# School Of Graduate Studies

## The Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

*A Thesis Submitted to Saint Mary's University,the School of Graduate studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration*

**By**

**Beimnet Ayele**

**Advisor**

**Assistance Professor Mohammed**

**January 2017**
**Addis Ababa**

# The Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

*A Thesis Submitted to Saint Mary's University,the School of Graduate studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Business Administration*

## By
## Beimnet Ayele

**APPROVED BY:**

_____ _____ _____

**Advisor**                          **Signature**                     **Date**


_____ _____ _____

**Examiner, Internal**               **Signature**                     **Date**


_____ _____ _____

**Examiner, External**               **Signature**                     **Date**


_____ _____ _____

**Dean of StudentsSignature**                     **Date**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## ABSTRACT

*The aim of this study is to analyze the psychological effect of perceived scarcity on consumer buying behavior played by the perception that a particular good is scarce and that this scarcity is intentionally created by the marketer in Addis Ababa, Kolfe kerranio sub city. In doing so, the buying value perceptions of the Kolfe kerranio sub city consumers in Addis Ababa were examined. Descriptive type of research design, Quantitative and Qualitative approach were employed to achieve the research objectives. The research location selected due to the convenience and proximity of area to the researcher and 384 was the sample size. In addition, a demographic questionnaire, and psychological effects influencing buying behavior value were administered. Data from the quantitative survey were analyzed using percentages, t-test, and Pearson's correlation. From the analysis of the relationships between demographic measures and measures of buying behavior, sex was found to have significant correlation with almost all the dimensions of psychological effects values, and the total decision to buy, except avoid regret and well planned values. Education level has significant correlation with avoid the worst and avoid fear psychological effects values. Monthly income has significantly negative relationship with avoid fear value (r= -.128, p<0.001), and avoid regret value (r=-.182, p<0.001), while marital status has significantly positively correlated with well-planned value (r=.135, p<0.01) and negatively correlated with avoid the worst value (r=-.216, p<0.01). Family size has significant positive relationship with well-planned value (r=.133, p<0.001), and avoid regret value (r=.145, p< 0.01). In all the correlated cases, the variables show negative relationship, which means that as one of the variables increases, the other tends to decrease, and vice versa. Based on the findings, implications are discussed and further research is suggested.*

## List of Acrimony and Abbreviations

FGD - Focus Group Discussion

FSV- Feeling secured Value

FV-   Fear Value

KKSC – Kolfe keranio sub-city

RT – Reactant Theory

WPV-Well planned value

# List of Appendix

Table of Contents                                                            Page

## List of Tables

# CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of the study

*Scarcity* is the term economists use to describe the phenomenon that people want more of a commodity than is freely available. Commodities include both physical goods and service that households buy. Commodities also include resources such as people's work effort, raw materials, and the land that is used to produce the household products (Gupta Shipra, 2013).

There are two type of scarcity environmentally induced and endogenously or human-induced. *Scarcity* cannot be eliminated. On environmental induced and there scarcity refers to the declining availability of renewable natural resources such as gold and diamond. There are three ways that scarcity can be raised. Demand-induced scarcity: Population growth or increasing consumption levels decrease the amount of limited natural resources available to each individual. Supply-induced scarcity: Environmental degradation decreases the overall amount of a limited natural resource, decreasing the amount available to each individual and   Structural scarcity: Unequal access to natural resources in a given society makes them scarce for large segments of the population. Human-induced scarcity can be generated due to forces of supply and demand. A "supply side scarcity" can arise when the retailer deliberately controls the supply of the product in the marketplace. On the other hand, in a "demand side scarcity," the retailer does not limit the supply of the product but the scarcity arises due to factors like high demand for the product thus leading to stock depletion. Both are forms of human induced scarcity but their origins are different, as one is controlled by the marketer and the other is controlled by the consumer. All of the scarcity signify a loss of freedom and contracted with people tend to desire products on which such limitations are place (Oses-Eraso, Udina, and Viladrich-Grau 2008).

Consumer awareness and knowledge level have appreciated dramatically with globalization and technology advancements (Blackwell, Miniard and Engel, 2001). Increasingly informed consumers have characterized by time. Attitudes and expectations

are constantly changing in response to a continuous flow of events, information and personal experiences (Mittal, 2006). Thus, the need to conceptualize important consumption behaviors arises with the homogeneity in consumer culture and behavior originating from the effect of globalization (Karraker, 2012); forcing large and growing economies worldwide to revisit their strategies to understand consumers and their respective buying behaviors.

Most research in consumer behavior has focused on the factors that influence decision making and examining consumer feeling towards scarce products. The research examining mediating role of 'anticipated regret' and suggested that scarcity messages (for example, time restricted Promotional messages) affect consumers' purchase intentions by affecting not only the perceived economic outcomes, but also the emotional outcomes (Swain, Hanna, and Abendroth (2006).

## 1.2. Statement of the Problem

There are two type of scarcity environmentally induced and endogenously or human-induced. *Scarcity* cannot be eliminated. On environmental induced scarcity refers to the declining availability of renewable natural resources such as gold and diamond.  In human induced scarcity the origins either the marketer or the consumer

Ethiopia's trade as well as marketing system is encouraging progress from time to time in regarding to the ever modernizing market system and the interests of consumers: protect the circulation of goods and services that put consumer's health at risk and protect consumers from unreasonable prices. (The Proclamation No. 686/2010 commercial registration and business licensing_ and Proclamation No. 685/2010 Trade Practice and Consumers' trade practice) However, there are still challenges in fair marketing system and competition also posing a threat to consumers, example the human induced scarcity on edible oil and sugar in 2011

The Whole seller and retailer have been creating artificial shortages this is due to inefficiencies of country the market system. In the previous years these artificial shortage

occurred special consumable good like edible oil and sugar and forced government to import to ensure the market stabilized

*"We plan to flood the market to overcome artificial shortages that have been created through inefficiencies in the market system. This includes artificial shortages in edible oil and sugar. We intend to import lots of edible oil and sugar and flood the market to ensure it is stabilized*,"Melese Zenawi , 2011

From my observation due to the security situation of the country   people are perceived that there will be shortage of consumable good and then they buy more that they want stock in their house.

Emert Hige (2013), Addis Ababa University, studied what are Psychosocial Factors that Influencing Consumers Buying to luxury products (products they are scare by their nature, example diamond).

Shipra Gupta (2013) studied with the same title in the context of fast fashion to examining consumer's feelings or reactions to unique scarcity environments that are strategically created marketers by examining how deliberate product scarcity influences the consumers' psychological and behavioral response.

Other researches done in Ethiopia  explored the many industrial products from the perspectives of products attributes, promotional practices, distribution systems and brand  loyalty and consumers buying behavior.( Mesfin, 2004; Anteneh, 2008; Tiliku, 2009; Getaneh, 2012; Bete, 2008; Gedamnesh, 2013).

Thus, to the best knowledge of the researcher, there exists no previous research concerning the effect of perceived scarcity on consumers buying behavior is not addressed. Therefore, this study has analyzed the psychological    effect played by the perception that a particular good is scared and that this scarcity is intentionally created by the marketer in Addis Ababa kolfe kerranio sub city. The researcher, thus, presents the

theoretical and observational gaps, to understand the psychosocial effect and response of consumer's buying behavior on the goods artificially created scarcity.

## 1.3. Research Questions

The main purpose of this study is to answer the question that "how do consumers react to the unique scarcity environments that are strategically created by the marketers? In doing this research the following research question is raised

- What psychologicaleffectsof artificially scared product have on consumers buying behavior?

- How do consumers react to the conditions of scarcity that are strategically created by a retailer or whole sellers?

- What pattern of buying behaviors do consumers exhibit across demographic factors?

- What are the relationships between consumer's demographic factors and the buying behavior?

## 1.4. Objective of the Study

### 1.4.1. General Objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine and gain better understanding of the physiological effect of perceived scarcity, scarcity created by market, on consumers buying behavior by scrutinize of the response of consumers for goods which are artificial scarce.

### *1.4.2. Specific Objectives*

- To  assessing psychological effects of artificially scared products has on consumers buying behavior

- To examine how  do consumers react to the conditions of scarcity that are strategically created by a   retailer or whole sellers

-  To analysis what pattern of buying behaviors do consumers exhibit across demographic factors

- To assessing  what are the relationships between consumer's demographic factors and the buying behavior

- Suggest what administrative and policy measures need to be taken by the pertinent body's

.

## 1.5.  Significance of the Study

The importance of this study can be viewed from two dimensions: theoretical contributions and practical implications. Theoretically, the study fills an important gap in the literature; that is, explores the consumer buying behavior when there is marker created shortage by analyzing of the selected respondent in Kolfe Keranio Sub-city. Hence, the findings of this study can add to the existing body of literature and can serve as an initial point on which future studies could be built on.  Practically,   it Suggest administrative and policy maker to do pertinent measure in the case of perceived scared market. Finally it used for the researcher partial fulfillment of the   requirement of Master of Business Administration

## 1.6. Scope the Study

The scope of this study is confined to the exploration and explanation of the consumer buying behavior of scared consumable good, the scarcity created by the market a purposively selected for sub city – Kolfe keranio Subcity .The reason select of this sub city is socioeconomic diversity of the area ,convenient and proximity of the sub city for the researcher

## 1.7. Limitation of the study

The conceptualization and operationalization concepts of the psychological effect of artificial scared on consumer buying behavior may not be robust. Hence it is difficult to explain consumer buying behavior in artificial scared market generalizability and rich implications of research findings.

The research done only on one sub city due to, this is because of resource limitations borne by the researcher. Hence, the researcher believes that the study needs to be further undertaken on a wider range, incorporating more factors of consumer buying behavior as well as on more regions of the country to ensure the comprehensive analysis and reporting of factors influencing buying behavior for the whole country.

### 1.9. Organization of the study

This research paper consists of five chapters. Chapter one presented an introduction to the psychosocial effect of consumers buying behavior, its significance, objectives, gaps to be filled, scope of the study and method of thesis organization. Chapter twopresent the theoretical and empirical foundation of the study are outlined. The review gives the necessary background knowledge to the research questions and objectives. It also establishes the boundaries of this study. Chapter three discussed  the methodology  be used in the study; Research Design, Research Participants, Sampling Techniques, Data Collection Instruments and Data Analysis Procedures. Chapter four contains an analysis

of the data and presentation of the results. Finallyin chapter five, the researcher presented concluding and highlights of recommendations that might be useful for future researches on the area for policy or decision makers.

