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1. Introduction

This first chapter begins with the background that explains the situation of Covid-19 in Sweden, the restrictions, recommendations, and the definition of the word misbehaviour, followed by the problematization, purpose, the research question, and ends with an outline.

1.1. Background

The world has been affected by several pandemics over the last decades. The last were the Hong Kong Flu, SARS-CoV-1, and the Swine Flu. History is repeating itself and Covid-19 spread over the world within a few weeks and no one was prepared for the consequences (Koch et al., 2020). On January 31st, 2020, Sweden received its first confirmed Covid-19 case (Krisinformation, 2020). To decelerate the virus spread, Sweden introduced multiple restrictions and recommendations. Throughout the pandemic, the restrictions and recommendations have varied (Cederblad, 2021). In the beginning of March 2020, Sweden prohibited crowds to 500 people. Later that month the restriction changed to 50 people instead. In April 2020, Carl XVI Gustaf, King of Sweden, gave a speech where he urged people to cancel Easter celebrations. In October 2020 the government raised the limitation of people from 50 to 300, and a month after to 8 people. This is still the limitation, except for funerals where 20 participants are allowed, in stores and gyms each person have ten square meters (Krisinformation, 2021). According to the Swedish public health authority (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2020), people should abstain from being in indoor environments such as Physical Retail Stores (PRS) and shopping malls. Stores are not even allowed to attract people to the physical stores by market sales (Johansson & Helander, 2020). Necessary visits to grocery stores and pharmacies are still allowed (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2020).
The ongoing pandemic call for the study of consumers’ behaviour in the retail industry. Koch et al (2020), Laato (2020), Pantano et al. (2020) and Sheth (2020) all agree that Covid-19 has affected and disrupted consumer behaviour, due to social distancing, recommendations and restrictions. One initial change in consumer behaviour was the hoarding of food and toilet paper, at the beginning of the outbreak (Laato et al., 2020). Another change was the increased use of internet services (Koch et al., 2020).

Changes in society, such as a pandemic, can lead to changes in norms. We believe that the Swedish governmental recommendations and restrictions have created a norm to solely shop in PRS when it is necessary. It is not illegal to visit a PRS but since the Swedish public health authority recommends people not to, the behaviour violates the current norm and is therefore seen as a misbehaviour (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2020). However, some people still chose to shop in PRS, even though it violates the norm (T. Josefsdotter, personal communication, 19 April, 2021). Shopping motivations need to be acknowledged to understand why people choose to shop in PRS during the pandemic. Shopping motivation is usually explained as either consumers shop to obtain certain objects that are practical and useful or for pleasure (Blythe, 2008). Hedonism and utilitarianism are two important dimensions and lay the basis of shopping motivations (Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Crowley et al., 1992; Engel et al., 1993; Helm et al., 2013; Scarpi 2012). Therefore, will this thesis focus on hedonic and utilitarian motivations.

People who still chose to shop in PRS during the pandemic violate the mentioned norm, which in this thesis is seen as misbehaviour. Our definition of ‘misbehaviour’ is based on Fullerton and Punj’s (2004) definition; actions that violate the generally accepted norms, or more specific; to ignore the Swedish public health authority’s recommendations and restrictions. The term misbehaviour may have a negative tone. However, this does not necessarily mean that people are irrational or illogical.
Research has found that consumers who violate norms and social standards might justify the behaviour through five techniques of the Neutralization theory (e.g., Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Harris & Daunt, 2011; Vitell & Grove, 1987).

In the meantime, city centres are dying. The government urges people not to shop in PRS during the pandemic which has caused an economic loss for the stores (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2020). Half of the rare goods trades had lost almost 40 percent of the revenue and a quarter had lost 60 percent or more (Svensk Handel, 2020). Two-thirds of retailers reported liquidity problems and one in four companies stated that they would be able to cope with a maximum of two months under the prevailing circumstances. The pandemic caused extensive disruption of the flow of goods. Another consequence of Covid-19 is the increased use of e-commerce since people stayed at home. However, the loss of sales in physical stores does not yet seem to be compensated by the fact that households consume more online. Many online retailers have experienced weaker demand initially with an exception for groceries and pharmacies (Svensk Handel, 2020). This situation has created a dilemma for consumers. In order for the stores to survive, people have to ignore the current norm, which makes the behaviour wrong from a governmental point of view and right from the store owner point of view. Shopping is necessary for the PRS’ future economy, since it is the main reason why people visit city centres (Hart et al., 2011). The more consumers who purchase, the more people can be employed and benefit the regional economy. Thus, the consumers are facing a difficult choice.
1.2 Problematization

Prior research has found that consumer behaviour has changed due to the pandemic (e.g. Koch et al., 2020; Laato, 2020; Pantano et al; Sheth, 2020). There have been multiple studies that investigate the consequences of Covid-19. For instance, Laato (2020) studied hoarding behaviour during Covid-19, and concluded there was strong relation between self-isolation and unusual buying behaviour. Pantano et al. (2020) studied the setbacks that retailers were facing during the pandemic. The authors suggested that retailers and academics need to rethink both strategies and tactics to survive the pandemic. Koch et al. (2020) investigated the motives of e-commerce during the lockdown in April 2020. Sheth (2020) studied consumers’ disrupted habits during the pandemic. Social distance and lockdowns have forced people to change habits. Since people are stuck at home, the use of online services has dramatically increased. For instance, people use these services to get food and necessities delivered to their home and the new habits are here to stay. Covid-19 was the mutual denominator for the studies while the studied population, aim, and result were different. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study investigates why people still visit PRS during the pandemic.

Consumer behaviour, or more specifically hedonic and utilitarian motivations, is a well-studied subject (e.g, Babin et al., 1994; Batra & Ahtola, 1991; Crowley et al., 1992; Helm et al., 2013; Koch et al., 2020; Langrehr, 1991; Li et al., 2020; Scarpi 2012). Hedonic and utilitarian motivations can explain why consumers choose to purchase certain products and services (Babin et al., Batra & Ahtola, 1991; Koch et al., 2020). Further, will four examples of hedonic and utilitarian studies be presented. Koch et al. (2020) studied the hedonic and utilitarian motives of e-commerce during the lockdown in Germany. Their study found that German consumers spend more time online during a pandemic and that hedonic motivation has been the dominating influence for generation Y and Z to shop through e-commerce. Another example, Demoulin and Willems (2019) used hedonic and
utilitarian motivations to study how the store's environment affects social factors, irritation and satisfaction. The findings showed that social factors are an important aspect for irritation in utilitarian settings while ambience play a greater role in hedonic settings. Li et al. (2020) used a hedonic and utilitarian perspective to study the usage pattern of the information channels the consumers used in retail stores. The study's purpose was to offer primary survey data in order to give an advantage to retailers. The findings were that hedonic consumers used more social media to do research, while utilitarian consumers used third-party reviews and search engines. Babin et al. (1994) developed a scale that measures hedonic and utilitarian values received from consumers experiences. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no research on hedonic and utilitarian motivations in PRS during Covid-19. Therefore, we believe that there is a gap in the research field.

Previous research has noted that consumer misbehaviour is an important subject, which is still a neglected topic (e.g Daunt & Greer 2015; Daunt & Harris, 2010; Fullerton & Punj, 2004). The found researched topic is broad and cover multiple dimensions (e.g Daunt & Greer, 2015; Daunt & Harris, 2010; Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morley, 2017; Reynolds & Harris 2009; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Vitell & Grove, 1987). The definition implies that consumer misbehaviour is when consumers violate accepted norms and social standards (Daunt & Harris, 2010; Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Reynolds & Harris, 2009). However, the found studies do not research about consumers that violate restrictions and recommendations during a pandemic. The acknowledged norms regard consumers to not pay unnecessary visits in PRS. To the best of our knowledge, previous research regarding how consumers justifies their actions are related to the Neutralization theory. The theory explains how people justify juvenile or delinquent behaviour (e.g Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morley, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Ugelvik, 2012; Vitell & Grove, 1987). Thus, leads to the subject that consumers visit PRS despite the recommendations and restrictions can be seen as consumer misbehaviour and awakens the curiosity that consumers might use
techniques from the Neutralization theory to justify their actions. However, to the best of our knowledge, the research regards consumer who commit illegal actions and therefore justify their action through different techniques related to the Neutralization theory (Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morley, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Ugelvik, 2012; Vitell & Grove, 1987). Therefore, we believe that there is a gap in the research area about the Swedish consumers who visit PRS regardless of the restrictions and recommendations, and how the behaviour is justified.

