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Abstract

Sending email is a very common activity among Swedish consumers nowadays. Email advertising has become a big part of the email usage - both permission-based and unwanted. The purpose of this study was to identify Swedish consumers’ total attitude towards permission-based email advertising, based on the three components cognition, affection and behavior. After identifying the attitude, correlation between the components was examined. The result was used to try Prensky’s generation theory regarding digital natives and digital immigrants, to investigate if it can be useful in the subject email advertising. A quantitative method was used, by publishing a survey on Facebook, which got totally 187 useful responses. The result showed an overall negative attitude and a high correlation between cognition and affection. A medium high correlation between cognition and behavior, and affection and behavior was found. The results partly showed a difference between digital natives and digital immigrants attitude towards email advertising. In the survey a division of four age groups, instead of two, was made. Results from the four groups showed a mix of positive and negative responses, which indicates that Prensky’s generation theory is too general, and cannot be used within email advertising.
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1 Introduction

Billions of emails are sent over the years and people spend a lot of time managing emails. A typical user has an inbox with 22% marketing-related e-mails. (Strauss, El-Ansary & Frost, 2006) According to Yee and Yazdanifard (2013) technology is growing and becoming more advanced with time and has a central role in several markets in different fields. Lots of companies use technology as an effective marketing tool to be more competitive. Yee and Yazdanifard (2013) further argue that since technology is becoming more advanced and useful to humans, the channels used for marketing is constantly changing. They explain marketing can be seen as an organizational function and process of communicating, and even used to create a relationship with consumers in different ways. The developments of digital media technologies have changed the perception of marketing within the Internet, email advertising, mobile advertising and social media. Yee & Yazdanifard (2013) further claims that the Internet is an obvious choice for marketing.

Lewis (2002) argues that no previous media channel offers the same advantages that email brings to the marketing area, for one, email communication is less expensive than other medium used for advertising. Wilson, Philips and Djamasi (2015) consider marketers who want to reach out to their consumers, increasingly use email advertising. Wilson et al., (2015) believe email marketing is a quick, economically efficient and easy way to broadcast messages to a specific group of consumers. Lewis (2002) argues that along with a lot of advantages, email advertising carries the burden of an ongoing spam, which is unexpected and unwanted emails. Yee and Yazdanifard, (2013) claims that in a typical mailbox, half of the emails are unwanted advertising emails.

1.1 Problem area

Despite the increased use of email advertising, Ellis-Chadwick and Doherty (2012) claim studies regarding digital marketing not often merely examine email advertising. Ström (2010) argues that attitudes toward email advertising often are forgotten and that the attitude depends on whether if the recipient requested the information or not. Some studies have been made regarding what people think about advertising emails and previous research regarding attitude towards email advertising shows a generally negative attitude. Grusell (2008) examined Swedish consumers’ attitude towards advertising and the results show that the consumers’
attitudes are more negative toward email advertising, both permission-based and unwanted emails, than advertising through other channels. This study does not compare email advertising to other advertisements, which differs this study from Grusell’s study. The purpose is to investigate if the consumers’ attitudes are more positive when only examine email advertising without comparing to other channels. Andersson, Fredriksson and Berndt’s (2014) study shows similar results; the majority of respondents generally have a negative attitude towards email marketing. The researchers describe how some of the respondents do not even read these emails; instead, they delete them immediately. The study examines decision-makers attitudes in a B2B-context, and not consumers’ attitudes. Yee & Yazdanifard (2013) argue that despite this, email advertising grows with time and is now a useful and reliable channel for marketing.

Companies are positive toward sending email advertising to their consumers because of several things (Wilson et al., 2015), which is a problem if the receivers’ attitudes are negative. This is interesting to investigate, due more and more companies use email as a marketing tool to reach to their consumers. Previous research shows a generally negative attitude towards email advertising when investigating decision-makers or comparing to other media channels. But what are the Swedish consumers’ attitudes towards email advertising as they themselves opted to subscribe to? Could it be more positive? In fact, it is easy to unsubscribe these emails. Investigating this is what makes this study original. However previous studies mostly have been regarding email advertising in general, and the studies made in Sweden focuses on investigate decision-makers in different companies. The difference between consumers’ attitude toward permission-based emails and unwanted emails is investigated. Some previous studies compare permission-based emails and unsolicited emails, also called spam, and the results show a more negative attitude towards unsolicited email than approved email. Previous studies regarding attitudes toward email advertising is in particular about B2B, so therefore in this study the consumers’ attitudes, also called B2C, will be in focus. The present study aims to fill an important gap in the literature by examine Swedish consumers’ attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling organizations. Mahmoud (2015) describes the area conducted to examine attitudes toward email advertising to be quite sparsely, which increases the relevance for this study. This study might be used as a pilot study, which can be used as a basis for researchers who want to make a similar but bigger study. In this study, the result cannot be generalized to the entire Swedish population, but it can be used as a basis for a similar, bigger study with a lot wider sample.

Long-Crowell (n.d) argues that attitudes are important to study for social psychologists because they help determine what we do, what we eat, how we vote and so on. According to Chowdhury
et al., (2006) attitude is also considered important in research regarding advertising. Bohner and Wänke (2002) consider the adoption that attitudes cause our behavior, to be the key reason why attitudes are studied. Breckler (1984) advocates that attitude ought to be divided into three components, cognition, affection, and behavior. The cognition happens when an individual form a perception of an object or a person, which means that cognition, is what an individual is thinking. Affection comprises emotional experiences and penchant for a person. Simply, affection is how an individual feel. Behavior is based on the individual's’ action in relation to the object or the person (Wilt & Revelle, 2015). Several researchers agree with Breckler and argue that an attitude is based on these three components (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014; Wilt & Revelle, 2015; Mahmoud, 2015). Since several researchers argue for these three components to be a proper way to identify attitudes towards a subject, the components will be used in this study. For simplicity, the three components in this essay will be referred to as the CAB-model: Cognition, Affection and Behavior. Andersson et al., (2015) results show that the individuals’ attitude is directly linked to their behavior. The connection between these variables will be examined in this study. Andersson et al., (2015) also explain that these three components do not necessarily affect each other. They consider it possible for an attitude to not contain all three components. An attitude can solely be cognitive or emotive.

At the beginning of the 2000-century, Prensky (2001) formed a theory, which advocates that generation affects which conditions we have towards the digital world, and thereby the attitude we have towards it. This theory is quite old, but still used in several studies from present. Prensky (2012) makes a division of two generations, those who were born before 1980, and those who were born after. He advocates a difference between those who were born into the digital world, digital natives, and those who were born earlier, digital immigrants. He further defined this as a central problem and describes that different generations speaks different languages and handle the digital world very different. He argues that the digital natives were born to use computers and the Internet, while the digital immigrants have a hard time to adjust to the digital world. He means that digital natives can multitask and handle fast information, in a completely different way than the digital immigrants. Further, he argues that everyone should learn as much as possible about the difference between digital natives and digital immigrants, and also learn about the new actions the digital world entails. Even if Prensky made this theory in 2001, it is still used in some studies from present. How is that? It is interesting to investigate his theory because several other researchers criticize his study, and claims there are other factors that matter (Helsper & Enyon, 2009; Jonkman, 2011; Bayne & Ross, 2007). But why do some researchers still use his theory to investigate things, is it a fact that born as a digital native or digital immigrant affects our attitude towards the digital world?
Prensky’s theory is regarding the digital world in big, and since email advertising is included in the digital world, it is interesting to see if the theory holds up even when testing it on a specific channel in the digital world. Will the attitude towards email advertising differ between the digital natives and the digital immigrants? It is interesting to see if Prensky’s statement, saying that everybody should learn as much as possible about the digital world, is necessary or not. So, after identifying the attitude towards email advertising, based on the CAB-model, the next step will be to examine if the results could be used along with Prensky’s theory.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to contribute to a wider knowledge of Swedish consumers’ attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling companies. The attitude is defined based on the CAB-model. Prensky’s theory about the generation affecting consumers’ attitude toward the digital world, is tested to see if it holds up while investigating email advertising. Product selling organizations who wants to form a bigger knowledge of the digital usage in different generations, and who wants to understand the consumers’ attitude towards email advertising, ought to be interested in this study.

1.3 Research questions

This study aims to answer the three research questions below. The first research question will be answered by looking at Swedish consumers’ overall attitude toward email advertising in different situations, based on the three components cognition, affection and behavior. The second research question will be answered by studying how the three components are related to one another, and how strong they affect each other. The third question will be answered by testing Prensky’s generation theory, based on the results from the consumers’ attitude towards email advertising, to investigate if his theory can be used when looking at people’s attitude towards email advertising.

- What is the consumers’ overall attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling organizations?
- Which correlation is there between the three components; cognition, affection and behavior?
- Does the consumers’ attitude match with Prensky’s theory regarding the different digital use based on generations?
1.4 Limitations

The study investigates Swedish consumers’ attitude, but does not examine the entire Swedish population since it is based on a convenience sample from our network. The study does not cover the attitude towards not approved email advertising, like spam. The study does not investigate decision-makers, also called business to business. Because the study aims to be interesting for organizations who wants to develop a knowledge about the attitude towards a product selling email, the study focuses on email advertising, and not both marketing and advertising emails.

1.5 Target group

This study aims primarily to product selling organizations that wants to develop their knowledge regarding digital usage and increase their understanding of consumers’ attitude towards email advertising. Since the study investigates the attitude towards permission-based emails, the study is a lot more useful for the companies who only send permission-based emails to their customers, than other studies regarding the subject. The results based on Prensky’s theory might be interesting for companies who want to adjust their emails to different generations. As mentioned above, this study might be used as a pilot study, and can, therefore be used by researchers who are interested in the topic and want to exploit the study for future research. The study can also be useful for students who want to learn about the subject or make a similar research.

1.6 Definitions

In this study, some diffuse definitions and terms are used. To make it easier for the reader, these are described below.

1.6.1 Attitude

The knowledge, confidence and behavior an individual has towards a person or an object, can be summarized in a term called *attitude* (Solomon, cited in Jacobsson and Sandvik, 2009). Chowdhury et al., (2006) explain attitude as a mental state where the individual tries to organize how they perceive their surroundings. They also consider attitude as a learned propensity of people’s actions. Tsang, Ho and Liang (2004) describe attitude as an individual’s consisting evaluations and emotional feelings towards a subject or an idea. Befring (1994) believe people
have attitudes and beliefs towards almost everything. He also claims attitudes are learned and stored in our personality and is the basis for our emotions and behavior.

1.6.2 Cognition

Cognition includes the mental state and processes. The cognition happens when an individual forms a perception of an object or a person. (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014) Cognition is what an individual is thinking (Wilt & Revelle, 2015).

1.6.3 Affection

Affection comprises emotional experiences and penchant for a person. Emotions are based on the negative or the positive perceptions the individual has for the object or the person. (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014) Simply, affection is how an individual feel (Wilt & Revelle, 2015).

1.6.4 Behavior

Behavior is based on an individual's’ action in relation to the object or the person (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014). According to Wilt and Revelle (2015), it can simply be described as what an individual does.

1.6.5 Marketing versus advertising

Lovering (2017) claims marketing refers to the process when narrowing down your target group, and deciding what kind of company you want to be. It includes colors, logotypes and other aspects, which together creates an image of your company. Further, marketing defines your brand and how you look towards potential customers. According to Lovering (2017) advertising, on the other hand, is the process of spreading the word about the product you are selling. She claims it is when you communicate to, and convince potential buyers that you have the right product for them. This study is regarding advertising emails, which according to Lovering (2017) is emails with a purpose to sell a specific product or products.
1.7 Disposition

The first part of this study consists of a theoretical reference frame including an introduction to previous research conducted in the subject attitudes towards email advertising. By this, the reader can form an understanding of the subject of this study. The theoretical chapter also includes the CAB-model of attitudes and Prensky’s generation theory. This is followed by a methodology chapter, which concretely presents the design of the study and discusses the method that is chosen for the collection and presentation of empirical data. This chapter includes this study’s scientific approach and what impact the approach may have on the study. The methodology chapter discusses source criticism, ethical considerations and research strategy. Chapter number three presents relevant empirical data from the web-based survey. In chapter four, the analysis, the empirical data is interpreted on the theoretical framework base, in purpose to answer the research questions. This study ends with a conclusion, where the final discussion and concrete answers to the research questions are presented along with a few suggestions for further studies regarding the subject.
2 Theoretical framework

Ellis-Chadwich and Doherty (2012) and Mahmoud (2015) claim that the selection of studies regarding attitudes toward email advertising is quite narrow. To give a view of the previous research, a summary of four previous studies regarding the subject is presented below. The methods and results from these studies are described. The summary of previous research is followed by a short introduction to digital media and how email advertising is used today. Later on, an introduction to the CAB-model is presented. Arguments to why the CAB-model is a useful way to identify attitudes are presented and the relation between attitudes and behavior is written about. Last but not least, Prensky’s generation theory is presented. The Theoretical chapter ends with a summary. Both previous research and theories will be used along with the findings in the Analysis.