.

# CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1. Theoretical Literature review

### 2.1.1 Consumer Buying Behavior

Consumer behavior, although mostly used to refer to the individual shopper, portrays two different consuming bodies: the end-use consumer and the organizational consumer (Mittal, 2006). The end consumer is who consumes products and services for one's own use or that of the household. And the organizational consumer buys products, equipment and services in order to run the organizations: which includes governmental agencies, companies, and institutions. The focus of this research is on the end used consumer. End-use consumption is perhaps the most ubiquitous/universal behavior, with choices fulfilling a social identity function (Wanke, 2009), for it involves every individual in role of either buyer or user.

Consumer behavior could be defined as how individual consumers and families or households make decisions to spend their available resources on consumption related items Consumer buying behavior influencing by different factor and theses are cultural factors, social factors, personal factors and psychological factors. Cultural factors: Cultural factors are coming from the different components related to culture or cultural environment from which the consumer belongs. Social factors: Social factors are among the factors influencing consumer behavior significantly. They fall into three categories: reference groups, family and social roles and status. Personal factors: Decisions and buying behavior are obviously also influenced by the characteristics of each consumer and Psychological factors: Among the factors influencing consumer behavior, psychological factors can be divided into four categories: motivation, perception, learning as well as beliefs and attitudes. (Loudon and Della-Bitta, 2004).

## 2.1.2 Scarcity

Scarcity is a pervasive aspect of human life and is a fundamental precondition of economic behavior. Although the academic marketing and consumer- behavior literatures

contain relatively little about the psychological effects of scarcity, marketing practitioners have long assumed that scarcity enhances the perceived value of products and opportunities (Michael Lynn, 1991).

Scarcity is a dominant aspect of economic behavior (Verhallen and Robben 2004). In general, it is of two types - exogenously or environmentally-induced and endogenously or human-induced (Oses-Eraso, Udina, and Viladrich-Grau 2008). Both signify a loss of freedom and, to negate this loss, people tend to desire products on which such limitations are placed. Scarcity, irrespective of whether it is exogenous or endogenous, enhances the perceived value of products and opportunities, thus resulting in higher product desirability, increased quantities purchased, shorter searches, and greater satisfaction with the purchased product (Shipra Gupta 2013; Lynn 1991).

As suggested, scarcity has a positive effect on preferences, but it tends to influence preferences only when consumers believe that market forces (i.e., forces related to demand and supply) create scarcity (Verhallen and Robben 1994). When consumers believe that scarcity is created accidentally or by non-market forces such as a missed order or failed delivery, then scarcity effects on preferences are not found.

In a retail environment, human-induced scarcity can be further generated due to forces of supply and demand. A "supply side scarcity" can arise when the retailer deliberately controls the supply of the product in the marketplace, i.e. supply is limited intentionally. On the other hand, in a "demand side scarcity," the retailer does not limit the supply of the product but the scarcity arises due to factors like high demand for the product thus leading to stock depletion, i.e., demand exceeding supply. Both are forms of human-induced scarcity but their origins are different, as one is controlled by the marketer and other is controlled by the consumer. (Shipra Gupta 2013)

The effects of scarcity have largely been examined in the context of advertising messages. Inman, Peter, and Raghubir (1997) and Suri, Kohli, and Monroe (2007) demonstrate that the presence of scarcity in messages actually enhances consumers' thoughtful analyses. The findings in both the studies suggest that individuals are more motivated to process

messages which have scarcity appeals connected to them. Studies also suggest that scarcity messages not only increase the choice of a good, but also increase the willingness to pay (Mittone and Savadori 2009).

Swain, Hanna, and Abendroth (2006) studied the influence of promotional restrictions, especially time restrictions, in influencing consumer purchase intentions. Their findings predict that time restrictions lower purchase intentions by lowering deal evaluations but also suggest that time restrictions increase purchase intentions by creating a sense of urgency and anticipated regret.

Eisend (2008) examined the influence of scarcity appeals in mass media and suggested the role of a "third-person effect" in enhancing value perceptions and, subsequently, purchase intentions. The study suggests that people, when exposed to scarce product announcements, take into consideration both the perceived influence of self and the perceived influence on others. This research has examined the impact of scarcity in retail environments. For example, the influence of product scarcity as which is created by retailer.

These studies suggest that scarcity created by market form of relative stocking level depletion of the consumable good in the market significantly affects consumer attitudes and thus promotes increased sales. Nichols (2012) suggests scarcity to be an important antecedent for consumer competitive arousal, where consumers compete to strive against others and thus make their choices accordingly. However, work on what different types of "consumer buying behaviors" may emerge due to deliberate manipulation of product scarcity within a retail setting is still absent in the literature and thus a motivation to conduct this study.

## 2.1.3. Theories Related to Scarcity

There are two different theories related to scarcity have been studied in social psychology: reactance theory (Brehm 1966, 1972; Brehm, Stires, Sensenig and Shaban

1966; Hammock and Brehm 1966) and commodity theory (Brock 1968; Lynn 1991). Reactance theory concerned with how individuals react when their freedom to choose is restricted.  On the other hand, commodity theory views a scarce product as a unique or valuable product to possess.

## 2.1.3.1. Commodity Theory

Commodity theory has been used to explain the psychological effects of scarcity. This theory claims that any commodity will be valued to the extent that it is unavailable (Brock 1968; Michael Lynn 1991). Commodity theory argues that individuals evaluate a product as more attractive when it is scarce rather than abundant. Through the lens of commodity theory, much research has tested the following four relationships: a product will be more attractive (1) when the number of suppliers is small, (2) when a restriction on availability is imposed by the seller, (3) when a consumer has to wait to attain the product, and (4) when the consumer has to make an extra effort to obtain the product (Shipra Gupta 2013; Brock 1968; Brock and Mazzocco 2003; Lynn and Harris 1997). Commodity theory further suggests that scarcity effects apparently depend on the following three conditions: (1) commodities must be useful and desirable, (2) they must be transferable from one person to another, and (3) they must have the potential to be possessed.

Overall, commodity theory provides an initial understanding of the scarcity effect and consumers' reactions to scarce goods, but fails to clarify the behavioral mechanism that underlies this motivational process (Verhallen 1982; Worchel 1992). A notable difference between commodity and reactance theory is the focus on variables, such as the degree of expected freedom that impacts the individuals' response to the choice constraint.

Thus, behavioral researchers suggest a dominance of reactance theory over commodity theory in explaining the consumer's decision making process under the conditions of product unavailability (Clee and Wicklund 1980).

## 2.1.3.2. Reactance Theory

Reactance theory focuses on an individual's reaction to the loss of perceived freedom. According to reactance theory, if an individual's freedom is threatened or eliminated, s/he experiences psychological reactance, which is a motivational state directed toward safeguarding a person's behavioral freedom (Brehm 1966; Clee and Wicklund 1980; Shipra Gupta 2013). This motivation leads to an intensified desire to accomplish the restricted behavior and simultaneously increases its perceived attractiveness (Brehm and Brehm 1981). Hence, a product's limited availability or perceived scarcity can connote a threat or loss of personal freedom and therefore, may trigger psychological reactance that leads to increased attention, attraction to the unavailable good, and ultimately, increased consumer motivation to obtain the alternative that is no longer accessible (Ditto and Jemmott 1989; Markus and Schwartz 2010; Worchel and Brehm 1971). Thus, in a situation where an individual can select between Alternative A and Alternative B and that the person is told to pick Alternative B (threatening the freedom to choose Alternative A), the individual is more likely to choose Alternative A in order to restore the freedom to have it, and hence Alternative A becomes more desirable (Brehm and Sensenig 1966; Crawford *et al.* 2002).

But reactance to the threatened behavior may also occur in a different way and consumers may actually react negatively to product unavailability (Hannah et al. 1975; Min 2003; Stiller 2011; Worchel and Brehm 1971). Min (2003) suggests that when consumers encounter a threat of an unavailable product, they experience negative feelings that motivate them to move in the opposite direction than what is implied by the threat.

Hence, when consumers feel the pressure to select a similar alternative that is inaccessible, they get motivated to avoid the similar alternative and rather select a dissimilar alternative in an effort to assert their freedom to choose (i.e., a boomerang effect).

In general, scarcity seems to create a sense of urgency among consumers (Michael lunny1991, and Huh 2011). This sense of urgency is more evident when there are limited

time windows to purchase limited product, and thus consumers tend to create "urgency to buy" in their minds. "Urgency to buy" as a desire of the consumer to buy the product right away, thus limiting consumers' freedom to delay buying decisions.

Both internal cues and external cues can trigger the urge to buy a product (Wansink 1994; Youn and Faber 2000). Internal cues refer to consumers' self-feelings, moods, and emotional states whereas external cues involve retailer-controlled environmental and sensory factors. Studies suggest that atmospheric cues in the retail environment (for example, sights, sounds, and smells) are important external triggers that influence consumers' urge to buy (Shipra Gupta 2013; Mitchell 1994). Additionally, marketing mix cues such as point-of-purchase, displays, promotions, and advertisements can also affect the desire of the consumer to buy the product right away.

This research focused on external cues like 'strategically imposed scarcity environments' created by the retailer, create a perception of scarcity in the mind of the consumer thus threatening his/her freedom to delay buying decisions. Country like Ethiopia Market perfection fail retailer could deliberately manipulate product availability within their stores and which threatens consumers' freedom to delay a buying decision, thus triggering psychological reactance and encouraging them to take immediate actions to safeguard their behavioral freedom. Consumers thus create a sense of urgency and a desire in their mind to buy

## 2.1.4 Urgency to Buy

In general, scarcity seems to create a sense of urgency among consumers (Shipra Gupta 3012 and Huh 2011).