This study was limited to generation Z which we define as people born between 1990 to 2000. Generation Z consists of 32% of the world's population which makes them the largest generation (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021). Previous research has found disparities between the shopping behaviour of different generations (Gilal et al., 2020). Each generation has their values and understanding since they are raised with the same political and social events. Generation Z are considered to have a high spending power. They are materialistic (Flurry & Swimberghe, 2016) and desire newer items often than other generations (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021) and want immediate results since 41% of the generation are impulsive shoppers (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021). Speed is a significant factor in all their activities. The generation also has an important impact on the world's consumer sales. The mentioned characteristics made it interesting to investigate generation Z’s shopping motivations.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the present thesis was to investigate why consumers chose to shop in PRS during the pandemic and how the behaviour is justified. The thesis was written from a consumer’s perspective and focuses on generation Z.
1.4 Research Question

Why do consumers feel the need to shop in physical retail stores in Sweden despite the Covid-19 recommendations and restrictions? Also, how do consumers justify their misbehaviour?

1.5 Outline

This thesis is divided into a set of chapters. The first chapter aims to introduce and create an understanding about the subject by explaining the problematization and background for consumers continuing shopping at PRS. The second chapter is presenting a theoretical framework where different theories will be featured. The third chapter provides understanding in the theoretical and empirical methodology that are used. The fourth chapter displays the empirical finding along with an analysis. The fifth chapter discusses the finding and provides insights. The sixth and last chapter includes a conclusion, summary, theoretical and practical contributions, followed by limitations and further research.
2. Literature Review

The second chapter includes a theoretical framework that starts with an introduction and explanation of shopping motivation followed by hedonism and utilitarianism, consumer misbehaviour, the Neutralization theory and ends with a conceptual framework.

2.1 Consumers Shopping Motivation

The research field had been dominated by research into economic and psychological aspects to understand shopping behaviour until Arnould and Thompson (2005) presented the Consumer Culture Theory (CCT). The theory is a subfield within consumer research, and it studies consumption choices based on social and cultural aspects. Arnould and Thompson (2005) found it confusing with all the theories related to consumer behaviour and therefore developed the CCT which they explained as “... a family of theoretical perspectives that address the dynamic relationships that address the dynamic relationships between consumer actions, the marketplace, and cultural meanings.” (p. 868). The CCT does not view consumption as a conscious activity, instead it is viewed as a sociocultural activity which is connected to consumers' emotions (Fahy & Jobber, 2015), for instance, why consumers shop for pleasure. CCT research has focused on four different areas (Hungara & Nobre, 2021). The first one is Consumer Identity Projects which explored consumers as active market actors. Marketplace Cultures is the second focus which studied the influence of social and cultural aspects of consumption. The third focus is Sociohistoric Patterning of Consumption which studied how structural and historical patterns affect consumption. The last focus is Mass-Mediated Marketplace Ideologies and Consumers’ Interpretive Strategies where the CCT has helped to understand how consumers read, respond, decode and resist marketing messages. Previous studies have used CCT to understand consumer participation and motivations (e.g., Hook et al., 2018; Kamboj & Rahman, 2017).
According to Hungara and Nobre (2021) marketplace culture is one of the most studied dimensions which investigates the consumers’ interactions, which in this thesis is consumer shopping motivation.

Jin and Kim (2003) defined shopping motivations as “the drivers of behaviour that bring consumers to the marketplace to satisfy their internal needs” (p. 399). A way to explain why people shop is hedonic and utilitarian motivation, which is two important dimensions of shopping experience and the basis of shopping motivation (Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Crowley et al., 1992; Helm et al., 2013; Scarpi 2012). hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations is also considered to be a key element to explain the consumer's post-purchase decisions and behaviour (Jones et al., 2006; Overby & Lee, 2006). For a long time the utilitarian aspect was in focus when it came to shopping. The shopping experience was seen as a task, but today the focus has changed. The shopping experience has gained a more emotional and entertaining value. Therefore, the hedonic aspect has become more important today than it was before (Babin et al., 1994; Langrehr, 1991; Roy, 1994; Wakefield & Baker, 1998).

2.1.1 Hedonism and Utilitarianism

Hedonism is defined as “the cult of pleasure” (Blythe, 2008, p 43; Table 1). Appearance is more important than functionality. For instance, clothes need to be eye-catching rather than used simply to keep warmth. According to Koch et al (2020) hedonic shoppers act on emotions rather than reason. People tend to purchase products and services to solve unhappiness, which are an example of hedonic motives. It is the sensation to obtain a product that is important, not the usefulness. The climax of the shopping experience is the buying process (Babin et al., 1994). Therefore, impulsive purchases are the outcome of the need to buy. Horváth and Adigüzel (2018) study showed that hedonic shopping motivations are strongly related to impulsive buying. Consumers do impulsive purchases in order to keep or improve the mood since planned purchases cannot does not give the same
excitement (Kato & Hishino, 2021). The impulsive purchase will therefore result in joy and satisfaction. This is applicable to the current pandemic since economic crises tend to change the purchase habits, which might have an impact on impulsive purchases (Sharma & Sonwalkar, 2013). Purchases in the store are particularly influenced since it is highly affected by the in-store stimulation. The probability to make impulsive purchases increases with the time spent in PRS (Stilley et al., 2010) and discounts (Chomvilailuk & Butcher, 2014). On the other hand, previous studies showed that impulsive purchase can result in regret if the purchase was made without sufficient information (Kato & Hishino, 2021). However, the purchase of products stimulates hedonic needs, while time pressure decreases the feeling of spontaneity and freedom which also decreases the hedonic motivation (Babin, et al., 1994). Experiences such as sports, travel and new hobbies will also stimulate the hedonic needs (Blythe, 2008).

Arnold and Reynolds’ (2003) showed that hedonic shopping motivation can be divided into six categories. The first category is adventure shopping. People shop because of the adventure and the excitement (Table 1). These shoppers tend to seek stimulation while shopping. The second category is social shopping, the reason people shop in this category is to socialize and spend time with friends and family (Table 1). The third category is gratification shopping where shopping is seen as a stress-relief activity (Table 1). People in this category often indulge themselves when shopping (Table 1). The fourth category is idea shopping, the reason to shop is to keep up with the latest trends and fashion. The fifth category is role shopping, people get happy when shopping for others. It is described as “The positive feelings they get from finding the perfect gift for someone” (p. 81). In that case, shopping is seen as an act of love. The sixth and last category is value shopping and it can be described as the hunt for sales and discounts (Table 1). The excitement is to seek discounts and save money and the discount is seen as the actual prize.
The definition of utilitarianism is practicality and usefulness (Blythe, 2008; Table 1). Utilitarian shoppers are task-oriented, rational and have a clear goal of the shopping (Aw, 2019; Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Athola, 1991). Utilitarian shoppers are driven by a desire to fulfill the basic needs or complete a functional task. The satisfaction derives from the outcome of non-emotional, aware and effective shopping which does not necessarily mean a purchase of the product. Utilitarian consumers can also receive satisfaction by collecting new information. According to Chiu et al., (2012) there are four dimensions of utilitarian shopping motivations: convenience, product offer, product information and monetary savings (Table 1). Convenience is an important aspect since it saves both time and effort. A wide variety of product offers helps the consumer to choose the right product, since it is possible to make comparisons. The goal of shopping can be to collect information about products. In stores consumers could collect information by feeling or trying the products and asking the staff. Furthermore, monetary savings is important since it is seen as an effective form of shopping.

Consumers with a utilitarian motivation shop with a work mentality. Whereas consumers with a hedonic motivation derive satisfaction from the actual process which is seen as a leisure activity rather than a task. Purchases which are motivated with a “should” are related to utilitarianism while “want” is connected to hedonism (Kumar & Sadarangani, 2021). Babin et al. (1994) stated that one does not exclude the other, shopping motivations could be both hedonic and utilitarian. Therefore, consumers can have both motivations at the same time. Consumers tend to seek for shopping stimuli, for instance, home decor and fashion, once the utilitarian purchase is done. Both hedonic and utilitarian motivations influence the purchase decision. Utilitarian consumers purchase once they find what they are searching for, while hedonic consumers tend to purchase on impulse. Cottet et al. (2006) agreed that hedonic and utilitarian motivations should not be seen as opposites. For instance, consumers may complete the shopping task in an effective way and search for information at the same time, which is a typical utilitarian motivation, may also
lead to hedonic satisfaction. Contrariwise, a hedonic task could generate in utilitarian satisfaction. The hedonic and utilitarian motivations explain why people feel the need to shop, not how they justify their behaviour. Utilitarianism is unlike hedonic motivation related to purchase deliberation, which is the deep consideration of whether to buy the product or not depending on service, product and price (Hoffman and Novak, 1996). Previous research showed that gender has an impact on shopping motivations (e.g., Hansen & Jensen, 2009; Hart et al., 2007). Females tend to attach a greater importance to social interaction, and the enjoyment of shopping which is a hedonic motivation. However, males appreciate convenience, time efficient, and easily accessible information which can be described as utilitarian motivations (Sebald & Jacob, 2018). Table 1 summarizes the different sub-categories associated with the hedonic and utilitarian motivations.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>Blythe, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialize</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress-relief</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indulge</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discount</td>
<td>Arnold &amp; Reynolds, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Aw, 2019; Babin et al., 1994; Batra &amp; Athola, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Blythe, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practically</td>
<td>Blythe, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Chiu et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Offer</td>
<td>Chiu et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Information</td>
<td>Chiu et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monetary Savings</td>
<td>Chiu et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Kato &amp; Hishino, 2021; Sharma &amp; Sonwalkar, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. The words associate to Hedonistic and Utilitarian motivations*
2.2 Consumer Misbehaviour