2.1 Previous research

Bengtsson (2016) made a research regarding advertising through SMS and email. The study aimed to identify different factors, which contributes to an attitude towards the subject. The study’s purpose was to see if the attitude towards advertising through SMS is the same as the attitude towards email advertising. The study also aimed to see if an attitude changes depending on age, and connections between age and attitude would thereby be found. The study was made with a quantitative method and based on a survey. The results were supplemented with some focus group interviews. The results showed both differences and similarities regarding the acceptability towards advertising through SMS and email. Advertising emails were according to the result, sent a lot more often than advertising texts. Results also indicated that the attitude towards email advertising was more positive than towards SMS advertising, which is because the respondents expected to receive advertising emails, but not texts. The conclusion is that attitude towards unsolicited advertising is very negative. The frequency of emails and texts was also of importance for the attitude.

Garland, Yang and Kang (2016) have written an article about members of a non-profit organization. The study aimed to find out which attitude the members had towards advertising through email and post. This study, as well as the one’s mentioned above, is based on a quantitative research method. The study’s purpose is to help advertisers develop a wider knowledge regarding different factors that could lead to a more positive attitude toward email
advertising, Results showed that email advertising is an effective marketing channel. Results also showed that the more technologies and online activities members join, the more positive attitude toward email advertising they get.

Mahmoud (2015) has examined consumers’ attitude towards email advertising in Syria. He aimed to investigate consumers’ beliefs, attitudes and behavioral reactions toward email advertising and examine the relationship between the variables. He uses the components cognition affection and behavior to investigate Syrian consumers’ attitudes. His research method is quantitative, by a cross-sectional study, and 954 emails were sent randomly to Internet users in Syria. In total, 273 received answers were used in the study. He claims consumers’ beliefs toward email advertising are significant for their attitudes toward it. He further explains that the respondents’ beliefs’ affect their behavior. Syrian consumers ignore spam or rarely read them, and have a negative attitude because of the adverse entertainment and information. Results show a generally negative attitude towards email advertising, but emails that contain in time reliable information and are designed in an attractive way gets a more positive response.

Andersson et al., (2014) also made a study regarding attitudes towards email advertising and the results points at the same direction, there is a negative attitude. In the study, they used a quantitative method and a survey to gather data. The researchers claim that the attitude affects future behavior, and in the case of email advertising, it means that the receiver deletes the email without opening it. It was also found that the attitude towards email advertising differs depending on ages and work position. The attitudes were more negative in the age group 40-49 and more positive in the younger group. They believed that this has to do with the fact that younger people are more used to the digital world. The researchers further claim that there is a connection between attitudes and actions.

### 2.2 Digital media

Lima-Turner and Gordon (1997) claims the Internet has the potential to affect different components of the marketing mix. They explain that place becomes less important since a two-way dialogue, without two people meeting in real life, becomes possible. People and companies from all over the world can easily be reached at a lower cost than with the offline marketing technique. Further, Lima-Turner and Gordon (1997) advocate that the marketing mix is experiencing a fundamental transformation thanks to the Internet, and communications between people from different sides of the world is now inexpensive and commonplace.
Strauss et al., (2006) argue that organizations have used electronic tools for a very long time. They claim the Internet created a new world of interesting ways to provide customer value, and that email newsletter continues to increase because of benefits including promote the company, personalize with tailored content and simplify to pass along information. Andersson et al., (2014) refers to a conducted report made in Finland 2011. The report showed that the most common daily activity among Swedish Internet users is the sending of emails. Lima-Turner and Gordon (1997) believes the growth in the use of email has ushered in a new type of communication. They explain that people previously had to rely on a slow postal service to communicate with people from a different part of the world. With the usage of email, people now have the possibility to reach each other in near real time.

2.3 Email advertising

Strauss et al., (2006) argues that billions of emails are sent over the years. A typical user spends a lot of time managing email and has a mailbox with about 22% marketing-related emails, and half of them are unwanted spam. Further, they define several advantages of email advertising. Postal direct mail is more than twice as expensive than email, receiving email is faster than postal mails and it is possible to link directly to a website. Marketers also have the opportunity to automatically individualize emails to meet the needs of specific users. Wollner (2015) consider another advantage being the simplicity to see results of how many receivers that actually buy something after receiving the email. He claims that if the goal is to increase selling numbers by using a campaign, the results is easy to evaluate when using email as an advertising channel.

Strauss et al., (2006) consider the risk of unsolicited emails and spam to be a disadvantage of email advertising. He further claims that consumers’ attitudes toward spam are more negative than unsolicited postal mail. Wollner (2015) argues the key for successfully advertising emails is to have permission to send the email. He argues for the importance to make sure that the receiver wants to receive the email, and claims that it is important to ask the customer more than once, before sending out the email.

Ström (2010) explains the difference between permission-based email advertising and unsolicited email advertising. He claims that according to Swedish law it is allowed to contact a consumer with advertising, in their profession, but it is not allowed to contact a private person with email advertising. Furthermore, Ström (2010) argues that even if you get permission-based emails, you might as well have a bad reaction towards it. He means it is up to the company
behind the email to decide whether the email is favorably even though there is a negative attitude coming from the responders.

Lewis (2002) argues that no previous media channel offers the same advantages as email. For one, email communication is less expensive than other medium used for advertising. He explains that e-newsletters not only works as a way to market specific items but can also act as a driver to the company’s website. Further, he advocates the effectiveness of the advertising message depends on the receiver believing the information is valuable. According to Lewis (2002) email is an ideal tool for customer retention because of the ability to send a message in almost real-time, which is ideal for maintaining an ongoing relationship with a customer. For customer acquisition, he also defines the amount of emails to be of importance. Email carries the burden of an ongoing spam, which is unexpected and unwanted emails. Therefore, according to Lewis (2002) email should be used with perspicacity and caution for customer acquisition. Wollner (2015) also writes about some important aspects while sending out advertising emails. He describes that it has to be possible to open and read the email on different media techniques. For example, it is not realistic to ignore outlook or a mobile phone. He believes the receiver should have the same experience reading the email no matter what kind of technique he or she uses.

2.4 CAB-model of attitudes

Long-Crowell (n.d) argues for attitudes to be an important topic of study. She argues that attitudes need to be studied for social psychologists because they help determine what we do, what we eat, how we vote and so on. Bohner and Wänke (2002) consider the adoption that attitudes cause our behavior, to be the key reason why attitudes are studied. They emphasize that attitude-behavior research, over several decades, enhanced our understanding of the attitude-behavior relation. Further, they indicate that previous research has examined if a near relationship exists between attitudes and behavior, and results indicate different conclusions. Some of the results showed that the connection was clearly obvious, and other results showed the opposite – it was hard to discover any link between the two. Bohner and Wänke (2002) consider a lot of previous research to mainly be regarding the attitude-behavior link. Further, they argue that a third variable now days are to address - the cognitive component and that early studies found the cognitive processes to matter for the overall attitude.

Breckler (1984) advocates that attitude ought to be divided into three components, cognition, affection and behavior. The three components are often used to identify an attitude towards an
object or an idea (Breckler, 1984; Falkheimer, 2001; Zanna & Fazio, 1982). Cognition includes the mental state and processes. The cognition happens when an individual form a perception of an object or a person. (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014) Cognition is what an individual is thinking (Wilt & Revelle, 2015). Affection comprises emotional experiences and penchant for a person. The emotions are based on the negative or the positive perceptions the individual has for the object or the person. (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014) Simply, affection is how an individual feel (Wilt & Revelle, 2015). Behavior is based on the individual's’ action in relation to the object or the person (Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014). According to Wilt and Revelle (2015) it can simply be described as how an individual act. Long-Crowell (n.d) describes attitudes as evaluations of ideas, object or people. She indicates that attitudes can be uncertain sometimes, like when an individual has mixed feelings about a situation or a person. Further, she claims that attitudes are in generally positive or negative. Kwon and Vogt (2010) argue that when an individual has a positive feeling towards an object, it is likely that the attitude towards it will be the same. When an individual has a negative feeling towards an object, the attitude tends to be so as well.

Falkheimer (2001) defines cognition to be directly linked to our logical capacity and our sense that creates meaning, while affection includes our emotions. He claims people are controlled both by emotional and meaning, which makes it impossible to differentiate the two. Falkheimer (2001) further argues for behavior to not be directly linked to the other components. He states that just because you know something is dangerous, like cigarettes, you might choose to smoke anyway. Andersson, Fredriksson and Berndts (2015) consider individuals’ attitudes as directly linked to behavior, but indicate that the three components do not necessarily have to be affected by each other. Further, they consider it possible for an attitude not to contain all three components; an attitude can solely be cognitive or emotive.

2.5 Prensky’s generation theory

The year 2001, Prensky (2001) created a theory regarding different digital generations. Prensky (2012) argues that different generations have different digital use and digital skills. He claims, these who were born into the digital world, that is these who were born after the year 1980, are digital natives. Further, he argues the digital natives easily multitask with different digital techniques, and receive instant information. He claims young people think and process information fundamentally different than the older generation. The people born after 1980, the digital natives are according to Prensky (2001) native speakers of the digital language of computers, video games and the Internet.
Furthermore, his theory argues these born before the digital breakthrough, before 1980, must adjust to the digital society and are digital immigrants. According to Prensky (2001) there is a difference between learning a new language and being a native speaker. He argues that digital immigrants must learn to use new techniques, which means they will never be able to completely understand the digital natives. He further argues that the distinction between the digital generations is essential. He explains it is not only technology-knowledge based, it is more cultural. The digital immigrants were born and grew up in a non-digital world, pre-Internet culture before they got to experience the digital society. The digital natives, on the other hand, were born and grew up only knowing the digital culture. He claims examples of characteristics for digital immigrants, is that they print everything out instead of working on screen, they do not go to the Internet for information and they read manuals instead of working online.

According to Prensky (2012), the difference between the digital natives and the digital immigrants is a big society problem. He points out that the biggest issue is the matter of education. He explains that teachers and students today speaks different languages, because of their different generations, and therefore has different skills to handle the digital world. He describes, during a short amount of time, technology has drastically changed human behavior. He claims the digital natives’ actions, affects the digital immigrant since they are daily interacting.

Jonkman (2011) indicates that generation theories are age racism and that humans are unique but still alike, human beings. He states, it is normal to have prejudices, which is why the generation debate and education in cultural diversity has several parallels. Most common is different broad generalizations of people. In conclusion, he states that we can have a hypothesis, but it is important to be responsive to individual differences. Generalization may be true of some, but certainly not of all. Helsper and Enyon (2009) are two researchers who criticize Prensky’s generation theory. Their study shows evidence against the conception of generation determine if a person is a digital native or digital immigrant. Their result indicates that young people tend to multitask and use the Internet for fact-checking and learning activities. Nevertheless, the results also showed that generation was not the only variable in explaining these activities. They found that gender, education, breadth of use, experience, self-efficacy and education are just as, if not more important than age while explaining how people become digital natives. While the results of their study showed differences between the two generations, there were similarities as well. Helsper and Enyon (2009) thereby claim that how much experience people have with using the Internet, is the mainly base to how they use it. Bayne and
Ross (2007) are also critical towards Prensky’s theory and argue it to be a dangerous opposition. They argue for other factors that matter, like the background, age and gender. They believe it is not possible to compare these two big generations to each other.