This sense of urgency is more evident when there are limited time windows to purchase limited product, and thus consumers tend to create "urgency to buy" in their minds. We define "urgency to buy" as a desire of the consumer to buy the product right away, thus limiting consumers' freedom to delay buying decisions. The felt urge to buy derives from Rook's focus on the sudden and spontaneous urge to buy something (Rook 1987). As per Beatty and Ferrell (1998), urgency to buy is a state of desire that precedes the actual impulse action and is experienced upon encountering an object in the environment. Both

internal cues and external cues can trigger the urge to buy a product (Wansink 1994; Youn and Faber 2000). Internal cues refer to consumers' self-feelings, moods, and emotional states whereas external cues involve retailer-controlled environmental and sensory factors. Studies suggest that atmospheric cues in the retail environment (for example, sights, the available information, state security mood) are important external triggers that influence consumers' urge to buy (Eroglu and Machleit 1993; Mitchell 1994). Additionally, marketing mix cues such as point-of-purchase, displays, promotions, and advertisements can also affect the desire of the consumer to buy the product right away.

First, as mentioned above, scarcity is based on the principle of reactance, where people respond to product shortage by placing greater psychological value on perceived scarce products and thus, are tempted to exhibit behaviors like sense of urgency and hoarding in order to restore their lost freedom. Extant literature also suggests scarcity leading to hoarding behaviors (Michael lunny1991 and Shipra Gupta, 2013), thus supporting our choice of variables

## 2.1.5. The Mediating Role of Anticipated Regret

The previous studies in decision making have focused on cognitive factors, but recently a growing body of research has emphasized the importance of emotions in decision making. Research examining the relationship between emotion and decision making has focused on emotions like anticipated regret (Bell 1982; Shipra Gupta 2013; Loomes and Sugden 1982). These anticipated emotions, though not experienced in the immediate present, are expected to be experienced in the future. Bell (1982) and Loomes and Sugden (1982) explicitly incorporated the anticipatory aspects of regret into their model of decision making, called "regret theory." According to this theory, the choice decision also depends on the feelings evoked by the outcomes of rejected options. People compare the actual outcome with what the outcome would have been if a different choice had been made, and experience emotions as a consequence of this comparison. These emotions include regret if the foregone outcome was better than the actual outcome and rejoicing if the foregone outcome was worse. Studies suggest that these emotional consequences of

decisions are furthermore anticipated and taken into account, especially when making decisions in uncertain situations.

Anticipated regret motivates behavior because regret is a particularly pervasive and powerful emotion that people wish to avoid. Several studies suggest that anticipated regret among consumers leads to choices which are safer, thus showing risk-aversion behaviors (Josephs *et al.* 1992; Li *et al.* 2010; Richard *et al.* 1996).

The current study suggests that among consumers perceived scarcity influences urgency to buy not only directly, but also indirectly, by affecting anticipated regret. Retailers, by adopting of hiding the item that consumer need for date to day consumption make consumers feel uncertainty about product availability. These retailers through different strategies make consumers realize that if they don't get the desired product right away, then they won't get it in future. Thus, consumers soon start to understand that while shopping in these stores if they wait then it is very likely that they will end up with not getting the desired product, a decision that they would regret and unsecured. Thus, we suggest that consumers under these retail environments are then more likely to anticipate the consequences of their decisions and to avoid regret due to ending up without the desired product and, thus, will actually buy the product immediately.(Shipra Gupta 2013)

## 2.1.6 In-store Hoarding

The two concept relating to consumer for having of product are In-store Hoarding and In-store hiding

Frost and Hartl (1996) define hoarding as consisting of the following key elements: (1) the acquisition of a larger number of possessions, (2) subsequent failure to discard possessions, and (3) resulting clutter that precludes the use of living spaces in the manner for which those spaces were designed. Hence, in general, hoarding is viewed as a type of inventory accumulation and is exhibited when one perceives high levels of risk for being deprived of the product (Frost and Stekette 1998; McKinnon, Smith, and Hunt 1985). Hoarding behaviors are generally motivated by a strong desire for immediate ownership of an item due to the fear of scarcity or unavailability of a product (Shipra Gupta 2013;

Michael Lynn 1991).

Hoarding behaviors are associated with an exaggerated sense of control or desire for control over possessions and have been considered in consumer and economic psychology literature in the context of materialism. Belk (1985, p. 267) defines possessiveness, a dimension of materialism, as the "inclination and tendency to retain control or ownership of one's possessions." Further, the emotional attachment that a hoarder develops for a possession, in particular, the tendency to relate the possession as part of one's self or one's identity also plays an important role in the hoarding of possessions. Hoarding behaviors are also associated with less willingness to share, negative reactions to unauthorized touching or moving of possessions, and concern over other people using or taking possessions (Frost *et al.* 1995). Given the nature of hoarding behavior, some researchers associate it with psychological disorders and suggest such behavior to be serious and threatening (Frost *et al*. 2009).

Recently, researchers have introduced the concept of 'in-store hoarding' and define it as consumers' desire to possess an item and keep it for themselves while shopping, although not sure whether they want to buy it or not (Byun and Sternquist 2008). It occurs due to a sudden urge to possess the merchandise generated due to certain situational factors like scarcity, uncertainty about product availability, or competition among shoppers. Studies also suggest that in-store hoarding can occur due to promotional factors (e.g., sales or special offers) or appealing product factors (e.g., color, quality, or design) (Byun and Sternquist 2008; Frost and Steketee 1998). These situational or promotional factors are likely to increase consumers' concerns about product availability, thus creating a fear of losing the product (or loss aversion behaviors) (Frost and Gross 1993; Frost, Meagher, and Riskind 2001; Verhallen and Robben 1994). Thus, in-store hoarding is different from regular buying behavior as it creates stronger emotional or psychological reactions, leading to consumers possessing the product without a clear intention of buying and keeping it to themselves until they reach a final buying decision.

## 2.1.7. In-store Hiding

The current study defines hiding behavior as a consumer's intentional act of removing the desired product from other consumers' sight and hence increases the odds of buying the desired item later. In the marketing literature, hiding behavior has been sparsely examined except in the context of thrift shopping (Bardhi and Arnould 2005) or Black Friday shopping (Lennon, Johnson, and Lee 2011). Both of the studies suggested hiding to be a time dependent behavior where the deliberate act to hide occurs a day before an event. Bardhi and Arnould (2005) suggested that in thrift stores, consumers one day before a dollar sale purposely hide the items of interest from the other consumers. Similarly, Lennon, Johnson, and Lee (2011) revealed a similar finding in the context of Black Friday and suggested that consumers go the day before and hide the desired item with a hope that the desired items will be available when they get to the store the next day.

Retailers by communicating scarcity threaten consumer freedom, thus triggering psychological reactance and encouraging them to take immediate actions to safeguard their behavioral freedom, leading to behaviors like urgency to buy or in-store hoarding. However, at the same time, consumers want to explore the different choices offered in the marketplace and thus use in-store hiding behaviors as a way to buy time and, thus, delay decision making on the perceived scarce items. In-store hiding as defined in this study extends to the sparse literature on hiding behaviors by suggesting that this behavior could occur while one is shopping and thus is not time dependent. Hiding behaviors further facilitate mere-possession effects and, similar to hoarding behaviors, reflect consumers' desire to possess an item of interest and keep it to themselves while shopping. Also, hiding behaviors exaggerate the desire for control over products and facilitate risk-avoidance behaviors. (Shipra Gupta 2013).

## 2.2 Empirical literature review

## 2.2.1. The Role of Gender on Urgency to Buy, In-Store Hoarding, and In-store Hiding Behaviors

Several studies proved significant differences in connection to purchase behavior and gender differences. The differences are based mainly on sociological and biological particularities. The researchers discovered significant differences between men and women in information processing, in approach to gift giving or approach to the attitudes toward the atmosphere of a retail location. (Mitchell 1994).

The impact of gender on the motivators themselves and loyalty to a brand or a shop is based on different need of social interaction. Women are more likely to yield to emotional factors while selecting a shop or a brand. Direct correlation between hedonistic values and satisfaction with the purchase was discovered among women. From the perspective of evaluation of the purchase place atmosphere, in general, women moved on the scale significantly higher than men. (Shipra Gupta, 2013)

Even if men caught up with women in connection to information search and product variability evaluation, they still aim at efficiency in approaching the final goal and apply more assertive strategies in reaching it. Women search, reflect directly and rely on interaction and personal contacts. These results to additional facts that are based on interpersonal affiliation to community, namely, women express higher loyalty to local shops than men. Women also invest more time while shopping in order to reach maximal gain. Similarly, different approaches to waiting in a shop were found out. Men have a more negative attitude to waiting and it impacts evaluation of the overall atmosphere of a retail location significantly. Women do not perceive waiting that negatively; in a measurement of time estimation spent waiting the data was often undervalued and women were markedly inaccurate.Shipra Gupta,2013

The responsibility of woman in Africa assumes the role of a food producer and processor, home-maker, caretaker and sometimes, a paid worker. Each of these roles imposes

different demands and expectations on women. In conjunction with the lack of basic infrastructure in rural areas these responsibilities leave women time poor. Most economic perspectives pay little, or no attention to unpaid economic activities.This may explain the lack of policy prescriptions that draw on the household's gender-based dynamics and their impact on human development. As a result, women, who are over-represented in the unpaid sector of the economy, have been, often, omitted from the policy debate. Blackden and Bhanu, 1998

## 2.2.2 The Concept of Food as commodity

There are two kind of commodity, these are consumable and non-consumable and food is considers as consumable commodity .The commodity nature of food became much more pronounced as capitalism grew and conquered most of the world's societies. This changed with capitalism or generalized commodity production. The endless accumulation of profits, the motive force of the capitalist system, occurs through the production of commodities or services to sell at a price in excess of the production costs. Production for the purpose of sale and profit, instead of production for use, is a defining characteristic of capitalism and essentially all commodity exchanges take place in markets. Indeed farming, the actual raising of crops and animals is only one part of the whole food system. The commodity nature of all parts of the agricultural/food system—farm inputs, actual farming, purchasing and processing raw agricultural goods, and wholesaling and retailing—means that many different types of commodities are produced and sold.

However, Food is one of the most basic of human need and routine access to a balanced diet is essential for both growth and development of the young, as well as for general health throughout one's life there is a critical contradiction when any basic human need is produced and sold as a commodity, whether we are considering food, health care, drinking water, or shelter. Fred Magdoff and Harry Magdoff ,2011

## 2.3 Operational Definition of Terms

The operational definition for technical terms is provided here under.

1. **Consumer** is one who consumes/buys/purchases consumable products/goods from a provider.

2. **Consumer behavior** is how individual consumers and families or households make decisions to spend their available resources on consumption related items

3. **Buying behavior** is the actual buying or purchase behavior of the consumer and the factors influencing the decision-making process.