During the past decades, research on consumer misbehaviour has taken off (Daunt & Greer, 2015; Fullerton and Punj, 2004; Harris, 2008; Reynolds & Harris, 2009). Fullerton and Punj (2004) claimed that a multitude of research has investigated consumer misbehaviour, yet the topic is neglected. The term misbehaviour implies that consumers violate accepted norms and social standards (Daunt & Harris, 2010; Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Reynolds & Harris, 2009). Hence, the terms acceptable and unacceptable behaviour needs to be determined (Fullerton & Punj, 2004). In this thesis acceptable behaviour is to follow governmental restrictions and recommendations. Meanwhile, unacceptable is the opposite, which means that a visit to a PRS constitutes a misbehaviour. According to Daunt and Greer (2015), most research has investigated consumers who engage in misbehaviour through analysing traits and identify factors. Some research is related to how customers misbehave towards firms (Fullerton & Punj 2004; Harris, 2010; Harris & Daunt, 2011; Reynolds & Harris, 2009).

However, the term ‘consumer misbehaviour’ is a broad subject since many consumers misbehave in multiple ways (Fullerton & Punj, 2004). Terms such as aberrant, deviant and dysfunctional behaviour have been used to further exploit and understand consumer misbehaviour (Daunt & Greer, 2015). Most consumers misbehave once in a while (Fullerton & Punj, 2004). At the same time, this type of behaviour is tolerated on multiple occasions. For instance, there are consumers who exploit firms’ return policies the employees allow the behaviour, since they focus on maintaining a good relationship with all consumers (Harris, 2010). A further example would be how consumers misbehave towards service firms, and where the employees allow the behaviour and maintain the policy that ‘consumers are always right’ (Daunt and Harris, 2010). Misbehaviour is under-reported by firms. Since the term is broad, it has a multitude of meanings such as shoplifting, vandalism, fraudery, verbal abuse toward employees etcetera. For instance, Harris (2010)
revealed how different factors can explain why consumers exploit retailer return policies. As mentioned, consumer misbehaviour is a broad subject that needs to be defined before an investigation can take place.

Consumer misbehaviour can be put into three categories, norms and expectations, labelling and behavioural intent. First, Fullerton & Punj (2004) explained the term misbehaviour considering norms and expectations to act in certain ways that are seen as incorrect and unacceptable. Second, to understand consumer misbehaviour on a deeper level, it is necessary to understand the sociology of deviant behaviour, which explains why certain behaviour is labelled as acceptable and the opposite. The deviant label considers what is right and what is not. When someone misbehave does not imply that the person acts illegal nor unethical. Third, behavioural intentions can be crucial for the determination of whether the behaviour is deviant or not.

### 2.3 Neutralization Theory

Neutralization theory has a long history that goes back to 1957 (Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morely, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1987; Vitell & Grove, 1987), and it explains how people justify unacceptable behaviour through a set of excuses (Harris & Daunt, 2011). The theory was first used to explain juvenile delinquent behaviour while the consumer retained a positive self-image (Jantz & Morely, 2017). Since then, the perspective has been exploited in various criminological and sociological research. However, the theory can also be applied towards consumer misbehaviour (Vitell & Grove, 1987). Individuals can deny responsibility for certain actions through five techniques (Harris & Daunt, 2011; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Vitell & Grove 1987).

Sykes and Matza (1957) found that there are five techniques of Neutralization that people use to justify juvenile behaviour and to continue having a positive perception
of their self-image (Jantz & Morley, 2017). The techniques used in this theory helps to explain consumers' justification of their misbehaviour. These techniques are denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemning the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties (Harris & Daunt, 2011). At first, denial of responsibility is when people do not take responsibility for the actions, since the factors posteriorly are beyond control. An example of individuals who use this excuse might say “I couldn’t help myself, I was desperate” (Vitell and Grove, 1987, p.434). Second, denial of injury is described as individuals argue that the misbehaviour is not serious since no one was harmed due to their actions. Third, denial of victim is caused by individuals who blame others for misbehaviour. For instance, causing harm toward someone is because the persons deserved the consequence (Harris & Daunt, 2011). Denial of victim can be referred to criminology where prisoners or criminals justify their actions in the context of it was the victims own fault (e.g Fullerton & Punj, 1987; Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morley, 2017; Ugelvik, 2012). Fourth, condemning the condemners occurs when individuals justify the behaviour since others act in the same way (Jantz & Morley, 2017). Last, appeal to higher loyalties is when individuals argue that their misbehaviour is a by-product (Harris & Daunt, 2011). It is an attempt to achieve a higher value or ideal in the end, rather than behave acceptably in that specific situation.

As mentioned, all techniques are used to justify misbehaviour. Vitell and Grove (1987) explicate that all techniques are both learned and also reinforced by social responses, thus misbehaviour has become more acceptable. However, norm violating behaviour does not mean that the norms should cease to exist. The Neutralization theory explains that the norms do not necessarily apply to the person who misbehaves. This thesis will examine four of the five techniques of Neutralization. The technique that is excluded from this thesis is denial of victim since Sykes and Matza (1957) explain rather aggressive and delinquent behaviour (e.g Jantz & Morley, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957 Ugelvik, 2012). The technique
might not be applicable for this thesis since it regards physical violence. However, every consumer does not deny unethical behaviour. Some take responsibility for the actions (Harris & Daunt, 2011).

2.4 Conceptual Framework

To our knowledge, previous research has not provided or explored an extensive model that explains why consumers turn to PRS during the Covid-19 pandemic and how they justify the behaviour. The conceptual framework consists of hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivation and the Neutralization theory, which is the foundation of this thesis. Hedonic and utilitarian motivation explain why people shop and is the basis of shopping motivation (Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Crowley et al., 1992; Helm et al., 2013; Scarpi 2012). The two motivations explain the consumers’ post-purchase decisions and behaviour (Jones et al., 2006; Overby and Lee, 2006). It is acknowledged that consumers misbehave (Fullerton & Punj, 2004), and there is a set of techniques to normalize the behaviour (Vitell & Grove, 1987). Thus, the used theories are the basis for the conceptual framework that is shown in Figure 1.

The primary objective for this figure is to display consumers’ shopping motivation and how it leads them to visit PRS and how they justify the actions (Figure 1). To the left in Figure 1, there are two boxes that explains the sub-categories for consumers' motivations which could be hedonic or utilitarian (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Aw, 2019; Babin et al., 1994; Batra & Athola, 1991; Blythe, 2008; Chiu et al., 2012; Kato & Hishino, 2021; Sharma & Sonwalkar, 2013). The arrows indicate that the sub-categories are the motivations for shopping at a PRS. The shopping motivations derive from the sub-categories, which result in consumers visiting PRS. Thus, the motivations are lined together with the box in the middle which is “shopping in PRS”. In this thesis we argue that shopping in PRS can be seen as a misbehaviour. Thus, after the visits, there is a belief that consumers will justify the
actions which leads towards the Neutralization theory. There are four arrows pointing towards the four Neutralization techniques in the boxes to the right in the figure. The aim is to explain how consumers might justify their visits in PRS. There are five techniques of Neutralization, but this thesis includes only four of those since the fifth technique considers how people justify the infliction of pain on someone else. *Denial of victim* is explained as “the victim got what the victim deserved” (Jantz & Morley, 2017, p. 2767), and therefore is not relevant for this study.

**Figure 1**

*Consumers motivations and Justifications for visiting PRS*

Note. Different ways that explain the motivation for shopping in PRS and how it might be justified.
3 Methodological Considerations

The third chapter includes a discussion of the theoretical and empirical method that is used.

3.1 Theoretical methodology

The first subchapter includes a brief introduction and discussion of chosen research philosophy, approach and design.

