



International MSc in Business Administration - Major in Marketing

In-store Buying Behaviour

Memories of Forgotten Needs

Amrita Dilipkumar Ranchhod Kanabar

ADVISORS: ANA ISABEL DE ALMEIDA COSTA

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of International MSc in Business Administration at Católica-Lisbon, School of Business & Economics

September 2012

AKNOWLEDGMENTS

“A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step” – Confucius

I would like to express my gratitude to my academic supervisor, Doutora Ana Isabel Costa, whose expertise, patience and support in all phases of this master’s dissertation added considerable value to its final quality. Without her motivation and encouragement I would not have considered a graduate career in research.

I would also like to show my appreciation to all my friends that are present in my life, and in particular I must acknowledge Filipa Marques for the help and energy transmitted and, Mitul Kanji, whose support vastly contributed during my thesis.

Above all, I would like to thank to the most important people in my life – my Family, specially my Mum and Dad for the patience and help given during my academic path. Without them, I would not be where I stand today. Therefore, I dedicate this dissertation to them.

In conclusion, I recognize that this research would not have been possible without the financial support of Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, through the Research Assistant Grant UNICEE-103929-BI5 and the Research Project FCT-103929/2008, and of a Portuguese retail company that wishes to remain anonymous.

ABSTRACT

In-store Buying Behaviour *Memories of Forgotten Needs*

Amrita Kanabar

This study aims to better illustrate in-store buying behaviour, in terms of how different stimuli activate parts of shoppers' brains to remember items that were not part of their shopping plans. The aim is to shed some light on shopper's attitudes and reactions towards national brands or private labels, the impact of loyalty cards on cardholders' shopping decisions, how shoppers with company behave differently than solo shoppers, and on the role of consumers' hedonic and utilitarian motivations in determining shopping behaviour.

In order to conduct the analysis proposed on this dissertation, it was used a set of primary data from a study that covered all stages of the consumer decision-making process. Research showed that while shoppers tend to plan their trips, the difference is marginal. Study of unplanned shopping revealed that choices tend to favour national brands. Loyalty cardholders are also revealed to favour national brands. Among those shopping with company, the study found that couples plan their trips more than shoppers who go with their children, extended family or friends. Finally, consumers with hedonic motivations were found to make more in-store purchases than shoppers with utilitarian motivations.

The results provide important insights for retailers and manufacturers, allowing them to price their products optimally, drive more effective promotions, segment their customers more precisely, and manage their brands and positioning better. A better understanding of shopper's motivations can help retailers provide better shopping experiences for customers. Ultimately, these actions can result in increased footfall, market share and profits.

SUMÁRIO

In-store Buying Behaviour *Memories of Forgotten Needs*

Amrita Kanabar

Este estudo procura ilustrar melhor o comportamento dos consumidores dentro dos espaços de retalho, em termos da forma como diferentes estímulos afectam partes do cérebro dos compradores, lembrando-os de produtos que não estavam na lista de compras original. O objectivo é clarificar as atitudes e reações dos compradores face a produtos de marca de referência ou de marca branca, o impacto dos cartões de desconto nas decisões de compra, a forma como compradores que vêm acompanhados agem de forma diferente dos que vêm sozinhos, e no papel das motivações utilitárias ou hedónicas em determinar o comportamento dos clientes. No intuito de conseguir responder às questões colocadas nesta dissertação, foram utilizados um conjunto de dados primários recolhido de um estudo que abrangeu todas as fases do processo de tomada de decisão do consumidor. A pesquisa mostrou-nos que embora os compradores tendam a planear as suas visitas e compras, a diferença é marginal. Este estudo de compras não planeadas revelou que as escolhas tendem a favorecer os produtos de marca de referência. Clientes com cartão de desconto também preferem este tipo de produtos. Entre os clientes que visitam os espaços acompanhados, o estudo revelou que os casais tendem a planear mais as suas compras do que clientes que visitam acompanhados dos seus filhos, amigos ou outros familiares. Por fim, clientes com motivações hedónicas tendem a fazer mais compras não planeadas do que clientes com motivações utilitárias.

O estudo sugere também formas de utilizar esta informação da melhor forma. Os resultados revelam conclusões interessantes para retalhistas e produtores, permitindo-lhes otimizar os seus preços, tornar as suas promoções mais eficazes, segmentar os clientes com maior precisão, e gerir melhor as suas marcas e posicionamento. Ao compreenderem melhor as motivações dos seus clientes, os retalhistas podem proporcionar experiências melhores. Estas ações podem resultar em mais vistas aos espaços de retalho, maiores quotas de mercado e lucros superiores.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. Background and problem statement.....	6
1.2. Aims and scope.....	9
1.3. Methodology.....	10
1.4. Relevance and implications.....	10
1.5. Dissertation outline.....	12
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	13
2.1. Consumer decision-making.....	13
2.2. In-store buying behaviour.....	14
2.3. Determinants of in-store buying behaviour.....	15
2.3.1 Product category characteristics.....	15
2.3.2 Retail marketing activities.....	16
2.3.3. Customer Characteristics.....	18
2.3.4 Shopping trip characteristics.....	20
2.4. Main Conclusions.....	23
2.5. Research Hypotheses.....	26
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	29
3.1 Research purpose and approach.....	29
3.2 Research strategy and method.....	29
3.3 Study Design.....	29
3.3.1 Population and Sample.....	29
3.3.2 Data collection.....	31
3.4 Data analysis.....	34
3.4.1 Assessment of purchase intentions.....	34
3.4.2 Assessment of shopping trip motivations and plans.....	34
3.4.3 Assessment of planned and in-store purchase decisions.....	34
3.4.4 Assessment of National Brands vs. Private Labels.....	34
3.4.5 Loyalty Cards Usage.....	35
3.4.6 Accompanied vs. Alone Shopping Trip.....	35
3.4.7 Utilitarian and Hedonic Motivations.....	35
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	37
4.1. In-store buying behaviour.....	37
4.2. In-store buying behaviour at brand level.....	38
4.3. Effect of Loyalty Card ownership.....	39
4.4. Accompanied Shopping vs. Alone Shopping Trip.....	40
4.5. Utilitarian vs. Hedonic Shopping Motivations.....	42
4.6. Conclusions.....	43
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS	44
5.1. Conclusions and implications.....	44
5.2. Limitations.....	46

5.3. Directions for future research.....	47
--	----

REFERENCES	49
Annex 1 - Practical details of the study (n=156).....	54
Annex 2 - Supermarket sections selected	54
Annex 3 - Supermarket product categories list	55
Annex 4 - Recruitment of participants.....	56
Annex 5 - Interview at store entrance	56
Annex 6 - Interview at store exit.....	58
Annex 7 - Self-administred questionnaire	60

LITS OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 - The ICA (Ida às Compras Acompanhada) data collection technique	31
---	----

LITS OF TABLES

Table 2.1 - Factors influencing in-store buying behaviour.....	24
Table 3.1 - Socio-demographic of the study sample (n=156).....	30
Table 3.2 - Measures of utilitarian and hedonic motivations.....	36
Table 4.1 - Mean differences between the percentage of in-store purchases of national brands and private labels (n=156)	38
Table 4.2 - Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases of national brands and private labels in Euros (n=156).....	39
Table 4.3 - Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases for national brands and private labels across consumers who have a loyalty card (n=137).....	40
Table 4.4 - Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases across accompanied vs. solo shoppers (n=156)	40
Table 4.5 - Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases between participants shopping with spouses and the remaining participants shopping accompanied (n=78).....	41
Table 4.6 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases (%) across consumers with utilitarian and hedonic motivations (n=156).....	42
Table 4.7 - Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases (€) across consumers with utilitarian and hedonic motivations (n=156).....	42
Table 4.8 – Summary of the research hypotheses.....	43

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and problem statement

Grocery shopping is a universal aspect that characterizes modern society. When entering a store, consumers are presented with countless sensory stimuli that help them make decisions among the variety of products available. More often than not, the set of incentives available inside the store can make consumers remember, or even reconsider, what they came to buy. Consequently, many purchase decisions may result from in-store activation of consumption needs or desires that did not exist prior to the shopping trip. Indeed, there seems to be a real opportunity to influence consumer choices at the point of purchase. According to POPAI (POPAI, 1995), more than two-thirds of all purchase decisions involve some level of in-store decision-making, consisting in what is typically called unplanned buying behaviour (Buckling & Lattin, 1991).

Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004) proposed a model of unplanned grocery buying that included several determinants and was consisted of four procedural stages: The first stage involved consumers entering the store and be exposed to several categories and displays which were influenced by some “contextual factors”, mainly trip type, number of aisles shopped, trip type and purchase involvement. Consumers then, generated motivational process for the in-store stimuli encountered, which are moderated by factors such as deal proneness, age, need for cognition and time pressure. When the stimuli encountered affected the decision of the consumer, the need to buy a product of a certain category was acquiesced, whether or not the consumer had planned initially to buy the product. The last stage was composed of the outcome of the decision making process, that is, the categories purchased – both those that were planned prior to entering the store and the ones occurred in-store. This comprehensive framework simultaneously incorporates the effects of product category, individual shopper and shopping trip features. An survey study employing this framework to assess in-store decision making in US grocery stores showed how variables like in-store displays, category hedonism, shopping habits, familiarity with the store, length and path of the shopping trip, gender, household size and social influences, can influence the decisions made inside the store. Similarly, Bell, Corsten & Knox (2011) have recently investigated how three groups of factors – consumer demographics and shopping habits, store environment features and shopping trip goals – may determine the number of unplanned categories present in the grocery shopping basket. The results of their consumer panel study show, however, that

unplanned buying is only partially explained by consumer demographics and shopping habits. The specific characteristics of each shopping trip, which encompass prior shopping experiences, in-store cues and shopping goals play, according to these authors, at least an equally influential role in explaining in-store decision making.

In light of the recent economic crisis, consumers have been forced to make sacrifices, carefully adapting to the circumstances by being more cost conscious (Groceryheadquarters.com, 2011). Retailers are thus forced to adapt to the increased price sensitivity and find new solutions to keep consumers interested in visiting the stores. One of the strategies is to invest further in the sales of private labels. Private labels are developed by various manufacturers and sold under the retailer's brand name, and are opposed to national brands that are sold under the manufacturer's own brand name (Raju et al., 1995). Private labels are often referred as private labels; however they are fully managed by a specific chain of stores. Data revealed by a recent study conducted by AC Nielsen (2010) indicates that the sales of private labels in Portugal are growing at about 6% annually, whereas national brands fall by 2.6%. A study conducted by APED (2009) showed that Portuguese consumers have already started to change their shopping habits, by buying smaller sized packaged products, seeking for lower prices and discounts, and buying private labels more often.

In spite of the growing relevance of private labels in the retail industry, no studies have yet focused on the relationship between these brands and in-store decision-making. For instance, by knowing whether or not private labels are more or less preferred by consumers who make mostly in-store purchase decisions, retailers may be able to concentrate on developing innovative products and, better position products in shelves and on augmented attributes like "health promotion" or "user-friendliness", in order to increase quality perception. According to some observers, private labels are successful not only because of their lower prices, but also because they increasingly offer good quality products (Karolefski, 1990). As retailers gain more experience in managing their own brands and improve them, national brands began to lose much of their appeal to consumers (Lenchek, 1990). As consumers' trust in the quality of private labels grows, they may become more likely to make more purchase decisions inside the store.

Loyalty card programs are an increasingly important tool for customer relationship management and promotional activities. These programs often offer important product discounts and other type of rewards to card owners, with the aim of increasing store patronage, raise the amount of money currently spent on the brand and attract new customers (Bellizzi & Bristol, 2004).

All the discounts are accumulated in the card and the consumer is entitled to use the money stored in future shopping trips. Card ownership is typically free of charge, with consumers having to provide some limited personal information in exchange. Not much is known about whether card holders make more in-store buying decisions than the non-card holders, who are not entitled to receive a discount and have to pay the regular price (Weinstein, 1999). By knowing whether the cardholders or non-card holders conduct their decisions inside the store, it will be possible to better understand if the retailers are using the loyalty cards as an effective marketing tool or merely as an electronic discount tool.

A recent study conducted by POPAI (2011) indicates that shopping trips and their outcomes may depend heavily on the size and composition of the shopping party. Namely, it shows that solo shoppers are more likely to spend more than those shopping with friends or family. In contrast, Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009) did not find a significant relationship between spending and shopping party size. Solo and accompanied shoppers may share the same purchase goals at store entrance, but once inside the store they may conduct their shopping trip differently as a result of social influences. According to POPAI (2012), it seems that accompanied shoppers tend to stick more to what is really necessary than solo one, even in the presence of family or peer pressure, particularly if they shop with the aid of a written shopping list. However, according to Kahn & McAlister (1997), accompanied shoppers tend to shop longer and cover more store space than solo shoppers, which may in fact increase their spending. These contradictions highlight the importance of studying further the effects of shopping trip party size on in-store decision-making. Besides size, the composition of the shopping trip party may also play an important role. It is known that reference groups can influence how information is processed by an individual and, consequently, their purchase decisions (Netemeyer & Teel, 1989). According to Bearden & Etzel (1982), the products and brands selected by each individual may indeed be influenced by the opinions of their reference groups. Nevertheless, the potential effects of different compositions of the shopping trip party on in-store decisions remains a rather understudied topic.