4. **The buying process** is a complex mental process as well as a physical activity buyers undergo to satisfy their needs and desires.

5. **Consumable product** is the state of being or an item/product which is desirable but essential.

**6 .Psychological effect expressed**, being secured, avoiding fear, avoiding regret, avoiding the worst, and well-planned

7 **Perceived scarcity:** it is human induced scarcity or market scarcity to increase of price and sale .The consumers perceive that there is scarcity even though is not real scarcity

# CHAPTER THREE: RSEARCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1. Research Design

As a plan and framework of a research project, the research design guides the data collection and analysis procedures to ensure that the study will ultimately address the relevant problem (Kothari, 2004).

In dealing with the research problems, descriptive method of research design was employed. Descriptive research according to Kothari (2004) is a fact-finding query, with the major purpose of describing the state of affairs as it exists at present. This research design isnot flexible, it is said to make enough provision for protection against bias, and also sufficiently specify the objectives of the study to ensure that the data collected are relevant. Taken of descriptive research design meets the aim to obtain complete and accurate information, with due concern for the cost- friendly completion of the study at hand.

## 3.2. Research Approach

The research problem in this thesis is to assess the Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior regarding consumable products. The theory verification nature of this research favors' both quantitative and qualitative approach oriented.

In order to achieve the objective of the study already stated, both primary and secondary data obtained from different sources are employed. The primary data is collected through different data collection instruments like questionnaire, focused group discussion and observation.

## 3.2. Study Area and Target Population

The study is conducted in Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia, and the study cite was KKSC (Kolfe keranio sub city)around Atena Tena, Asra Semint Mazioa and Wingate. The targeted population is selected due to proximity and convince of the targeted consumers for the researcher

## 3.3. Sampling Techniques of the Study

Following relevant sampling procedures, sample consumers were selected, from which primary data was collected. The basic requirement for a sample is that, sample must be as representative of the population as possible (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970; Jonker & Pennink, 2010). Krejcie & Morgan (1970) presented an approach identified by the research division of National Education Association (NEA) in 1960, which is capable of giving a mathematical solution and as such is a frequently used technique for determining a sample size. This calculation gives a sample size that ensures a desired level of precision rate and confidence level.

For this study a 95% confidence level was taken with a confidence interval of 5%. The sample population of the research is100,000 focused on the areas of Atena Tena, Asra Semint Mazioa and Wingate .With a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of 5%, the sample size of this research is 384 respondents, following the NEA (1960, cited in Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) sample size calculation formula below

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where

S = Sample size

X = Z value (1.96 for 95% confidence level)

N =      Population Size

P =      Population proportion (expressed as decimal); (assumed to be 0.5 (50%) - his provides the maximum sample size).

d =      Degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion *(.05).*

## 3.4. Pilot Test

A pilot test conducted with the aim to solve ambiguity in language and structure, to check validity, reliability and feasibility of the instrument. In the present study, the Amharic version of the instrument was administered to 10 respondents in the study area.

### 3.5. Research Variables

#### 3.5.1. Independent variable

In this research, the independent variable is physiological effect is represented by five value dimensions; namely, being secured, avoiding fear, avoiding regret , avoiding the worst, and well-planned and other independent variables are Sex, Age, Educational level, income ,Marital status and family Size

## 3.5.2. Dependent variable

In this research, the dependent variable is buying behavior

## 3.6. Data Collection Instruments

Getting appropriate data is the key to reach accurate study results. The two most important research instruments is employed to collect primary data - questionnaire and focus group discussions were used in this research. The questionnaires are served as the main data collection instrument. This is because as the major objective of this study is to assess the Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior and questionnaire is assumed to help to a great extent to obtain the needed data.

Accordingly, the questionnaire administered is adopted from previous studies (Ling, 2009; Shipra Gupta 2013) for the study. This questionnaire involved different items that supposed to measure the consumer buying behavior under perceive scarcity of consumable product, in order to draw out the psychological effect of perceived scarcity on buying behaviors.

The second important instrument of primary data, Focus Group Discussion (FGD), was employed with the aim to allow the respondents to inform the study from their experience. There were five FGDs conducted among the user of consumable product

As addressed above, secondary data also was used to primarily construct the basic framework of the study before proceeding to primary data collection.

## 3.6.1. Validity of the Scale

Assessing the extent to which the scale measures given construct is what's all about validity. Among the different types of validity, content validity is chosen due to time and resource constraints, which the researcher has been burdened with. Simply defined, content validity is the extent to which the elements within a measurement procedure are relevant and representative of the construct that they will be used to measure (Haynes et al., 1995). Establishing content validity is a necessarily initial task in the construction of a new measurement procedure (or revision of an existing one). The scale chosen for this study is represent for measuring the response of the consumer on buying of goods which are strategically scared.

To verify this, the researcher went through each item on the scale in order to make sure that they fit into the context. The questionnaire is then translated from English to Amharic for respondents' easy use. During the process of translation, it is ensured that the core meanings of the sentences were retained. In other words, some items are modified to fit the Amharic sense of the language, rather than making use of direct translation.

The translated instrument is given to an experienced translator for review purpose, who has ample knowledge on the field. This helped to maintain the context of meanings and intensions

of each item in the scale. Review was made by comparing the English and Amharic languages versions of the instrument. From the response is known that presenting both forms helped to check whether meanings are lost within the translation or otherwise..

### 3.6.2. Reliability of the Scale

Reliability refers to the consistency or repeatability of the measure. The scale of the perceived scarcity as motivational factors to buying decision is reported to have an internal consistency of 0.91 in the assessment made by Ling (2009).

Internal consistency reliability of the Amharic versions of the instrument is determined for the total and for the subscales.

## 3.7. Data Collection Procedures

The first step in the data collection procedure is questionnaires are distributed for fill out for quantitative.

To have maximum rate of return the researcher is gone every individual of questionnaire distributed. In addition, FGD is conducted after collecting the Qualitative data.

## 3.8 Ethical Considerations

In the process of data collection, issues related to voluntary participation and informed consent is used. In response the researcher was equipped with the necessary fact files to fully inform prospective participants about procedures involved in the research. To protect the privacy of participants, the principle of anonymity is strictly adhered to. The confidentiality of filled data is also guaranteed and no personally identifiable data has not been collected.

While dealing with the secondary data, the necessary precaution was taken not to misinterpret, which might lead to serious implications.

## 3.9. Data Analysis Procedures

The collected data were entered into IBM SPSS version 23 (Statistical Package for Social Science, version 23) computer programs. The entered data was checked and explored. Following this, appropriate data analysis techniques were selected, taking the research objectives, characteristics of the data, and the underlying properties of the statistical techniques into consideration

Descriptive statistical tests of frequency, percentage and standard deviation were employed to check the general pattern of consumer buying behavior of the respondents according to the demographic characteristic. T-test was compute to determine whether there is a significant mean difference between the subscales. In other words, research questions would be analyzed by $t$-test to check whether the consumer at KKSC different from the test value.

Pearson correlation was computed to provide information whether the independent and dependent variables correlate with each other, and to measure the degree of relationship between variables.

## CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDING

As mentioned in the methodology section, both quantitative and qualitative data were used for this research. For quantitative data, descriptive data analysis, and one sample $t$-test is computed on the summed scores of each subscale (being secured value, fear value, avoiding the worst value, avoid regret value and well planned value), to test mean differences.

To achieve objectives of the study, Pearson's correlation coefficients were also calculated to observe the relationships among the variables influencing buying behavior and to see the internal consistency of the measures.

Towards this end, the data collected from the sample population was screened for missing values, as well as extreme responses and only complete questionnaires were considered for the data analysis. Out of the total 384 questionnaires distributed, with additional 5% in case of missing values, a return rate of 95% was achieved. Where, 10 questionnaires were not returned and 9 of them discarded for irregularities in responding.

## 4.1. Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Profile of Respondents

In this section the Demographic information of consumable product consumers were presented.

According to *Table 4.1,* out of the 384 total samples of respondents the data is found to be 72.4% were females while 27.3% were males.

Concerning their age, out of 369 respondents (15 reported missing), comparatively the majority of them 48.2% , 39.8% , 5.7% , and 2.3% were of age groups of 36-45, 20-35, 46-55, and above 56 years, respectively. In other words, those respondents of age between 20- 45 years amount to 88% of total respondents. The mean, mode, minimum and maximum of ages were correspondingly as 35.5, 38, 25, and 65.This show that majority participant were with different age range and of high probability to involve in purchasing of consumable products

*Table 4.1*. **Summary of Demographic Profile of Respondents (sex, age and education)**

| # | Demographic characteristics | Descriptive Statistics | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | **Sex** | | |
| | Female | 278 | 72.4 |
| | Male | 105 | 27.3 |
| | **Total** | 384 | 100 |
| 2 | **Age** | | |
| | 20-35 | 153 | 39.8 |
| | 36-45 | 185 | 48.2 |
| | 46-55 | 22 | 5.7 |
| | > 56 | 8 | 2.3 |
| | No response | 15 | 3.9 |
| | **Total** | **384** | **100** |
| | *Mean* | 35.51 | |
| | *Median* | 36 | |
| | *Mode* | 38 | |
| | *Std. Deviation* | 7.61 | |
| | *Variance* | 57.85 | |
| | *Minimum* | 25 | |
| | *Maximum* | 65 | |
| 3 | **Educational background** | | |
| | primary school | 196 | 51 |
| | Secondary school | 108 | 28.1 |
| | Diploma | 54 | 14 |
| | first degree | 26 | 6.8 |
| | **Total** | **384** | **100** |

In relation to respondents' educational level, from the total sample, the majority were found to be primary level, which is 51% ; while 28.1%  were secondary level and 14%  were Diploma holders and only 6.8%   were first degree holders and above. This indicate that the research participant were from different educational back ground.