### 2.6 Theoretical reflection

According to Chowdhury et al., (2006), attitudes is considered important in research regarding advertising. Breckler (1984) advocates attitude to be divided into three components, cognition, affection and behavior. Since several researchers (Breckler, 1984; Bhanthumnavin & Bhanthumnavin, 2014; Wilt & Revelle, 2015; Mahmoud, 2015) argue for the three components to be a proper way to identify a total attitude, the model has been chosen for this study. Since Prensky (2012) point out his theory as a big society issue, the theory is interesting to try on praxis today, and along with the subject email advertising. A couple of authors are critical toward Prensky's theory, which makes it even more interesting. Prensky's theory about different generations using the digital world differently has been chosen for this study partly because of Prensky's statement that it is a society issue, and partly because there are researchers who are critical towards it. These theoretical inputs have not been used along with each other in any previous research, which makes it interesting to investigate consumer attitudes toward permission-based email advertising out of Prensky’s perspective. This study aims to fill a gap in the research field by developing an understanding of the total attitude towards permission-based email advertising, and how the year of birth matters.
3  Methodology

The difference between a qualitative and quantitative method is primarily the type of data the method produces. A common way of explaining the difference is that a qualitative method produces soft data, and a quantitative method produces hard data. Soft data is often generated through video recordings, interviews, and field observations and similar. Hard data includes numbers and countable facts that can be used to create statistics. Quantitative researchers measure different phenomenon and the research strategy is based on quantification along with data gathering and data analysis. (Bryman and Bell, 2013) Harboe (2013) claims the study’s purpose should be decisive to the choice of method. The purpose of this study is to identify the total attitude towards email advertising and to find correlations between the three components in the CAB-model. The purpose is also to compare two different generations and see if the attitude differs based on the year of birth. A survey with capture questions was considered a suitable way to gather data for this study, instead of interviews or similar. The aim was to gather as many responses as possible to be able to find correlations. The aim was not to investigate people’s feelings or get a deep insight of what they believe. Interviews were therefore not considered necessary. A high number of responses were important, and it would not have been possible to implement about 100 interviews. We wanted a quick answer on what they think about advertising through email. A quantitative method was therefore chosen for this study, and a survey was the basis for the empirical material.

3.1  Scientific approach

The scientific approach of this study is positivistic. According to Denscombe (2000), positivism is grounded on the premise that in the social world, there are patterns and regular units, causes and consequences, like natural sciences. He argues, for positivists, the purpose of social science research is to detect these patterns in the social world by using scientific methods. In this study, a survey was used to collect data. The survey was structured with captured responses so the respondents had no opportunity to write their own answers. By using a survey, it was possible to gather about 200 answers for this study. Because of the number of answers, it was possible to see a pattern and regular units, which indicates this study's positivistic approach.

This study aims to try an existing theory on praxis. According to Alvesson and Sköldberg (2008) a deductive approach starts on a general rule and claims that it explains an individual case of interest. They explain this approach differs from the inductive approach, which basically
starts in several cases, and observes a relation between the different cases. The inductive approach means a certain risk since you start from a collection of cases and claims a result based on the cases. They further argue that the deductive approach, however, is a lot less risky, since it predicts the case that ought to be explained before it is being tested. 2008) In this study, there was a predicted case that was tried on praxis through a survey, which implies this study had a deductive approach.

### 3.1.1 Cross-sectional design

Bryman (2011) claims in social science if data is collected by survey questions in a certain time to produce quantifiable data, survey studies often include a cross-sectional design. According to Bryman (2011) a cross-sectional survey is a method researchers use for an assemblage of quantitative data in more than one case and the method is often used to find a pattern and a correlation between different variables. This study’s purpose is to identify attitudes and find correlations between the three components in the CAB-model, which makes a cross-sectional design highly relevant. Bryman (2011) claims a cross-sectional survey can only be used to study relations and correlations between dissimilar variables when respondents’ answers questions about different variables at the same time. Further, he considers this to be a research problem since it makes researchers unable to manipulate the respondents, which otherwise is possible by an experiment (Bryman, 2011).

### 3.2 Course of action

Harboe (2013) claims the choice of method should be chosen based on the type of research question. This study aims to investigate Swedish consumers’ attitude towards email advertising and it was considered suitable to gather as many responses as possible and then look for a pattern in the results. This explains why a quantitative method was chosen. Examples of commonly used tool in a quantitative research, according to Harboe (2013) is surveys, statistical data processing and experiments. The study also aims to find relations between the three components: cognition, affection and behavior. For this purpose, a larger group of responses, and short answers is preferable to a small group of responses with wider answers. We argue that a survey with captured answers was more appropriate for this study than an actual meeting with the responders.
3.2.1 Sample size

As the purpose of this study was to investigate the difference between different generations, it was important to gather responses from both generations. Trost (2001) consider it difficult to gather data from the whole population you decided to investigate because it could be expensive and complicated to send the survey to a million people. Trost (2001) argues for the researcher to make a selection from the population. Bryman (1997) also claims researchers rarely examine the whole population, instead, they make a selection in the population. Since the most important thing is to get responses from different generations for this study, a convenience selection of the population was conducted. According to Trost (2001), convenience sample is when the researcher “take what you get” and publishes the survey on different channels. Bryman (1997) argues, most literature authors and researchers use convenience or random selections while using a quantitative method. This sample is considered suitable for this study since no specific age will be investigated. The responses to the survey were controlled by degrees, to make sure the survey got responses from both digital natives and digital immigrants.

3.2.2 Survey design

As mentioned, a survey was used to collect data for this study. To reach out to a wide population, the survey was published on Facebook. Trost (2001) writes about different ways to collect data by surveys and claims a lot of surveys now days are published on the Internet. The survey for this study included questions based on the three components: cognition, affection and behavior. An operationalization was used for translating the theoretical terms into questions and answers, without the respondents’ knowledge. Previous research, for example, Nilsson and Mazetti-Nissen (2016) and Mahmud (2015) used a survey to collect data. When designing the survey for this study, we had a look at how previous research designed surveys and we also based the survey questions on what previous research and theory recommended. The survey was divided into three areas, based on the three components and the respondent replied to questions connected to one component at a time, see appendix 1. To design the survey this way was considered appropriate since a possible relation between the three components will be clear. This way of designing a survey is also recurrent in previous research regarding the three components.

The survey for this study was designed in a way for the responders to respond on a scale from 1 to 5, agree to disagree. This is called a Likert-scale and was introduced by R Likert in 1982 and is often design on a scale between 1-5 or 1-7 (Befring, 1994). Trost (2001) describes that well-
used variables while working with behavior and social science, and also surveys, is rankings. Befring (1994) describes that the method contains statements with positive and negative claims about the chosen theme, where the responder has five answers to choose from. While designing this survey for this study, the matter of size was carefully decided. A number of questions with a positive versus negative approach were also thought through, trying to have a mix of questions. According to Befring (1994), a mix of positive and negative questions is a way to avoid unserious answers. Ejlertsson (1996) argues that the design of the survey becomes decisive for how the responders reply to it. Ejlertsson (1996) describes that how the survey questions are presented will influence on whether the responder takes the survey seriously and answer each question carefully and thoughtfully or not. He means that a survey which presents a careless impression and that perceive as illogical, will not be taken as seriously as a well prepared and logical designed survey.

3.2.3 Pilot study

Before publishing the survey on social media for response, a pilot study was made to make sure the survey was understandable. A group of 12 individuals in our network were asked to answer the survey and give us feedback. After their feedback, the survey was supplemented and then published on Facebook. The changes that were made based on the feedback, were mostly regarding the formulation of questions. Also, we got feedback on the number of positive and negative questions and tried to get a more even number of these. Some questions were considered unnecessary and were deleted. A pilot study should be the first stage gathering any data, according to Robson (2011). He also claims a pilot study helps to identify problems and converting the design into reality.

3.2.4 Survey strategy

To be able to collect as many responses as possible, the survey was published on Facebook. A short description of what the survey is regarding was written along with the survey. An approximate time to respond to the survey was also written to make sure the responders knew how fast it could be done. Besides publishing the survey on Facebook, friends and families gave the survey to their friends and colleagues, to reach an even bigger group of responders. The survey was published on Facebook for a week, and after that, an examination of the number of responses was made. If the amount would not have been considered to be enough, the survey would have been published once again to remind those who has not answered. The goal was to
collect about 200 responses. According to Befring (1994), it is a good idea to send out some reminders, because it often results in responses from those who were not unwilling to respond in the first place. According to Trost (2001), you often come to think about delimiter questions while designing the survey. To increase the chances of a high number of answers, the survey had as few and short described questions as possible.

### 3.2.5 Responses not used

Before starting to analyze the data, it is important to have a close look at the responses and sort out the unserious responses (Trost, 2001). The total number of responses was 205, and out of them, 187 were useful. For example, at question number 1, where the people who do not receive advertising emails were supposed to stop answering, four of the responders continued. These responses were deleted. Some of the respondents only replied to half of the survey or chose several alternatives at one question. These responses can be misleading, which is why they were deleted. A reflection of this is that all questions should have been obligatory, and it should only have been possible to choose one alternative on each question.

### 3.2.6 Data analysis

Robson (2011) describes a quantitative analysis should be kept simple. He advocates that simple expositive statistics, tables and visualized image of the data, is what should be in focus. The data collected in this study were analyzed using statistical calculations and presented with the help of figures, tables and charts. Eggeby and Söderberg (1999) describes the collected data, should be compiled in any way in order to get an overview of the material. To get an overview of the collected data for this study, a table with a summary of all questions with answers was made. This table was used as support to analyze the consumers’ total attitudes based on the percentage of the questions.

When a table of a summary of the result was made, the next step was to start looking at correlations between the answers. Bryman and Bell (2013) claims that a bivariate analysis aims to analyze two variables at a time, to make it clear how they are related to each other. For this essay, Statistical Package for Social Science, SPSS, according to Spearman’s rho, was used to compile the empirical data for the survey. To carry out complex statistical tests, SPSS is one of the most used statistical calculation package (Robson, 2011). By using SPSS it was possible to look at two questions at a time and see the correlation number. The aim was to look at correlation numbers between two questions from two different components, and the highest
number to find out of a scale 0-1, where 1 is the highest, was 0.69. A correlation number of 0.7 was found, but the number was between two questions from the same component. This was not interesting to use in this analysis because the purpose was to look at correlations between different components. Bryman and Bell (2013) describes connection tables, also called contingency table, is the most flexible method for analyzing correlations. They explain, when using connection tables it is possible to analyze two variables at the same time, which means that it is possible to find correlations, just like when using SPSS for this essay. Eight interesting correlations were sorted out, and chosen based on how they can reply to the research question number 2. They were primarily chosen because of a high correlation number between two components.

The last step was to make cross tables, which show the average number of answers in the scale 1-5 of each question. One table was made to show every age alternative from the survey, and the other table to show different average numbers of each question divided according to Prensky’s generations’ theory, digital natives and digital immigrants. This was made as a basis for answering research question number 3.

### 3.3 Method discussion

By using a survey for this study, it was possible to gather a number of 200 replies. This would not have been possible if interviews were used to collect data. Due to the number of responses, it was further possible to see patterns and relations both between the three components from the CAB-model, and from the different generations. Therefore, a quantitative method is still considered as suitable for this type of research questions. As mentioned, the purpose was to generalize and not exemplify, which also suggest that a quantitative method is appropriate. Regarding the sample, it was important to collect responses from both generations. To make sure to reach out to both generations, the sample could have been chosen in another way. One example would be to be more specific and contact some form of organization like an office and a school. This would mean a knowledge of ages of the respondents, before sending the survey for response. This way to gather data was considered, but not chosen because it was assumed to result in fewer responses. To get as many responses as possible a lot of effort was made in the survey design. It was important to not have too many questions, and that the questions were short and understandable. With a higher number of question, more interesting information and correlations, might have been found. The decision of having few and short questions was made because it was preferable to get a high number of responses. People on Facebook are probably not interested in responding to a survey, which takes 10 minutes to complete. According to
Trost (2001), the Likert-scale is suitable when measuring attitudes. The survey strategy was a useful assistance during the whole survey process and worked out in a good way. To publish the survey on Facebook, and with help from friends and family sharing the post on their Facebook, finally resulted in almost 200 responses. There is a lot of different social media that could be used to publish the survey, but since the goal was to collect about 200 responses, and because the goal was reached after a week only using Facebook, this was considered to be enough. Because of a few number of questions and an approximate time to answer the survey, the number of responses probably increased.