3.1.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy is a set of systems of different beliefs and assumptions in the development of knowledge (Saunders et al., 2016). The chosen philosophy has been the point of departure and shapes the investigators in the research process. There are three major philosophical perspectives which are positivism, realism and interpretivism (Bell et al., 2019). Positivism is a philosophy where the already existing knowledge is the real knowledge. Realism stands for the belief that objects are independent and exist apart from an individual's mind. For instance, the research influenced by realism investigates the factors that affect people rather than to investigate the person by themselves as objects (Saunders et al, 2016). Last, interpretivism bases its beliefs on that human relationships and actions are complex. Interpretivist philosophers do not believe in generalization. Investigations require a deep understanding, and to understand the subjective meaning of social conduct and social actions of humans to be able to navigate the surroundings smoothly (Bell et al., 2019). This thesis concerns a deeper understanding of consumers' behaviour towards why they choose PRS rather than e-commerce during the pandemic. This is the reasoning to use interpretivism due to the philosophy is aligned with the purpose.
3.1.2 Research Approach

According to Bell et al. (2019) the research approach includes three courses which are deduction, induction, and abduction. The deductive approach is the most common view associated with the relationship between theory and research. Researchers with a deductive philosophy bases their study on theory and thereafter evaluate it through their own investigation. Induction is the contrast to deduction (Saunders et al, 2016). The inductive approach studies the research field without the literature in mind (Denscombe, 2016). An abductive approach is where deduction and induction are combined (Bell et al, 2019; Saunders et al, 2016). However, the deductive approach is aligned with this thesis since it is based on an already existing theory. Previous studies and theory guides the empirical research.

3.1.3 Research Design

A quantitative, qualitative or mixed method can be used to collect data when conducting research. The qualitative method is aligned with this thesis since the focus is to understand each individual rather than generate generalized data. The method is used for small-scale studies and to generate non-numerical data (Bell et al., 2019; Saunders et al., 2016). Furthermore, to conduct the study, there is a need to understand social interaction, societal problems which cannot be described through numbers. An advantage with this method is that the research can be the sole way to study the world through the eyes of the people (Bell et al., 2019). Furthermore, this research design is often associated with interpretivism (Saunders et al., 2016). The research can manage complex social situations since the research tends to become quite analytic and specific (Denscombe, 2016). The investigation frames the real world in small fragments which enables the analysis to go further and deeper. A further advantage is the tolerance for ambiguity and contradictions in qualitative study since social situations accommodate misconceptions and etcetera. However, the research does not come with advantages solely. There is a set with multiple disadvantages as well. For instance, one disadvantage is the difficulty to convert qualitative data into numbers, since the research focuses on the
individuals rather than generalization. Thus, it is harder to generalize the research that affects the reliability which will be discussed further below. Such studies are time-consuming which requires investigators time and energy to complete. As mentioned, this thesis is specified and narrowed down to a small fragment of the world of research. Yet, there is a belief that this study matches qualitative research to investigate consumers behaviour on a deeper level.

### 3.2 Empirical methods

The second subchapter includes a discussion presenting the empirical method. This part concludes the chosen research strategy, data collection, diary method, diary guide, participant selection, data analysis, trustworthiness and the limitations.

#### 3.2.1 Data Collection

There are different ways to collect qualitative data, for instance, interviews, focus groups, observations, and diaries (Denscombe, 2016). Bell et al. (2019) explained that diaries, which is the chosen method, are used when a researcher is interested in investigating a specific situation. Diaries can determine if daily events have a correlation and can also be used to investigate if individuals behave differently in the same situations (Bolger et al., 2003). Previous studies have used diaries when investigating consumption. For instance, Papaoikonomou et al. (2018) used a time and event-based diary design when they studied the information gathering process by ethical oriented consumers. The purpose with the diaries was to capture the searching process about ethical consumption. Argano et al. (2014) used a three-day shopping diary to track Canadian consumers' payment choices when shopping.

Wheeler and Reis (1991) explained that there are three different methods of diaries. The first is interval-contingent design where the participants report at regular intervals, for example, each day before bedtime (Wheeler & Reis, 1991). The second is time-design (Papaoikonomou et al., 2018), where the reports are fixed,
random, or a combination of both (Wheeler & Reis, 1991). The third method is event-contingent design, where the participants report directly after the specific event has occurred. One advantage of time-contingent and event-contingent design is credibility. Reports are written close in time to the event, which reduces the risk of forgetting or re-evaluating. A disadvantage is the intrusiveness of the task, for instance if the participant is in a hurry or busy it could be bothering. There are two further disadvantages of all three methods. The first is the task which can be time-consuming. The second is when the participants devote more time to reflect on events and be more self-aware, which could lead to changed behaviour. The event-contingent design requires an evident definition of the event has any ambiguity may cause the participants to leave out important information (Bolger et al., 2003). To avoid the ambiguity there should only be one main event to focus on.

The chosen method for data collection was an introductory diary and a shopping diary. The introductory diary contained questions about age, place of residence, general thoughts about shopping, and shopping habits. The shopping diary was used to track the purchasing and the participants were encouraged to fill in after each time they shopped in a PRS. A combination of time- and event-contingent diary design was used in the thesis to reduce the risk of the participants forgetting or re-evaluate. The participants were encouraged to fill in the diary once at the beginning to answer general questions and then after each purchase to ensure that the data was collected unaffected. The entries per participant varied since the diary is a combination of time- and event-contingent design (2-4 purchases). The diaries recorded the participants' motivations to shop in PRS during the pandemic and also how they justified the behaviour.

Diary as a data collection tool is preferred over other qualitative methods, for instance, interviews because it decreases the risk of forgetting details and re-evaluate actions (Papaoikonomou et al., 2018). Another advantage with diaries is
that it captures the consumer's true behaviour, while a disadvantage with the method is the high drop-out rate. A further disadvantage is that diary writing increases the participants' self-awareness about their shopping which might change the behaviour and give incorrect results. Diary writing is a time-consuming process, and it requires commitment from the participants. A further disadvantage is that the authors have less control over the process than for example an interview, which could result in participants not following instructions, writing about irrelevant topics and not getting detailed answers.

3.2.2 Diary Instructions

An introductory diary was first introduced that contained nine questions about age, place of residence, general thoughts about shopping, and shopping habits. The participants were encouraged to answer the questions as soon as possible. The diary contained ten questions about specific shopping habits that the participants were encouraged to fill in after each time they shopped in a PRS. The chosen timeline was two weeks since Pàmies et al. (2016), Richter (2011), Siemieniako (2017) and Waskul et al. (2009) recommended a time frame between two to six weeks. The outcome may have become more trustworthy with a longer time frame. Unfortunately, there was a strict time-limit that did not allow us to have a longer period of time. The diary timeline was at the end of a month since we believe that people shop more after payday. The qualitative survey and the diary were submitted online due to the pandemic that hinders us to meet our participants. The diaries were written anonymously since some of the questions are more sensitive and we wanted the real answer and not the expected one.

3.2.3 Diary Guide

The diary guide was written in Swedish (Appendix A; Appendix B) and has been used to illustrate essential parts of consumers motivation and justifications. The outline of the diary was connected to this thesis theoretical framework, and therefore supports the research deductive approach (Denscombe, 2016; Saunders et
The diary was divided into two parts. The first part was an introductory diary that was used to get the participants in the mindset of analysing their behaviour (Appendix A). The second part was a shopping diary that was used to receive insights and knowledge about the consumers’ motivations and how they justify their actions (Appendix B), which is related to the conceptual model (Figure 1). The aim with the diary was to receive elaborated answers, which was why the questions were mainly open (Denscombe, 2016). The open questions let the participants discuss other perspectives besides the theory.

With the conceptual model (Figure 1) in mind, the diary was also divided into two categories. The first category was the motivations consumers had for visiting PRS (Appendix A; Appendix B). The purpose of the questions was to gain information about which motivations that made consumers shop in PRS. The second category was how the consumers justified their actions (Appendix B). The purpose of the questions regarding justification is to retrieve information if the participants are related to the theory or if they justify it differently.

3.2.4 Participant Selection

Convenience sample was chosen as selection procedure (Denscombe, 2014). A preferable choice of participant selection would have been a systematic selection, but unfortunately it was a hard selection to do during a pandemic. An advantageous choice was to choose people that were around and easily accessible. The advantage with a convenience selection is that it is inexpensive, fast and easy. Since the diary demands commitment, it was an advantage that we already knew the participants, which decreased the risk of a high drop-out rate. A disadvantage with convenience sample is the impossibility to generalize, since there is no way to figure out which population is representative (Bell et al., 2019). Despite that the selection is often used in researches about consumer behaviour. Good research does not use its study objects because they are easy to find but for special reasons related to the subject
(Denscombe, 2014). Therefore a requirement was introduced, the participants should have shopped the last month, which ensured the collection of suitable data. The participants were picked out via our personal network and were contacted through text messages. The participants were close friends who we know would do as a favour and be committed to the task. The chosen participants were six males and eleven females between the ages 22 to 27. Since diaries involve a commitment, it may be difficult to ask strangers to contribute. 21 people were asked to participate and 20 accepted. Unfortunately, there were three drop-outs and a total of 40 diary entries were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Number of purchases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hässleholm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bromölla</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bromölla</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kristianstad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The table show the demographics and how many purchases each participant made

3.2.5 Data Analysis

Thematic analysis is one of the most frequently used approaches when it comes to the analysis of qualitative data (Bell et al., 2019). Coding was used to analyse the content of the diary and the qualitative survey. Coding is the natural starting point for multiple qualitative studies where the data is broken down into different parts where the codes can be categorised, and different patterns can be identified. A disadvantage with coding is the risk of losing the specific context. Deductive codes
were used in the first round of coding where the content was divided into terms and codes according to our conceptual model, thus the subcategories to Neutralization theory, and hedonic- and utilitarian motivations. In the first round of coding the participants’ answers were divided into different categories, either according to hedonic and utilitarian motivations, or the Neutralization techniques. For instance, the answer “It was an unplanned purchase mostly because we wanted to treat ourselves” is a hedonic motivation since the motivation to shop was indulgence. Therefore, this answer was coded as a hedonic motivation. In the second round of coding we searched for new findings other than the motivations or the Neutralization techniques. That is, when the participants had other motivations or justified their behaviour in other ways than was what mentioned in the theoretical model.