**Table 4.2. Summary of Demographic Profile of Respondents (Income, Marital Status and Family size)**

| # | Demographic characteristics | Descriptive Statistics | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **1** | **Monthly income in ETB** | | |
| | Below 3000 | 266 | 69.3 |
| | From 3001 to7500 | 77 | 20.1 |
| | from 7501 to13000 | 26 | 6.8 |
| | above 13001 | 15 | 3.9 |
| | **Total** | **100** | **100** |
| 2 | **Marital status** | | |
| | Married | 200 | 52.1 |
| | Single | 172 | 44.8 |
| | Widow | 12 | 3.1 |
| | **Total** | **384** | **100** |
| **3** | **Family size** | | |
| | Below 5 | 224 | 58.3 |
| | From 5-7 | 120 | 31.3 |
| | above 7 | 40 | 10.4 |
| | **Total** | **384** | **100** |

Moreover, as shown in *Table 4.2,* the majority of the respondents, 69.3%, fall within the category of monthly income Birr below 3000. Followed by a monthly income of Birr 3001 - 7500 amounting to 20.1%, and 6.8% of them getting a monthly income of Birr 7501- 13000. While only 3.9 of them were getting above Birr 13001.So the research incorporate participants were in different income category

Regarding the percentage of marital status, 52.1% of respondents were married and 44.8% were found single; and the remaining 3.1% represented the widowed respondents.

As to family size, from the total of 384 respondents, 58.3% of them reported having below 5 family members, 31.3% reported having 5-7 family members, and 10.4% found to have a family size of above 7.The majority of respondents   were married and having member of up to 7, this imply that the participant were having of high probability in involving in procuring of consumable product

## 4.2. Consumable Product versus Attitude to buy them

Studies of Gupta Sipra and other proven that there is significant differences in connection to purchase behavior and gender differences. The differences are based mainly on sociological and biological particularities.

**Table 4.3. Gender and attitude towards purchasing of daily consumable product**
**Cross tabulation**

| | | | Attitude towards purchasing of daily consumable product for the Family by going of market | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Positive | Negative | No Response | Total |
| Sex | Female | Count | 208 (54%) | 46 (12%) | 24(6%) | 278 |
| | Male | Count | 69 (18%) | 33 (8.6%) | 3(0.7%) | 105 |
| **Total** | | | **277 (72%)** | **79 (20.5%)** | **27 (7%)** | **383** |

As presented in the above table, Regarding to gender , 54% of women consumers were found with positive attitudes to buying consumable products, and 12% were negative; while from the total remaining 6% difference showed the 'no response'. 18% of men consumers were found with positive attitudes to buying consumable products, and 8.6 % were negative; while from the total remaining 6% difference showed the 'no response'. This imply that women are more positive that men in purchasing of daily consumable product.

*Table 4.4:* **Descriptive statistics of perceived scared product purchase attitude**

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Negative | 79 | 20.6 |
| | Positive | 278 | 72.4 |
| | No Response | 27 | 7.0 |
| | **Total** | **384** | **100.0** |

Generally as presented in the above table, 72.4% of consumers were found with positive attitudes to buying consumable products, and 20.6% were negative; while the remaining 7% difference showed the 'no response'. This indicate that most of the participant of the research were having positive attitude towards buying of consumable product, so it make the research more reliable

## 4.3. T-test on Perceived consumable product buying values

The literature review section of this study has discussed about factor that influence consumer buying behavior and among them psychological factors is one and it is described by motivation, perception, learning as well as beliefs .In this study perception is among the major factor on buying behavior. Thus, to measure how sample respondents express their buying behavior, were presented here below. The responses were made using 5-point likert scale of measurement: from strongly agree with value of 5, to strongly disagree with a value of 1. To check response differences the middle ground (3) was taken as the test value and one sample t-test has been conducted. For such a reason, the following procedures were considered.

**Conditions in computing the variables mean for each liker item**:

- Test value = 3,

- The statistical difference is not significant when M < 3, and mean difference is considered statistically significant when M > 3.

- p-value 2-tailed,

- 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference. With these considerations a one sample t-test was conducted.

**One Sample T-test on "avoiding of the worst" value as contributing factor for buying behavior**

**Table 4.5. One sample T- test on avoiding the worst as contributing factor for buying behavior**

|  | Test Value =3 | | | | | 95% CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | T | DF | Std. Deviation | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Avoid the worst | 17.845 | 383 | 0.766 | .000 | .698 | .62 | .77 |

As it can be seen from *Table 4.5,* a one-sample t-test was run to determine whether avoiding the worst score in consumable product buying behavior was different to 'normal' test value, defined as a score of 3.0. Accordingly, avoiding the worst scores were normally distributed, as *p< .05, t* value is greater than 1.96, and there were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a

histogram. The obtained mean avoiding the worst score (3.70 ± 0.77) was higher than the population normal test value. Thus, a statistically significantly difference of 0.70 (95% CI, 0.77 to 0.62), t(383) = 17.845, *p* = .000. The result, thus, support the conclusion that consumers buying behavior regarding consumable products for perceived scarcity could be attributed positively by avoiding the worst value factor.

## One Sample T-test on "feeling secured" Value (FSV)

*Table 4.6*. **One sample t-test on feeling secured**

| | Test Value = 3 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 95% CI | |
| | T | Df | Std. Deviation | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Feel secured | 8.357 | 383 | 1.093 | .000 | .466 | .36 | .58 |

As shown in *Table 4.6,* a one-sample t-test was run to determine whether feeling secured value score for perceived scared consumable product buying behavior was different to 'normal' test value, defined as a score of 3.0. Accordingly, FSV scores were normally distributed, as *p*< .05, *t* value is greater than 1.96, and there were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a histogram. The obtained mean FSV score (3.47 ± 1.093) was higher than the population normal test value, with a statistically significantly difference of 0.46 (95% CI, 0.36 to 0.58), t(383) = 8.357, *p* = .000. Thus, the result supports the conclusion that consumers buying behavior regarding consumable products could be attributed positively to buying behavior of feeling secured value factor.

## One Sample T-test on "Fear Value" (FV)

*Table 4.7:* **One Sample T-test on fear value**

| | Test Value = 3 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 95% CI | |
| | T | Df | Std. Deviation | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Fear value | 9.339 | 383 | 1.164 | .000 | .555 | .44 | .67 |

As indicated in *Table 4.7,* a one-sample t-test was run to determine whether FV score in consumable product buying behavior was different to 'normal' test value, defined as a score of

3.0. Accordingly, fear value scores were normally distributed, as *p*< .05, *t* value is greater than 1.96, and there were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a histogram. The obtained mean fear score (3.55 ± 1.164) was higher than the population normal test value, with a statistically significantly difference of 0.55 (95% CI, 0.44 to 0.67), t (383) = 9.339, *p* = .000. The result, thus, support the conclusion that consumers buying behavior regarding perceived scares products could be attributed positively to fear value factor.

**One Sample T-test on "avoid regret" subscale**

*Table 4.8:* **One Sample T-test on avoiding regret**

| | Test Value = 3 | | | | | 95% CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T | Df | Std. Deviation | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Avoid regret | 11.10 | 383 | 1.053 | .000 | .596 | .49 | .70 |

As indicated in *Table 4.8,* a one-sample t-test was run to determine whether fear value score in consumable product buying behavior was different to 'normal' test value, defined as a score of 3.0. Accordingly, fear value scores were normally distributed, as *p*< .05, *t* value is greater than 1.96, and there were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a histogram. The obtained mean avoid regret value score (3.596 ± 1.053) was higher than the population normal test value, with a statistically significantly difference of 0.596 (95% CI, 0.49 to 0.70), t (383) = 11.101, *p* = .000. The result, thus, support the conclusion that consumers buying behavior regarding perceived scared consumable products could be attributed positively to avoiding regret value factor.

**One Sample T-test on "well –planned" value (WPV)**

**Table 4.9. One-Sample T- Test for well -planned value**

| | Test Value = 3 | | | | | 95% CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | T | Df | Std. Deviation | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Lower | Upper |
| WPV | 14.590 | 383 | 0.853 | .000 | .635 | .55 | .72 |

A one-sample t-test was run to determine whether WPV score in consumable product buying behavior was different to 'normal' test value, defined as a score of 3.0, reference is made to *Table 4.9.* Accordingly, WPV scores were normally distributed, as *p*< .05, *t* value is greater than 1.96, and there were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a histogram. The obtained mean WPV score (3.635 ± 0.853) was higher than the population normal test value, with a statistically significantly difference of 0.635 (95% CI, 0.55 to 0.72), t (383) =14.590, *p* = .000. The result, thus, support the conclusion that consumers buying behavior regarding perceived scared consumable products could be attributed positively to well-planned value factor.

## 4.4. Pearson Correlation Result of Decision to Buy

In search for answers to the research questions, the correlation between the five underlying psychological effect to buying behavior; i.e., avoiding the worst, feeling secured, avoid fear, avoiding regret, and well planned were examined. Accordingly, all factors have a positive and significant relationship with the decision to buy perceived scared consumable products. While examining the effect size of correlation coefficients, based on Cohan's (1988) level of magnitude, between the factors the highest correlation value obtained was feeling secured (.603), then avoid regret (.562), third was avoid fear (.473), fourth was avoid the worst (.466), ), and the least correlated factor was well planned (.318).

**Table 4.10: Inter-correlation matrix**

| Dependent Variables | | Buying Behavior |
|---|---|---|
| Avoid the worst | Pearson Correlation | .466** |
| | N | 383 |
| Feeling secured | Pearson Correlation | .603** |
| | N | 383 |
| Avoid Fear | Pearson Correlation | .473** |
| | N | 383 |
| Avoid regret | Pearson Correlation | .562** |
| | N | 383 |
| Well planned | Pearson Correlation | .318** |
| | N | 383 |
| ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | |

According to *Table 4.10,* the correlations of the five psychological effect influencing decision to buy were shown. The finding shows that the highly correlated factor was feeling secured (r=.603, p<0.01), thus being the decisive buying behavior regarding consumable products. The second important factor correlated with the consumer decision to buy consumable products was avoid regret (r=.562, p<0.01). The other two factors equally correlated and have moderate relationships with the decision to buy, in this study, were avoid fear and avoiding the worst of perceived scared consumable products with Pearson correlation coefficients of .473 and .470, respectively. Both factors are highly associated with relevant others than on the characteristics of the products.

And, the least correlated and the lowest related determinant of consumer buying behavior is well planned with Pearson correlation coefficients of .318. Well planned value degree of correlation is the least as compared to other factors included in this study.