3.3.1 Generalizability

The purpose of this study is to generalize, instead of exemplify. Bryman (1997) claims there is a big difference between a quantitative research and qualitative research. He further explains, in a qualitative research, the results do not have to be representative and therefore not generalizable. A quantitatively oriented research often strives for the ability to show that the survey’s results can be applied to other situations or people as well, and therefore not only on the ones being studied. He argues, to be able to do that, a big group of responses is necessary. The reason for why a lot of energy is put on generalizability is according to Bryman (1997) because a quantitative researcher can imitate a nature science method and approach. Even though this study's result is based on approximately 200 answers, it is not enough to generalize to the entire Swedish population. These 200 respondents are not strategically chosen to cover the whole Swedish population. The random sample for this study was based on our network on Facebook, which means it was not available for all Swedish consumers to reply. The division of men and woman, and different ages is not even, which is an argument for why the results from this study cannot be generalized. In future research, this study could be used as a pilot study. A study with a strategically chosen sample, which includes evenly divided groups of gender and age, could result in a generalization for all Swedish consumers.

3.3.2 Reliability and validity

According to Bryman (2011), there are a couple of techniques that can be used to study and calculate the value of the results for the research. Reliability is regarding measuring how reliable the results are. By making a pilot study before sending out the survey, misunderstandings and unclear questions were partly avoided. Without the pilot study, there would probably have been some unclear questions, mostly because they were taken for granted...
by us who know the background for the theses. A reflection made afterward, was that some questions did not really indicate anything about an individual’s attitude towards the subject. For example, the question, *I believe email advertising is good since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media*, can indicate a negative attitude, even though the respondent is positive towards both. When he or she has to choose, maybe they like advertising on social media a little more but still like email advertising as well, which indicates a misleading result.

Out of 187 responses, 134 were at the age of 18-35, which according to Prensky’s theory are digital natives. There were 53 respondents in the age of 36 and older, which are digital immigrants. As we can see, there were very few responses from the age group 36-45. Therefore, this is important to keep in mind when reading the conclusions based on their age group. When making the analysis regarding the Prensky’s theory, and adding age 36-45 and 46+ together, age 36-45 might change the average number dramatically, which also might indicate a misleading result. Age 36-45 has half a number of responses that age 46+ has. Also, the significant difference between the number of responses from digital natives and digital immigrants is important to keep in mind. A result with the same amount of responses from both generations, and an even number of each age would have been given us a fairer result.

Also a major of the respondents were women, 72.2% which one should be aware of. By using capture responses in the survey for this study, the responders had no possibility to write their own answers. If the survey had open questions, the results probably would have been different. Since every answer is based on a scale from 1-5 it is easy to group the results, which it would not have been if the survey had open questions. The respondent only had the questions and alternatives included in the survey to express their opinion, which means that they might have more to say about the subject that would indicate a different result.

Validity concerns if the research really researches the object in question (Bryman, 2011). The purpose of this study is to identify consumers’ total attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling companies. By publishing the survey to a wide group of consumers and contact people in our surrounding, the study results in Swedish consumers’ total attitude from different age generations, based on our sample. The study, therefore measures what it intends to measure. Bryman (2011) claims, reliability and validity are separated from each other but also related. He explains that validity requires reliability. If a result is not reliable it cannot be valid, and if a measure is not reliable over time, it cannot form a measure with validity. The subject the study is regarding is quite current and well talked about. If the situation regarding the usage of email advertising changes over time, the attitude towards the subject
would likely change as well. Based on this, it is not possible to promise a similar result if the study is performed a couple of years from now.

### 3.3.3 Challenges

This is the first time for us to use a quantitative method for an essay. This resulted in some issues along the way and sometimes it was hard to know how to continue. After gathering the responses for the survey for example, the project had a brake. To be able to find out how to continue, an extra tutoring opportunity was necessary.

Another issue was to get the older generation, about age 46 and older, to respond to the survey. After the survey had been published on Facebook for a week, it became clear that the majority of the responses were from people in the same ages as us, 20-30 years old. To even the number out, the survey was sent directly to people in the age of 46+ and thereby sent on by them. This was helpful and resulted in 36 responses from the age 46+. Another challenge was to write this essay in English, as it is our second language. To manage, it has been helpful to have a dialogue between the two of us, and also with the supervisor. It was challenging, but not as hard as expected.

### 3.4 Ethical considerations

Holme and Solvang (1997) advocate the importance of the author being aware that research including a human being and a society could imply some ethical issues. They claim that respect for the human being and the society is a fundamental starting point in social society research. According to the Swedish Vetenskapsrådet (2002), there are some ground rules to follow when making a study like this. The ground rules are following: *The information obligation, the consent obligation, the confidentiality obligation and the use obligation*.

*The information obligation* means that the author has to inform the respondents of the purpose of the research (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). Along with the survey, an explanation of what the results would be used for was made, to make sure the respondents knew what they were contributing to. *The consent obligation* requires consent from the respondents, saying that they accept contributing in the research (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). The respondents choosing to reply to the survey gives their consent automatically. *The confidentiality obligation* means that the authors have to handle any personal information as promised (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). No names from any respondents are therefore mentioned in the essay. *The use obligation* means
that the respondents have to be informed of what the essay is for and who is going to read it (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). The respondents were informed that the results only would be used for the essay and the only ones who would read it was the authors, the supervisor, the examiner, and opposing students. We have not broken this promise.

3.4.1 Source criticism

The sources of this essay have been reviewed by criteria – authenticity, temporal association, independence and tendency freedom. Criteria require the source to be what it purports to be. It shall not be an abstract of a different source or give a skewed picture of reality caused by an individual’s personal, political or economic views. The source must also be relevant in time. (Thurén, 2013) These criteria have been the basis of the study and provided support in the assessment of the sources credibility. This study seeks to use in time and as present sources as possible, but older references also occurs in the study. Theory that is published before the 2000-century have been examined and is considered to still has a central role in today's research. One example is Befring from 1994. Though, it is always useful to keep this in mind that some sources are older than others, while reading the theses. A lot of sources have been used to complete each other, both to underline a statement, and also to make sure a sufficiently varied picture of opinions and perspectives are given.
4 Findings

Chapter Findings include data collected from the survey for this study. In this chapter you will be introduced to the results obtained through the survey by visual models, tables and figures, to get a view of the results.

4.1 Demography

To get an overall picture of the respondents that chose to respond to the survey, there were some demographic questions at the beginning of the survey. Though, the age of the respondents is the only aspect that was used in the analysis.

4.1.1 Gender

The total number of useful responses was 187. Of the 187 responses, the majority were women. A percentage of 72,2, which corresponds to 134, of the respondents was women. Only 27,8%, 52 responders were men. And at last, 1%, which corresponds to one person, chose the alternative “other”.

4.1.2 Age

Figure 2 below shows the division of age. Out of 187 responses, the majority was in the age of 18-25. 48,1%, which corresponds to 91 respondents, is between ages 18-25. 23,2%, which corresponds to a number of 43 respondents, has an age between 26-35. 21%, which corresponds to 39 people, had the age of 46 years and older. The smallest group of responders, 7,7%, 14 people, is between 36-45 years old.
4.2 Attitude towards email advertising

Table 4 below is a summary of all the responses from the survey. The questions were divided based on the three components: cognition, affection and behavior. The table shows the percentage distribution of answers divided into the scale on 1 to 5, “disagree” to “agree”. The questions in the survey had both a positive and negative approach, which means that the percentage response varies and therefore it is not right to just look at the percentage response in the “agree” column to say if the people has a positive approach towards email advertising or not. The questions having a negative approach, is therefore marked with an asterisk, to make it simple to pay attention to the variety of questions. At the majority of the questions, the responses are clearly showing a negative attitude. These questions are marked with an “N” and stands for negative. Four questions had a more even percentage number, but these questions are now considering to not really say anything about an individual’s attitude towards the subject, as described in challenges, see Methodology 3.3.3. Table 4 is followed by a specific presentation and explanation of the results in each component to make it clearer for the reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>I consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers</td>
<td>16,2 %</td>
<td>20,1 %</td>
<td>32,4 %</td>
<td>25,5 %</td>
<td>5,9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is inspiring</td>
<td>28,4 %</td>
<td>29,9 %</td>
<td>29,9 %</td>
<td>8,8 %</td>
<td>2,9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: The respondents’ ages from the survey.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>I prefer email advertising over other media advertising, such as advertising on social media or printed advertising in the mailbox</td>
<td>23.6% 12.8% 31.5% 20.7% 11.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>I think I get permission-based advertising emails too often *</td>
<td>3.9% 5.4% 12.8% 24.6% 53.2%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media</td>
<td>24.1% 20.7% 28.1% 21.2% 5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I appreciate to receive permission-based advertising emails</td>
<td>30.2% 28.2% 27.2% 10.4% 4%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as rewarding and interesting</td>
<td>30.2% 29.2% 29.7% 9.4% 1.5%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I feel curious when receiving an advertising email, and want to read it immediately</td>
<td>52.7% 21.9% 19.9% 5% 0.5%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as annoying *</td>
<td>5% 10.9% 26.2% 28.7% 29.2%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I find it stressful to always be available for mailshots *</td>
<td>25.6% 15.8% 19.7% 22.2% 16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>I find it annoying to receive emails along with private emails *</td>
<td>5.9% 8.9% 19.3% 26.7% 39.1%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>I open every advertising email I receive</td>
<td>56.9% 21.3% 7.4% 6.9% 7.4%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>I read every advertising email I receive</td>
<td>68.4% 19.7% 8.3% 1.6% 2.1%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>I often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website</td>
<td>36.1% 34.7% 21.8% 6.4% 1%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Email advertising never leads me to purchasing something at the company’s website or visit their shop *</td>
<td>19.8% 28.2% 30.7% 13.4% 7.9%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>I often delete advertising emails without opening them</td>
<td>8.9% 13.3% 18.7% 21.2% 37.9%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>I often unsubscribe from email advertising from company I previously approved *</td>
<td>13.3% 10.8% 26.6% 27.6% 21.7%  N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. A table that summarizing the results of the survey.
4.2.1  Cognition

For this study, five questions were asked to form knowledge of Swedish consumers’ attitude towards permission-based email advertising. It is obvious in the results that the majority of respondents do not consider email advertising as inspiring and they think they get advertising emails too often. The first question, if they consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers, the percentage breakdown is quite even. We can see that the majority, 32,4% of the responders chose number 3 on the Likert-scale, but 25,5% chose number 4, which is quite high and indicates a positive attitude. We can see a similar result at question 7, where 31,5% choose number 3 and 20,7% choose number 4. This shows that the responders think they get advertising emails too often, and they do not believe advertising emails is inspiring. Still, they consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers and prefer email advertising in front of other media advertising. Question 5, 7 and 9 has a mixed percentage breakdown, which shows that the responders do not agree with each other. These three questions, as mentioned above, do not really implicate anything about the responders’ attitude towards email advertising. Based on the result from question six and nine, the responders’ cognition towards email advertising is quite negative.

4.2.2  Affection

In this study, consumers’ emotions about permission-based email advertising are investigated. This component is dominated of negative responses. In question 10, 11 and 12 most respondents chose the lowest number (1) of the Likert-scale. The majority of the respondents does not appreciate email advertising and do not consider the emails to be rewarding and interesting. Only 1,5% chose number 5 on the Likert-scale in question 11, and 0,5% feel curious when receiving emails. A majority, 25,6 %, also responds that they do not feel stressed to always be available for mailshots, while 39,1% finds it annoying to receive emails along with private emails. In this component, 19,3 %, up to 29,7 %, respondents chose the middle number of the Likert-scale (3). To sum up, the questions in this component generally have a negative response. Consumers do not feel email advertising is an advertising channel, which brings positive feelings.

4.2.3  Behavior

At question 16-21, the response points at a negative attitude. We can see that only 7,4% chose number 5 at question number 16 if they open every advertising email they receive. 56,9%
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claims they disagree, which points at a direction saying they rarely open every advertising email they receive. Question number 17 has similar results and only 2,1% agrees with the statement that they read every advertising email they receive. So 7,4% claims they open every advertising email they receive, but only 2,1% claims they read the emails. At question number 20 we can see a straight line towards number 5 on the Likert-scale. The majority of responders, 37,9% claims they often delete advertising emails without opening them. But 8,9% disagree with this statement and chose number 1 on the Likert-scale, which is a higher percentage number than at the statement saying they open the emails or read them. So fewer people delete the emails than read them. At question number 19 we can see, the majority of a high percentage is at number 1-3 at the Likert-scale. This indicates that the responders do not agree to that they never purchasing anything from the company's website because of the email they received. Though, this is a little strange formulated question, which can easily be misunderstood so the results might be misleading. But based on the results we have got, this question points at a positive attitude towards receiving advertising emails, since they indicate that people sometimes shop from the web-site because of the email. At the last question, the percentage breakdown is quite even. The highest percentage number is at number 4 on the Likert-scale, which shows that the majority of the respondents often unsubscribe from companies they previously approved to receive emails from. This points at a negative attitude as well.