3.2.6 Trustworthiness

To increase the trustworthiness of this thesis four criteria have been considered credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Bell et al., 2019; Denscombe, 2016; Saunders et al., 2016). These four criterias will be discussed in this subchapter.

First, the credibility refers to if study is believable to others (Bell et al., 2019; Saunders et al., 2016). 20 people were asked to partake in the study where three were disqualified since they answered the diary once, which led to an unqualified answer. The requirement was to answer the diary at least twice. Otherwise, it could be hard to determine if the diaries have a correlation and if the participants behave differently in the same situations. A total of 60 diaries were collected throughout the timeframe. The diary's open questions let the participants discuss other perspectives besides the theory.

Second, transferability explains whether the findings can be generalized (Bell et al., 2019; Denscombe, 2016; Saunders et al., 2016). Generalization can be hard to
achieve in a qualitative research since the focus is depth rather than breadth (Bell et al., 2019). It might be difficult to apply this research to future research, since it investigates a specific or unique social situation and is a small scale study. However, this thesis does not focus on transferability. The aim of this thesis is to contribute in depth investigation, rather than generalising.

Third, Bell et al. (2019) explained that similar to reliability, dependability demonstrates the trustworthiness of a qualitative research. Dependability might be hard to achieve with qualitative research since the investigators might specify the research on such a deep level that it cannot be replicated in other situations (Denscombe, 2016; Saunders et al., 2016). In order to achieve dependability the collected data should be available. The diaries were submitted online through “drive” and were stored online and on personal computers. To maintain anonymity each participant was given a personal code.

Last, confirmability can be ensured by the objectivity of the author (Bell et al., 2019) and that the authors acted in good faith and removed personal values (Bell et al., 2019). The data was analysed through an objective perspective since no personal opinions were expressed during the collection of data. The diary was written in Swedish and the quotes were translated to English. In order to avoid the translation misunderstandings, the quotes were translated with help from a teacher.

3.2.7 Limitations

The study has several limitations, for instance, the study only focuses on generation Z. Further research could investigate a broader population. Second, since the diary is submitted online, our influence on the process was limited and could result in some irrelevant subjects. Some participants may have perceived the question “How long did the purchase (shopping round) take?” as the time at the checkout while others as the time they went into the store and then returned. For instance, it is unlikely to find, try on and buy underwear in under three minutes. We relied on the
participants’ perception of time, which is not always correct. Furthermore, a problem is that misunderstanding might arise since we as investigators understand the subject in another way than the participants might do. Third, all participants that were given the diary might become more attentive towards their consumer behaviour than they would have been otherwise. Fourth, the short time frame was a further limitation and the study would be more trustworthy if there had been longer data collection time. Finally, a further limitation was the convenience sample was which could affect the credibility of this thesis.
4. Empirical Findings and analysis

The fourth chapter presents the findings from the diary followed by an analysis based on the conceptual framework. The chapter includes two subchapters. The first subchapter presents findings and analysis of the consumer motivations. The second subchapter presents the findings and analysis of how the participants have justified their behaviour.

4.1 The Motivations

The aim of this chapter is to understand why consumers shop in PRS in Sweden despite the pandemic. Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations are used to investigate the research question and analyse the findings, since they have been two important motivations of shopping experience and the basis of shopping motivation (Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Crowley et al., 1992; Helm et al., 2013; Scarpi 2012). Deductive coding was used to map out hedonic and utilitarian motivation and inductive coding to identify the new findings.

One consequence of a pandemic can be an economic crisis, which in turn tends to change consumers’ purchase habits (Sharma & Sonwalkar, 2013). The findings indicate that some participants had changed their behaviour and chose e-commerce to reduce the spread of the virus. Other participants chose to shop in PRS to help the local retailers survive. One participant used e-commerce more but was disappointed about the delivery, and therefore chose PRS instead. However, some participants did not change their shopping habits due to the pandemic. Other limited the visits to clothing stores, but still visited stores without e-commerce such as second hand. Other reasons have been to get out of the house and do something fun. Another participant has shopped less due to economic difficulties created by the pandemic.
The findings showed a difference in the shopping motivations between the genders. Several of the female participants thought that the social and enjoyment of the shopping is most important, “I was bored at home, I wanted to socialize and buy something impulsive. I was at home all day and worked and therefore needed to get out of the house”. The male participants appreciated the effectiveness and time-efficiency: “I was nearby and needed the products the same day. It was time-efficient!”.

The findings are in line with Sebald and Jacob’s (2018) findings that females tend to attach a greater importance to social interaction, and the enjoyment of shopping which is a hedonic motivation. In contrast, males appreciated convenience, time efficient, and easily accessible information which can be described as utilitarian motivations (Sebald & Jacobs, 2018). Previous research has also shown that gender has an impact on shopping motivations (e.g., Hansen & Jensen, 2008; Hart et al., 2007). However, even if more females based the shopping on hedonic motivations there were males who also did hedonic purchases. Likewise, there were females who also sometimes based the shopping on utilitarian motivations, or a combination of both. According to Babin et al. (1994) hedonic motivation does not exclude utilitarian motivation. Shopping motivations could be both, for instance, consumers can seek shopping hedonic stimuli after the utilitarian purchase is finished. Both hedonic and utilitarian motivations can influence the purchase decision.

4.1.1 Hedonic motivations

As mentioned, hedonism is defined as “the cult of pleasure” where appearance is more important than functionality (Blythe, 2008, p 43). By understanding the participants’ attitude towards PRS, we can understand why they chose to shop in PRS. Findings indicated that the participants viewed shopping at PRS as a fun experience, a way to socialize with friends and a way to go outside the home which all relates to hedonic motivations (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). Several participants
highlighted one advantage for PRS was the ability to see, try and feel the product before purchasing it. The participant also mentioned that one disadvantage was that consumers must adjust to opening hours. Another participant thought that an advantage of shopping in PRS is that it is more environmentally friendly.

According to Arnold and Reynolds (2003) a hedonic purchase contains at least one of the six categories, which are *adventure shopping, social shopping, gratification shopping, idea shopping, role shopping* and *value shopping*. An example of a typical hedonic based purchase was how one participant went to the mall with her friend on a Friday afternoon to indulge themselves. They wanted to spend some time together to get inspiration from the retailers. She bought sweatpants, spotlight lamps and skincare products. They walked around in the mall for approximately two hours. Indulgence-purchases are a type of gratification shopping which is one of the six categories (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). Social shopping and idea shopping are two other categories of hedonism. Since the purchase was done with a friend the purchase was also based on social shopping. The participant saw the shopping trip as a way to socialize. The participant went to the store to seek inspiration and therefore based the purchase on idea shopping. The same participant went to a different PRS on another day in order to find more inspiration:

...I was unsure of what I needed in order to build a display cabinet, so I took help from a kitchen planner. Kitchen planners can also be used online, but I think it is a habit for me to visit a physical store. I have always done it to see, feel, try, think and just walk around. Shopping for me when it comes to renovation / things for the home becomes more of an experience and visually easier in a physical store. I visited a physical store because I think it is nicer than to shop online and it was easily accessible when I drove past the department store on the way to my parents. I bought the goods because I am renovating my apartment and would like to see the products in real life before I decide...
In order to complete a task that is a utilitarian motivation, which in this case is to renovate the apartment, the participant needed to find help and inspiration which is hedonic motivations and information which is utilitarian. The participant did another purchase a couple of days later. She bought bits to drill and the purchase took 10 minutes and was done together with a friend. The findings indicated that one consumer used both hedonic and utilitarian motivations. Even if one purchase was based mainly on one motivation the next purchase was based on a different, or a combination of both. Table 3 shows how the six categories (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003) were used by the participants as motivations to shop in PRS.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Illustrative examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>“I was bored at home”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>“Shopping for me when it comes to renovation / things for the home becomes more of an experience and visually easier in a physical store”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialize</td>
<td>“No, I had company. Because I did not want to shop alone”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress-relief</td>
<td>“Sat at home all day and worked so I needed to get out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indulge</td>
<td>“It was an unplanned purchase mostly because we wanted to treat ourselves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>“It was fun to spend time with friends and look around in stores at the same time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discount</td>
<td>“Went to a store and saw that they had a sale”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>“Impulsive purchase, took the opportunity while we walked past the store”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new finding that is not mentioned in the theory but still can be applicable is *time-killer* which was defined as when consumers shopped to pass time. Since the
consumers often thought the activity was enjoyable and impulsive it could be related to hedonic motivations.