## 4.5. Pearson's Correlation of Buying Behavior by Demographic Factors

To check whether there are significant relationships between demographic measures and measures of buying behavior, Pearson's correlation was computed. The result of the correlation analysis is presented in the *Table 4.11.*

*Table 4.11:* **Pearson's Correlation Between Buying Behavior and Demographic Measures**

|  | Avoid the worst | Feeling secured | Fear | Avoid regret | Well planned |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sex** | .000** | .000** | .050* | .408 | .188 |
| **Age** | .189 | .797 | .310 | .236 | .192 |
| **Educational Background** | .000** | .230 | .000** | .161 | .261 |
| **Monthly Income** | .980 | .468 | .012* | .000** | .073 |
| **Marital Status** | .000** | .546 | .059 | .815 | .008** |
| **Family Size** | .213 | .094 | .216 | .005** | .000** |
| ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | |

As the p-value table above has shown, sex was found to have significant correlation with almost all the dimensions of buying behavior, and the total decision to buy, except avoid regret and well planned values. Education level has significant correlation with avoid the worst and fear values.

Monthly income has significantly negative relationship with fear value (r= -.128, p<0.001), and avoid regret value (r=-.182, p<0.001), while marital status has significantly positively correlated with well-planned value (r=.135, p<0.01) and negatively correlated with avoid the worst value (r=-.216, p<0.01). Family size has significant positive relationship with well-planned value (r=.133, p<0.001), and avoid regret value (r=.145, p< 0.01).

In all the correlated cases, the variables show negative relationship, which means that as one of the variables increases, the other tends to decrease, and vice versa.

## 4.6. Summary from Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

To support the quantitative data on consumable products buying behavior collected through questionnaires, two FGDs were conducted with women and men group of voluntary participants of the study. In line with the study questions, the discussion points were manually organized and the profile of consumers and the discussion point presented as bellow.

**Profile of Consumers:** In the discussion made, the participants all alike pointed out the fact that it is the middle age generation (between 25- 48 year) who are the daily buyers of consumable products, along with those having family size or decide on their income single-headedly. The study exposed that consumers' willingness to spend is dictated more to sex and size of family members rather than income, educational level, marital status and age.

**Buying decision factors:** For the different discussion points that were believed to extract participants' perception of the buying decision derives from a consumers self-experience; responses that support the qualitative findings were obtained. Buying for avoiding the worst and being secured value, along with maintaining enough amounts of scared goods for family wellbeing had surfaced in the discussion.

**Buying behavior future concept.** The last discussions points were to identify possible areas of changes, which would be made by both the consumer and government, to influence the buying behavior. Thus, participants pinpointed that in today's economy, the Government should look more toward accessibility and availability of basic consumable good across different income levels and should be responsible for dissemination of information for consumers and the consumer should have also enough information before buying of secured product.

# CHAPTER FIVE:  CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.2.    Conclusions

These research findings have two fold significance; first, in enriching the body of knowledge among academics, and second, serving as a guiding document for practitioners. It is important to the academics since relationships have been assumed based on the theories of TRA and CT. Moreover, consumer buying behavior is a dynamic field and contagious phenomenon, in view of the effects on access and availability.

Attempts have been made to understand consumer buying behavior regarding purchase of perceived scared consumable products .To address it of different   research questions are raised as seen below

What psychological effects of artificially scared products have on consumers buying behavior? To answer this, the SPSS Pearson's correlation done accordingly and result illustrated that, being secured, avoiding the worst, fears, avoid regret and well planned values influencing the intension to buy.Accordingly, findings verified feeling secured as one of the significant contributing factors for buying behavior for perceived scarcity. It exhibited that there is a strong relationship between consumable product buying behavior and feeling secured variable.

This could best be described using reactance theory (RT), discussed in the literature review chapter, that an individual's freedom is threatened or eliminated, s/he experiences psychological reactance, which is a motivational state directed toward safeguarding a person's behavioral freedom. Hence, while purchasing consumable products, the value for feeling secured is identified as the most important psychosocial effect followed by being avoiding regret, fear, avoiding the worst ,fear and Well planned, in the KKSC consumers. All effect exhibited strong levels of significance.

The other two physiological effect having high relations with buying behavior, in this study, were being secured and avoid regret of consumable products. Both factors are highly associated with relations to relevant others, on the availability of the products. Meaning, being secured is associated keeping freedom from the influence came through unavailability of the product while, avoid regret

goes with avoiding all problems regarding to disappearance of product from market. Thus, these two factors were found to highly influence the intension to buy perceived scared consumable products.

According to the result of the relationship between thedemographic factor and buying behavior of the consumers the majority of respondents were age between 20- 45.This show that the majority of the middle age are responsible for buying of consumable product either themselves or their family. Based on the demographic information, sex was found to have significant correlation with almost all the dimensions of buying behavior, and the total decision to buy, except avoid regret and well planned values .Hence ithave significant influence onconsumers buying behavior.Even though Education level has significant correlation with avoid the worst and fear values the research result imply that education level does not have influence on baying behavior. According to the research finding majority of the income level of respondents were below Birr 3000 and monthly income has significantly negative relationship with fear value, and avoid regret value, this indicate that these variable inversely related with the income. Though it is monthly income level does have not influenced by consumers buying behavior. Marital status has significantly positively correlated with well-planned value and negatively correlated with avoid the worst value, which mean one variable increase the other decrease and vice versa. Family size has significant positive relationship with well-planned value and avoids regret value. Bothe factors, marital status and family size, have significant influence onconsumers buying behavior

## 5.3. Recommendations

The general understanding of the influencing factors of consumers buying behavior, needed to be examined and re-examined with the ever changing effects of access and availability and technology. As such studies consider the value perception differences between people with different responsibility and age groups; as it necessitates investigating the behavior in the context of the particular culture, which became the reason for the inception of this research.

Moreover, the higher correlated and the lowest related determinant of consumer buying behavior is feeling secured and well planned respectively. Generally, what is expected when buying consumable products would have been the high assurance of the owning of the products. Hence the consumer should have enough information while procuring of scared product

Government need to work on perceived scared product by giving priority for basic product which needed for daily uses, in capitalizing of ideas of feeling secured and avoiding the worsts and other factors, as the result of this study shown.

This research pinpointed that Government need to carry out periodic survey to understand the market and daily consumer need; which would help to protect the basic product consumers

Government should have regular survey regarding scared product to the market and disseminating of the information to public to create   awarnace with in the consumers

Gov. should put strong policy to monitor the Whole seller and segregate the role of whole seller and retailer

Government should implement to police and controlling mechanism to protecting the consumer and the market. However, it seems evident that there is a high necessity to advance the understanding of Perceived scarcity and scared product to monitor situation in the side of consumer.

# REFERENCES

**AntenehEndale (2008).** *Consumer Perception of Service Quality: In the case of St. George Brewery Factory* (Unpublished master‟s thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

**Aggarwal, Praveen, Sung Youl Jun, and Jong Ho Huh (2011), "Scarcity Messages: A Consumer Competition Perspective**," *Journal of Advertising,* 40 (3), 19-30.

**Angst, Corey M., Ritu Agarwal, and Jason Kuruzovich (2008), "Bid or Buy? IndividualShopping Traits as Predictors of Strategic Exit in Online Auctions**," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce,* 13(1), 59-84.*ConsumerResearch,* 15 (3), 139-67.

**BeteLema (2008).***Consumer Attitude Towards Hotel Service Quality*(Unpublished master‟s thesis).Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

**Blackwell, D., Miniard W., & Engel F. (2001),** *Consumer Behavior*(10th ed.). Ohio: outh-Western Thomson Learning Publishers.

**Bell, David. E. (1982), "Regret in Decision Making under Uncertainty**," *Operations Research,* 30, 961-81.

**Blackden, M. and Bhanu, C. (1998). Gender, Growth and Poverty Reduction:** Special Program of Assistance for Africa, 1998 Status Report on Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Technical Paper 428, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

**Brehm, Jack W. (1966),** *A Theory of Psychological Reactance,* Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

**Brehm, Sharon S. and Jack W. Brehm (1981),** *Psychological Reactance: A Theory of Freedom and Control*, London: Academic Press.

**Brock, Timothy C., ed. (1968),** *Implications of Commodity Theory for Value Change,* New York: Academic Press.

**Brock, Timothy C. and Philip J. Mazzocco, eds. (2003),** *Responses to Scarcity: A Commodity Theory Perspective on Reactance and Rumination,* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Crawford, Matthew T., Allen R. McConnell, Amy C. Lewis, and Steven J. Sherman (2002), "Reactance, Compliance, and Anticipated Regret**," *Journal of ExperimentalSocialPsychology,*38,56-63.

**Ditto, Peter H. and John B. Jemmott III (1989), "From Rarity to Evaluative Extremity: Effects of Prevalence Information on Evaluations of Positive and Negative Characteristics**," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 57 (1), 16-26.

**Durmaz, Y. (2014). The Impact of Psychological Factors on Consumer Buying Behavior and an Empirical Application in Turkey**.*Asian Social Science*; *10*(6): p. 1911-2025.

**Eisend, Martin (2008), "Explaining the Impact of Scarcity Appeals in Advertising: The Mediating Role of Perceptions of Susceptibility**," *Journal of Advertising*, 37 (3), 33-40.

**Eroglu, Sevgin A. and Karen A. Machleit (1993), "Atmospheric Factors in the Retail Environment: Sights, Sounds and Smells**," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 34.

**EmertHigeEgziabher (2015). *Psychosocial Factors Influencing Consumers Buying Behavior Of Luxury Products***(Unpublished master" s thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

**Fred Magdoff and Brian Tokar, eds., *Agriculture and Food in Crisis: Conflict, Resistance, and Renewal*** (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010).

**Gupta, Shipra (2013).The Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior,** Dissertations and Theses from the College of Business Administration, University of Nebraska – Lincoln

**Hannah, Edward T., Elena R. Hanna, and Barbara Wattie (1975), "Arousal ofPsychological Reactance as a Consequence of Predicting an Individual's Behavior**," *Psychological Report*, 37, 411-20.

**Inman, Jeffery J., Anil C. Peter, and Priya Raghubir (1997), "Framing the Deal: The Role of Restrictions in Accentuating Deal Value**," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 24 (June), 68-79.

**Josephs, Robert A., Richard P. Larrick, Claude M. Steele, and Richard E. Nisbett (1992), "Protecting the Self from the Negative Consequences of Risky Decisions**," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 26-37.