Consumers may have different goals and motivations when conducting their shopping trips. According to Cardoso & Pinto (2010), purchase motivations can be broadly divided into two groups: utilitarian and hedonic. Consumers with utilitarian motivations employ a more rational approach to their shopping activities and derive little fun or enjoyment from a particular shopping trip (Babin et al., 1994). In contrast, hedonic shopping involves impulsive and enthusiastic motivations felt during the shopping trip, and the creation of close relationships with products and particularly brands (Hirschman & Holbrock, 1982). Prior

studies have looked into how unplanned purchases can be motivated or inhibited by the utilitarian and hedonic character of products or product category. For instance, Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2009) concluded that products from essentially hedonic categories were more susceptible to stimulate unplanned buying than those from utilitarian ones. On the other hand, Wakefield & Inman (2003) examined if the consumers were equally price sensitive when buying with hedonic vs. utilitarian motivations, and whether this was influenced by the social context of the purchase. However, little is known about how the overall hedonic or utilitarian character of a particular shopping trip, rather than of the individual products purchased, influences in-store decision making.

1.2 Aims and scope

- The aim of this dissertation is to study how retailers' marketing and branding activities and shopping trip characteristics influence the occurrence of in-store buying decisions during grocery shopping. In view of this, the following research questions are put forward: Does the preference for private label brands affect the level of consumers' in-store decision making?
- Does ownership of a store loyalty card affect consumers' level of unplanned purchases?
- Do accompanied shoppers make more or less in-store buying decisions than those carrying out their grocery shopping trips alone? And does it matter who exactly is brought along in the shopping trip (e.g. spouse, children, friends, colleagues)?
- How do the overall grocery shopping motivations (utilitarian vs. hedonic) affect the incidence of unplanned purchases?

The research questions proposed will be answered based on primary data collected in a field study, carried out in three large grocery stores of a leading food retailer in Portugal. According to Farhangmehr et al. (2000), hypermarkets and supermarkets are the preferred store format for grocery shopping in Portugal, one of the reasons being that their assortment often includes product categories other than food, personal hygiene and household cleaning products, such as home decoration and home improvement products, books and stationery, sports and outdoors equipment and clothing, among others.

1.3. Methodology

The performance of the field study involved the development of a new method of data collection: the *Ida às Compras Acompanhada* (ICA), or *Accompanied Shopping Trip*. This technique aims to gather data from all the stages of the grocery shopping trip: the pre-shopping phase - which occurs prior to store entrance and where purchase goals, intentions and plans are formulated -, the actual shopping trip, and the post-shopping phase, in which shoppers evaluate the results of their shopping upon leaving the store. This approach combines the advantages of the methods previously employed to study shopping behaviour: *Shopping with Consumers* (Otnes, McGrath & Lowrey, 1995), the POPAI surveys (POPAI, 2009-2010) and the analysis of shopping lists (Spiggle, 1987). One-hundred and fifty-six supermarket shoppers were randomly selected upon entering the store and recruited for an ICA, which included two individual interviews (pre- and post-shopping), the observation of shopping behaviour and answering a self-administered, written questionnaire. The data collected in this way, along with the contents of the corresponding payment receipts was then submitted to statistical analysis.

1.4. Relevance and implications

Retailers have been paying increasing attention to numerous factors that influence purchase decision making inside their stores - such as store image, organization of the passageway, product placement and packaging -, in order to optimize their promotional strategies accordingly (POPAI Europe, 1998). The study of in-store decisions that might lead to planned or unplanned buying has thus important implications for managers and their strategic planning, as well as for academics interested in learning more about consumers' buying decisions and the role play by situational cues in decision-making

Products acquired through supermarket shopping bring value to the consumer by satisfying needs and providing functional benefits and/or psychological satisfaction (Martin, 1998). Consequently, both manufacturers and retailers can more easily optimize their marketing activities and achieve their business goals, if they can learn more about the sources of value shoppers in different segments gain from in-store activities. This knowledge can, for instance, help marketers design new methods to approach shoppers that are more likely to lead to in-store decisions - for instance, the bundling of offers may yield better results for hedonic than for utilitarian oriented consumers. Moreover, given that traditional marketing efforts are becoming less effective (Gretzel, Yuan & Fesenmaier, 2000), marketers should try to increase promotional efforts that helps consumers to make decisions inside the store, like store

coupons, attractive displays, active bundling and multi-unit packaging. Finally, learning about the relative importance of situational and individual factors will help both retailers and manufacturers to better allocate their promotional budgets.

Retailers can benefit with consumers that purchase more private labels since private labels have reduced advertising costs and the marketing of the products is done at the store it-self. Additionally, knowing in which categories private labels are being more consumed, retailers can improve their products and perhaps increase the number of private labels in other categories that are less purchased under this type of brand.

Regarding loyalty cards, retailers can design special promotions to the products that give discounts with the presence of the loyalty card. For instance, consumers that hold a loyalty card and make more decisions inside the store will notice the discounts offered and purchase more products that were initially planned. Consumers will then encourage others to take advantage of the loyalty card and explain the advantages that bring to their shopping experience, which will affect directly the retailers by retaining existing customers, acquire new customers, generate more frequent visits and increase product awareness.

Some consumer prefers to shop alone while other prefer the company of family and friends. Regardless their differences, both type of consumers are different. Even though the stimuli encountered in-store is equal for solo and accompanied shoppers, both have high expectations before entering the store and retailers should develop customize marketing since both type of consumers when interacting with in-store marketing realize a larger mean in spending than those who planned prior to entering the store.

For the consumers who are more hedonically oriented, retailers should stress the emotional side of the shopping experience by developing attractive displays for them. For the highly utilitarian oriented consumers, good price/quality balance, promotions based on price and functionality of the product, emphasize innovations, efficient store organization and comparisons of price and products might be the variables to take more into account.

Taking all of this into account, this dissertation should give a valid contribution to answer a few of the questions retailers might have about how consumers make their choices, in particular when, how and why they engage in in-store buying decisions. The results yielded by it should thus be relevant for the design and planning of store layout, assortment and promotional activities, particularly in the case of Portuguese retailers. They should help retailers become more competitive, achieve higher profits and ultimately increased the satisfaction of its customers.

1.5. Dissertation outline

Chapter 2 provides the outcome of the literature review related to the consumer's buying decisions inside the store. The hypotheses will be derived from the literature and constitute a framework that will guide the implementation of an empirical study. Chapter 3 explains the methodology adopted followed by the Chapter 4 that introduces to the discussions of the results obtained on performance of the data analysis. Finally, Chapter 5 reviews the main conclusions and the relevance and implications of the study conducted. The limitations of the investigation as well as possibilities for further research are also considered on this part.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter starts by presenting a general description of the various types of consumer decision-making processes. A detailed literature review on in-store buying decision and which variables, so far, have accounted for the occurrence of unplanned purchases is next presented. This review is structured according to the conceptual framework used by Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2009) to group the variables that can potential affect in-store buying, which divides them into product, customer and shopping trip characteristics. Based on its results, testable research hypotheses are derived at the end of the chapter.

2.1. Consumer decision-making

Babin & Harris (2009) define three main types of perspectives that can be employed in the study of consumer decision-making processes: the *rational*, *behavioural influence* and *experiential decision making perspective*.

The *rational perspective* proposes that when consumers decide what to buy, they try to incorporate as much information as possible with what they already know about the product, compare the services, features and after weight the positives and negatives of the alternatives to arrive at a satisfactory decision. This process is often associated to the evaluation of the functional or utilitarian value of the purchases. Utilitarian value is derived from the purchase of products or information in a fast and efficient manner, and reflects a less emotional evaluation of the shopping outcome (Babin et al., 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). The *behavioural influence perspective*, on the other hand, suggest that consumers often choose products based mainly on situational cues such as promotional stimuli, store layout features or point of purchase advertising (Babin & Harris, 2009). Finally, the *experiential perspective* suggests that consumer choose products based on the intangible emotional value or appeal they hold to them. In this case, the utility of a product derives from the experience consumers enjoy while buying or using it – the hedonic value - rather than from its functional or utilitarian aspects. As they are here described, all three types of consumer decision making process proposed by Babin & Harris (2009) bear great relevance for the study of in-store decision making in the context of grocery shopping trips.

Solomon (2010), on the other hand, identifies three types of consumer's decisions: The *extended problem solving* corresponds to a traditional decision-making perspective, where more expensive or innovative products are bought and purchases are more infrequent and

entail higher levels of risk and involvement. In this case, consumers take more time and effort searching for and selecting amongst different product offers. In this case, product information can come from internal sources (e.g. previous experiences) and/or external sources (e.g. internet). Each alternative offer is carefully evaluated and the appropriate choices are made to reach the ultimate satisfaction of the consumer. The *limited problem solving* approach, however, is used when consumers use simple decision rules to choose among alternatives. There is less time spent deciding than with the extended problem solving, since there is low amount of risk associated with the purchase as well as a low product involvement. *Habitual decision-making* (or routine decision making) occurs when the choices are made with little to no conscious effort, for low cost products, for frequent purchases and lower involvement. In this case, consumers hardly spend any time searching for and deciding about alternative product offers, they already know what brand and products are more likely to satisfy their needs. This approach to decision making categorizes grocery shopping as a type of habitual decision making process, since consumers are assumed to make in-store decisions mainly based on past purchase behaviour and fairly automated routines. As they are here described, all three types of consumer decision making process proposed by Solomon (2010) do not offer much in terms of providing a valuable account of the process of in-store decision making, as it is carried out in complex environments such as grocery stores.

2.2. In-store buying behaviour

In-store buying decisions can be defined as the set of purchase decisions made exclusively inside the store, that is, which were in no way planned prior to store visit. The result of such in-store buying decisions is also known in literature as unplanned purchases, or unplanned buying behaviour (Park, Iyer & Smith, 1989). Conversely, planned purchases are those which were deliberately planned by shoppers for a particular shopping trip, prior to entering the store (Bucklin & Lattin, 1991).

It is assumed that consumers make in-store decisions mainly as a response to stimuli present in the store environment during the shopping trip, for instance, point of purchase promotional activities, store layout, assortment characteristics, price, among others. These stimuli prompt consumers to consider or remember that there is a need for a certain product category which was not considered at the time when the shopping plans were made (Inman, Winer & Ferraro, 2009). The study of consumer behaviour inside the retail environment aims mainly at the segmentation of customers based on their shopping patterns. (Applebaum, 1951). This can help retailers to better understand consumer responses to the various incentives presented

inside the store, and thus find better solutions to various marketing issues posed by design of the retail space, product placement and positioning. Point-of-purchase marketing strategy and tactics are thus crucially dependent on a good understanding of what factors affect in-store decision-making. In view of this, Kaltcheva & Weitz (2006) suggested that the type of shopping trip can also influence the decisions made inside the store, along the actual shopping paths undertaken by consumers inside the store (Chandon et al. 2002).

2.3. Determinants of in-store buying behaviour

2.3.1 Product category characteristics

Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2009) have recently carried out an insightful study on in-store decision-making. In this study, interviews to 2300 grocery shoppers in 14 U.S. cities were conducted, resulting in a very large cross-sectional purchase data set. The authors argue that consumers make decisions inside the store as a response to the incentives they encounter in the shopping environment. However, they also argue that consumer responses to in-store stimuli should be moderated by a number of category-level and trip-level factors. Their results show that a lower purchase frequency, a higher display advertising intensity and the more pronounced hedonic character of categories all promote unplanned buying.

While shopping, consumers are faced with countless choices between hedonic and utilitarian products. The difference between these two choices is that the first is more driven by emotional desires and the second on cognitive reflections. According to Khan & Dhar (2004) hedonic goods are “multisensory and provide for experimental consumption, fun, pleasure and excitement”. On the other hand, utilitarian goods are “primarily instrumental and their purchases are motivated by functional product aspects”. It is relevant to state that both of hedonic and utilitarian consumption depend on the perception of each consumer. As stated on the study carried by Khan & Dhar (2004), the choices of hedonic vs. utilitarian products are not in between positive and negative choices. Both selections differ on the perception of the consumers.

Shopping dilemmas also arise when consumers have to choose between vices and virtue products (Wertenbroch, 1998). Hui, Bradlow & Fader (2009), for instance, suggest that the purchase of virtue items (e.g. fruits, vegetables) can increase the consumer willingness to purchase vice items (cakes, ice-cream), motivated by impulsive behaviour, and the contrary can also happen, when more vice items are bought, consumers increase the negative self-attribution, and might buy more virtue products, motivated by rational behaviour. As suggested by Ainslie (1975), when consumption is still far away, consumer might have

planned to buy something that will benefit them on the long run, but when the time arrives to make a decision, consumers end up making decisions on the immediate appeal without thinking how it will affect later. This type of contradiction has major implications on the decision-making theory inside the store environment (Read & Loewenstein,1999).

Dhar & Wertenbroch (2004) developed a conceptual integration between hedonic/utilitarian and vice/virtue products and made a research addressing the two origins that, till the date were from different theoretical backgrounds. On their study, first it was described the differences between these two propositions and then demonstrated that they are not necessarily inconsistent. It was described that the hedonic/utilitarian paradigm tends to focus on obstacles faced by the consumers on choosing hedonic products whereas the vice/virtue paradigm has concentrated on the impulsivity of vice categories, which will be based on a decision made automatically for immediate consumption. Basically, the research on the hedonic/utilitarian distinction demonstrates the outcome of the effective vs. functional priorities and how consumers change their decisions between these attributes. In contrast the vice/virtue distinction has emphasized the self-control on consumers that may maximize impulsive shopping. As stated on this study, hedonic products deliver immediate benefits, similar to vice products that not also provide immediate benefits but also delay negative consequences. Similarly, utilitarian good deliver benefits after the consumption of the products, which is parallel to the acquisition of virtue products that also bring positive consequences after the consumption. Regarding in-store decision-making, some studies uncovered that “vice” products (,beer, high-fat foods, chocolate) are more likely to be purchased on impulse than “virtue” products. (Wertenbroch, 1998). Moreover, Kurt & Stilley (2011) conducted a shopping survey and two field experiments, revealing that a virtuous (vs. a vice) shopping basket can license subsequent impulsive spending. This implies that when a customer has already assembled a more virtuous grocery-shopping basket, the likelihood of conducting more in-store buying afterwards increases.