4.3 CAB-model of attitudes

In this paragraph, SPSS and statistics from the data are presented in cross tables, which show different correlations between the questions. Of all correlations, the eight most relevant and interesting correlations were chosen. Each correlation is between two questions from two different components, and the questions from the eight correlations are visualized in bar graphs with related descriptions.

4.3.1 SPSS

The results were transformed into a cross table with the computer package program SPSS, according to Spearman’s rho. The table shows the correlation between two questions at a time. Higher number means higher correlation. For example, question 11 and 13 has a high correlation number: 0,659, which mean the responses is connected. Each correlation number is marked with one, two or no asterisk. No asterisk means the correlation number is not statistically proved, and therefore not trustworthy. Two asterisk means the correlation number is
highly statistically proved. The highest correlation number is 1,0, and lowest 0. It can also be a minus, which only means one of the questions has a negative approach and thereby indicates a negative correlation. The correlation is still the same. The eight chosen correlations are marked; please have a look at annex 1 to see the document.

Along with the total summary of correlation between the different questions, a summary of the correlation between the three components - cognition, affection and behavior – has also been calculated. At table 5 below you find the results of the calculation. It shows the correlation numbers between all components and as you can see, the highest correlation is between cognition and affection, with correlations number 0,746. The correlation between cognition and behavior is the lowest with a number of 0,452. Affection and behavior have a medium high correlation number, 0,538.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>,746**</td>
<td>,452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>,746**</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>,538**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>,452**</td>
<td>,538**</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Correlation between the components.

4.3.2 Eight interesting correlations

Below, are eight bar graphs visualizing the statistics of the eight questions included in the eight chosen correlations. These eight questions have interesting correlations along with each other and will be analyzed further on, in the Analysis chapter. To make it easier for the reader, the eight correlations have been visualized in annex 2. The bar graphs below show the exact answer.
to the eight questions, to make is possible for the reader to go back to this while reading the analysis chapter.

Figure 6 below shows the responses to question 6, asking how much the respondent agree or disagree to email advertising being inspiring. A high majority chose number 1-3 on the Likert-scale, 88,2% in total. This means a high negative response and also a high middle number, number 3 in the Likert-scale. The graph shows a low response to the highest numbers, 4-5, on the Likert-scale. When adding the percentage response at number four and five on the Likert-scale, we can see that only 11,7% believe email advertising is inspiring.

![Bar graph showing the responses of question 6.](image)

If email advertising is enjoyable because it is directed towards an individual, unlike advertising on social media, the responders feel different about. In figure 7 you can see that 44,8% chose the number 1 and 2 on the Likert-scale, which means they do not believe it as enjoyable. 27,1% of the respondents chose number 4 and 5 on the Likert-scale, and thereby considers email advertising enjoyable. The highest number in this graph is number 3, which shows that 28,1% of the respondents partly agree to if email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards them.
I believe email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media.

![Bar graph showing the responses of question 9.](image)

**Figure 7:** Bar graph showing the responses of question 9.

In figure 8 below, you can see the respondents’ answers to question 10, if the respondents appreciate receiving permission-based email advertising. The graph shows that the majority of respondents chose number 1 and 2 on the Likert-scale, a total of 58.4%, which indicates that they do not appreciate to receive permission-based email advertising. 14.4% of the respondents chose the highest numbers, 4 and 5, on the Likert-scale, which indicates that they feel an appreciation while receiving email advertising. 27.2% of the respondents chose number 3 on the Likert-scale and therefore partly agrees to the statement about appreciating receiving permission-based email advertising. This questions’ response leans towards a negative direction.

![Bar graph showing the responses of question 10.](image)

**Figure 8:** Bar graph showing the responses of question 10.
Question number 11 in the survey is about if the respondents feel email advertising is rewarding and interesting. Figure 9 shows the responses for this question. As you can see a total of 59.4% of the respondents chose number 1 and 2. They totally disagree that email advertising is rewarding and interesting. Only 10.9%, of the responses, chose number 4 and 5 on the Likert-scale, which indicates that they feel it is rewarding and interesting. 29.7% chose number 3 on the Likert-scale and either partly agree to the statement, or do not have an opinion that suits their answers.

I feel email advertising is rewarding and interesting.

![Figure 9: Bar graph showing the responses of question 11.](image)

In figure 10 we can see that the respondents seemed to agree with each other, and feel that email advertising is annoying. The percentage split between 3-5 on the scale, is quite even. When adding the percentage numbers on alternative 3-5 on the Likert-scale, we can see that about 84.1% agrees to if email advertising is annoying. Almost as many respondents who choose number 4 and 5 on the scale, choose number 3, which means they partly agree. So in total, the predominant answers are the percentage division at number 4 and 5 at the scale, which is equal to 59.7%. Only 10.9% choose number 2 and only 5% choose number 1 at the scale. The results indicate that the respondents feel email advertising is annoying.
**You've got email! A study about attitudes towards email advertising, based on the components cognition, affection and behavior**

I feel email advertising as annoying.

![Bar graph showing the responses of question 13.](image1)

**Figure 10**: Bar graph showing the responses of question 13.

In figure 11, we can see that the percentage breakdown of the replies to if email advertising is a great way to take advantage of valuable offers, is quite evenly divided between 1,2,4 on the scale 1-5. The highest percentage number is at number 3 and the lowest at number 5. The majority of responders, 23,4% partly considers email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers. Only 5,9% agrees completely to if email advertising is a great way to take advantage of valuable offers.

I consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers.

![Bar graph showing the responses of question 5.](image2)

**Figure 11**: Bar graph showing the responses of question 5.

In figure 12, we can see that the majority of the responses claims they never use the hyperlink to visit the company's website. We can see that the percentage response to alternative 1 and 2 on the Likert-scale are quite even and the numbers are high. In total, 70,8% claims they rarely use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company's website. At the alternative 4 and 5 the
percentage number is very low, the lowest number of response is at number 5 on the Likert-scale. 21,8% choose number 3 which shows that 21,8% partly agrees to if they use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website.

I often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website.

To the question, if the respondents often delete advertising emails without opening them, 37,9% choose the highest number on the Likert-scale, see figure 13. There is a straight line from number 1-5, and 8,9% do not agree to if they delete emails without opening them. This is a low percentage number and the percentage number at 2-4 is quite low as well. The results indicate that the majority of the respondents often delete advertising emails without opening them.

I often delete advertising emails without opening them.

Figure 12: Bar graph showing the responses of question 18.

Figure 13: Bar graph showing the responses of question 20.
4.4 Prensky’s generation theory

This chapter presents two tables and descriptions of the respondents’ answers divided according to age groups. One table shows the average number of responses on the scale 1 to 5, in relation to their ages. Also here the questions with a negative approach are marked with an asterisk. This is important to keep in mind while comparing the average number of questions with a negative approach, to average numbers of questions with a positive approach. In the second table the average number is divided according to Prensky’s generation theory, digital natives and digital immigrants.

4.4.1 Average in relation to age

Question number 5 at table 15 below shows a higher average number at the age of 26-35 than at the age of 18-25. The difference is not convincing, but there is a difference indicating that the respondents between age group 26-35 are more positive towards using emails to take advantage of valuable offers, than the age group of 18-25. When having a look at what the age group 36-45 and 46+ think, it is clear that the 36-45-year-olds are the most negative towards using email advertising to take advantage of valuable offers. The average number for age group 36-45 is 2.0, which is below the middle number of the scale, 2.5. Age group 46+ has an average number of 2.53, which is above the average limit 2.5. So the only group of ages who fell below the average number 2.5 was the ages 36-45. It is important to keep in mind that the group of age 36-45 had the least number of responses, which can affect the average number. When adding the age groups together according to Prensky’s generation theory, see table 16, that the average number of digital natives is 3.08, and the digital immigrants is 2.38. This indicates that the digital immigrants falls below the average limit 2.5, their response are considered to be negative, while the digital natives has a positive response.

Question number 6, regarding if the respondents believe email advertising is inspiring, the average number of age group 18-25, 26-35 and 46+ is similar, a number around 2.3. Age 36-45 has an average value of 2.0, which is outstanding from the other three. When adding these together, based on Prensky’s generation theory, the average number differs markedly. The number is 2.31 at the digital natives and 2.17 at the digital immigrants. Either way, the response is below the average limit 2.5, which points at a negative attitude, both from the digital natives and the digital immigrants. Since the average number from age 36-45 is a lot lower that from the other ages, this number affect the average number to the age of 46+ while adding these together. Since the lowest number of responses were from age group 36-45, this is important to
keep in mind at this question as well. If the responders prefer email advertising over other media advertising, question number 7, the responses differ a bit more than at the questions right before. Age group 18-25 has an average value of 2,66, while age 26-35 has an average value of 3,36. When adding these two ages together, we get an average number of 2,9 which points at a positive attitude from the digital natives. At age 36-45, the average number is 1,93, which is below the limit 2,5. Age group 46+ has an average number of 2,92, which is quite high comparing to 1,93, even if they, according to Prensky’s generation theory, belong to the same generation. The average numbers we got from the digital natives were 2,9 and the digital immigrants 2,65, which shows that both generations are above the average limit 2,5 and thereby points at a positive attitude.

At question number 8, we can see that the average number at each age is quite even. Every average value is above 4,0. The lowest average number belongs to age 46+. At question number 9, regarding if the respondents believe email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards an individual unlike advertising on social media, the average numbers differs a bit from each other. Age 18-25 has an average number of 2,59, age 26-35 an average number of 2,74. When adding these two together, according to Prensky’s generation theory, we get an average value of 2,64. Age 36-45 has an average number of 2,21 and age 46+ has an average number of 2,71. We can see that age 46+ has a higher average value than 36-45 even if they are older. When adding these two together we get an average number of 2,58. To summarize, the average numbers of both generations is above the limit 2,5, and they are quite similar. If the respondents appreciate to receive permission-based email advertising, which is question number 10, the responders seemed to agree. The lowest average number, and the average number that differs from the other three belongs to age group 36-45. Once again, we should keep in mind that the lowest number of responses came from this group of age, which might indicate that the result is not trustworthy. When looking at the two generations, we can see that the digital natives have an average number of 2,38 and the digital immigrants an average number of 2,19. Both generations are below the limit of 2,5.

At the next question, number 11 regarding if the respondents feel email advertising is rewarding and interesting, the respondents agreed with each other. We can see that both age 18-25 and age 26-35 has an average number of 2,23. Age 46+ has the highest average number, 2,34 and age 36-45 the lowest, 1,92. When adding these together according to Prensky’s generation theory, we get the exact same average value, 2,23. Both generations are below the limit of 2,5 but this is the only question, which has got the exact same average number at both generations. Whether if the respondents feel curious when receiving an advertising email, which is question number 12,
they were quite agreed on as well. The average numbers that belong to age 18-25, 26-35 and 46+ are quite similar. Age 18-25 got an average number of 1,77 and age 26-35 an average number of 1,72. Age 46+ got an average number of 1,81, which is not far from 1,77. Age 36-45 got an average number of 1,58, which differs from the others. Still, it is important to keep in mind that the age 36-45 had the least number of responses. When adding these together according to Prensky’s generation theory, we can see that the numbers do not differ much at all. The digital natives get an average value of 1,75 and the digital immigrants a value of 1,74. To summarize, both generations fell below the limit of 2,5, which indicates a negative attitude.

When looking at question number 13: I feel email advertising is annoying, the average values are quite similar and quite high. Age group 18-25 has an average number of 3,63 and age group 26-35 an average number of 3,66. Age 46+ has an average number a bit less, 3,58. The number that differs the most from the others is an average number of 4,21, which belongs to age 36-45. Age 36-45 often has the lowest average number, but in this question it is markedly higher than the others. When adding them together, the digital natives get an average number of 3,64 and the digital immigrants an average number of 3,75. Even if age 46+ had a lower average number than both age 18-25 and 26-35, the average according to Prensky’s generation theory, points at a higher average number at the older generation. Both generations end up above the limit 2,5.

