå vad Brothers är för ett varumärke skulle jag behöva veta mer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag vet inte hur bra Brothers kommer att vara förrän jag har köpt det.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag vet vad jag får när jag köper något från Brothers och detta spar tid åt mig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers ger mig det jag vill ha och detta spar tid och ansträngning åt mig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Nu, några frågor om hur du ser på Brothers som varumärke.

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers som smart.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers kommer sannolikt att komma ut med bra produkter i framtiden.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag upplever att Brothers är bra på att lösa konsumenters problem.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers har produkter av hög kvalitet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers produkter är bättre än genomsnittet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brothers ägnar stor uppmärksamhet åt detaljer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Jag upplever Brothers som intressant.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag vill köpa produkterna som visas i Brothers skyltfönster.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag upplever varumärket Brothers som...

Dåligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Bra
Negativt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Positivt
Ofördelaktigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fördelaktigt

Jag upplever att Brothers...

	Instämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Instämmer helt
Är trovärdigt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Är kompetent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Är ärligt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Har förtroende för sina produkters kvalitet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Den här skjortan syntes i fönstret:



Hur mycket skulle du vara beredd att betala för den? (svara i kronor)

Hur mycket tror du att den kostar? (svara i kronor)

Till sist, ett par frågor om dig som konsument.

	Stämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Stämmer helt
Jag shoppar oftast under reor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag tycker om att leta efter rabatter när jag shoppar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jag tycker om att leta efter riktiga fynd när jag shoppar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Jag shoppar för att...

	Stämmer inte alls	2	3	4	5	6	Stämmer helt
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hålla mig uppdaterad på trender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hålla mig uppdaterad på nytt mode	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Se vilka nya produkter som är tillgängliga	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

En genomsnittlig månad besöker jag klädbutiker... (svara i uppskattat antal gånger)

Jag besöker Brothers butiker...

	Aldrig när jag går på stan	2	3	4	5	6	Varje gång jag går på stan
.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

En genomsnittlig månad lägger jag ungefär _____ kronor på kläder:

En genomsnittlig månad lägger jag ungefär _____ kronor på kläder från Brothers:

Jag är:

Kvinna Man

Min ålder är:

Min e-mailadress är (för att vara med i utlottningen av presentkortet):

Appendix 4: Email to the respondents



Kundundersökning:
HEJ BROTHERSMEDLEM

Vi värderar din åsikt och hoppas att du vill hjälpa oss att bli ännu bättre genom att svara på några frågor. Tillsammans med Handelshögskolan i Stockholm genomför Brothers under våren 2013 en undersökning om skyltfönster.

Du hittar undersökningen genom att klicka på länken nedan, och den tar ca 5–10 minuter att genomföra.

Som tack för din tid lottar vi ut 5 presentkort à 500 kr bland dem som svarar, som kan användas i valfri Brothersbutik.

Stort tack på förhand!

Vänliga hälsningar,
Sofia Björkman, Affärsutvecklingsansvarig Brothers.

TILL FRÅGORNA!