2.3.2 Retail marketing activities

- **Private vs. National Brands**

The products displayed in grocery stores have different prices and it is the consumer’s choice to find the best alternatives to fit their preferences on saving money. Some alternatives presented by Garretson, Fisher & Burton (2002) include coupons offered by manufacturers, special promotions on particular product categories, searching for shelf discounts, or purchase private label brands. When studying the products manufactured for the food market, it is

interesting to analyse the parallel distribution of national brands, distributed under a brand name owned by the producer or distributor, and that of private labels, owned and controlled exclusively by retailers (Sethuraman & Cole, 1999). In order to control the supply channel in the presence of both national and private brands, manufacturers and retailers have both a complex and inter-dependent relationship, since they both compete to maximize the share on the products sold in the supermarket. Manufacturers increase the market shares of their brands mainly by ensuring customer loyalty. For retailers, it is important to keep their customers fully satisfied, as they will switch stores if their favourite brands are not available during their shopping trip.

Retailers are gaining significant power in order to seize consumers. The main reason for this is the growth of private labels in Europe, as the power of retailers is increasing and becoming consolidated, and the quality of the products offered is largely improving. ACNielsen (2005), conducted a study with 21,100 respondents in 38 countries with the aim of better understanding their opinions about retail private labels as an alternative to national brands in terms of their quality, value for money, packaging and positioning. About 78% of Europeans agreed that private labels were indeed a good alternative. Strikingly, 89% of the Portuguese consumers interviewed perceived private labels as a good alternative, mainly because of the superior quality/price ratio of private labels, as well as due to the strong presence of hard discount stores. The same study also uncovered that the more consumers are exposed to private labels, the better they perceive them. In contrast, in markets where private labels are less prevalent, fewer consumers purchase them, and more assume that these are of lower quality and performance.

Private labels appeared in Portugal in the early 90's. At this stage, they were associated with a lower quality to justify the lower price. Now, after 20 years, private labels have finally won the confidence of Portuguese consumers, to the point where the retailers started to put their names on the products as a brand. In comparative studies, the private labelled products are often the right choice for its quality and price, particularly in the case of a food basket, as they can provide 30% of savings for consumers when compared to equivalent products of national brands (Revista DECO, 2011).

- **Loyalty Cards**

During the 1990's, new methods for collecting consumer's data were introduced which allow retailers to store consumer's purchase information and purchase history through the use of loyalty, reward, points, advantage or club cards (Glossary L., 2011). A card-based program

allows consumers to present their card during the checkout, to become entitled to receive a discount on the current purchase, or an accumulation of points that can be used in future purchases (Bellizzi & Bristol, 2004). The main objective of introducing these card-based programs was to increase loyalty, by trying to promote re-purchases (Smith et al., 2003). Some authors have questioned the usefulness of the loyalty programs and stated that the card-based programs can also differentiate from the competitors (Dowling & Uncles, 1997). Others authors like Ziliani & Bellini (2004) stated discount cards are more important to provide useful data on consumers which can later be used for designing different kind of marketing strategies. Bellizzi & Bristol (2004) suggested that discount cards do not make any difference in terms of greater store loyalty, but may deliver higher sales.

2.3.3. Customer Characteristics

In-store buying behaviour can be heavily moderated by consumer demographics and shopping habits (Bell, Corsten & Knox, 2011). Kollat & Willet (1967) originally studied the degree to which customer characteristics can lead influence unplanned purchasing by conducting interviews with 596 shoppers before and after they entered grocery stores in the US. In this way, they obtained a cross-sectional data set of grocery store purchases in 64 product categories. Their findings suggest that 50% of all grocery shopping is unplanned, and that this is mainly due to shopper recalling forgotten needs inside the store, when exposed to certain environmental cues. They also ascertained that household size, gender, number of shopping trips per week, number of purchases, use of a shopping list (only when more than 15 products are purchased), shopping trip goal and the number of years that the shopper has been married, were the main factors leading to in-store buying behaviour. Later on, Inman, Ferraro & Winner (2009) showed that women made more unplanned purchases than men, and that the greater the size of the household, the greater the occurrence of unplanned purchases.

Bell, Corsten & Knox (2011), on the other hand, studied consumer's goals, objectives and out-store marketing activities, and how these influenced the decisions made inside a grocery store. They concluded that the higher the level of abstractness of consumer's shopping goals, the higher the occurrence of in-store buying behaviour. More recently, Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011) studied the effect of culture drivers on consumers tendency to carry unplanned shopping, by using longitudinal shopping data from the United States, China, Western Europe and Brazil. They found that, irrespectively of country-of-origin, shoppers who had more abstract goals prior to entering the store conducted more unplanned purchases, which in contrast revealed that the concreteness of the shopping trip goal could be influenced by

immediate needs. They also uncovered that those shoppers that are more concerned about budget carry more in-store decisions than the ones concerned about time.

Park, Iyer & Smith (1989) conducted a large experiment in an urban university involving 68 subjects (53 females and 15 males) responsible for grocery shopping for their household. Their study investigated how subjects' store knowledge and time available for shopping affected their purchase intentions, mainly the failure to make intended purchases, unplanned buying and brand or product class switching. This study drew some interesting conclusions, namely that in-store information processing occurred mainly when subjects had lower store knowledge and felt more time pressure, and that this, in turn, increased the level of in-store buying behaviour. Furthermore, these factors also increased brand switching, due to increased difficulty felt when searching for the products needed, and thus increased the rate of failure to make intended purchases. In contrast, subjects with high store knowledge and less time pressure were more involved in making comparisons between brands and products and hence switched brands less often. In general, however, subjects who shopped under the high-store knowledge condition switched brands/products more often than those who shopped under the low-store knowledge condition, irrespective of the level of time pressure.

Most studies of in-store decision-making and its determinants reviewed so far have focused on how stimuli encountered inside the store had an affect on consumers and categories. Bell, Corsten & Knox (2011), however, focused on examining consumer's goals, objectives and out-store marketing activities and how these influenced the decisions made inside a grocery store. They concluded that the higher the level of abstractness of consumer's shopping goals, the higher the occurrence of in-store buying behaviour. Beatty & Ferrel (1989) discovered that when consumers are conduct a pleasant shopping trip generate a positive feeling about the shopping environment, influencing to conduct more unplanned purchases.

Finally, Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004) showed that deal prone consumers are more predisposed to in-store decision-making. The number of shopping trips conducted per week also has some impact on in-store decision. Moreover, shoppers who carry a list decide less inside the store, since they were are more certain of which categories to buy. In addition to this, larger households, households with greater incomes and shoppers who considered themselves as impulsive were more prone to carry in-store decision-making. Hence, customer activities such as list use, more frequent trips, limiting the aisles visited, and paying by cash reduce in-store buying.

2.3.4 Shopping trip characteristics

Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004) showed that situational factors, (e.g. shopping pattern, the presence and location of in-store displays or shopping party size) constituted the most significant driver of in-store decision-making. For instance, customer activities such as, shopping. However, it seems that not all reasons for the occurrence of in-store buying behaviour results from the fact that consumers are persuaded by in-store stimuli and deviated from their original shopping plans. Some consumers often make in-store decisions consciously and believe that it might be beneficial. For example, Stilley, Inman & Wakefield (2010) suggests that consumers may leave room for impromptu decisions to be made inside the store, since they may not want to invest further time and cognitive effort to plan every purchase of their grocery-shopping trip. Therefore, it is proposed that consumers have in-store slack, meaning that when consumers predict the budget allocated for the shopping trip, they also include the possibility of making decisions inside the store.

It is important to analyse the numerous intangible and emotional behaviour on the acquisition of products before we can understand the total consumption and behavioural activity inside the grocery store. Babin, Darden & Griffin (1994) recognized that a shopping trip can either be valuable or valueless, depending on its hedonic and utilitarian outcomes, which, in turn, can promote or restrain impulse buying. Also, it is important to analyse the influence of the atmosphere of the store and how it reflects on the consumer's shopping behaviour (Kaltcheva & Weitz, 2006), which also depends on the shopping motivations for a particular trip (utilitarian vs. hedonic).

Engaging in major shopping trips also enhance in-store buying behaviour as found in Kollat & Willet (1967), however Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011) not only confirmed the above but also studied the abstractness of the shopping goals and how positively relates to major shopping trips and fill-in shopping trips. Also, findings uncovered from this study state those shoppers that are more concerned about budget carry more in-store decisions than the ones concerned about time. So far, the studies conducted in the area of in-store buying behaviour only captured the consumer's final purchases at the checkout point and focused on static factors rather than the entire process and its' dynamics.

- **Hedonic vs. Utilitarian Motivations**

It is important to analyse the numerous intangible and emotional behaviour on the acquisition of products before we can understand the total consumption and behavioural activity inside the grocery store. Babin, Darden & Griffin (1994) recognized that a shopping trip can either

be valuable or valueless, depending on hedonic and utilitarian outcomes, which can increase awareness on the consumer's consumption behaviour (e.g. impulsivity). Also, it is important to analyse the influence of the atmosphere of the store and how it reflects on the consumer's shopping behaviour (Kaltcheva & Weitz, 2006), which also depends on the shopping motivations for a particular trip (utilitarian vs. hedonic).

Voss et al (2003) view utilitarian attitudes as more instrumental and concerned with the more functional consequences of product usage", while hedonic attitudes "are based on affective/emotive gratification derived from sensory product/brand attributes". Consumers with utilitarian motivations conduct their shopping for necessity, concentrating in buying solely products that are needs, finishing their shopping trip fast and search information that's is just necessary to complete the task. On the other hand, consumers with hedonic motivations are willing to experiment new products, services and the browsing effect increases (Kaltcheva & Weitz, 2006)

Utilitarian and hedonic shopping motivations may also result from a specific shopping situation. Van Kenhove et al. (1999) explains that when consumers realise they need something urgently, they give more value to store proximity, become more utilitarian oriented, whilst consumers that are hedonic oriented give more importance in finding new ideas while shopping. Finally, Dawson et al. (1990) explained the relationship between the consumer's shopping motivations and their emotional states. For example, situational factors, such as "crowding or atmospherics" may cause negative emotions that might interfere with the shopping motivations and goals of the consumers. He makes a correlation between these motivations and goals, by concluding that when utilitarian motivations is high, goal attainment suggests control, since the ultimate objective is the acquirement of the product. In the contrary, when hedonic motivation is high, the main goal for the consumer is to experience fun and pleasure. As also enlightened by Lunardo & Mbengue (2009) utilitarian oriented consumers want to achieve their goals "quickly, easily and efficiently, whilst for the consumers with higher levels of hedonic motivations are less prone to attain their goals by controllability.

- **Accompanied vs. Alone Shopping Trip**

Rook (1987) called for a deeper investigation of the social factors (group vs. solo buying) affecting unplanned purchases, particularly impulsive buying. Rook & Fisher (1995) discovered that normative evaluations influence consumer's buying behaviour and suggested that when consumers shopping alone, they might feel less socially observed, allowing them to

act on impulse. In contrary, shopping with others should increase one's inhibitions when acting on impulse. Consistent with this, Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009) suggested that shoppers who were accompanied by others while shopping were not significantly more likely to make unplanned purchases. However, Luo (2005) found that the presence of others increases one's normative evaluations during the shopping trip, which makes them act less on impulse. He also investigated whether the two primary sources of social influence (peers and family) activated different behaviour in in-store decision-making, depending on the group's cohesiveness and the individual susceptibility to influence. Peer groups should make less pressure and judge less someone's unplanned purchases, whereas family members may voice more economical concerns and give less room for one to make in-store decisions.

A reference group is a group to which an individual or another group is compared (Kelley, 1947), and to which the individual relates or aspires to belong. Comparisons with reference groups frame one's self-knowledge and self-evaluations (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). Childers & Rao (1992) distinguish two types of reference groups: the familial and the peer-based reference group. They also studied how these two types of reference groups had different levels of influence on individual purchase decisions, including across cultures. Sociological studies distinguish two types of families: the nuclear families and the extended families. According to Schaninger & Buss (1986), nuclear families are composed by two spouses and children, representing one family unit. On the other hand, extend families are typically composed by the parenting figures, siblings and their spouses who all live in "one large joint-family arrangement" (Rao et al. 1991). Childers & Rao (1992) emphasize how extended families can strongly influence one individual's consumption behaviour based on existent interaction and observation. On the other hand, nuclear families (spouse and children) can also have great impact in one's decision making, because individuals identify themselves to a greater degree with their close family members. In particular, and according to Park (1982), a husband and wife take a common view and even come to "act as joint decision makers". In this so-called synoptic ideal, the couple assigns defined roles to each spouse, where each of them makes individual decisions that aim to maximize the couple's joint utility. A recent study from POPAI (2011) examined the impact of having a second person during the shopping trip and if they had any influence on the final purchases of the shopper. The study revealed that consumers shopping alone spent more than the ones that were accompanied. Both groups had budgeted the same amount of money before entering the store and spent less than what it was planned initially. However, despite the similarities of both groups, solo shopper spent on average more 11% than accompanied shoppers. Another insightful

conclusion was the impact of shopping companions on solo shopper was low, and that there seemed to be little to no influence of companions on the final shopping basket (except for infrequent shoppers). However, when considering who came along with the solo shoppers, it was found out that family had much more influence on solo shopper's purchases than those coming with friends.

2.4. Main Conclusions

The literature review performed shows that there are many internal and external factors that may lead to the occurrence of in-store decision making and unplanned purchases in the grocery store environment. Table 2.1 summarizes all the variables that increase or decrease in-store buying behaviour that were studied so far, divided in three main groups: product category, customer characteristics and shopping trip characteristics.