### 4.1.2 Utilitarian motivations

The definition of utilitarianism is practicality and usefulness (Blythe, 2008). Utilitarian shoppers are task-oriented, rational and have a clear goal of the shopping (Aw, 2019; Babin et al., 1994; Batra and Athola, 1991). Utilitarian shoppers are driven by the desire to fulfill basic needs or complete a functional task.

By understanding the participants' attitude towards e-commerce, an understanding is created in which situations they choose e-commerce over PRS. Therefore, can we also get an understanding of why the participants choose to shop in PRS during the pandemic. The findings indicate that the participants often referred e-commerce as fast, smooth and convenient. Several participants agree that an advantage with e-commerce is the broad product selection and the ability to compare prices. It is also more practical and time-efficient to order from home. All these characteristics are related to utilitarian motivations.

According to Chiu et al (2012) a utilitarian purchase contained at least one of the four dimensions: convenience, product offer, product information and monetary savings. An example of a typical purchase based on utilitarian motivations was how one participant went to a PRS on her way to another errand. She had planned to purchase new shoes since she desperately needed them. She went alone and purchased the shoes within 20 minutes. The purchase was described as “It was nice to get it done, went quickly and smoothly.” She visited the store since the product offer is wide and the store does not have e-commerce. The visit was fast and effective, since she needed shoes and the purchase was also practical and useful. The purchase was based on all of four dimensions of utilitarian shopping (Chiu et al., 2012). Convenience, since it was on her way to another errand. Product information, because she was able to see, feel and try on the shoes. The store had a
wide offer of products and therefore was the dimension product offer based on. Monetary savings was based on since the store had great prices. Table 4 shows how the four dimensions (Chiu et al., 2012) were used by the participants as motivations to shop in PRS.

Table 4
Utilitarian motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Illustrative examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>“We both had errands to make”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>“Yes, had a wound on the foot and I needed new shoes to be able to get home”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>“I visited the physical store because it is nicer than shopping online and more easily accessible”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Offer</td>
<td>“The store has no e-commerce, as well as a large selection and good prices”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Information</td>
<td>“I wanted to see the product in real life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monetary Savings</td>
<td>“It was also cheaper in store than online”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New findings that are not mentioned in the theory but still are applicable is that the purchase was necessary, did not have time to wait and was effective. The three findings can be related to utilitarian motivation since utilitarian shoppers are driven by the desire to fulfill basic needs and because necessary products often are seen as useful (Blythe, 2008). The faster the product is collected, the faster the task is completed and satisfaction is achieved (Batra et al., 1994).

4.1.3 Typical purchases, a combination of the motivations
The purchases were based on a combination of hedonic and utilitarian motivation and divided into four types of purchases which were the participants' most common motivations: impulsive-, time saving-, product information-, and indulge-purchases.
An example of a typical product information-purchase was how one participant went to the store with his partner to buy curtains, pillowcases and a blanket. They went to a PRS in order to get the right perception of the colour and because it was cheaper than e-commerce. The purchase took 15 minutes and was based on two of the four dimensions of utilitarian shopping (Chiu et al., 2012). Since the participant was able to see, feel and touch the products the purchase was based on product information and monetary savings because PRS was cheaper than e-commerce. However, the purchase was also based on hedonic motivations since it was done together with someone. Social shopping is one of the six dimensions of hedonic shopping motivation where the consumer sees shopping as a way to socialize and spend time with friends.

An example of a typical impulsive-purchase was how one participant explained that he had lunch with his partner when he saw that a store had a sale. Since it was a good sale he purchased pants, shirt and a t-shirt. He mentioned that he did not need new clothes, but since it was such a good sale he purchased them anyway. The visit was impulsive and took approximately 20 minutes. Impulsive purchases are related to hedonic motivations (Horváth & Adigüzel, 2018) and are the outcome of the need to buy (Babin et al., 1994). The purchase was done together with his partner which is related to social shopping which is another hedonic motivation (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003). The purchase was also based on utilitarian motivations since it was related to monetary savings, the sale, and time-saving, the purchase took 20 minutes. Most of the impulsive purchases which are a hedonic motivation were either done alone, fast or related to monetary savings which are all utilitarian motivations.

An example of a typical time-saving-purchase was how one participant visited a store alone in order to buy a birthday gift for her sister. She bought a hand mixer and some blankets, the purchase took approximately 30 minutes. She visited a PRS since she did not have time to order the gift online and then wait for the delivery.
Time-saving is an utilitarian motivation while purchasing a gift is related to role shopping which is a hedonic motivation where shopping is seen as an act of love.

An example of a typical *indulge-purchase* was how one participant drove to a PRS together with a friend to see the offer, get inspiration and indulge themselves. She bought moss pillars, soil and pots. The purchase took 20 minutes which indicates that the purchase was effective and that is a utilitarian motivation. Get inspiration and indulge is based on hedonic motivations. The findings indicate that the purchases are not based on one motivation, but on several. In most cases the purchase is both based on a combination of hedonic and utilitarian motivations.

The diaries could determine if the purchases have a connection and show if the individuals behaved differently in the same situations (Bolger et al., 2003). The findings indicated that there was no visible connection between the participants and one specific motivation. The motivations changed between the different purchases the participant did.

### 4.2 Justifications

The purpose of this section was to discuss the different justification found in the diaries. As mentioned, visiting PRS is seen as a misbehaviour since it violates the current norms, social standards, and the participants were aware about the stigmatism that had been created. On multiple occasions, the participants indicated that they had misbehaved in the diaries. Previous research mentioned that people who misbehave tend to justify their behaviour to make the situation seem less severe (e.g., Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morely, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957). Neutralization Theory explains four ways the participants might justify their actions. The four justifications are *denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemning the condemners* and *appeal to higher loyalties* (Harris &
Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morely, 2017; Vitell & Grove, 1987) were used to code the data.

As previously mentioned, every time a participant answered the diary indicated that they had misbehaved due to this thesis definition of misbehaviour. The empirical findings showed that participants justified their actions through the techniques of Neutralization theory.

As new way of justifying the behaviour that is not part of the Neutralization theory, was evident in the empirical findings. The new technique was similar to denial of injury, as the participants asserted that they did behave even though they violated the social norms and standards. Several participants argued that they followed all the other restrictions and recommendations. Yet, since the participants still went to a PRS and violated the norm, they misbehaved and therefore felt a need to justify it somehow. This thesis new technique will be named denial of disobedience, since the consumers deny that they have disobeyed the current recommendations and restrictions.

The question “play with the thought now that your purchase is against the restrictions and therefore violates the current norms, how would you justify your purchase?” was used to specifically ask the participants how the actions were justified. On multiple occasions, the participants’ justifications were related to the four techniques of Neutralization (Table 5). For instance, the technique named denial of responsibility was used by some participants. These participants mentioned factors that were beyond their control, for instance, that the store did not have e-commerce and therefore they needed to visit it. Another example was denial of injury, which refers to consumers who justify their actions through mentioning that nobody was hurt due to them. One participant was nearby and felt that it could not hurt to pay the stores a visit.
The *condemnation of the condemners* was frequently used in the diary. One participant justified the behaviour by claiming that: People do not care about the restrictions about the max in stores, even if I wait outside does not mean that others will. Some participants also mentioned that they believed that their actions would not have much of an impact on others since people that do not care, will not start to care about the situations due to one man's actions. Furthermore, a few participants justified their visit in PRS as supporting the local retailers, which is connected to the technique *appeal to higher loyalties*. Even though the behaviour is classified as a misbehaviour, some participants made the purchases for a better cause, to help the retailers survive.
Table 5
Neutralization Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Illustrative Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutralization Theory</td>
<td>Denial of Responsibility</td>
<td>“I was in desperate need for new shoes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I suppose that I could not resist to purchase the bits”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I still visit stores that do not have e-commerce as an option”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td>“The store was empty, we did not pose a danger…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Would motivate that nobody was hurt”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“since I already was it felt like it could not hurt to visit a couple stores”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation of the Condemners</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Unfortunately, everybody else does it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…since others does not care, it unconsciously affects my decisions as well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“People do not care about the restrictions about the max number in stores, even if I wait outside does not mean that others will”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to higher Loyalties</td>
<td></td>
<td>“And if you shop during these times, then you might try to support the local business…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“To shop in second hand contributes a good cause to society”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I want retailers near me to survive, which is why I try to buy something to support them”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four types of purchases mentioned in the previous subchapter were also analysed through how the actions were justified in specific ways. First, one participant who was impulsive, did not necessarily justify the action:

*I cannot defend my purchase to be honest, it was an egoistic choice. The choice was based on my mental health to get out of my home and do something fun for my own pleasure. However, if I would justify my actions, then I would say that it was early in the morning since it was not crowded,*
I kept my distance and disinfected my hands before and after I went to the store.