At question number 14, regarding if the respondents find it stressful to always be available for mailshots, the respondents did not seem to agree with each other. Age 18-25 got an average number of 2,6 and age 26-35 an average number of 2,76, which show that they quite agree with each other. When looking at the older generation, we can see that age 36-45 got the highest average number, 4,08 and age 46+ got the second highest, 3,21. All age groups end up above the limit of 2,5. When adding them together, the digital natives get an average number of 2,66 and the digital immigrants an average number of 3,44. The digital immigrants have a markedly higher number than the digital natives. In question number 15 the average numbers are markedly high. All age groups end up above the limit of 2,5 to if they find it annoying to receive advertising emails along with private emails. Age 18-25 has an average value of 3,73 and age 26-35 an average value of 3,94. The highest average number, 4,65 belongs to age 36-45, and the lowest average number, 3,7 belongs to age 46+. The results show a mix of average values, and the two age groups, which belong to the digital immigrants, do not seem to agree since their average number differs markedly. When adding them together and dividing them into digital natives and digital immigrants, we get an average number of 3,8, for the digital natives and an average number of 3,96 for the digital immigrants. The numbers do not differ much when putting them together in digital generations.
Next question, number 16, regarding if the respondents open every advertising email they receive, the digital natives and digital immigrants has the exact same average number, 1.86. When looking closer at the different ages though, we can see that the numbers differ markedly. Age 18-25 has an average number of 2.03, age 26-35 an average number of 1.55, which is a lot lower. Age 36-45 has the lowest average number, 1.43 and age 46+ the same average number as age 18-25. Both generations end up below the limit of 2.5. At question number 17, if the respondents read every advertising email they receive, the numbers are lower than in the previous question. Age group 18-25 has an average number of 1.51. Age group 26-35 has an average number of 1.34 and the lowest average number of 1.28 belongs to age 36-45. The highest average value, 1.6 belongs to age group 46+. Every age group falls below the limit of 2.5 and when adding them according to digital natives and digital immigrants, we can see that the digital natives have an average number of 1.45 and the digital immigrants a bit higher average number of 1.52. When asking the respondents if they use the hyperlink to visit the company’s website, which is question number 18, the two age groups who belong to the digital natives, agrees with each other. As do the two ages for the digital immigrants. Age 18-25 has an average number of 2.10 and age group 26-35 has an average number of 2.15, which is quite similar. When looking at the older generation, we can see that age 36-45 has an average number of 1.57 while age 46+ has an average of 1.79. When adding them together, the digital natives have an average number of 2.10 and the digital immigrants an average number of 1.73. They both end up below the limit of 2.5 but the numbers differs markedly from each other.

Question number 19 is regarding if email advertising leads to the respondents purchasing something from the company behind the email. Age group 18-25, at the first table, has an average value of 2.59 and age group 26-35 has an average value of 2.83. The average value from age group 36-45 is 2.14 and from age 46+ the average number is 2.58. This means that the majority of the respondents from all age groups, except 36-45 are less likely to visit and shop from the sender of the advertising email. It shows a bigger probability that the respondents from age 36-45 will purchase something at the company’s website or visit their shop. The second table shows that the digital natives have a higher average value with 2.67 than digital immigrants with an average value of 2.46. Both generations have an average value close to the limit of 2.5, but digital immigrants show a more positive response. Digital immigrants are more likely to buy something from the company’s website or in their shop than the digital natives.

The average values of question 20 are quite high through all age groups. The majority of respondents from this study often delete advertising emails without even opening them. Age group 18-25 has an average value of 3.68 and age 26-35 an average value of 3.69. The highest
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average value is in age group 36-45 with 4,43. The lowest average value is 3,40 and belongs to respondents in age group 45+. The average values do not differ as much when putting the age groups together into digital generations. The respondents in digital natives have an average value of 3,68, while digital immigrants have a value of 3,67. High average values of both generations’ show the respondents often delete advertising emails from product selling companies, without opening them. The last question, I often unsubscribe from email advertising from a company I previously approved”, is also dominated by high average values. The first age group has an average value of 3,36 and age group 26-35 an average value of 3,04. The highest average number is 4,07 and belongs to age group 36-45. Worth having in mind is still stat the number of responses of age group 36-45, is the lowest. Respondents in age group 46+ constitute the second highest average value with number 3,42. Summarized according to Prensky’s generation theory, the difference is small. The second table shows digital natives with an average value of 3,25 and digital immigrants with an average of 3,60. Both generations show a high tendency to unsubscribe from email advertising from companies they previously approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>CAB</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Age 18-25</th>
<th>Age 26-35</th>
<th>Age 36-45</th>
<th>Age 46 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>2,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is inspiring</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>1,79</td>
<td>2,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I prefer e-mail advertising over other media advertising, such as advertising on social media or printed advertising in the mailbox</td>
<td>2,66</td>
<td>3,36</td>
<td>1,93</td>
<td>2,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I think I get permission-based advertising emails too often *</td>
<td>4,24 *</td>
<td>4,45 *</td>
<td>4,14 *</td>
<td>4,03 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media</td>
<td>2,59</td>
<td>2,74</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>2,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I appreciate to receive permission-based advertising emails</td>
<td>2,31</td>
<td>2,51</td>
<td>1,71</td>
<td>2,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as rewarding and interesting</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>1,92</td>
<td>2,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I feel curious when receiving an advertising email, and want to read it immediately</td>
<td>1,77</td>
<td>1,72</td>
<td>1,58</td>
<td>1,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as annoying *</td>
<td>3,63 *</td>
<td>3,66 *</td>
<td>4,21 *</td>
<td>3,58 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I find it stressful to always be available for mailshots *</td>
<td>2,60 *</td>
<td>2,76 *</td>
<td>4,08 *</td>
<td>3,21 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I find it annoying to receive emails along with private email *</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>3,94</td>
<td>4,65</td>
<td>3,70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15: A summary of Average number in relation to ages.

* Questions with negative approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>CAB</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Digital natives</th>
<th>Digital immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>- C</td>
<td>I consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers</td>
<td>3,08</td>
<td>2,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- C</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is inspiring</td>
<td>2,31</td>
<td>2,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>- C</td>
<td>I prefer email advertising over other media advertising, such as advertising on social media or printed advertising in the mailbox</td>
<td>2,90</td>
<td>2,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>- C</td>
<td>I think I get permission-based advertising emails too often *</td>
<td>4,31*</td>
<td>4,06 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- C</td>
<td>I believe email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media</td>
<td>2,64</td>
<td>2,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I appreciate to receive permission-based advertising emails</td>
<td>2,38</td>
<td>2,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as rewarding and interesting</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>2,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I feel curious when receiving an advertising email, and want to read it immediately</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>1,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I feel email advertising as annoying *</td>
<td>3,64 *</td>
<td>3,75 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I find it stressful to always be available for mailshots *</td>
<td>2,66 *</td>
<td>3,44 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>- A</td>
<td>I find it annoying to receive e-mails along with private e-mail *</td>
<td>3,80</td>
<td>3,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>- B</td>
<td>I open every advertising email I receive</td>
<td>1,86</td>
<td>1,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>- B</td>
<td>I read every advertising email I receive</td>
<td>1,45</td>
<td>1,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>- B</td>
<td>I often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website</td>
<td>2,10</td>
<td>1,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>- B</td>
<td>Email advertising never leads me to purchasing something at the company’s website or visit their shop *</td>
<td>2,67 *</td>
<td>2,46 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 External and internal validity

The pilot study was made to avoid threats against both the internal and external validity. Also, the surveys design was based on what previous research and theory recommend, which we would argue support the study’s internal validity. Thanks to the pilot study, the threat towards the internal validity for this study was limited. But, since there were some mistakes made regarding the survey questions, and since the number of respondents with age 36-45 is markedly low, we cannot say that the result is fully reliable. We would argue that the internal validity for this study is middle high, since the conclusions is based on the result of the survey along with theory. Since the total number of respondents is quite low, and since the sample was not strategically chosen, the results are not enough to generalize for all Swedish consumers. This means that the external validity is low, but we would argue that it is possible to receive a similar result if the study was made one again with a survey published on Facebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>20 B</th>
<th>21 B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - B</td>
<td>I often delete advertising emails without opening them</td>
<td>3.68 *</td>
<td>3.67 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - B</td>
<td>I often unsubscribe from email advertising from company I previously approved *</td>
<td>3.25 *</td>
<td>3.60 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Questions with negative approach.

Table 16: A summary of Average number in relation to ages.
5 Analysis

At the following chapter, findings for this study are analyzed along with the theory from the theory chapter. The three research questions are analyzed and responded, each below one paragraph, starting with number one. Based on the analysis with findings along with theory, conclusions are drawn. The conclusions are based on the sample for this study, and it is therefore not possible to predict that the results can be generalized to all Swedish consumers. Under each paragraph, a summary is made to once again answer the research question and short remind the reader of the most important aspects.

5.1 Attitude towards email advertising

According to Strauss, El-Ansary and Frost (2006) billions of emails are sent over the years and a typical user spends a lot of time managing emails. When the survey for this study was published on Facebook, it was never mentioned that only people who get advertising emails should respond to it. Yet, the respondents who answered “no” to the question if they get advertising emails were sorted out. These responders were only four people, which means that out of approximately 200 responses, only four never gets email advertising. This result suggests the same thing as the previously mentioned authors; a lot of people spend time managing emails. Based on this, it is possible to argue that the usage of email is common.

5.1.1 Total attitude

A majority of previous research shows in general negative attitudes towards email advertising, whether they are permission-based or not (Bengtsson, 2016; Mahmoud, 2015; Andersson et al., 2014). This study shows similar results and based on the CAB-model, the majority of the responses from the survey indicates highly negative figures, see table 4. For example, the table shows 53.2 % of the responders’ thinks they get permission-based email advertising too often. More than half of the respondents chose the highest number, 5, on the Likert-scale, which is one of the highest percentages in the table. It is, therefore, affordable for organizations to pay attention to this result. Even though the results indicate generally negative attitudes towards permission-based email advertising, a few questions show the opposite. For example, in question number 5, the majority of the respondents chose number 3 and 4 on the Likert-scale. They consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers. A few of
the other questions with a high negative percentage number also had a number of positive responses, which indicates that the respondents did not totally agree. These responses, however, is a minority. What distinguishes this study from previous research is the examination of permission-based email advertising, which could be a factor affecting the responses and therefore generate more positive responses. Even with some responses indicating a positive attitude towards the subject, the negative responses are clearly predominant. Therefore, the findings of this study concur with the results from previous research.

Strauss et al., (2006) write that a disadvantage with emails is the risk of spam. They claim that a typical user has an inbox with 22% advertising emails and that half of them are unwanted emails. Even Lewis (2002), claims that email carries the burden of an ongoing spam, which is unexpected and unwanted emails. According to Strauss et al., (2006), consumers’ attitudes toward spam is more negative than the attitude toward unsolicited postal mail. In this study, it is clear to see in table 4 at page 26 that 14 out of 17 questions had a highly negative response. At 14 questions the response showed a negative attitude towards permission-based email advertising. This is worth discussing since Strauss et al., (2006) claims that the negative attitude is towards unwanted spam. This study is regarding permission-based emails, and based on Strauss et al., (2006) statement, the attitude towards these emails should be positive compared to unwanted spam. Ström (2010) claims that even with permission-based emails, a bad reaction might as well arise toward the email. Ström (2010) then means it is up to the company behind the email to consider if the emails are favorably even though there is a negative attitude towards it. This statement goes well along with this study's results. In figure 4 we can see that even with permission-based emails, the attitude towards advertising emails is in general negative.

5.1.2 Summary

To answer this study's research question number one, regarding how the Swedish consumers’ attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling organizations is, a summary of the text above is now presented. Based on what the findings for this research indicate, and based on what the authors mentioned above claims, the attitude towards email advertising is in general negative. Even when examining the attitude towards permission-based email advertising, like in this research, the results are the same. The survey for this study had some questions, which do not really imply anything about an individual's attitude towards a subject, like questions number 5, 7, 9 and 14. The results show a mix of responses to these questions and the questions that clearly implies an attitude towards a subject. It is, therefore appropriate to argue that an individual can consider email advertising as a great way of taking
advantage of valuable offers, but still have a negative attitude towards it. The negative attitude can thereby be because of the fact that the individual feel that he or she gets advertising emails too often, which can be seen as spam. The sample for this study is not enough to generalize for the entire Swedish population, but still, the random sample that was used for this study showed an obvious result. The results can therefore be interesting for organizations, and some arguments for what the Swedish consumer’s attitude towards permission-based email advertising is can be made.