**Karraker, M. (2012). *Global Families: Contemporary Family Perspectives,*** (2nd ed.). US: SAGE Publication.

**Kothari, R. (2004). *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques***. (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.

**Krejcie & Morgan (1970). Determining Sample Size for research Activities, *Educational and Psychological Measurement,*** no. 30. p. 607-610. Retrieved from http://home.kku.ac.th/sompons/guest speaker/KrejcieandMorgan article.pdf

**Lynn, M. (1991), "Scarcity Effects on Value: A Quantitative Review of the Commodity Theory Literature,**" *Psychology and Marketing,* 8, 43-57.

**MacInnis, Deborah J. and Linda L. Price (1987), "The Role of Imagery in Information Processing: Review and Extensions,"***Journal of Consumer Research,* 13 (4), 47391.

**Marks, J. (2002), "More than a Few Good Man,"***Home Textiles Today,* 23(35), 12-13. **Markus,**

**Hazel Rose and B. Schwartz (2010), "Does Choice Mean Freedom and Well Being?,"** *Journal of Consumer Research,* 37 (August), 344-52.

**McKinnon, G., Mitch. E. Smith, and Keith H. Hunt (1985), "Hoarding Behavior among Consumers:Conceptualization and Marketing Implications**," *Academy of Marketing Science,* 13, 340-51.

**Melese Zenawi s (2011) (Ezega.com**). To evidence that the existence of perceive scarcity in Ethiopia http://Ezeag.com

**Meyer, John P. (1980), "Causal Attribution for Success and Failure: A Multivariate Investigation of Dimensionality, Formation and Consequences**," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 38 (May), 704-18.

**Min, Kyeong Sam (2003),** *"Consumer Response to Product Unavailability,"* Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University.

**Mitchell, David J. (1994), "For the Smell of It All: Functions and Effects of Olfaction in Consumer Behavior,"** *Advances in Consumer Research*, 21, 330.

**Mitchell, Vincent-Wayne and Gianfranco Walsh (2004), "Gender Differences in German Consumer Decision-Making Styles**," *Journal of Consumer Behavior,* 3 (4), 33146.

**Mittone, L. and L. Savadori (2009), "The Scarcity Bias**," *Applied Psychology,* 58 (3), 453-68.

**Moore, Christine M. and J. Fernie (2004),** *Retailing within an International Context*: Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

**Mittal, B. (2006**). I, me and mine: how products became consumers' extended selves. ***International Journal of Basics and Applied Sciences,*** *5.* p. 550-562. DOI: 10.1002/cb.202.

**Nelson, Emily (2000), "Mass-Market Retailers Look to Bring Checkout Lines into the 21st Century,"** in *The Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition.*

**Nichols, Bridget S. (2012), "The Development, Validation, and Implications of a Measure of Consumer Competitive Arousal (Ccar),"** *Journal of Economic Psychology,* 33, 192-205.

**Richard, R., J. van der Pligt, and N. K. de Vries (1996), "Anticipated Regret and Time Perspective: Changing Sexual Risk-Taking Behavior**," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making,* 9, 185-99.

**Rook, Dennis W. (1987), "The Buying Impulse,"** *Journal of Consumer Research,* 14, 189-99.

**Sternquist, Brenda (2007),** *International Retailing*, New York, NY: Fairchild Publications.

**Stiller, Meike (2011),** *"Is Less More? The Influence of Scarcity Strategies on Variety Seeking,"* Doctoral Dissertation, Maastricht University.

**Suri, Rajneesh, Chiranjeev Kohli, and Kent B. Monroe (2007), "The Effects of Perceived**

**Scarcity on Consumers' Processing of Price Information**," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 35 (1), 89-100.

Swain, Scott D., Richard Hanna, and Lisa J. Abendroth (2006), "How Time Restrictions Work: The Roles of Urgency, Anticipated Regret, and Deal Evaluations," *Advances in Consumer Research,* 33, 523-25.

Oses-Eraso, Nuria, Federic udina, and Montserrat Vilarich-Grau (2008), "Environmental versus Human-Induced Scarcity in the Commons: Do they Trigger the Same Response?" *Environmental and Resource Economics,* 40 (4), 529-550.

Verhallen, Theo M. and H. S. J. Robben (1994), "Scarcity and Preference: An Experiment on Unavailability and Product Evaluation," *Journal of Economic Psychology,* 15, 315-31.

Wansink, B. (1994), "The Dark Side of Consumer Behavior: Empirical Examinations of Impulsive and Compulsive Consumption," *Advances in Consumer Research,* 21, 508.

Wheeler, Chritian S. and Jonah Berger (2007), "When the Same Prime Leads to Different Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research,* 34, 357-68.

Wicklund, Robert A. (1974), *Freedom and Reactance,* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Worchel, S. (1992), "Beyond a Commodity Theory Analysis of Censorship: When Abundance and Personalism Enhances Scarcity Effects," *Basic and Applied Social Psychology,* 32 (5), 906-14.

Worchel, S. and Jack W. Brehm (1971), "Direct and Implied Social Restoration of Freedom," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18 (3), 294-304.

Youn, Seounmi (2000), *The Dimensional Structure of Consumer Buying Impulsivity: Measurement and Validation*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Youn, Seounmi and Ronald J. Faber (2000), "Impulse Buying: Its Relation to Personality Traits and Cues," *Advances in Consumer Research,* 27, 179-85.

**Appendix A**

## Saint Marry University School of Graduate

## Questionnaire on "The Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers in consumable product'

Dear Respondent,

I would like to express my gratitude for your participation in this research. Its purpose is to gain knowledge of   The Psychological Effects of Perceived Scarcity on Consumers' Buying Behavior in Kolfe keranio sub city Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Psychosocial effect of perceived scarcity on consumer buying behavior as a partial fulfilment of a Master's degree in  Saint Marry University, School of Graduate.

You may tick any of the choice that show how strong your feelings are. Please be assured that the information is used only for this research and is strictly confidential. Thanking you in advance, I kindly request you:

> ➢ To read each item carefully and record your genuine opinion on the basis of your exposure:
>
> ➢ To not consult others while responding to the items;
>
> ➢ To respond to all questions and try not to leave any item unfilled;
>
> ➢ Not to write your name or include any other personal details; and
>
> ➢ To return the completed questionnaire to the assigned person.

The scope of consumable products in this research are daily use product like as edible oil, sugar teff

**Part I: General Information**
In answering to the questionnaire, please use tick on the choice provided.

**1. Gender**
> ➢ Female
>
> ➢ Male

**2. Age**

**3. Educational Background**

> Secondary education      > College Diploma      > B.A. Degree

     M.A & above

**4.Monthly Income in ETB**

☐ Under 3000

☐ 3000-7500

> 7500-13000

> Above 13000

**5.** Marital status

> Single     > Married     > Divorced     > Widowed

**6.** Family size

Less than 5

> Between 5-7
> Above 7

**Part II: Specific Information**

This part of the questionnaire gathers information to identify the psychosocial factors influencing consumer buying behavior to buy Marker created scared products.

7. My attitude towards purchasing of daily consumable product for the Family by going of market

> Negative
> Positive

| S/N | BUYING BEHAVIOR INFORMATION | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neutral (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **To measure psychosocial effect on buying behavior** | | | | | |
| | **Avoiding the worst** | | | | | |
| 8 | I buy scared product to protect myself from the worst. | | | | | |
| | **Feeling Secured** | | | | | |
| 9 | Owning of Scared product can make me fell secured. | | | | | |
| 10 | Owning of more Scared product make me feel safe | | | | | |
| 11 | I buy perceived scared product is to avoiding of pressure | | | | | |
| | **Fear Values** | | | | | |
| 12 | I buy scared product because I fear that it will disappear the market. | | | | | |
| | **Well Planned** | | | | | |
| 13 | Buying of more scared product reflect one person's consciousness | | | | | |
| 14 | buying scared product increase social status | | | | | |
| 15 | When I bought scared product it make me considered as well planned person | | | | | |
| | **Avoiding regret** | | | | | |
| 16 | I buy scared consumable product to avoid myself from the regret if the good is disappeared | | | | | |
| 17 | While shopping in the store, I would be upset if I missed buying some products of interest | | | | | |
| | **Analyzing demographic on buying behaviors** | | | | | |
| 18 | I buy perceived Scared product because I have surplus income | | | | | |
| 19 | I buy perceived scared product because I am the responsible for the family | | | | | |
| 20 | I buy perceived scared product because am the responsible person to protect my family | | | | | |
| 21 | While shopping in the store, when I found products of interest, I bought them without considering the consequences | | | | | |

| S/N | BUYING BEHAVIOR INFORMATION | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neutral (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Examine consumers react to the perceived scared item** | | | | | |
| 22 | While shopping in the store, I found that the products of interest were often scarce | | | | | |
| 23 | While shopping in this store, when I found products of interest, I couldn't resist buying them | | | | | |
| 24 | While shopping in this store, I have carried more products than what I intended to buy | | | | | |
| 25 | When I found products scared in , I hurried to grab them | | | | | |
| 26 | While shopping in this store, I bought products of interest without thinking | | | | | |
| 27 | While shopping in the store, when I found products scared , I had an urge to buy them even though I had not intended to buy them | | | | | |
| 28 | While shopping in the store, I didn't feel like buying things on the spur of the moment | | | | | |
| 29 | While shopping at the store, I thought that scarcity was strategically created by store | | | | | |
| 30 | While shopping in the market, when I found products scared I developed a desire to buy them | | | | | |
| 31 | While shopping in the market , when I found the product I need bought it spontaneously | | | | | |

| S/N | BUYING BEHAVIOR INFORMATION | Strongly disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neutral (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | While shopping in the store, carrying more items than what Intend to buy when I feel the product scared. | | | | | |
| 33 | While shopping in the store, when I found the product scared I would tell for any one so that they would be available to me later | | | | | |
| 34 | When shopping at this store, I think that the seller intentionally creates the product scarcity by limiting the quantity of the product | | | | | |
| 35 | Sometimes when I found perceived scared a product in the store, I did not want to put it down although I was not sure if I would buy | | | | | |

Thank you for the Participation

APPENDIX B

ቅድስተ ማርያም ዩኒቨርሲቲ የትምህርት ክፍል የድህረ ምረቃ መመረቂያ ፅሁፍ ለማዘጋጀት የተሰናዳ መጠይቅ
ውድ የጥናት ፅሁፍ ተሳታፊ፦