The participant, in some ways, tried to explain that even though it was an egoistic choice, they still managed to be safe and not hurt anyone which can be referred to as *denial of injury*. There were participants that did argue that they were safe during their visit in PRS. However, the participants' intentions were to keep themselves safe, instead of not hurting others. Thus, this could mean that the empirical findings showed a new type of technique.

The different purchases were justified similarly, yet there were occasions where the consumers justified differently. First, the impulsive consumer, however, used *denial of injury* as a justification for visiting a PRS. For instance, the participant wrote “Nobody was hurt by the actions. Went fast in and out”. The participant planned to purchase washer liquid and ended up purchasing it and lightbulbs which took 15 minutes. Second, one participant who visited a PRS for acquiring information about a product used *denial of responsibility* and *condemnation of the condemners* as justifications. She mentioned “I could not resist shopping and everybody else does it unfortunately”. Third, the time-saving purchases were justified by the participant mentioning that they were fast and they kept safe. Indulge-purchases were justified by reassuring that the participants were safe, which is also referred to the new technique *denial of disobedience*. 
5. Discussion

The fifth chapter includes a discussion on the empirical findings in relation to the theoretical framework and the found previous research.

Covid-19 created a difficult dilemma for the consumers, either listen to the government who urges people not to shop in PRS, or help the local retailers survive. Our findings were in line with previous research which has found that consumer behaviour has changed due to Covid-19 (Koch et al., 2020; Laato, 2020; Pantano et al; Sheth, 2020). Some consumers had shopped through e-commerce to reduce the spread of the virus, while others shopped in PRS to help the local retailers survive. One participant shopped less due to economic difficulties created by the pandemic. The findings indicated that consumers' attitude towards e-commerce was mostly utilitarian, which does not line up with Koch et al.'s (2020) study, which found that hedonic motivations dominated e-commerce during the pandemic.

The most common motivations were impulsiveness, speed, search for product information (see, touch and feel the products) and indulge themselves. Most of the motivations are in line with the main characteristics for generation Z which are impulsivity, desire for immediate results and speed (Djafarova & Bowes, 2021; Flurry & Swimberghe, 2016). Even if speed is a significant factor for generation Z it could have been affected by the pandemic. Consumers do not want to spend time in PRS longer than necessary and risk getting sick. The motivations to search for product information and indulge themselves are not characteristics of generation Z. However, it could be an outcome of the pandemic since people’s opportunity to engage in leisure activities are limited. Consumers visited PRS for enjoyment purposes and the activity was seen as a distraction.
The newfound codes were time-killer, support society, necessary, no wait and effective, which all were justified in the same way except time-killer. The action was justified by both admitting that it was misbehaving and that they wanted to help their sister who was in a risk group. Four of the new findings could be related to either hedonic or utilitarian motivations. Thus, to support society is related to the technique *appeal to higher loyalties*.

All techniques of Neutralization were found in the diaries. In general, two techniques were more frequently used by the participants when they justified their purchases. *Denial of injury* and *condemnation of the condemners* were the two more frequently mentioned. This could mean that these two techniques have been seen as more relevant by the participants to use to justify their behaviour.

A common way the participants justified their behaviour was through the new technique *denial of disobedience*, that they still were responsible. For instance, some participants stated that even though they were misbehaving, they were still cautious and followed the current restrictions and recommendations. The participants commonly acknowledged that they either tried to keep the distance, visited PRS on less crowded times, sanitized their hands and checked out how many consumers that were in the PRS before going in. Previous research mentioned that people use Neutralization techniques in attempts to justify their misbehaviour (Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morely, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1987; Vitell & Grove, 1987). The consumers tend to justify their action by mentioning that the actions were responsible. In general, even though the consumers misbehaved, they still argued that they followed the recommendations and restrictions. For instance, several participants mentioned that they used hand sanitizers, went to the stores when it was less crowded, and kept their distance.
On occasions, some participants claimed that there was nothing to justify. Some acknowledged that it was an act of misbehaviour which could not be justified since they could have acted differently. This could mean that some consumers argue that visiting a PRS is not a misbehaviour and therefore do not need to be justified. Meanwhile other consumers' points of view were the contrary, which might mean that they believe that their actions could be justified.

Harris and Daunt’s (2011) findings showed that consumers who use Neutralization techniques appear to experience guilt and therefore justify their actions. Thus, this is somewhat in line with this thesis, since several consumers justified their actions with Neutralization techniques. However, some consumers did not justify their behaviour and we assume that these consumers did not feel guilt for their actions. Another parallel with the previous research is that the Neutralization theory concerns five different techniques consumers use to justify their behaviour (Jantz & Morley, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Vitell & Grove, 1987). This thesis include four of the techniques (denial of responsibility, denial of injury, condemnation of the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties), and added with a technique where consumers justify their behaviour through arguing that they did not hurt themselves.
6. Conclusion

The sixth and last chapter summarizes and concludes the thesis with focus on the findings presented in chapter four and five. The research question will be answered, thereafter the theoretical and practical contribution will be presented. The chapter ends with limitations and suggestions for further research.

6.1 Summary of the thesis

Covid-19 has affected consumer behaviour due to the recommendations, restrictions and the social distancing. Consumers are facing a difficult choice since the Swedish public health authority recommended people to abstain from visiting indoor environments such as PRS and shopping malls. Meanwhile, city centres are dying due to the financial losses. The purpose of the thesis was to investigate why consumers chose to shop in PRS during the pandemic and how the behaviour was justified. Hedonic and utilitarian motivations were used to explain why people shop since they are considered to be a key element to explain the consumer's post-purchase decisions and behaviour (Jones et al., 2006; Overby and Lee, 2006; Ryu et al., 2010). The Neutralization theory was used to explain how the consumers justified their actions. The conceptual model combined hedonic and utilitarian motivations with the Neutralization theory. The empirical material was gathered through a time- and event-contingent diary design and the 17 participants were chosen based on a convenience sample.

The findings indicated that the pandemic had an impact on consumers' shopping habits and that both hedonic and utilitarian motivations affect consumer’s intentions to shop in PRS. The most common motivations the consumers based the purchase on was impulsiveness, speed, product information, and indulgence.
Even though it is not illegal to visit a PRS, it violated the norm which in this thesis is seen as a misbehaviour. Misbehaviour is actions that violate the generally accepted norms, or more specific, it means a person ignores the Swedish public health authority’s recommendations, restrictions and visits a PRS. Further findings showed that all four techniques of Neutralization were shown in the empirical findings. Yet, denial of injury and condemnation of the condemners were the two more frequently used justifications, as explained by the Neutralization theory. However, the consumers even more frequently justified their action by referring to the fact that the restrictions and recommendations were followed. The technique was called denial of disobedience.

6.2 Conclusion

The purpose of the thesis was to investigate why consumers chose to shop in PRS during Covid-19 and how the behaviour was justified. This thesis was written from a consumer's perspective and focuses on generation Z. We conclude that the Covid-19 pandemic has an impact on consumers’ shopping habits. Some consumers chose to shop more through e-commerce than before the outbreak. Other consumers chose to shop more in PRS than before, in order to help the local retailers survive.

A further conclusion is that there is not one answer to why consumers shop in PRS during a pandemic. In most cases, the purchases were based on both hedonic and utilitarian motivations. Even though a main reason to shop was utilitarian there were still hedonic motivations. For instance, a consumer bought a useful product in 10 minutes together with a friend since she did not want to be alone. The purchase was useful and effective which is both utilitarian motivations, but it was together with a friend, which is a hedonic motivation. Only a few of the purchases were based on one motivation. Therefore, can we not prove that one motivation was dominating.

To answer the question why consumers chose to shop in PRS during a pandemic, the most common motivations were impulsiveness, speed, search for product
information (see, touch and feel the products) and indulge themselves. The motivations are both hedonic and utilitarian, which is another reason why one motivation is not dominating. Therefore, this study indicates that both hedonic and utilitarian motivations are equally important why consumers choose to visit a PRS during a pandemic. Further conclusion shows that generation Z main characteristics are in line with our result.