5.2 CAB-model of attitudes

This part aims to answer research question number two, which correlation is there between the three components; cognition, affection and behavior? Bohner and Wänke (2002) claim that attitudes cause our behavior, but lately, studies concluded that the cognitive component also matters to the total attitude. Andersson et al., (2015) also consider individuals’ attitudes to be directly linked to behavior but explains that these components do not necessarily have to be attached to each other. They claim it is possible for an attitude not to contain all three components, so an attitude can solely be cognitive or emotive. In this study, the total attitude is investigated to see if any clear correlations between these three components could be identified. The results differ from question to question and eight interesting correlations are analyzed in the following paragraphs, with a theoretical basis.

5.2.1 Cognition - Affection

Bohner and Wänke (2002) claim that previous research about the relation between attitudes and behavior has given different results. Bohner and Wänke (2002) describe that some results showed an obvious correlation, while other results showed that it was hard to find any link between the two components. Bohner and Wänke (2002) further argue that nowadays, cognition is described as a variable, which we should take into consideration while examining the total attitude towards a subject. When examining the connection between the components in this study, results showed that the highest correlation number is the correlation between the components cognition and affection with 0,746, see table 5.

When looking at the response to if advertising emails are inspiring and if it is appreciated, we find a high correlation number, 0,681, see annex 2. The result indicates a high correlation between the two components cognition and affection. The respondents’ outlook towards if advertising emails are inspiring, has a similar outlook to if they appreciate receiving advertising
emails. The two questions are quite similar to each other, and it would have been a little odd if the responders, who find it inspiring to receive advertising emails, did not appreciate to receive them. This is important to keep in mind while looking at the results.

Falkheimer (2001) claims that people are controlled both by emotional and meaning, cognition and affection, which means it is impossible to differentiate the two components. The results from this study support Falkheimer’s (2001) statement and we can see a high correlation between the two components with 0,587, see annex 2. The two questions in this correlation differs a bit from the questions in the other chosen seven correlations. The two chosen questions might have an impact on each other. It is possible that the respondents who chose a high number on the Likert-scale, find email advertising as rewarding and inspiring because the emails are directed towards a person, unlike other advertising on social media. This sort of questions might affect the results and might therefore not indicate a relation between the two components. These two questions do not necessarily correspond to cognition and affection. The fact that an email is directed towards a person might be a factor to why the respondents are positive towards it, instead of describing the component. But, the results of this study supports Falkheimer’s (2001) statement.

The highest correlation of the eight chosen correlations is the number 0,690, which you can see in annex 2. The correlation is between the question to if the respondents consider email advertising as a good way to take advantage of valuable offers, and the question if the respondents appreciate receiving advertising emails. The results indicate a high correlation, which also supports Falkheimer (2001) statement regarding that people are controlled by both emotional and meaning. These, who consider email advertising as a great way of taking advantage of valuable offers, also appreciate receiving advertising emails, or the opposite. This correlation might have the same issue as the correlation above, where the questions are quite similar. It would be a little odd if the people, who consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers, did not appreciate receiving the emails.

There is an interesting correlation between two questions, which are each other's opposite. The correlation is between whether if the respondents feel that advertising emails are annoying or inspiring. Since these two are each other's opposite, you might think that the correlation between them would be quite high. The responders who agree to if advertising emails are annoying, would most probably not agree to that it is inspiring. The correlation shows a number of 0,541, which is medium high, see annex 1. The result shows that even if email advertising is annoying, it can still be inspiring. Previous research has examined why the attitude towards
email advertising is mostly negative and found that the respondents feel that they receive advertising emails too often. This might have something to do with this study's results, it is possible that the respondents feel it can be inspiring, but is still annoying because of the number of emails that are sent. This number still indicates a correlation between the components and supports Falkheimer (2001) statement, that people are controlled both by emotional and meaning, cognition and affection.

5.2.2 Affection - Behavior

When looking at the correlation between whether if the responders find it annoying to receive advertising emails and if they delete the emails without opening them, we get a correlation number of 0.407, see annex 2. The highest correlation falls under number 5 on each question, which we can see in annex 2. This means that the people who chose number 5 on the Likert-scale, to whether they feel that advertising email is annoying or not, also chose number 5 to if they delete the emails without opening them. Andersson et al., (2014) found in their study that there is a negative attitude towards email advertising, and that attitude affects future behavior. Their study showed that people delete advertising emails without opening them, which goes well along with this study's results. Number 5 on the Likert-scale is the highest alternative and means that the responder totally agrees with the statement. Since number 5 in the table has no yellow staple, it means that a majority of the respondents chose number 5 on both questions. It is interesting to see a medium high correlation between these two since we can see that this study's result and Andersson et al., (2014) results, points at a high correlation between affection and behavior. The expectations were probably to find an even higher correlation between these two components. If a person feels that email advertising is annoying, there is a quite big chance of he or she deleting the email without opening it.

The correlation between respondents that often delete emails without opening them and respondents who feel email advertising as annoying is 0.407, see annex 2. This shows an interesting correlation and means that even if a person does not find it annoying to receive advertising emails, they might just as well delete it without opening it. Bohner and Wänke (2002) writes that previous research shows different results regarding the relation between attitude and behavior. They mean that some results show that the connection is obvious, and other results show the opposite. Some results of this study show no clear relation between the attitude and behavior. Even if a person does not find it annoying to receive an advertising email, they might as well delete it either way. Due to the results showing both a high correlation between the two components, and a lower connection between them, it might be difficult to know if the fact that
the respondents find it annoying to receive advertising emails, is the reason to why they delete it, or not. Since we can see that the respondents who disagree to if advertising emails are annoying, still quite agree to if they delete them without opening them, it might be possible that they delete it for other reasons.

Further one example showing a correlation between affection and behavior is regarding if the respondents find it annoying to receive advertising emails, and if they often use the hyperlink in the email to go to the company's website. The results show that if they feel it is annoying to receive advertising emails, they highly never use the hyperlink to visit the company's website. This result supports Andersson et al., (2014) results regarding attitude have affection on an individual’s behavior. The results also show that if they do not feel it as annoying, they sometimes use the hyperlink. This concrete example further supports Andersson et al., (2014) results regarding that attitude has an impact on an individual's behavior and shows that since they do not feel it is annoying, they are more interested in the emails and want to read more. The correlation number, 0.400 is medium high, so the identified correlation overall does not totally support Andersson et al., (2014) results regarding the connection between the affection and behavior.

5.2.3 Cognition - Behavior

In table 17 below, you can see a summary with correlations between the components in total. The table shows number 0.452 as a correlation between the component cognition and the component behavior, which means it is a medium high correlation.

The SPSS table, see annex 1, shows a medium high correlation with 0.471 between the respondents who consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers and those who use the hyperlink in the emails to visit the company’s website. The correlation between respondents who believe email advertising is inspiring and then use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website, is also a medium high correlation number with 0.446, see annex 2. This study does not indicate an obvious correlation between cognition and behavior. The respondents’ answers show they can consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers, but still not visit the website for further information. This could be a problem for the organizations sending these emails if they are hoping and wanting the consumers to use their hyperlink. Bohner and Wänke (2002) claim previous studies concluded that cognitive processes matter to the overall attitude. Falkheimer’s (2001) on the other hand, states that behavior is not direct linked to the other components, he explains,
because you know something is dangerous, like cigarettes, you might choose to smoke anyway. This partly supports our findings. The correlation between the components is still medium-high, but not convincing. Just because you appreciate valuable offers, do not automatically lead you to buy the product.

5.2.4 Summary

A lot of correlations between the components have been found, some with high correlation, others with medium-high correlation. The findings of this study indicate a high correlation between the components cognition and affection, with a correlation number 0.746. Table 17 below shows a summary of correlations between the three components. Based on the results of this study, we say that if you have a belief towards something, in this case email advertising, it is directly linked to your emotions towards it. This in turn, partly affects the respondents’ behavior. The examples above show some of the respondents feel it rewarding and interesting to receive offers by email advertising, but would not because of the email visit the company’s website or buy something in their shop. This is interesting to pay attention to and make companies who use email advertising aware of. Is there something special in these emails that does not appeal to the consumers, or is it possible they just feel they receive too many advertising emails? As previously mentioned, the respondents’ answers in general, show a negative overall attitude.

Medium high correlations, with correlation number around 0.538, were dominated by the components affection and behavior. Consumers’ emotion in this study, partly affects their acting towards email advertising. In some cases, it shows a higher correlation between the components, while in other cases they are not related at all. The lowest correlation between the components is between cognition and behavior with a correlation number of 0.455, which in this study indicates that it is not an obvious correlation between these components. It is still a correlation, but not a convincing one. To sum up, the analysis primarily shows a high correlation between cognition and affection, but also partly between these two along with behavior. Since some of the questions regarding behavior, unfortunately, can be perceived as misleading, it is based on the results of this study, not fair to make a statement saying that the correlation between cognition and behavior, or, affection and behavior, is lower than between cognition and affection. Results of this research indicate that correlations between these three components exist.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Affection</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affection</strong></td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.538**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Correlation between the three components.

5.3 Prensky’s generation theory

At the following part, research question number three is analyzed and answered: *Does the consumers’ attitude match with Prensky’s theory regarding the different digital use based on generations?* To respond to this question, the average value of responses on each question has been taking into account. Table 15 and 16, from *Findings*, is the basis for the following part and it is recommended to have a look at table 15 and 16 while reading.

Prensky (2012) argues that different generations have different digital use and digital skills. He claims that those born after the year 1980 were born into the digital world and are used to computers and the Internet. This generation he named *digital natives*. Further, he argues that those born before the year 1980 must adjust to the digital world, and therefore are having a harder time using it. This generation he named *digital immigrants*. When examine this by the sample of this study, some results support the theory, and some results point at a different direction and are contradictory.

5.3.1 Supporting

The result of 10 out of 17 questions supports Prensky's theory. The average number of responses to these questions differs more or less in each question. When asking the respondents if they believe email advertising is inspiring, the digital natives have a higher average number than the digital immigrants, which concurs with Prensky's theory. The result also points at the same direction as Andersson et al., (2014) conclusion that the attitude towards email advertising
differs depending on ages. When looking more carefully at the different ages at the age table, the result is a bit different. The youngest age and the oldest age have a very similar number, 2,33 and 2,31. The table shows that age 46+, which belongs to digital immigrants, find it more inspiring than age 26-35, which belongs to digital natives. This result does not support Prensky’s theory, but when the average numbers are put together, according to digital natives and digital immigrants, the result is 2,31 and 2,17. This shows that the digital natives find it more positive than the digital immigrants, which supports the theory. It is clear that age 36-45 affects the results at the digital immigrants. As mentioned before, it is important to keep in mind that the number of responses was the lowest at this age. Therefore, the results might be misleading.

This kind of results, where table 16 supports the theory when table 15 shows different results, is recurrent in a lot of questions. Digital natives have a higher average number to whether email advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards an individual, but the difference is not predominant. The result at table 15 indicates a different result. When dividing the ages into smaller groups, the results actually shows that age 46+ has a higher average number than age 18-25, and in the middle of this is age 26-35 with an average number of 2,74. This result is a mix and does not match with Prensky’s theory at all. Prensky (2012) argues that the digital natives have an easier way to handle the digital world, while the digital immigrants have a hard time to adjust. According to this result, age 46+, which belongs to the digital immigrants, has a higher average number than age 18-25, the digital natives. These two ages are the youngest and the oldest, and according to Prensky’s theory, the results ought to show the opposite. This type of question is regarding the digital world, and even if the respondents do not agree to this statement, it does not necessarily mean that they are negative towards the digital world. The results might as well indicate that the respondents prefer advertising on social media, which is regarding the digital world as well. Therefore, the result does not indicate that the younger generation, digital natives, are more positive towards the digital world than the digital immigrants.