በቅድሚያ በዚህ ጥናት ተሳታፊ በመሆን ፍቃደኛ በመሆንም ከፍ ያለ ምስጋናዬን ላቀርብ እወዳለሁ። የዚህ መጠይቅ አዘጋጅ በቅድስተ ማርያም ዩኒቨርሲቲ የትምህርት ክፍል የማስተርስ ዲግሪ ተማሪ ስሆን ጥናቱን የማካይደው ይህንኑ ትምህርቴ ለማጠናቀቅ እንዲረዳኝ ነው ። የትናቱ ትኩረት እጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡትን ነገርግን እጥረት ላይ ያይደለ የምግብ አይነቶች በጊዜው ባህሪ ላይ ያላቸው ተፅዕኖ ለይቶ በማውጣት ላይ ያነጣጠረ ነው። የሚሰጡት መረጃ የጥናቱን አቅጣጫ የሚማራና ጥናቱን ለማጠናቀቅ የሚረዳ ስለሆነ መጥናቱ ውስጥ ጥልቅ ግብአት ነው።በመሆኑም በመጠይቁ ከቀረቡት አማራጮች በበለጠ የሚያምኑበትን አማራጭ የያዘውን ሳጥን ላይ የራይት ምልክት ያድርጉ (✓)
ይህን ቅፅ በመሙላት የሚሰጡኝ ምላሽ ለዚሁ የጥናት ስራ ብቻ የሚውል መሆኑን ደግሜ ለማረጋገጥ እወዳለሁ።መጠይቁን በመሙላት ለሚያደርጉልኝ ትብብር በቅድሚያ ያለኝን ከፍተኛ ምስጋና ከወዲሁ እየገለጽኩ በትህትና የምጠይቅዎ፦

- ❖ በዚህ መጠይቅ የተካተቱትን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ በግል ልምዶ ላይ ብቻ የተመሰረተ እውነተኛ ምላሽ እንዲሰጡኝ።

- ❖ መጠይቁን በሚሞሉበት ወቅት ሚሰጡት ምላሽ ከራስዎ መነጨ እንጂ ከሌሎች ጋራ በመመካከር የተገኘ እንዳይሆን

- ❖ በመጠይቁ ላይ በቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች በሙስ ምላሽ እንዲሰጥና ምንም ጥያቄ ሳይሞላ እንዳይቀር

- ❖ በመጠይቁን ላይ ስሞን ወይም ምስለ እርሶምማንነት የሚገልፅ ማንኛውንም አይነት መረጋ እንዳይቀርብ

- ❖ የተሞላውን መጠይቅ ለዚሁ ተግባር ለተመደበው ሰው በመመለስ እንዲተባበሩኝ ነው

አላቂ የምግብ አይነቶች ትርጉሜ በዚህ ጥናት

በዚህ ጥናት አላቂ የምግብ አይነቶች ማለት እለት ከእለት ለምግብነት የምንጠቀምባቸው ማለትም እንደ ጤፍ ፣ ሀይት ፣ጫው የመሳሰለትን ነው።

ክፍል አንድ፦ጠቅላላ መረጃ

1. ፆታ       ሴት  ☐      ወንድ ☐
2. እድሜ --------------------------------------------------------
3. የትምህት ደረጃ
   ☐ የመጀመርያ ደረጃ
   ☐ ሁለተኛ ደረጃ
   ☐ ዲፕሎማ
   ☐ የመጀመርያ ዲግሪ
   ☐ ሁለተኛ ዲግሪና ከዛ በላይ

4. ወራዊ ገቢ
   ☐ ከ3000 በታች
   ☐ ከ3000-7500
   ☐ ከ7500-13000
   ☐ ከ13000 በላይ

5. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ
   ☐ ያገባ
   ☐ ያላገባ
   ☐ የፈታ
   ☐ የትዳር ጓደኛ የሞተበት

6. የቤተሰብ ብዛት
   ☐ ከ5 በታች
   ☐ ከ5-7
   ☐ ከ7 በላይ

ክፍል ሁለት፦- ዝርዝር መረጃ

ይህን የመጠይቅ ክፍል ለምግብነት በዕለት ኑሮአችን የምንጠቀምባቸውና በተለያየ ምክንት እጥረት የተከሰተባቸው የሚመስለ የምግብ አይነቶች በተመለከተ የጥናቱ ተሳታፊዎች የምግዛት ባህርያት ላይ ተፅኖ የሚያሳድር ማህበራዊና ስነልቦናዊ መረጃዎችን የሚያስባስብ ነው።

7. ዕለት በዕለት ለምግብ የሚያገለግሉ ምግቦች ወደ ገቢያ ሄደው ለመግዛት ያሎት
   ☐ አስተሳሰብ አውንታዊ
   ☐ አለታዊ

| ተ.ቁ | የመግዛት ባህርያት መረጃ | ፍፁም አልስማማም | አልስማማም | ምንም አስተያየት | እስማማለሁ | በጣም እስማማለሁ |
|------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------------|---------|-------------|
| 8 | የስነ ልቦና ተፅህኖ በመግዛት ባገሪ ላይ ያለው ተፅህኖ | | | | | |
| 9. | በእጥረት ላይ የጣሰ የሚመስል የምግብ አይነቶች የምገዛው እራሴ ከአስከፊ ሁኔታ | | | | | |
| 10. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶችን በበቁ ሁኔታ ሲኖሩኝ የእፍይታ ስሜት | | | | | |
| 11. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶችን የምገዛው ገበያ ላይ ይጠፋል ብዬ ስለምፈራ | | | | | |
| 12. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶች በብዛት መግዛት የአንድ ሰውን የንቃት | | | | | |
| 13. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶች መግዛት በህበረተሰቡ ውስጥ ያለውን ደረጃ ከፍ | | | | | |

| ተ.ቁ | የመግዛት ባሃርያት መረጃ | ፍፁም አልስማማም | አልስማማም | ምንም አስተያየት የለኝም | እስማማለሁ | በጣም እስማማለሁ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶች መግዛት የአንድ ሰው የጥንቁቅነት ባህሪን ያሳያል | | | | | |
| 15. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ ይነቶች መግዛት ድንገት ጠፍቶ ከሚያጋጥምን ፀፀት ያድናል | | | | | |
| 16. | እጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶች በብዛት በቤቴ ሲኖሩ ከፍርሃት ነፃ | | | | | |
| 17 | እጥረት ላይ ያለ የሚመስለ የምግብ አይነቶችን የምገዛው ከጭንቀት ነፃ | | | | | |
| 18 | ልገዛ የምፈልገውን ዕቃ ሳልገዛ ብቀርና ከገቢያ ቢጠፋ በጣም እዝናለሁ | | | | | |
| በገገርው ባህሪ የተመረከዘ አጠቃላይ መረጃ | | | | | | |
| 19 | እጥረት ላይ አለ ተብለው የሚገመቱትን የምግብ አይነቶች የምገዛው ከበቂ በላይ ገንዘብ | | | | | |
| 20 | እጥረት ላይ አለ ተብለው የሚገመቱትን የምግብ አይነቶች የምገዛው የቤተሰብ ሃላፊ ስለሆንኩኝ | | | | | |

| ተ.ቁ | የመግዛት ባሃርያት መረጃ | ፍፁም አልስማማም | አልስማማም | ምንም አስተያየት | እስማማለሁ | በጣም እስማማለሁ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | እጥረት ላይ አለ ተብለው የሚገመቱትን የምግብ አይነቶች | | | | | |

ሸማቾች በዕጥረት ላይ አለ ተብለው የሚታሰቡትን የምግብ አይነቶች ላይ ያላቸውን አመለካከት ለመዳሰስ

| 22 | ዕቃዎች በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ በዕጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡ የምግብ አይነቶች ሳገኝ ያለምንም ማመንታት ዕገዛለሁ | | | | | |
| 23 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ ብዙውን ጊዜ የምፈልጋቸው የምግብ አይነቶች ዕጥረት ውስጥ ሆነው ያጋጥሙኛል | | | | | |
| 24 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ በዕጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡ የምግብ አይነቶች ሳገኝ ለመግዛት አላመነታም | | | | | |
| 25 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ በዕጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡ የምግብ አይነቶች ሳገኝ ከዕቅዴ | | | | | |
| 26 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ በዕጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡ የምግብ አይነቶችሳገኝ በፍጥነት እገዛለሁ | | | | | |
| 27 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ የምለልጋቸውን የምግብ አይነቶች ሳገኝ እንዳያመልጠኝ ሰለማስብ | | | | | |

| ተ.ቁ | የመግዛት ባህርያት መረጃ | ፍፁም አልስማማም | አልስማማም | ምንም አስተያየት የለም | እስማማለሁ | በጣም እስማማለሁ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ በዕጥረት ላይ ናቸው ተብለው የሚታሰቡ የምግብ አይነቶች ሳገኝ ያለ ዕቅዴ ዕገዛለሁ | | | | | |
| 29 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ የምፈልገውን ዕቃ ባገኝ እንኳን ሳላመዛዝን አልገዛም | | | | | |
| 30 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የሚመስለ የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳይ እጥረት | | | | | |
| 31 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳይ መግዛት | | | | | |
| 32 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የሚመስለ የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳገኝ ወዴ የውኑ ጋዘለሁ | | | | | |
| 33 | ገበያ ውስጥ ሆኜ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የሚመስለ የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳገኝ ብዙ ገዛለሁ፤ ምንም | | | | | |
| 34 | በእጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶችን በገበያ ውስጥ ሳገኝ የሚገኝበትን ቦታ ለማንም አልነግርም | | | | | |

| ተ.ቁ | የመግዛት ባሃርያት መረጃ | ፍፁም አልስማማም | አልስማማም | ምንም አስተያየት | እስማማለሁ | በጣም እስማማለሁ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | በሸመታ ላይ እያለሁ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የሚመስል የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳይ ነጋዴዎች አውቀው እንዳደረጉ አስባለሁ | | | | | |
| 36 | በበገበያ ውስጥ ሆኜ እጥረት ላይ ያለ የምግብ አይነቶችን ሳገኝ ልግዛ አልግዛ ሳልወስን በብዛት | | | | | |

- የጥናቱ ተሳታፊ ስለሆኑ በጣም አመሰግናለሁ