The Neutralization theory explains four techniques that consumers might use to justify their actions. All four techniques were found in the diaries the participants have written. The most used techniques were condemnation of the condemners and denial of responsibility. These two techniques explain that consumers justify their action by arguing that everybody does it or that they could not resist the temptations to visit the PRS. However, the new technique was called denial of disobedience. The technique involved consumers that justified their behaviour by mentioning that they follow the restrictions and recommendations. Thus, we believe in consumers try to show that even though they are misbehaving, they are still responsibly and safe.

### 6.3 Theoretical Contributions

Previous research has showed that consumers’ shopping motivations can be based on hedonism and/or utilitarianism. However, to the best of our knowledge, previous research has explored consumer motivations towards e-commerce. For instance, Koch et al. (2020), mentioned that the hedonic motivations are dominating. Koch et al.’s (2020) study showed that consumers shop more through e-commerce than PRS during Covid-19. However, their study investigated German consumers during the lockdown. This study regards Swedish consumers that still have a choice to shop in PRS. This thesis contributes with new insights in consumers' motivations for visiting PRS.
The found research regarding consumer misbehaviour and the Neutralization theory regards consumers who might be aggressive and might use physical violence (Fullerton & Punj, 1987; Harris & Daunt, 2011; Jantz & Morley, 2017; Sykes & Matza, 1957). The Neutralization theory includes five justification techniques where four of these were relevant for this thesis.

This thesis has contributed new insights, as far as we know, into the field consumer behaviour since we illustrated a connection between hedonic and utilitarian motivations, and the Neutralization theory.

6.4 Practical Contributions

This research outlines the process from consumers’ motivation toward visiting the PRS to how they justify why they went to the store and did not choose e-commerce. From a practical point of view, our insights highlight different motivations that can independently or co-dependently alongside other motivations turn into actions for the consumers. This study helps PRS to understand why consumers visit them and therefore know what actions to take to meet the consumer’s needs. For instance, the stores could offer the service to pick up the products outside the store since some people chose e-commerce to reduce the spread of the virus. Another option would be to get the product delivered home from the local stores with free delivery.

Furthermore, this thesis provides information that not all consumers justify the actions. Thus, this indicates that either consumers do not feel the need to justify the actions, or that the consumers acknowledge their misbehaviour. This thesis has combined multiple theories to map out the consumer’s reasoning during the process. This information is useful for the Swedish public health authority in order to know why consumers shop in PRS despite the recommendations and restrictions, and therefore know what measures to make.
6.5 Limitations and Further Research

This thesis was limited to consumers who visit PRS, which might be half the story. Further research could investigate consumers' motivation for choosing PRS or e-commerce. An investigation on what consumers prefer and how they motivate their choice of the shopping alternatives. Another limitation could be that the Neutralization theory was the only used theory to describe how consumers might justify their behaviour. Further research could use other theories besides the Neutralization theory to get a more nuanced analysis.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Introductory Diary Guide

Introduction
Thank you for participating in our bachelor thesis. To start your diary, we want you to answer these questions to get started with the mindset. Our goal is to understand your way of thinking and reasoning, and we appreciate if you can elaborate it as much as possible.

Participants
- 7 Males
- 11 Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal code</td>
<td>To let the participants be anonymous, yet we still are able to separate them from each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>The question is for us to reassure us that all participants were within the frames of the generation Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where do you live?</td>
<td>The purpose is to receive information about the participants demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What do you believe is the advantages with e-commerce, respective physical retailers? Please elaborate</td>
<td>This question investigates the participants' attitude towards e-commerce and PRS. By understanding the participants' attitude towards e-commerce, the understanding of in which situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have the pandemic affected your attitude towards e-commerce, respective physical retail?</td>
<td>They choose e-commerce over PRS increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you claim that your consumer behaviour has changed during the pandemic? Why/why not?</td>
<td>This question regards the general thoughts about shopping and shopping habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would you say that you have good knowledge concerning the restrictions about visiting physical stores due to the pandemic?</td>
<td>This question is a complement to the previous one. We wanted detailed answers on what the consumers think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which restrictions would you say is the most important?</td>
<td>This question’s purpose is to see how well aware the consumers are about the restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What do you think about the current restrictions? (Are they relevant, strict enough, effective, easy to follow, etcetera)?</td>
<td>This question is a compliment to the previous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will hopefully help the participants in the mindset of their consumer behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tack för att du vill bidra till vår kandidatuppsats. För att starta upp ditt dagboksskrivande så vill vi att du svarar på dessa frågor för att komma in i tankesättet. Vi vill förstå hur du tänker och resonerar och uppskattar därför
utvecklade svar. Avsätt gärna tid för att svara på frågorna och försök att vara så analytisk och reflektierande som möjligt.

Coding
1. Personkod

Demographics
2. Ålder
3. Var bor du?

Consumers point of view
4. Vad ser du för generella fördelar med e-handel, respektive fysisk handel? Utveckla ditt svar
5. Har din inställning till att handla i e-handel respektive fysisk handel förändrats i och med pandemin?
6. Skulle du vilja påstå att ditt köpbeteende har förändrats under pandemin? Varför/varför inte?

Consumer awareness
7. Har du god kännedom angående restriktionerna som gäller handeln som en följd av pandemin?
8. Vilka är de viktigaste restriktionerna enligt dig?
9. Vad anser du om de nuvarande restriktionerna (är de relevanta, lagom hårda, effektiva, lätta att följa etcetera)?
Appendix B – Shopping Diary Guide

Introduction
Please answer the questions after each time you have made a purchase in a physical retail store (exclude food, services such as hairdressers, massage etcetera). Try to think through your answers thoroughly and answer as detailed as possible. NOTE! You only need to answer once during your shopping trip.
Thanks for all help! We hope that you are pleased with your purchase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal code</td>
<td>To let the participants be anonymous, yet we still are able to separate them from each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What did you plan to purchase?</td>
<td><strong>Utilitarian &amp; Hedonic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With this question, we received information about the participants mindset before visiting a PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What did you end up buying?</td>
<td><strong>Utilitarian &amp; Hedonic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By asking this question, we received information about whether the purchase was based on hedonistic or utilitarian motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How long did your shopping trip take?</td>
<td><strong>Utilitarian &amp; Hedonic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question was a compliment for the previous two questions, and for us to get a bigger picture about their shopping trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did you go yourself? Why/why not?</td>
<td><strong>Utilitarian &amp; Hedonic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question was a further compliment to previous questions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Why did you choose to visit a physical store? (there are many causes, for example you wanted to support the business, there was a sale, you wanted to socialize, it was necessary, impulsive, treat yourself, wanted to see and touch the product, no risk in shipping, inspiration etcetera) please discuss and reflect!</td>
<td>Utilitarian &amp; Hedonic &amp; Neutralization theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By asking this question, we received information about what were the main-motivation(s) the participants had before visiting the PRS</td>
<td>By asking this question, we received a perception about the Swedish consumers point of view on both their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchase was necessary to do in a physical store? Motivate shopping motivations and their argumentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Play with the thought that your purchase is against the restrictions and therefore violates current norms, how would you justify the purchase? (There are multiple reasons: You could not resist the temptation, since “everybody” else does it, there was no harm in your action, or you wanted to support the business during times like these etcetera). Please motivate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neutralization Theory**

By asking this question, we received how the participants justified their action. To understand if their justifications are related to our theory or if they might justified it as something else.

Vänligen svara på frågorna efter varje gång du har handlat en produkt i fysisk butik (ej mat, service såsom frisör, massage och dylikt etc.). Försök att tänka igenom svaren noga och svara så utförligt som möjligt. OBS! Om du skulle handla flera produkter under samma shoppingtur så behöver du bara svara på enkäten en gång.

Tack för hjälp! Hoppas du är nöjd med ditt inköp

**Demographics**

1. Personkod
2. Vad hade du planerat att köpa
3. Vad köpte du?
Utilitarian & Hedonic motivations
4. Hur lång tid tog inköpet (shoppingrundan)?
5. Handlade du ensam? Varför/varför inte?
6. Hur kommer det sig att du valde att besöka en fysisk butik? (det kan finnas många orsaker ex. behövde varan snabbt, stöta butikerna, det var rea, socialisera sig, nödvändigt köp, impulsköp, unna sig, tidsfördriv, känna på produkten, inget förstörs i frakten, inspiration, annat…). Resonera och reflektera!
7. Gick du enbart in i den butiken du handlade i eller gick du in i flera efteråt? Hur kom det sig?

Neutralization Theory
10. Lek med tanken nu att ditt köp bryter mot restriktionerna och därmed också mot vad som just nu är norm, hur skulle du då ha försvarat ditt inköp? (det finns många orsaker till detta såsom: du kunde inte hålla dig från att handla, att alla andra gör det, ingen skadades av handlingen eller att du gjorde det för att hjälpa butiken under dessa tider etcetera)? Motivera hur du tänker.