Table 2.1. – Factors influencing in-store buying behaviour

Variables	Effect on in-store buying behaviour	Source
PRODUCT CATEGORIES		
Number of purchases	Not conclusive	Kollat & Willet (1967)
Infrequently purchased items	Increases	Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
Hedonic product categories	Increases	Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
Vice products	Increases	Wertenbroch 1998).
Virtuous shopping basket (vs. vice shopping basket)	Increases	Kurt & Stilley (2011)
CUSTOMER CHARACTERISTICS		
Household size	Increases	Kollat & Willet (1967); Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004; 2009)
Number of shopping trips per week	Increases	Kollat & Willet (1967)
Household with greater incomes	Increases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004); Stilley, Inman & Wakefield (2010)
Demographics	Increases	Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009)
Gender: women	Increases	Granbois (1968); Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
Number of years shopper as been married	Increases	Kollat & Willet (1967)
Shopping habits	Increases	Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009)
Low store knowledge and no time pressure	Increases	Park, Iyer & Smith (1989)
High store knowledge and no time pressure	Decreases	Park, Iyer & Smith (1989); Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009)
More abstract goals prior to entering the store	Increases	Bell, Corsten & Knox (2011)
Higher level of purchase involvement	Decreases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
Satisfaction while shopping produces a positive feeling	Increases	Beatty & Ferrel (1989)
Culture	Increases	Abbratt & Goodey (1990)
Collective countries (vs. Individualist)	Increases	Lee & Kacen (2008)
Impulsive buyers by nature	Increases	Rook & Fisher (1995); Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
Deal prone consumers	Increases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)

Major shopping trip customer	Increases	Kollat & Willet (1967); Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004); Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009); Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011)
Shopping pattern customer	Increases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
More frequent trips customer	Decreases	Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
SHOPPING TRIP CHARACTERISTICS		
Shopping list (only more than 15 products are purchased)	Increases	Kollat & Willet (1967)
Shopping list	Decreases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
Promotional activities (point-of-sale, shelf designs, etc.)	Increases	Abraff & Goodey (1990); Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
All aisles visited; purchase made at the end of aisle or at the check-out register	Increases	Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004)
Paying by cash	Decreases	Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
Time available for shopping	Increases	Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009)
Time spent inside the store	Increases	Huang, Hui, Inman & Suher (2011)
Past experiences, in-store experiences	Increases	Bell, Corsten & Knox (2009)
Shopper accompanied by children	Increases	Granbois (1968)
Shoppers accompanied by others	Decreases	Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009)
Influence of peers	Increases	Luo (2005); POPAI Study (2011)
Influence of family	Decreases	Luo (2005)
Influence of family in solo purchases higher than friends	Increases	POPAI Study (2011)
Accompanied shoppers purchased more than solo shoppers	Increases	Granbois (1968)
Solo shopper spent more than accompanied shoppers	Increases	POPAI Study (2011)
Budget concerns	Increases	Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011)
Time concerns	Decreases	Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011)

2.5. Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses are developed to investigate relationships between consumer's in-store purchases and private labels vs. national brands, loyalty cards, alone vs. accompanied consumers and hedonic vs. utilitarian.

Due to the economic downturn, consumers started to change their shopping habits and consequently find new strategies in order to adapt to the current scenario by purchasing more private labels. According to ACNielsen (2010) consumers started to realize that the quality of the products is the same for private labels when compared to national brands. However, according to Abratt & Goodey (1990); Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004) promotional activities like point of sales, shelf designs and how products are positioned, can affect in-store purchases, and let consumers to spend more money in national brands. Therefore, it is assumed that:

H1: Consumers that make more in-store buying decisions purchase more private labels than national brands.

H2: The total amount in euros spent for in-store buying decisions is higher for national brands than private labels.

As stated by Mauri (2003), supermarkets have been trying to increase loyalty to keep consumer's interest on their stores by find new promotional methods, specially discounts on the products offered. Promotional activities, as seen, increase in-store buying behaviour (Abratt & Goodey, 1990; Inman, Ferraro & Winer, 2004) and according to Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011), when consumers are more concerned about their budget while shopping, the proportion of in-store buying behaviour increases. However, Bellizzi & Bristol (2004) suggest that loyalty cards do not make much difference in terms of store loyalty, but might deliver greater sales. Therefore the question remains if consumers who have loyalty cards spend more money in in-store decisions, since they might have discounts accumulated from previous shopping trips. If the consumer does in fact increase in-store buying behaviour when, it might reveal that these consumers have accumulated more money on their loyalty cards from past shopping trips and used it for future shopping, since they mentally think that the money stored in the loyalty card will be useful for immediate needs realized only inside the store. Consumers might also use the advantage to have a loyalty card to receive discounts in national brands, since promotional efforts and communication is higher for this type of

brands. Therefore, it is proposed that:

H3: Consumers who have a loyalty card make more in-store decisions than planned purchases.

H4: Consumers who have a loyalty card make more in-store purchases for national brands.

Studies have yielded opposing controversial results about the relationship between shopping party size and in-store decision-making. Inman, Winer & Ferraro (2009) conclude that accompanied shoppers carry out less in-store buying behaviour. The composition of the shopping party may also play an important role on this matter (Luo 2005; POPAI (2011). Luo (2005) states that the two primary sources of social influence – peers and family – activate different in-store buying behaviour. Members of peer groups who accompany the shopper should be more carefree and judge unplanned purchases less negatively, while family members could have more economical concerns and thus be more likely to advise against them. Consistent also with Park (1982), who claimed that couples shopping for groceries often take a common view and act as joint decision makers to make purchases, it is proposed that:

H5: Accompanied shoppers make more in-store buying decisions than shoppers who carry out their shopping trip alone.

H6: Customers shopping has a couple make less unplanned purchases than those shopping with other family members, friends or acquaintances.

Van Kenhove et al. (1999) suggest that consumers who have more utilitarian orientations are more keen to finish their shopping trip quickly. Also according to Knox, Corsten & Bell (2011), shoppers who are more concerned about time make less in-store decisions. On the other hand, customers who are more hedonically oriented in their shopping trip give more importance to browsing while shopping, which might make them spend more time inside the store, and hence increase of the proportion of unplanned purchases in their shopping basket. Moreover, the higher the level of abstract goals, the higher the proportion of unplanned purchases (Bell, Corsten & Knox, 2011), and since abstract goals relate closely to more hedonic shopping motivations (Blythe, 2008), it is proposed that:

H7: Consumers with hedonic shopping trip motivations make more in-store decisions than consumers in mainly utilitarian shopping trips.

The next chapter presents the methodology employed in the performance of a field study, with the aim of statistically testing the research hypotheses put forward.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In order to address the aims of this dissertation, the research hypotheses formulated in Chapter 2 were tested through the performance of a field study amongst supermarket shoppers. The present chapter describes in detail the methodological approach employed to conduct this study and analyse its results.

3.1 Research purpose and approach

An explanatory approach was selected to investigate how retailers' marketing and branding activities, as well as shopping trip characteristics, influence the occurrence of in-store buying decisions during grocery shopping. This is the appropriate methodological approach to empirically test research hypotheses and establish causal relationships between the variables investigated (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2007).

3.2 Research strategy and method

In view of the explanatory approach undertaken, a quantitative research strategy was developed that entailed the collection of primary data through the performance of a field study (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). The ICA (Ida às Compras Acompanhada), the data collection technique employed, was purposefully developed for this study and entails both the performance of one-to-one, structured interviews with supermarket shoppers and the observation of their actual shopping behaviour, as well as self-administered questionnaires. This approach combines advantages of some methods employed in the past to study shopping behaviour: *Shopping with Consumers* (Otnes, McGrath & Lowrey, 1995), the POPAI surveys (POPAI, 2009-2010) and the analysis of shopping lists (Spiggle, 1987).

3.3 Study Design

3.3.1 Population and Sample

The population of interest was defined as adults (i.e. older than 18 years) residing in Portugal for the last 5 years, who carry out their regular grocery shopping trips in large supermarkets of the Lisbon area. To guarantee a randomly selected sample, every 10th shopper entering the store (or one every 5 minutes, whichever came first) was intercepted by an interviewer (POPAI, 2009-2010; Stilley, Inman & Wakefield, 2010b). Measures were taken to ensure that one shopper only participate in the study once. A sample of 156 individuals who met the

population requirements and completed the study was gathered through this procedure, which yielded thus a total of 156 valid, individual shopping trips.

Table 3.1 presents the socio-demographic characteristics of the sample. It was composed by women (75%) and men (25%), aged between 22 and 84 years old, mainly married and with children. The majority of the participants had a high education level, were employed and stated to benefit from a household monthly net income of between €1000 and €1999.

Table 3.1 – Socio-demographic characteristics of the study sample (n=156).

Variables	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>	
Female	75%
Gender	25%
<i>Age</i>	
Mean ± SD	48.01 ± 14.75
<i>Marital Status</i>	
Married or cohabiting	59.3%
Single	23.9%
Divorced	12.3%
Widow	4.5%
<i>Children</i>	
Yes	68%
<i>Number of children</i>	
No children	32.1%
1	26.9%
2	26.9%
3 or more	14.1%
<i>Number of people in the household</i>	
Mean ± SD	2,71 ± 1,61
[Minimum; Maximum]	[1;7]
<i>Number of people in the household under 18 years old</i>	
Mean ± SD	0,53 ± 1
<i>Educational attainment</i>	
Elementary school	21%
High school grad	26%
Higher education	53%
<i>Current occupation</i>	
Student	2.6%
Self-employed	8.3%
Employed	62.2%
Housewife	2.6%
Retired	21.8%
Unemployed	2.6%
<i>Household monthly net income</i>	
Low (< € 1000)	11.5%
Middle (€1000 - €1999)	44.2%
High (≥ 2000)	33.3%
NA	6.4%

3.3.2 Data collection

With the cooperation of a major Portuguese retail company, data collection was conducted in three large supermarkets in the area of Lisbon: Amadora, Oeiras and Carnide. Eleven interviewers participated in the study, being carefully selected and trained to guarantee the quality of the data collected. Data collection took place between May 20 and June 18, 2011. Specific dates were chosen to ensure that both weekdays and weekends were covered, as well as national holidays and different times of the day. Annex 1 summarizes some of the practical details of the field study. Annex 2 list the sections of the supermarket considered in the shopping visits, while Annex 3 details the main product categories on offer.

Figure 3.1 presents the ICA, the data collection technique employed, which comprises 5 stages: recruitment of participants, interview at store entrance, accompanied store visit, interview at store exit and self-administered questionnaire.



Figure 3.1 – The ICA (Ida às Compras Acompanhada) data collection technique

Stage 1: Recruitment of participants

In order to check if potential participants belonged to the population of interest, a few questions were made as presented in Annex 4. If recruited, the participants were only informed that the purpose was to learn how shoppers behave inside the store. At this point, they were also informed that with their collaboration they would be compensated with a €10 gift card, which could be used only in future shopping trips.

Stage 2: Interviews at store entrance

An interview was conducted before participants entered the store in order to better understand their overall shopping motivations, shopping plans and specific purchase intentions (see Annex 5). First, shoppers were asked whether they had brought a written shopping list with them or not; if this was the case, the list was copied by the interviewer. Participants were subsequently asked to enumerate any other items they were intending to purchase, which, for any reason, had not been written down in the list. At the end of the shopping trip, and given the consent of participants, the actual shopping lists were also collected. In the absence of a written shopping list, participants were asked to enumerate the items they were planning to purchase in that specific shopping trip. These items were recorded by the interviewers, who were instructed to write down all the items mentioned by the exactly same words being used by participants (Kollat & Willett, 1967). Questions about purchase intentions were carefully designed and interviewers were told to be careful when formulating them, in order to influence participants' answers as little as possible. Consequently, shoppers were not asked about the specific items (products, brands, categories) they were or were not intending to buy, but rather about their general purchase intentions, namely "what" they were coming to buy at the store. Participants were thus free to reveal their purchasing intentions at any level of aggregation. Participants were then asked about the kind of shopping trip they were engaging in. Their answers were coded into one of more of 17 pre-defined types of shopping trips developed from previous studies (Bell, Corsten & Knox, 2011; POPAI, 2009-2010). To ascertain store preferences, participants were also asked why they had chosen that specific supermarket to conduct their shopping trip. Their answers were coded into one of more of 19 pre-defined types of store preferences developed from previous studies (Bell, Corsten & Knox, 2011; POPAI, 2009-2010; Young-Kyung & Kang, 2001, Handelman & Arnold, 1999; Sirohi, McLaughlin & Wittink, 1998; Arora, 1982). If interviewers could not match (a part of) a participant's answer to a pre-defined type, they wrote the contents of his or her answer as completely as possible. Finally, data on the resources committed to the shopping trip (time and money, means of transportation, size and composition of the shopping party), participants' shopping habits and other characteristics of that particular shopping trip were also collected

Stage 3: Accompanied store visit

Stage 2 was crucial to build rapport with the participant, in order to reduce the discomfort or psychological barriers that could compromise the quality of the data collected during the next

stages. Indeed, during the third stage, the accompanied shopping, there was no further interaction between interviewers and participants. While participants carried out their shopping, the interviewers' main tasks were to observe their behaviour unobtrusively and take written notes, so that later on the shopping script of each participant could be well defined. Data collected during this stage were not analysed in this dissertation, as they fall out of its scope.

Stage 4: Interview at the store exit

At check out, participants were asked to provide some details about the shopping trip they had just completed (see Annex 6). This information was complemented with the authorized collection of their payment receipt, to help to identify and classify instances of planned and unplanned shopping later on during the analysis. At this point, shoppers were asked if they had bought all of the initially intended items and/or any additional ones. In order to answer this question, participants were invited to cross-check the items purchased against their original purchase intentions by looking inside their shopping cart/bags, at their payment receipts or shopping lists. They were, however, in any way confronted by the interviewer with the records of their purchase intentions gathered at the store entrance. Furthermore, and unlike in the study of Beatty & Ferrell (1998), the interviewers did not itemize and/or classify the contents of shopping carts at this point, either alone or together with the participant. These procedures were followed to avoid the introduction of social desirability bias or undue subjective interpretations of the interviewers about planned and unplanned purchases.