The majority of respondents feel that email advertising is annoying. With a limit of 2,5, the average numbers are markedly above the limit. When looking closer at the division of ages, the results indicate a similar opinion of all ages, besides age 36-45, which is a lot higher. Prensky (2012) argues that the digital natives easily can multitask with different digital techniques and receive information, but the result from this study indicates that email advertising also bothers the digital natives. According to table 16, showing the difference between the digital natives and the digital immigrants, the results partly supports Prensky’s theory. Prensky (2012) argues for a
difference between the generations, which the result shows. But as mentioned above, the results
also indicate that the digital natives are bothered by the emails, the digital world, which they
should not be according to Prensky. Also, when looking closer at the division of ages, results
show a similar opinion of all ages, besides the age of 36-45. When adding these together, it is
clear that the high average number of age 36-45 increase the total average number of the digital
immigrants. So, according to the age table, the result does not really support the theory, since
age 46+ has an average number, almost as high as age 18-25 and 26-35.

If it is annoying to receive advertising emails along with private emails, the results showed a
high average number at each age. When looking at the digital natives and the digital
immigrants, the results are quite similar; the difference is not markedly high, which we can see
in table 16. Still, the digital immigrants have a higher average number than the digital natives,
which shows a difference between them, which supports Prensky's theory. However, the
difference is not convincing, but since Prensky's theory is regarding the digital world in whole,
it is difficult to argue that the result contradicts to his theory. There is, however a study made by
Andersson et al., (2014), which indicates that the attitude towards email advertising is affected
by age and work position. This study aims to try Prensky’s theory in the context of email
advertising, and based on the generation table, the results support the theory, and according to
the age table, the results contradict.

According to Prensky (2012), the digital natives easily multitask while using the digital world.
When asking the respondents if the often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company's
website, results showed that the digital natives use it more often than the digital immigrants.
Even when looking closer at the division of ages, results indicate the same. With a limit of 2,5,
both generations are below. Since Prensky (2012) argues that the digital natives easily multitask
when using the digital world, it might be possible to expect a higher average number to the
digital natives. Also here, the results from the two generations are quite similar, which does not
support Prensky’s generation theory. Prensky (2012) also claims that the different generations
different digital use is a society issue. He describes that teachers and students speaks different
languages and use the Internet in different ways.

Another result from this study, points out that the digital immigrants find it more stressful to
always be available for mailshots, than the digital natives. It differs quite a lot between these
generations, but it differs quite a lot between the four age groups as well. When looking closer
to the age groups responses, we can see that age group 46+ is more negative than age group 18-
25. This finding goes along with Prensky’s theory and also supports Andersson et al., (2014)
results, where the age 40-49 were more negative than the younger response group. Andersson et al., (2014) further believe this is because the younger people were more used to the Internet.

5.3.2 Contradictory

Helsper and Enyon (2009) criticize Prensky’s generation theory and consider it to be other things, which determine if a person is a ‘digital native’ or a ‘digital immigrant’. According to them, breadth of use, experience, self-efficacy and education, are factors that explain how people become digital natives. Based on Prensky’s generation division, 7 out of 17 questions from this study’s survey contradict his theory. Two of these questions, number 11 and 16, show exactly the same average number of digital natives and digital immigrants. This shows their digital use do not differ, which it based on Prensky’s generations theory, should do.

The difference between the average values of the four age groups is greater. At question number 11, age group 18-25 and age group 26-36 have the same average number, while it differs a lot more in the other two age groups. Question number 16, indicates a bigger difference between the age groups. The two middle age groups show a lower probability of opening advertising emails than the youngest and the oldest, even if the respondents, in general, shows a low opening frequency.

Another result of this study, which contradicts to Prensky’s generation theory, is question 19. Results shows a smaller difference between the generations behavior concerning whether they visit a product selling company’s website or shop because of the advertising email. The group of people Prensky calls the digital natives, are however less likely to visit the company’s website or shop, than the digital immigrants. The digital natives have an average number above the limit of 2,5, and the digital immigrants an average number below the limit. This indicates a positive attitude from the digital natives, which supports Prensky’s generation theory.

The average value differs a bit between the age groups. Half of the digital natives are less likely to visit and shop from the sender of the advertising email, than the other half. This increases the credibility Bayne and Ross (2007) claims, that it is a dangerous opposition to discuss Prensky’s theory. They further argue for other factors that matter, like background, age and gender and believe it is not possible to compare these two big generations to each other. Based on results of this study, regarding attitudes and behavior towards email advertising, we can see that year of birth in is not enough to generalize a large generation division.
5.3.3 Summary

So, can we apply Prensky’s theory when looking at Swedish consumers’ attitude towards email advertising? Prensky (2012) argues that different generations have different digital use and digital skills, which the majority of the result of this study shows. The result indicates that 7 out of 17 questions has an average value that shows that the digital immigrants are more open to email advertising than the digital natives. The result from these 7 questions, contradicts to Prensky’s theory. Out of 17 questions, 10 questions show that the digital natives are more open and positive to email advertising than digital immigrants, which supports Prensky’s theory. So if this study only had based its results from table 16, the results would indicate that Prensky’s generation theory is applicable, also when looking at the attitude towards email advertising. But since the ages were divided into smaller groups, the result does not really match. The results from table 15 in Findings indicate a different result.

The result shows a mix of average values with both high and low values from different age groups. For example, age 46+ often shows more openness to the usage of advertising emails than respondents from age group 18-25, while age 36-45 has a very negative response. When this happens, the response from age 36-45 lowers the average number of the digital immigrants. This makes their average number lower than the digital natives, even if age 18-25 actually had a lower average number than age 46+. As previously mentioned, the number of responses from age 36-45 differs markedly from the other ages and is a lot lower. There is reason to believe that this indicates a misleading result, but the result shows a lot of examples where age group 46+ or 36-45 is more open to the usage of advertising emails than the younger generation. Based on the result from this study, we have reason to believe that a division of digital natives and digital immigrants is too general. As Jonkman (2011) claims, even if we have hypotheses, it is still important to be responsive to human individuals’ differences. The finding of this study agrees with Jonkman’s statement, generalization may be true of some, but certainly not of all. Also, previous research indicates that different factors, like experience or background, also matter. When dividing the ages into smaller groups, the results of this study do not support Prensky's generation theory. This result concurs with previous research in the area of Prensky’s generation theory (Bayne and Ross, 2007; Helsper and Enyon, 2009; Jonkman, 2011).
6 Conclusions

The first research question this thesis aims to answer is: *What is the Swedish consumers’ total attitude towards permission-based email advertising from product selling organizations?* The responses from the survey in this study were dominated by negative attitudes toward permission-based email advertising from product selling organizations. Although the findings show general negative attitudes, there were some positive responses. A sample of individuals for this study can consider email advertising as a great way of taking advantage of valuable offers, but still have a negative attitude towards it. The findings show that more than half of the respondents think they get permission-based email advertising too often. The fact that the respondents feel they receive email advertising too often and experience it as spam, might therefore be the reason for why the negative attitude occurs.

The second research question that has been investigated is: *Which correlation is there between the three components: cognition, affection and behavior?* Several correlations between the components have been identified, with both high and medium high correlations. The highest correlation is between cognition and affection, which means the respondent’s beliefs towards email advertising, is directly linked to their emotions towards it. Further, this partly affects the respondents’ behavior regarding email advertising. Medium high correlations were found between the components affection and behavior, and also cognition and behavior. This means, consumers’ emotions and cognitions partly affect their behavior regarding email advertising, which does not indicate a convincing correlation between these components.

The third research question this thesis had is: *Does the consumers’ attitude match with Prensky’s theory regarding the different digital use based on generations?* The results partly show a difference between digital natives and digital immigrants attitude towards permission-based email advertising. When summarizing the digital natives and the digital immigrants’ responses, the results partly math with the theory. In this study, 10 out of 17 questions showed indicate that digital natives were more positive towards the usage of email advertising. But since this study made a more carefully division of ages, and based the results on four age groups instead of two, the result does not match with the theory. Results from this study indicate a mix of responses when sometimes age 46+ is more positive towards the subject than age 18-25.

So, the conclusion of this study is that based on the CAB-model and the sample of this study, there is, in general, a negative attitude towards permission-based email advertising. There is
also partly a correlation between all three components, but most between cognition and affection. The attitude towards permission-based email advertising does not match with Prensky's generation theory, according to the sample of this study. The division of generations needs to be narrowed down since results from only looking at the two generations are misleading. The sample for this study is not enough to generalize for the entire Swedish population but can be used as a pilot study with a random selection of Swedish consumers based on our network.

6.1 This study’s contribution

The result of this study goes well along with previous research, showing a negative attitude towards email advertising. However, the results from this study were not as negative as the majority of previous research, which might have to do with the examination of permission-based emails. This study fills the gap in previous research regarding the attitude towards email advertising, by contributing with a wider knowledge of the Swedish consumers’ attitude towards permission-based email advertising. The results of this study contradict to Prensky's theory and thereby contribute to a different way of looking at people’s different use of advertising emails. Product selling organizations can learn that even with permission-based email advertising, a general negative attitude often occurs. This might be important for them to continuing working with. We also learned that different ages handle the digital world different, which may be something that the product selling organizations should keep in mind while sending the emails. Would it be a good idea to adjust the emails for the consumer? We would argue that they should have a look at different factors, which is crucial for a negative attitude, and also see if it is possible to adjust the advertising emails for different ages. To know how to adjust the emails, further investigations needs to be done.

6.2 Suggestions for further research

To be able to generalize the results, this study could be done with a lot wider and more strategically chosen sample. This study has a division of four age groups, and it would be interesting to make even smaller groups and see if the results differ even more. It would also be interesting to include the younger age, for example, the age of 10-18 in the study, and see how the results differ between the age 10-18 and the older groups. Previous research investigates if other factors matters for the attitude and results show several examples, like the number of emails. It would be interesting to examine this but focus on permission-based emails. This
would help the companies behind the emails to know why there is a negative attitude. Another example that is discussed in previous research is the way gender affects the usage of the digital world. This would be interesting to investigate along with Prensky’s age theory.

Another suggestion for further studies is to make a similar study with the same focus, but with a qualitative method including longer interviews with several consumers that receive permission-based email advertising. It would then be possible to ask an open question and get a detailed answer. It would be interesting to interview all kind of ages to see the difference, not only digital natives and digital immigrants. Would the study’s results and conclusions differ a lot if this study solely were made with a qualitative method?
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Annex 1 – SPSS Table

The table below shows the correlation between the survey’s questions. Higher number means higher correlation. Each correlation number is marked with one, two or no asterisk. No asterisk means the correlation number is not statistically proved, and therefore not trustworthy. Two asterisk means the correlation number is highly statistically proved. The highest correlation number is 1.0, and lowest 0. It can also be a minus, which means one of the questions has a negative approach and thereby indicates a negative correlation. The correlation is still the same.

The eight chosen correlations are marked with a light red color.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question's Title</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Addenda</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*
Annex 2 – Eight correlations

When looking at the SPSS table, we have one question vertical, and the other question horizontally. Along with the questions, there is a number from 1-5, which corresponds to the likert-scale. The yellow staples show the width of responses and which number at the likert-scale the respondents chose on the question vertical and the question horizontal. If the yellow staple is small, and for example placed between numbers 1-3, it means that the majority of responses fell on number 1 at the question vertical and number 3 at the question horizontal. If the yellow staple is tall, it indicates that the spread of responses was wider, and thereby it indicates a lower correlation between the two questions.

The places where there is no yellow staple, indicates a high correlation. There are a few marks, which show where some respondents replied, but the thick line is the one we ought to pay attention to. The thick line shows where on the scale the majority of responses fell. Also each yellow staple has a thick line, and for that there is the same explanation. The yellow staple indicates the spread of responses, while the thick line on top of the staple, or in the bottom of the staple, shows where the majority of responses fell. When looking at the thick line, both in the staples or where there is no staple, we can see that they either creates an increasing line or the opposite, reading from the right. This line means that there is a correlation between the questions. For example, if a respondent chose number five to if it is annoying to receive advertising emails, he or she chose number one to if it is inspiring. Another respondent chose number 4 to if it is annoying, and number 2 to if it is inspiring. And then the pattern continues and makes it possible to draw a line from the thick line at the beginning to the thick line at the end.

I often delete advertising emails without opening them
I feel e-mail advertising as annoying

I feel e-mail advertising as annoying
I often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website
I believe e-mail advertising is inspiring

I often use the hyperlink in the email to visit the company’s website

I feel e-mail advertising is annoying

I consider e-mail advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers

I feel e-mail advertising as rewarding and interesting

I believe e-mail advertising is enjoyable since it is directed towards me, unlike advertising on social media
I appreciate to receive permission-based advertising emails. I believe email advertising is inspiring. I consider email advertising as a great way to take advantage of valuable offers.