Finally, participants were also asked whether or not they had conducted their shopping trip as they usually did, whether they have visited all aisles or just the ones where they intended to purchase something, whether they had browsed more or less than did actual shopping and how they evaluated the shopping trip and the store on several aspects.

Stage 5: Self-administered questionnaire

Participants were finally asked to complete a self-administered written questionnaire (see Annex 7), which included the rating of items in psychographic scales, in order to assess relevant individual characteristics like habit, impulsivity and shopping styles. Socio-demographic characteristics were also asked at the end of the questionnaire.

3.4 Data analysis

3.4.1 Assessment of purchase intentions

The set of purchase intentions of each participant was compiled from his or her shopping list, when available, and/or from the buying intentions verbally elicited during the pre-shopping interview. Out of the 156 participants, 64 (41%) had a written shopping list. The verbatim descriptions of the 156 sets of purchase intentions were then content analysed according to established procedures and classified into 5 different levels of aggregation according to a pre-defined typology (Kollat & Willett, 1967) – store section, product category, product sub-category, product type, brand and quantity.

3.4.2 Assessment of shopping trip motivations and plans

With respect to the resources committed to shopping plans, participants planned to spend on average € 55.15 ± 44.27 and 43 ± 23 minutes in their shopping trip. The majority of the participants (87%) chose the car as means of transportation to the store, while only 9% used public transportation and the remaining 4% went on foot. Concerning the actual resources committed, participants spent overall € 73.12 ± 65.37 on their purchases, and 34 ± 20 minutes to complete their shopping trip and arrive at the check-out.

3.4.3 Assessment of planned and in-store purchase decisions

The set of purchasing intentions of each participant, the content of his or her payment receipt and other data collected at the post-shopping interview were used to determine the instances of planned and unplanned grocery purchases. Each purchased item in the receipt was considered planned whenever its buyer had stated a corresponding purchase intention at any of the following aggregation levels: quantity, brand, product type, sub-category or category; all remaining cases were coded as in-store decisions. The results of this classification were, conditional to the available data, cross-checked with the information provided by participants at the post-shopping interview, when asked to enumerate items they did not plan to buy prior to store entrance, but actually ended up buying, as well as planned items that ended up not being bought.

3.4.4 Assessment of National Brands vs. Private Labels

In order to test H1 and H2, the total and the ratio of unplanned purchases of private labels and of national brands were computed by conducting Paired-sample t-test analysis. The total basket of products of each participant was analysed in order to access the type of brands

consumers decided to purchase. For each item it was identified the name of the brand, and then checked if it was planned or unplanned. The total number of national brands or private labels was then, divided by the total number of unplanned purchases, in order to give the percentage allocated for each type of brand.

3.4.5 Loyalty Cards Usage

At the beginning of stage 4, customers were asked if they had a loyalty card in order to receive discounts on their shopping. In order to understand whether customers that hold a card make more in-store buying decisions, firstly it was compared if there was any difference between the customers who did not hold the loyalty card with the ones who did. Then, it was analysed if the consumers that have a loyalty card make more in-store purchases or planned purchases, and how much they spent in monetary terms. The statistical significance of mean differences in unplanned purchases and total spending between loyalty card-holders and non-holders was estimated, to allow for the testing of hypotheses H3 and H4 by conducting Paired sample t-test analysis. From a total of 156 participants, 137 had a loyalty card and the remaining 19 conducted the shopping-trip without a loyalty card.

3.4.6 Accompanied vs. Alone Shopping Trip

The effect of conducting the shopping-trip accompanied vs. (alone) on the share of in-store buying decisions was also accessed. Consumers were asked whether they came shopping alone or accompanied, and whether they came accompanied with family or friends. This information was then crossed with the dependent variable – in-store purchases. In order to test H5 and H6, it was conducted ANOVA analysis. Over half of the participants (n=78) conducted their shopping trip alone and the other half conducted accompanied. From the total universe of 78 participants that went shopping accompanied, 53.85% were accompanied by children, extended family and friends and the remaining 46.15% were couples.

3.4.7 Utilitarian and Hedonic Motivations

In order to determine the level of utilitarian and hedonic motivations, first it was necessary to measure the shopping goals and store goals of the participants, which were present in the questionnaire at the beginning and after the shopping trip. Table 3.2 presents the questions that were used in order to classify the shopping motivations of each participant. The questions are taken from the stage 2 (interview at the store entrance) and stage 4 (interview at store

exit). Based on past literature, the answers given were analysed in order to determine the shopper's utilitarian and hedonic motivations.

Table 3.2 – Measures of utilitarian and hedonic motivations

Shopping Motivations			Reference
Stage 2	Utilitarian Motivations	Hedonic Motivations	
1. Que tipo de compras veio fazer hoje? (Registe todas as opções mencionadas pelo participante)			
Compras para utilizar no próprio dia	X		Voss et al. (2003)
Vim comprar algo que me lembrei de repente e me fazia falta	X		Kaltcheva & Weitz (2006)
Compras para aproveitar descontos		X	Arnold & Reynolds (2003)
Compras para aproveitar ofertas		X	Arnold & Reynolds (2003)
Compras como passeio ou lazer		X	Arnold & Reynolds (2003)
Compras de produtos frescos	X		Voss et al. (2003)
Stage 4			
8. Hoje percorreu as secções desta loja como habitualmente o faz?	Sim: X	Não: X	Kaltcheva & Weitz (2006)
9. a) Passou apenas nos corredores em que sabia que queria comprar algo?	Sim: X		Van Kenhove et al. (1999)
9. b) Percorreu também outros corredores? Porquê?			
Para ver novidades		X	Van Kenhove et al. (1999)
Para passear		X	Van Kenhove et al. (1999)
Para garantir que não me esquecia de nada	X		Van Kenhove et al. (1999)
12. De 1 a 5, como avalia a sua visita de hoje a este supermercado, relativamente aos seguintes aspectos:			
A visita foi muito agradável	X		Kim (2006)
A visita foi divertida:		X	Dawson et al., (1990)
A visita correu conforme eu tinha esperado:	X		Kim (2006)

The following chapter presents the results and discussion of the statistical analysis conducted in order to test the research hypotheses put forward.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the statistical analyses conducted on the data collected during the field study, including the test of the research hypotheses earlier proposed.

4.1. In-store buying behaviour

According to the data analysis performed, about 47% of all purchases of the participants were decided only inside the store. It is clear from the confrontation of shopping lists, purchase intentions and receipts that mainly utilitarian product categories like cereals, milk, fruit and vegetables, canned food, fresh meat are mainly planned prior to the shopping trip (these were listed in 90% of the written shopping lists collected). On the other hand, the purchase of products with a more pronounced hedonic character, like potato chips, cookies, chocolates, ice cream, ready-made meals and cosmetics, seem to have been for a great deal decided only inside the stores.

The incidence of unplanned grocery shopping found in this study, albeit large in absolute terms, is actually slightly lower than that found in previous studies, for instance by Kollat & Willet (1967) found that 50.5% of decisions were decided prior to entering the store. However, this study was conducted before the current financial and economic crisis started and refer only to US grocery shoppers, whereas the present study is considerably more recent and took place in a South European country. Even so, the difference in the results is quite small. The result of the percentage of in-store buying behaviour was slightly different as those reported by Kollat & Willet (1967). They found that 50.5% of decisions were decided prior to entering the store while this study reports that 47% of decisions are made in-store and 53% are planned. The understandable explanation for these results is the low level of disposable income available to the consumers, due to the current difficult economic and financial conditions, and the price increase of the products. Therefore, the habits of consumption are changing and the consumers are opting to plan their shopping before going to the supermarket, and making fewer decisions inside the store.

Still, according to INE (Instituto Nacional de Estadística) the retail value in grocery sales increased in 2010 as compared to non-grocery products. This is explained by the fact that the consumers are purchasing goods that are only for principal necessity. This trend is clarified when the total basket of products was analysed. For example, products like cereals, milk, fruit and vegetables, tinned products, meat and fish are previously planned and in 90% of cases one of these products are always stated in the shopping list. On the other hand, products that

were decided inside the store were mainly hedonic, like potato chips, cookies, chocolates, frozen products, ready-made meals and cosmetics. Additionally, the amount of money spent for in-store purchases and planned purchases are also relatively small. Regarding how much money it was spent on the shopping trip, shoppers spent on average € 27.96 ± 7.15 on planned purchases and € 28.46 ± 8.28 on unplanned ones.

4.2. In-store buying behaviour at brand level

It was observed that shoppers spent on average, € 25.78 on in-store purchases for national brands and € 10.91 on private label products. This difference can be explained both by the lower amount of unplanned items purchased from private labels observed, and the pricing tactics that characterize store brands.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 presents the results of the statistical test of H1 and H2, respectively. They show that, contrary to what was expected, the highest percentage of unplanned purchases refers to items from national brands. Given that the difference between the share of unplanned purchased items between store brands and national ones is statistically significant ($p > .05$) in both cases, H1 is rejected.

Table 4.1 – Mean differences between the percentage of in-store purchases of national brands and private labels (n=156).

Type of brand	Share of in-store purchases (quantity) % Mean ± SD	t	Sig.
National Brands	58.75 ± 27.12	4.240	0.000*
Private Labels	41.25 ± 26.37		

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

Such results are probably explained by the fact that unplanned purchases occur mainly in response to in-store promotional stimuli, which, more often than not, refer to products from national brands. They are consistent with the finding of previous studies, claiming that in-store promotional activities, like point-of-sales, shelf designs, etc., increase the likelihood of in-store decision-making (Abratt & Goodey, 1990; Inman, Ferraro & Winer (2004). National brands typically offer more deals and discounts than national brands, as well as actively pay to occupy preferred shelf space and take a more aggressive stance on brand communication and promotion.

Moreover, when it comes to packaged goods (as opposite to perishable ones), national brands are preferred by shoppers instead of private labels. A reason for this trend is the fact that the

majority of supermarkets and hypermarkets are more concentrated on processed foods rather than fresh items, allowing consumers to be more exposed to national brands.

In order to test H2, which proposed that the total amount in euros spent for in-store purchases is higher for national brands than for private labels, a Paired sample t-test was conducted. Its results are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases of national brands and private labels in Euros (n=156)

Type of brand	Share of in-store purchases € Mean ± SD	t	Sig.
National Brands	18.49 ± 7.34	6.783	0.000*
Private Labels	7.72 ± 3.21		

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

It can be observed that shoppers spent on average, € 18.49 on in-store purchases of national brands and € 7.72 on private label products. Therefore, H2 is accepted. The reasoning for this can be explained how private labels' emphasize on cost leadership which can more easily help place a product at an impulse-buy price point, a factor that is further fuelled by aggressive promotional activity and noticeable differences in prices between private label goods and national brands.

4.3. Effect of Loyalty Card ownership

From a total of 156 participants, 88% owned a loyalty card (n=137) and the remaining 12% did not hold a loyalty card (n=19). In order to test H3, a Paired-sample t-test was conducted to assess the mean differences between of the share of in-store purchases and of planned purchases for shoppers who owned a store loyalty card. No overall significant differences were found ($p=0.154$), hence H3 is rejected

The effect of having a loyalty-card on in-store purchases for national brands was also investigated by conducting a Paired-sample t-test. The results are presented in Table 4.3. After establishing that national brands are more likely to be included in shoppers' in-store purchases than private labels, it was found that this does not change significantly ($p < .05$) for the loyalty cardholders sub-sample (n=137). Therefore, H4 could not be rejected.

Table 4.3 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases for national brands and private labels across consumers who have a loyalty card (n=137).

Type of Brand	Share of in-store purchases (%)		T	Sig.
	Mean ± SD			
National Brand	58.52 ± 27.18		3.828	0.000*
Private Labels	41.48 ± 26.59			

*Significant at p<0.05

National brands make greater promotional efforts, through preferential placement in terms of shelf space, more aggressive promotions and stronger brand communication. Consumers can see this increased promotional activity as an opportunity to acquire national brands at more favourable prices, while retailers stand to gain more favourable terms from their suppliers in order to further emphasise these efforts, and to improve their image towards consumers by becoming associated with lower prices even on national brands.

4.4. Accompanied Shopping vs. Alone Shopping Trip

From a total of 156 consumers, 50% conducted the shopping trip accompanied. In terms of the share of in-store purchases, accompanied shoppers registered 54.16 ± 24.64, whilst consumers that shopped alone registered 45.84 ± 23.84.

Table 4.4 presents the results of the statistical test of the mean differences in the share of in-store purchases across accompanied vs. solo shoppers (n=156). These lead to the conclusion that when participants conducted the shopping trip accompanied, this increased significantly (p>.05) the likelihood of engaging in in-store decision making. Therefore, H5 could not be rejected.

Table 4.4 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases across accompanied vs. solo shoppers (n=156).

Accompanied vs. Alone Shopping	Share of in-store purchases (%)		F	Sig.
	Mean ± SD			
Accompanied	54.16 ± 24.64		4.597	0.034*
Alone	45.84 ± 23.84			

*Significant at p<0.05

These result contradict what was found in previous studies, namely that shopping with others does not have an effect on in-store buying behaviour (Inman, Winer & Ferraro, 2009). The study of POPAI (2012) also indicated that solo shoppers spent more money on groceries than accompanied shoppers, an average of \$20 more. The present study found that accompanied shoppers not only conduct more in-store buying behaviour, but in monetary terms are capable

of spending more: a total average of the shopping trip of € 35.89 ± 9.33, opposite to solo shoppers who spent on average € 21.89 ± 6.47.

This means that accompanied shoppers spent more € 14.00 than the opposite segment. One of the reasons for this trend can be explained by the fact that accompanied shoppers, even if they enter the store with their initial set of products planned, decisions made inside the store get a boost from the accompanying shopper, that can make recommendations and help communicate deals or new products that the original shopper may not be aware of.

Furthermore, it was also analysed with whom accompanied shoppers came to the supermarket with and which of the groups, couples or peer-based, influenced more in-store behaviour. H6 hypothesizes that people shopping, as couples tend to make less in-store purchase decisions than those shoppers that enter the store with children, extended family or friends/acquaintances. Table 4.5 shows the mean differences observed between the share of in-store purchases of participants shopping with spouses and that of the remaining participants shopping accompanied (n=78). This result shows that shopping with members of a peer-based reference group has a more positive impact on the shoppers' in-store decision making than shopping with a spouse. Consequently, H6 could not be rejected.

Table 4.5 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases between participants shopping with spouses and the remaining participants shopping accompanied (n=78).

Accompanied Shoppers	Share of in-store purchases (%)		F	Sig.
	Mean ± SD			
Couples	48.05 ± 22.97		4.479	0.041*
Children, Extended Family, Others	51.95 ± 26.12			

*Significant at p<0.05

This supports the statement of Childers & Rao (1992) that explain how extended families and peer-based reference groups have a strong impact in an individual's decision making. The results also confirm the study conducted by Luo (2005) where it is stated that family members have more economical concerns and do not allow one to consider an in-store decision. Consumers shopping with their spouses are maybe more concerned about preserving their common budget, making them, as seen, less susceptible to the impact of promotional messages in retail spaces than consumers shopping with children, extended family and friends.

4.5. Utilitarian vs. Hedonic Shopping Motivations

From a total of 156 consumers, 80 had utilitarian motivations and the rest 76 consumers were more hedonically oriented. H7 was tested by analysing the motivations of each participant individually with the responses given in stage 2 and stage 4 about the purchase intentions and shopping motivations. In order to study this analysis, was conducted an ANOVA analysis in which are presented in Table 4.6. The results show that consumers with hedonic shopping motivations make more unplanned purchases than those with utilitarian ones. Consequently, H7 can not be rejected.

Table 4.6 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases (%) across consumers with utilitarian and hedonic motivations (n=156).

Shopping Motivations	Share of in-store purchases (%)		F	Sig.
	Mean ± SD			
Utilitarian	37.64 ± 20.63		52.880	0.000*
Hedonic	62.36 ± 21.84			

*Significant at p<0.05

Additionally, it was also investigated whether shoppers with higher hedonic motivations spent significantly more money on unplanned purchases than those with utilitarian ones. Table 4.7 presents the results of the corresponding ANOVA. The results reveal that shoppers with higher hedonic motivations spent, on average, more €24.58 on unplanned purchases than shoppers with utilitarian motivations.

Table 4.7 – Mean differences in the share of in-store purchases (€) across consumers with utilitarian and hedonic motivations (n=156)

Shopping Motivations	Share of in-store purchases (€)		F	Sig.
	Mean ± SD			
Utilitarian	17.80 ± 5.77		29.233	0.000*
Hedonic	42.38 ± 8.30			

*Significant at p<0.05

The results confirm what was analysed by Bell, Corsten & Knox (2011), who stated that consumers that have more abstract shopping goals are more prone to make unplanned purchases. Consumers with hedonic motivations might not see shopping as a chore but as an experience in and of itself.

As such, even if there is some planning involved in their shopping, their trips to the retail space take longer and consumers travel through the length of the retail space to check for new

products or special offers (in-store promotions), which is to say, shoppers with hedonic motivations expose themselves to stimuli aimed at encouraging unplanned shopping and increasing overall amount spent, resulting in more in-store purchases and higher amounts spent.

Conversely, consumers with utilitarian motivations plan their shopping more ahead and try to curb in-store decision-making. Within the retail space, they probably will go directly to the products that they came to purchase and avoid, or ignore in-store stimuli. This results in less unplanned purchases and less overall spending.

4.6. Conclusions

The statistical analysis conducted in order to test the research hypothesis, enabled to clarify many aspects about in-store buying behaviour, the dependent variable throughout this study. Moreover, it was possible to investigate how consumers behave inside the store, what types of brands they prefer, the usage of loyalty cards, if they went shopping alone and with whom and also the utilitarian and hedonic shopping motivations, and how all these variables explain the process of in-store buying behaviour. The following table provides the summary of all the hypotheses tested:

Table 4.8 – Summary of the research hypotheses

Research Hypotheses	Total Sample
H1	Rejected
H2	Accepted
H3	Rejected
H4	Accepted
H5	Accepted
H6	Accepted
H7	Accepted

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

After analysing all the data and testing the hypotheses, the present chapter will explain the conclusions and the main findings of this study, in order to answer all the research questions proposed. In addition, the results provide important insights for retailers as well as drivers for future research and the limitations encountered during the study.

5.1. Conclusions and implications

According to the knowledge gained when analysing the literature on this field, this is a unique study that attempts to examine consumer's in-store buying behaviour, typically known as unplanned purchases. It has been analysed that in-store buying behaviour is the intention of the purchase of certain products that the consumer was not expecting to buy or only remembered after entering the store, due to all the stimuli available. In either case, the incentives available in-store "activates" the memories of forgotten needs helping consumers to conduct in-store decision-making.

The present study revealed that, on average, 47% of the grocery items are decided in-store. One of the most interesting findings of this dissertation is that, counting only with the in-store purchases, consumers buy more national brands than private labels. This trend can be explained how consumers see increased promotional activity in-store that is translated into an opportunity to acquire national brands at more favourable prices, while retailers stand to gain more favourable terms from their suppliers in order to further emphasize these efforts, and to improve their image towards consumers by becoming associated with lower prices even on national brands. Another interesting finding when analysing national brands and private labels was how consumer spent, on average, more € 14.87 on in-store purchases for national brands than private labels. This provides insight into shoppers' decision-making processes, and informs retailers (and national brands) on how they should approach the retail marketplace. In this case, a strong focus on cost leadership has allowed retailers to extract more value from shoppers' unplanned shopping decisions relative to national brands, which focus more on differentiation. In turn, this search for differentiation leads national brands to effectively pay retailers for prime shelf space, allowing retailers to claim yet more value as their strategy isn't based on getting shoppers' attention through shelf space or presentation but through lower prices. In a way, this tells us that national brands help subsidize the low prices offered by private labels.

It was also concluded that consumers who carry a loyalty card make more in-store decisions for national brands. Promotion of national brands may or may not make as much profit for retailers as sales of private labels, but favourable prices on key national brand products can attract increased foot traffic. Retailers can capitalise on this by working to induce further in-store purchases through in-store communication and placements. Analysis of data from loyalty card carriers can reveal which goods are more likely to be sold in connection with others, allowing retailers to better coordinate these promotional activities. It can also reveal highly relevant information on what makes consumers switch to or from a brand or type of product, in terms of pricing and related promotional activity. Targeting opportunities, including even offers designed for unique consumers (through their loyalty cards) can generate loyalty from consumers towards a retailer that better caters to their needs, and can introduce a sort of discriminatory pricing that is more closely related to each shopper's willingness to pay for a specific product.

Another important conclusion of this dissertation is that consumers that carry their shopping trip accompanied conduct more in-store buying behaviour than consumers shopping alone. Accompanied shoppers not only conduct more in-store buying behaviour, but in monetary terms they spend more. This social aspect of shopping can be leveraged by retailers who promote shopping as a social activity, and who encourage word of mouth recommendations. Shopping as a social activity can be encouraged by making the overall shopping experience more pleasant and varied, and word of mouth recommendations can be gained through offering of samples and original communication initiatives, that encourage shoppers to remember and mention brands that are attached to messages that shoppers share. Promotions targeting accompanied consumers could focus on different consumer tastes to sell different varieties of the same product, or increased brand interaction by offering samples and encouraging discussion with and between shoppers.

Another unique and relevant result is how couples make more planned purchases as opposite to shoppers that came with children, extended family and friends/others, that consequently carried more in-store buying behaviour. Children are known to be susceptible to communication from brands and retailers, leading some to physically place their products on shelves at the equivalent to a child's eye-level. Retailers can take advantage of this with a two-step approach: First, encourage shopping with friends, as noted above, as well as with children, using communication targeted towards them and making it easier to shop with children, providing parents with strollers or hosting activities for children in retail spaces.

Second, inside their spaces, retailers can target communication and promotional activity towards children and children's products.

Another interesting result from this dissertation is how consumers with higher hedonic motivations conduct more in-store purchases, and consequently spend more money. While retailers do not know *ex-ante* whether a given consumer is driven by utilitarian or hedonic motivations, knowledge of each group's shopping habits can still be applied by retailers. Knowing that consumers with hedonic motivations have higher spend are more susceptible to in-store stimuli, retailers should focus not on identifying hedonic shoppers, but on inducing hedonic shopping habits in utilitarian shoppers, and on getting the most out of hedonic shoppers. Hedonic shoppers spend more time within the retail space and take care to check for new products and promotions. With this in mind, some retail spaces are already arranged so that shoppers are exposed to many different products before arriving at what they came to buy. This can be built upon, for example by periodically rearranging sections of the retail space so that shoppers spend more time browsing through products. This requires less cost and effort than total store reorganisations and minimises the risk of annoying regular shoppers with constant, large shifts in store organisation.

Analysis of purchase data can reveal which items are bought with a utilitarian motivation (by both utilitarian and hedonic shoppers). Having identified these items, retailers can place them in specific parts of the store in a way that maximises exposure to products and promotions, and can associate other products to the utilitarian products in order to create a cross-selling opportunity, for example by promoting goods that are complementary, but where only one is bought regularly with utilitarian purposes. This can be achieved by promotional prices, physically placing the goods closely and suggesting their pairing, or a combination of these measures. Hedonic shoppers themselves are attracted to new products and susceptible to promotions. By striving to introduce new products, even if only temporarily, retailers can capitalise on this interest and keep hedonic shoppers visiting their stores, and by keeping some promotions in-store and unpredictable, using interesting promotional activities (such as events, samplings and appealing communication materials), and communicating the advantages of in-store browsing to consumers, retailers can make shopping experiences more valuable to hedonic shoppers, potentially increasing both footfall and overall sales.

5.2. Limitations

Another limitation of this study was the lack of comprehension in how in-store buying behaviour actually occurs. For example, how certain brands are chosen at the store,

consumers that do a “mental” brand switch when looking at the product’s price, package or even the placement of the product on the shelf. Also, understanding how accompanied shoppers were interacting with each other was difficult to measure, especially with couples that act as joint decisions makers. In order to answer these questions a detailed analysis of the shopping trip of each participant would be necessary, however even though the information was collected, it was not possible to analyse due to time constraints. Therefore, it would be interesting to analyse how in-store stimuli influence consumer’s unplanned purchases, as well as how recall might be affected by additional exposure.

5.3. Directions for future research

The data extracted from the new methodology used – ICA (Ida às Compras Acompanhada) should be refined in order to understand the consumer’s decision-making process, and more precisely in-store buying behaviour. For example, it would be pertinent to expand the study of unplanned purchases for each section of the supermarket. This way, it will be possible to understand which areas of the store occur more in-store decisions. Following this, the study of the path taken by each consumer and also which areas occur more in-store purchases for national brands or private labels would be particularly relevant in the design and planning of the store environment, allowing retailers to allocate promotions in the respective sections of the supermarket where more traffic is present.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, further research should be taken in other retail contexts. With the development of online shopping and social websites, it would be interesting to apply the framework conducted on this study to measure how consumers make unplanned purchases while doing online shopping and take into consideration future visits to the online store. Academic research on this area is limited and there should be new behavioural models in order to gain unique and specific information of each consumer, especially to the area of consumer-based electronic commerce.

REFERENCES

- Abratt, R. & Goodey, S.D. (1990), "Unplanned buying and in-store stimuli in supermarkets", *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 11, pp. 111-121.
- ACNielsen (2005) The Power of Private Label in Europe An insight into consumer attitudes, pp. 30-45
- Ainslie, G. (1975), "Specious reward: A behavioural theory of impulsiveness and impulsive control", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 82, pp. 463-496.
- Applebaum, W. (1951), "Studying customer behaviour in retail stores", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 16, No. 2. pp. 172-178.
- Arnold, M.J. & Reynolds, K.E. (2003), "Hedonic shopping motivations", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 79, pp. 77-95.
- Babin, B.J., Darden, W.R., & Griffin, M. (1994), "Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20, pp. 644-656.
- Babin & Harris (2009) "CB³", Cengage Learning, Student Edition, pp. 125-290
- Bearden, W.O. & Etzel, M.J. (1982), "Reference group influence on product and brand purchase decisions", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 183-194.
- Beatty, S.E. & Ferrell, M.E. (1998), "Impulse buying: Modeling its precursors", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 74, pp. 169-191.
- Bell, D.R., Corsten, D. & Knox, G. (2009), "Unplanned buying on shopping trips", *Marketing Science Institute Working Paper*, Report No. 10-109, pp. 10-109
- Bell, D.R., Corsten, D. & Knox, G. (2011), "From point of purchase to path to purchase: How pre-shopping factors drive unplanned buying", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 75, pp. 31-45.
- Bellizzi, J.A. & Bristol, T. (2004), "An assessment of supermarket loyalty cards in one major US market", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 21, pp.144-154.
- Blythe, J. (2008), *Consumer behaviour*, Cengage Learning EMEA
- Bucklin, B.E. & Lattin, J.M. (1991), "A two-state model of purchase incidence and brand choice", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 10, pp. 24-39.
- Cardoso, P.R. & Pinto, S.C. (2010), "Hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations among Portuguese young adult consumers", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 38, pp. 538-558.
- Chandon, P., Hutchinson, J. W. & Young, S. H. (2002), Unseen is Unsold: Assessing Visual Equity with Commercial Eye-Tracking Data, working paper 2002/85/MKT, INSEAD, Fontainebleau.
- POPAI Brasil (2009/2010), Comportamento do Consumidor em Super e Hipermercados, *The Global Association for Marketing at Retail*, pp. 1-55.

- Dawson, S., Peter, H.B., & Nancy, M. R. (1990), "Shopping Motives, Emotional States, and Retail Outcomes", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.60, pp. 408-427.
- Dhar, R. & Wertenbroch, K. (2004), "The costs and benefits of temptation: Choice set effects on consumption utility", Working Paper, Yale University and INSEAD.
- Dowling, G.R. & Uncles, M. (1997), "Do customer loyalty programs really work?" *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 38, pp. 71-82.
- Farhangmehr, M., Marques, S. & Silva, J. (2000), "Consumer and retailer perceptions of hypermarkets and traditional retail stores in Portugal", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol 7, pp. 197-206.
- Garretson, J.A., Fisher, D., & Burton, S. (2002), "Antecedents of private label attitude and national brand promotion attitude: similarities and differences", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 78, pp. 91-99.
- Ghauri, P. & Gronhaug, K. (2005). *Research Methods in Business Studies, a practical guide*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Granbois, D.H. (1968), "Improving the study of customer in-store behaviour", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.32, pp.28-33.
- Gretzel, U., Yuan, Y. & Fesenmaier, D.R. (2000), "Preparing for the new economy: Advertising strategies and change in destination marketing organizations", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 39, pp.146-156.
- Hirschman, E.C. & Holbrook, M.B (1982), "Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods & propositions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46, pp. 92 – 101.
- Huang, Y., Hui, S. K., Inman, J. & Suher, J. (December 2011), "The path to unplanned purchase: Understanding point-of-purchase drivers of unplanned consideration and purchases using video tracking", *MSI Working Paper*.
- Hui, S., Bradlow, E.T. & Fader, P.S. (2009), "Testing behavioural hypothesis using an integrated model of grocery store shopping path and purchase behaviour", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 36, pp. 478-493.
- Inman, J. J., Ferraro, R. & Winer, R.S. (2004), "Where the Rubber Meets the Road: A Model of In-Store Consumer Decision-Making," *Marketing Science Institute Report*, pp. 98-122.
- Inman, J.J., Winer, R.S. & Ferraro, R. (2009), "The interplay among category characteristics, customer characteristics, and customer activities on in-store decision making", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73, pp.19-29.
- Karolefski, J. (1990), "Recession is growth opportunity," *Supermarket News*, 28-29.
- Kelley, H.H. (1947), "Two functions of reference groups", in: Swanson, G.E: *Readings in Social Psychology*, (Ed.) Guy E. Swanson et al., New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp. 410-414.

Khan, U., & Dhar, R. (2004), "A behavioural decision theoretical perspective on hedonic and utilitarian choice, Chapter in "Inside Consumption Frontiers of Research on Consumer Motives, Goals and Desires (Ed.) Ratneshwar, S., & Glen, D. R., pp.144-165.

Kahn, B.E. & McAlister, L. (1997), "Grocery Revolution: The New Focus on the Consumer", *Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley*.

Kaltcheva, V.D., & Weitz, B.A. (2006), "When should a retailer create an exciting store environment", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 70, pp. 107-118.

Kim, H. (2006), "Using hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations to profile inner city consumers", *Journal of Shopping Centre Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 57-79.

Knox, G., Corsten, D. & Bell, D.R. (2011), "*Shopping Goals and Unplanned Buying Across Cultures and Countries*".

Kollat, D.T. & Willett, R.P. (1967), "Customer impulse purchasing behaviour", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 4, pp. 21-31.

Kurt, D. & Stille, K. (2011), "Lost your license to spend? The moderating role of savings on the licensing effect of virtuous shopping basket composition on impulsive spending".

Lee, J.A., & Kacen, J.J. (2008), "Cultural influences on consumer satisfaction with impulse and planned purchase decisions," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61, pp. 265-272.

Lenchek, B. (1990), "The Rebirth of Private Label," *Progressive Grocer*, No. January, pp. 75-82.

Lunardo, R. & Mbengue, A. (2009), "Perceived control and shopping behaviour: The moderating role of the level of utilitarian motivational orientation", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 16, pp. 434-441. Luo, X. (2005), "How does shopping with others influence impulsive purchasing?", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol.15, pp. 288-294.

Martin, C.L. (1998), "Relationship marketing: a high-involvement product attribute approach", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 7, pp. 6-126.

Mauri, C. (2003), "Card loyalty: a new emerging issue in grocery retailing", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 10, pp. 13-25.

Netemeyer, R.G. & Teel, J.E. (1989), "Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.15, pp. 473-481.

Otnes, C., McGrath, M.A. & Lowrey, T.M. (1995), "Shopping with consumers: Usage as past, present and future research technique", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 20, pp. 97-110.

Park, C. W. (1982), "Joint decisions in home purchasing: A muddling-through process", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 151-162.

Park, C.W., Iyer, E.S. & Smith, D.C. (1989), "The effects of situational factors on in-store grocery shopping behaviour: the role of store environment and time available for shopping", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 422-433.

POPAI (1995), *The 1995 POPAI Consumer Buying Habits Study*. Englewood, NJ: Point-of-Purchase Advertising Institute.

POPAI Europe (1998), *The POPAI Europe Consumer Buying Habits Study*. Co-ordination by Retail Marketing In-store Services Limited, Watford, Herts: POPAI Europe. Reproduced with permission of POPAI Europe.

POPAI (2011), *The 2011 POPAI shopper Influence Study*. The Global Association for Marketing and Retail.

Rao, A.R, Childers, T.L. & Dutta, S. (1991), "Theoretical perspectives on intergenerational influences in consumer behaviour", Working Paper, Department of Marketing, University of Minnesota.

Raju, J.S., Sethuraman, R. & Dhar, S.K. (1995), "The introduction and performance of store brands", *Journal of Management Science*, Vol. 41, pp. 957-978.

Read, D. & Loewenstein, G. (1999), "Enduring pain for money: decisions based on the perception of memory of pain", *Journal of Behavioural Decision Making*, Vol.12, pp.1-17.

Revista Deco (2011), *Defesa do Consumidor, Proteste*, No. May, pp. 3-7

Rook, D.W. (1987), "The buying impulse", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 14, pp. 189-199.

Rook, D. & Fisher, R.J. (1995), "Normative influences in impulsive buying behaviour", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 22, pp. 305-313.

Saunders M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2007), *Research methods for Business Students*, London: Pearson Education, pp. 308-420

Schaninger, C.M. & Buss, W.C. (1986), "A longitudinal comparison of consumption and finance handling between happily married and divorced couples", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 48, pp. 129-136.

Sethuraman, R., & Cole, C. (1999), "Factors influencing the price premiums that consumers pay for national brands over store brands", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 8, pp. 340-351.

Solomon (2010), *Consumer behaviour: Buying, having and being*, Global Edition, 9th Edition, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Spiggle, S. (1987), "Grocery shopping lists: what do consumers write?", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 14, pp. 241-245.

Stilley, K.M., Inman, J.J. & Wakefield, K.L. (2010), "Planning to make unplanned purchases? The role of in-store slack in budget deviation", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 37, pp. 264-278.

Van Kenhove, P., De Wulf, K. & Van Waterschoot, W. (1999), "The impact of task definition

on store-attribute saliences and store choice”, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 75, pp.125-137.

Voss, G.B. & Parasuraman, A. (2003), “Conducting measurement validation with experimental data: cautions and recommendations,” *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 14, pp. 59-73.

Wakefield, K.L. & Inman, J.J. (2003), “Situational price sensitivity: the role of consumption occasion, social context and income”, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 79, pp. 199-212.

Weinstein, S. (1999), “Building loyalty”, *Progressive Grocer*, Vol. 78, pp. 89-92.

Wertebroch, K. (1998), “Consumption self-control by rationing purchase quantities of virtue and vice”, *Marketing Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 317-337.

Ziliani, C. & Bellini, S. (2004), “Retail micro-marketing strategies and competition”, *International Review of Retail Distribution and Consumer Research*, Vol. 14, pp. 7-18.

Other Sources:

APED (2009), “A evolução da concentração da indústria e da distribuição em Portugal”, Parlamento Europeu, Roland Berger Strategy Consultants GmbH.

Evaluating private label (2011), www.groceryheadquarters.com (2011). Accessed on the 26th December (2011).

Glossary L., Loyalty Program (<http://www.elect-mer.com/glossary-1.html>), Electronic Merchant Systems. Accessed on the 7th January 2012.

ANNEX 1 – Practical details of the study (n=156 interviews).

	# ICAs
Carnide	59 (38%)
Oeiras	55 (35%)
Amadora	42 (27%)
Weekend (Saturday)	77 (49%)
Weekday (Thursday and Friday)	61 (39%)
National Holiday (Friday)	18 (12%)
Morning (9h-14h)	39 (25%)
Afternoon (14h - 19h)	73 (46%)
Night (19h- 0h)	44 (28%)

ANNEX 2 – Supermarket sections.

Supermarket Sections	
Grocery	Bakery
Dietetics	Alcoholic Drinks
Beverages	Decoration
Cleaning Products	Garden and Animal
Personal Hygiene	Clothing
Dairy Products	Toys
Frozen Products	Stationery
Butcher	Leisure
Fishmonger's	Electricity and Bricolage
Delicatessens	Automobile
Fruits and Vegetables	Sports

ANNEX 3 – Supermarket product categories list

Section	Product Category
Mercearia/Grocery	Arroz, Massas, Farinhas, Azeites, Óleos, Vinagres, Feijão, Grão, Temperos, Conservas, Patés, Sopas, Refeições, Batatas-fritas, Snacks, Sobremesas, Açúcares, Adoçantes, Cereais, Cafés, Misturas, Chocolate para leite, Chás, Compotas, Mel, Cremes para barrar, Bolachas, Biscoitos, Bolos, Chocolates, Pastilhas elásticas, Alimentação infantil
Área Viva/Dietetics	Alim. c/ Frutose, Alim. c/ Edulc., Alimentos s/ Glúten, Alimentos s/ Lactose, Alim. Desportistas Suplem. Desportistas, Chás, Infusões, Controlo de Peso, Produtos Biológicos
Bebidas/Beverages	Águas, Sumos, Néctares, Refrigerantes, Cervejas
Drogaria/Cleaning Products	Detergentes/Produtos limpeza, Acessórios de limpeza, Ambientadores, Calçado, Inseticidas, Guardanapos, Rolos de cozinha, Papel Higiénico, Conservação de Alimentos
Higiene/Personal hygiene	Higiene oral, Higiene Corporal, Cabelo, Cosmética, Mãos, Unhas, Pés, Produtos solares, Depilatórios, Desodorizantes, Perfumaria, Básicos de saúde, Produtos p/ incontinência, Lenços de Papel, Higiene Bebé
Lacticínios/Dairy products	Leites, Iogurtes, Bebidas de soja, Bebidas refrigeradas, Sobremesas, Manteigas, Margarinas, Natas, Cremes culinários, Ovos
Congelados/Frozen Products	Legumes, Frutas, Refeições, Mariscos, Refeições carnes, Peixes, Gelados, Sobremesas
Talho/Butcher	Novilho, Suíno/Porco, Ovino, Coelho, Aves, Preparados, Carne congelada
Peixaria/Fishmonger's	Bacalhau, Peixe fresco, Peixe congelado, Salmão fumado e especialidades
Charcutaria/Delicatessens	Carnes, Queijos, Refeições prontas
Frutas e Legumes/Fruits and Vegetables	Legumes, Frutas
Padaria e Pastelaria/Bakery	Padaria, Pastelaria, Tostas
Garrafeira/Alcoholics drinks	Vinho, Vinhos generosos, Champanhes, Espumantes, Aguardentes, Licores, Whiskies, Espirituosas
Casa e Decoração/Decoration	Arrumação, Cozinha, Mesa, Artigos de festa, Artigos banho, Decoração da casa, Têxteis lar
Jardim e Animais/Garden and Animal	Jardim, Animais
Roupa/Clothing	Bebé, Homem, Senhora, Criança
Gourmet	Doçaria, Mercearia, Padaria, Temperos, Condimentos, Refrigeradores, Congelados, Conservas
Brinquedos/Toys	Filmes, Triciclos, Outros veículos
Papelaria/Stationery	Cadernos, Arquivos, Escrita, Didáticos, Desenho/Pintura, Colas, Fitas Adesivas, Arrumação
Livraria/Book shop	Top 10, Apoio Escolar, Dicionários, Gramáticas, Infante-Juvenil, Literatura, Arte, Gastronomia, Saúde/ Bem-Estar, Técnicos, Viagens e Lazer, Lazer
Lazer/Leisure	Desporto, Campismo
Iluminação e Bricolage/Electricity and Bricolage	Energia, Bricolage
Automóvel/Automobile	Óleos, Tratamentos Motor, Limpeza, Protecção, Ferramentas, Baterias, Acessórios, Electricidade, Equip. Exterior, Equip. Interior, Ambientadores

ANNEX 4 – Recruitment of participants

A) INTERCEPÇÃO DOS CLIENTES

Bom dia/Boa tarde/Boa noite, o meu nome é _____ e sou estudante de Mestrado da Universidade Católica Portuguesa. Estamos a seleccionar participantes para um estudo sobre o que é que os clientes fazem dentro deste supermercado, com o fim de recolher dados para a minha tese. Estaria disposto/a a colaborar?

A) SELECÇÃO DE PARTICIPANTES

Vou agora colocar-lhe algumas questões iniciais:

1. **Reside de forma permanente em Portugal?** SIM NÃO

2. **Tem idade igual ou superior a 18 anos?** _____

Muito bem. De acordo com as respostas que me deu até aqui encontra-se em condições de participar neste estudo, caso o deseje. Garantimos que a sua colaboração permanecerá anónima e que os dados recolhidos (até aqui e durante a continuação do estudo) permanecerão totalmente confidenciais.

Estamos a realizar este estudo com o apoio das lojas, mas EXCLUSIVAMENTE para a Universidade Católica Portuguesa e APENAS com fins científicos. Não iremos por isso facultar os seus dados para nenhum outro fim ou a qualquer outra instituição que não a Universidade Católica Portuguesa.

A sua participação neste estudo será remunerada com um cartão presente e no valor de 10 euros. Este cartão ser-lhe-á dado no final da sua colaboração com o estudo, e poderá utilizá-lo em compras futuras em qualquer das lojas abrangidas. Está disposto/a a participar?

- SIM
 NÃO

Vou então explicar-lhe agora em que consiste o estudo. Terá primeiro que responder a mais umas breves perguntas, antes de entrar no espaço de compras da loja. A seguir, iniciará as suas compras como costuma fazer habitualmente, mas eu irei acompanhá-la/o à distância durante o seu percurso, de modo a que possa registar alguns dados sobre o percurso que vai realizar durante a mesma. Durante esse acompanhamento não será incomodado e poderá realizar as suas compras com toda a normalidade.

Depois disso, colocar-lhe-ei mais algumas breves questões e terminaremos. Na totalidade, a sua colaboração implicará apenas mais 20 minutos para além do tempo que normalmente demoraria com as suas compras. Podemos então iniciar o estudo?

- SIM
 NÃO

Muito obrigada por aceitar colaborar connosco, vamos então começar.

ANNEX 5 – Interview at store entrance

1. **Trouxe lista de compras?**

- SIM (a)
 NÃO (b)

a. **Para além dos itens escritos na lista de compras, lembra-se de mais alguma coisa que venha comprar?**

b. **Que compras vem fazer hoje a este supermercado?**

- **É só isso que precisa?** _____
- **É tudo o que vem comprar?** _____

- Não se lembra de mais nada? _____
- Não vem comprar mais nada? _____

4. *Relativamente às compras que acaba de mencionar, vem fazê-las para uma festa/evento OU para uma empresa OU para revenda OU para oferta?*

- SIM
- NÃO

Pedia-lhe agora que me fornecesse alguns dados para fins estatísticos. Estes serão registados de forma a garantir a sua privacidade.

2. Que tipo de compras veio fazer hoje?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar pouca coisa | <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar algo que <u>me apeteceu</u> de repente comprar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar muita coisa | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras de algo que se tinha <u>esquecido</u> numa visita anterior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Compras do mês | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras para aproveitar promoções |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Compras da semana | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras para aproveitar descontos |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Compras do dia | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras para aproveitar ofertas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Compras para <u>utilizar</u> no próprio dia | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras como passeio ou lazer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar algo que <u>se acabou</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Compras de produtos frescos |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar algo que <u>me fazia falta</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Outro tipo de compras: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar algo que <u>me lembrei de repente</u> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vim comprar algo que <u>me lembrei de repente e me fazia falta</u> | |

3. Para quem vem fazer compras hoje?

- Para mim
- Para o meu agregado familiar
- Para outros

4. Quais as razões que o/a levaram a escolher este supermercado hoje?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preços baixos | <input type="checkbox"/> Proximidade ao trabalho |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promoções | <input type="checkbox"/> Proximidade a casa |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cupões | <input type="checkbox"/> Ter pouca gente |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outro tipo de descontos | <input type="checkbox"/> Não haver filas para pagar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Variedade de produtos | <input type="checkbox"/> Facilidade de acesso |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Qualidade dos produtos embalados | <input type="checkbox"/> Facilidade de estacionamento |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Qualidade dos produtos frescos | <input type="checkbox"/> Horário de funcionamento |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Qualidade dos produtos da marca | <input type="checkbox"/> Porque tem sempre novidades |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Variedade dos produtos da marca | <input type="checkbox"/> Outro: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poder visitar outras lojas ao mesmo tempo | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Poder comprar tudo no mesmo local | |

5. Vai fazer ou já fez compras noutra supermercado/hipermercado hoje?

- SIM. Quais? _____
- NÃO

6. Tem conhecimento de algum produto ou marca que esteja hoje em promoção aqui?

- SIM. Quais? _____
- NÃO

7. Como teve conhecimento dessa promoção?

- Recebi informação através de e-mail
- Vi anúncio (s) na televisão
- Ouvi anúncio (s) na rádio
- Vi anúncio (s) em revistas
- Vi anúncio (s) em outdoors
- Li o folheto com a informação sobre as promoções
- Recebi informação de uma das marcas que está em promoção
- Tenho um talão para descontar numa das marcas
- Tenho um cupão, que trouxe para descontar

Outro:

8. Quanto dinheiro estima vir hoje gastar em compras?

9. Quanto tempo estima vir hoje gastar nas compras? _____

10. Qual o meio de transporte que utilizou na sua deslocação até aqui?

- Viatura própria
- Viatura de terceiros
- Transporte público
- A pé
- Outro.

Qual? _____

11. Faz compras sozinho/a ou acompanhado/a?

Sozinho Acompanhado (Por quem? _____)

12. O _____ (refira especificamente o nome da loja em que se encontra) é um dos supermercados onde habitualmente faz compras?

- SIM** (Passe para a questão 12.1)
- NÃO** (Passe para a questão 13)

12.1. Frequência de compras nesta loja:

- Menos de uma vez por mês
- 1 vez por mês
- De 2 a 3 vezes por mês
- De 1 a 2 vezes por semana
- De 3 a 6 vezes por semana
- Todos os dias

12.2 faz mais compras neste supermercado:

Durante a semana (5 dias úteis)

Ao fim-de-semana

12.3. Qual o horário habitual de compras neste estabelecimento:

- Entre as 9 e as 12h
- Entre as 12 e as 14h
- Entre as 14 e as 19h
- Entre as 19 e as 21h
- Depois das 21

13. Suporte seleccionado para transporte de compras:

- Carrinho grande
- Carrinho pequeno
- Carrinho (tamanho único)
- Cesto sem rodas
- Cesto com rodas
- Caixa de papel ou plástico
- Suporte próprio. Qual? _____
- Nenhum

Hora da entrada na zona de compras: _____

ANNEX 6 – Interview at store exit

1. Das coisas que tinha planeado inicialmente levar, houve alguma que tivesse ACABADO POR NÃO COMPRAR?

- NÃO**
 - SIM. Quais?**
-
-
-

2. Quais pensa serem as razões para não ter conseguido comprar tudo o que tinha planeado?

- Não encontrei na loja
- Não existia na loja
- Fiquei farto/a ou cansado/a e não me apeteceu comprar mais nada
- Esqueci-me
- Não tive mais tempo
- Não consegui escolher e acabei por desistir de comprar
- O produto era muito caro e acabei por desistir de comprar

- Percebi que afinal era um produto dispensável
- Comprei outro produto em substituição: _____
- Outro: _____

3. E comprou algumas coisas que NÃO TINHA INICIALMENTE PENSADO em comprar?

- NÃO**
 - SIM. Quais?**
-
-
-

4. Quais pensa serem as razões para ter comprado mais coisas do que as que tinha inicialmente planeado?

- Estou cansado/a
- Estava com pressa
- Não consegui escolher e trouxe tudo
- Estava (m) em promoção/com desconto
- Lembrei-me que precisava
- Não consegui evitar
- Chamou-me a atenção e decidi comprar
- Porque compro sempre estes produtos
- Comprei sem pensar
- Sei que alguém gostaria que eu lhe comprasse este produto
- Quis experimentar um produto novo
- Outro: _____

5. *No caso do participante ter dito na entrevista inicial que vinha comprar algum item para o agregado familiar e/ou outros, peça agora para indicar no talão quais foram esses itens (assinale com uma cruz).*

6. O facto de no início o/a ter informado, que receberia um Cartão Presente no final, influenciou de alguma forma as compras que fez hoje?

- NÃO**
- SIM. Porquê?** _____

7. *No caso do participante ter lista de compras, peça para recolhê-la agora.*

8. Hoje percorreu as secções desta loja como habitualmente o faz?

- SIM**
- NÃO. Porquê?** _____

9. *E: (Ler as 2 opções de resposta)*

- Passou apenas nos corredores em que sabia que queria comprar algo?**
- Percorreu também outros corredores?**

Porquê? *(Pode assinalar mais do que uma opção)*

- Para ver novidades
- Para passear
- Para garantir que não me esquecia de nada
- Outro: _____

10. Ao longo das compras, foi tentando contabilizar o dinheiro que ia gastando para não exceder o montante que tinha pensado gastar hoje?

- SIM**
- NÃO**

11. Ao longo das compras, foi tentando contabilizar o tempo que ia gastando, para não demorar mais do que tinha inicialmente previsto?

- SIM**
- NÃO**

12. De 1 a 5, como avalia a sua visita de hoje a este supermercado, relativamente aos seguintes aspectos:

	1	2	3	4	5
A visita foi muito agradável					
A visita foi divertida					
Havia muita variedade por onde escolher					
A visita correu conforme eu tinha esperado					
Hoje estavam demasiadas pessoas no supermercado					
Hoje achei que os produtos estavam mais caros do que o habitual					
A visita foi uma maneira útil de aproveitar hoje o meu tempo					
As compras hoje foram mais cansativas do que o habitual					
Fiz as compras da mesma forma que faço normalmente					
Não fiquei muito satisfeito com o resultado final das minhas compras					

13. Diga em que medida concorda com as seguintes afirmações (1 significa discordo totalmente e 6, concordo totalmente):

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Grande parte do tempo que estive dentro do supermercado foi passada à procura do que havia de comprar						
2. É correcto dizer-se que estive mais tempo à procura do que haveria de comprar do que propriamente a fazer compras						
3. Durante o tempo que estive dentro do supermercado, concentrei-me em procurar apenas o que vinha comprar.						

ANNEX 7 – Self-administered questionnaire

1. Por favor indique o seu grau de concordância com as seguintes frases, assinalando a opção correcta de resposta com um X.

Fazer compras no supermercado é uma actividade:	Discordo totalmente					Concordo totalmente
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Que faço regularmente						
Que faço muitas vezes						
Que decido fazer espontaneamente						
Cujos detalhes esqueço logo após a ter concluído						
Para a qual não preciso pensar muito						
Que faço de forma automática						
Que já faço há muito tempo						
Cujos detalhes teria dificuldade de explicar a outros						

2. Por favor indique o seu grau de concordância com as seguintes frases, assinalando a opção correcta de resposta com um X.

Num supermercado:	Discordo totalmente				Concordo totalmente	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
É frequente comprar coisas de forma espontânea						
Muitas vezes compro coisas apenas porque me apetece						

Muitas vezes compro coisas só porque me despertam o interesse						
Acho divertido comprar coisas só porque mas apetece ter						
Acontece-me frequentemente fazer compras sem pensar						
Muitas vezes compro coisas sem pensar primeiro se fazem falta						
Faço muitas vezes compras de que me arrependo mais tarde						

3. Por favor indique o seu grau de concordância com as seguintes frases, assinalando a opção correcta de resposta com um X.

	Discordo totalmente			Concordo totalmente		
	1	2	3	4	5	6
<u>Ao fazer compras num supermercado:</u>						
Esforço-me por escolher produtos com qualidade						
Não perco tempo, opto quase sempre pela melhor marca						
Não perco tempo, opto quase sempre pela marca mais publicitada						
Controlo quanto estou a gastar, para não exceder o orçamento						
Controlo quanto tempo estou a demorar, para não me atrasar						
Esforço-me por encontrar produtos que valham a pena o preço						
Tento gastar o mínimo tempo e/ou esforço						
Demoro a decidir, para me certificar que escolho de forma acertada						
Opto quase sempre por comprar produtos de marca própria						
Penso bastante antes de decidir o que vou comprar						
Normalmente não perco tempo à procura dos produtos com desconto						
Não perco tempo, opto quase sempre pela marca mais barata						
É frequente sentir-me indeciso/a quanto ao que hei-de comprar.						
Tento ao máximo escolher produtos que estejam em promoção						
Tenho por hábito comprar sempre as mesmas marcas						
Esforço-me por comparar marcas no que toca à relação qualidade-preço						
Gasto algum tempo a ver e a comparar os preços dos produtos						

4. Por favor, indique agora alguns dados sobre si próprio:

4.1. Género: Feminino Masculino

4.2 Data de nascimento:

___/___/___

4.3 Habilitações literárias:

- 1º ciclo do Ensino Básico (Primário)
- 2º ciclo do Ensino Básico (Preparatório)
- 3º ciclo do Ensino Básico (9º ano)
- Ensino Secundário (Liceu, 12ºano)
- Bacharelato ou Licenciatura
- Mestrado ou Doutoramento

4.4 Actividade Profissional:

- Estudante
- Trabalhador por conta própria
- Trabalhador por conta de outrem.
- Dona(o) de casa ou doméstica(o)
- Reformado
- Desempregado

4.5. Local de Residência:

Código Postal (completo)

Freguesia: _____

4.6 Estado Civil:

- Casado(a)
- Solteiro(a)
- União de facto
- Divorciado(a)
- Viúvo

4.7 Tem filhos?:

NÃO

SIM.

Quantos? _____

De que idade (s)? _____

4.8 N.º de pessoas no seu Agregado Familiar: _____

4.9 N.º de pessoas com menos de 18 anos no Agregado Familiar: _____

4.10 Rendimento Mensal Líquido do Agregado Familiar:

- Menos de 1000 Euros
- 1000 - 1499 Euros
- 1500 - 1999 Euros
- 2000 - 4000 Euros
- Mais de 4000 Euros
- Não sabe/não responde