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ABSTRACT

Grocery retailers are faced with many challenges. Among them are competition, employee theft and deviant consumer behaviour (DCB). Deviant consumer behaviour violates generally accepted norms of consumer behaviour in retail settings. There has been a lot of research conducted on DCB and different terms and phases have been used to describe the behaviour, ie “dysfunctional customer behaviour”, (Daunt and Harris, 2012), “aberrant consumer behaviour” (Fullerton and Punj, 1993) and “consumer misbehaviour” (Fullerton and Punj, 1997). However, the research conducted on how the behaviour affects retailers, particularly grocery retailers has been limited.

The primary objective of this study was to examine how DCB affects grocery retailers in Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality. More specifically, the relationship between DCB (dependent variable) and independent variables - impact on profits (RPROF), impact on inventory (INV), impact on grocer security (SECU), impact on employees (EMPL), impact on customers (CUST) and measures to minimize or stop DCB (STOP) was established.

Questionnaires were used as a measuring instrument. Out of the 100 questionnaires distributed, 70 were usable. The empirical results showed that there is a significant relationship between DCB and the independent variables. Recommendations on how best the stores can deal with DCB were made and measures to minimize or stop DCB were presented. Recommendations for future studies were also presented.

Key words: Deviant consumer behaviour (DCB), grocery retailer, Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality.
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CHAPTER 1

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The grocery industry is a mature, highly competitive and rapidly growing industry. Grocery retailers supply a variety of goods - fresh produce, dry goods and non-grocery products (Smith, 2006). In addition, they supply services, such as locational, convenience, parking, and in-store amenities, such as lighting, check-out facilities, and customer assistance (Smith, 2006).

This study will focus on the following leading grocery stores in Nelson Mandela Bay:

- **Shoprite Holdings Limited** is the largest food retailer. It consists of Shoprite, the flagship brand, serving the mass middle market; Checkers, targeting time-pressed, higher income consumers; OK Foods & Grocer Stores situated in rural towns, suburbs and neighbourhoods and catering to the needs of the communities in which they are allocated; and Usave, a “no frills” discounter focussing on lower income consumers (www.shopriteholdings.co.za).

- **Pick 'n Pay Holdings Limited** is the second largest food retailer. It comprises of Pick n Pay Stores and Boxer Super Stores. Pick ‘n Pay targets the middle to higher-income markets, while Boxer targets lower income markets (www.picknpay.co.za).

- **SPAR Group Limited** is a Netherlands-based franchise retail firm, which operates in suburbs, neighbourhoods and rural towns (www.spar.co.za).

- **Woolworths Foods** operates from Woolworths clothing stores, Engen garages and independently situated stores and targets middle to higher income groups (www.woolworthsfood.co.za).

- **Makro** offers a one-stop-shop for consumers, as it offers food, the latest electronics, houseware, camping and outdoor equipment and liquor,
(www.makro.co.za). Makro has only one store in the Eastern Cape and is situated in Kabega Park, Nelson Mandela Bay.

- **Game** is the largest discount retailer in Africa. Game boasts 110 stores in 12 African countries, with two of those stores located in Nelson Mandela Bay (www.game.co.za).

The grocery retail establishment is one of the major contributors to the economy worldwide. This is particularly the case in South Africa, wherein grocery retailers remain one of the main contributors to the national economy, even during recession periods - when consumers tend to spend less on different commodities, i.e. clothing and furniture - their grocery shopping remains fairly constant. The grocery retail industry is one of the biggest employers and major tenants in shopping centres throughout South Africa. However, a number of factors threaten this industry and its survival. Among these threat factors is competition. Many grocery retailers are commonly situated in close proximity to one another, and therefore they tend to have to compete in terms of the pricing of the goods they sell, which sometimes results in selling their products below cost. They also sell perishable goods, which need to be sold as far in advance of the ‘best before’ date thereof, or they risk selling these items on a marked-down price closer to the expiry date. Grocery retailers normally have to have a “loss-leader” category, the products in which they reliably sell at cost or below cost in order to attract customers in advantage over a nearby competitor selling similar products.

Among the challenges that face this industry, is deviant consumer behaviour. Deviant consumer behaviour (also referred to in this study as DCB) is described by Geurts (1975-1976) as behaviour in a retail store that society considers inappropriate or in conflict with a pre-established accepted society norm. Different terms and phases have been used to describe this behaviour: “aberrant consumer behaviour” (Fullerton and Punj 1993); “problem customers” (Bitner, Booms and Mohl 1994); “inappropriate behaviour (Strutton, Vitell, and Pelton 1994); “consumer misbehaviour” (Fullerton and Punj 1997); and “jaycustomers” (Lovelock 1994, 2001) as cited by Harris and Reynolds (2003:145).
The research study will examine the impact of deviant customer behaviour (DCB) on Nelson Mandela Bay grocery retailers and seeks to establish measures that can minimize or stop deviant consumer behaviour in Nelson Mandela Bay grocery retail establishments.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The primary purpose of the grocery retail industry is to generate profit through sales, loyal customers and repeat customers. The behaviour expected in retail establishments is that customers will buy products, pay for them and leave the store without any misbehaviour. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in most Nelson Mandela Bay grocery stores. Among the challenges faced by the industry is a high incidence of DCB, which will be discussed extensively in this research. This behaviour ranges from misbehaviour that is considered petty – i.e. eating of grapes or reading of magazines in the store - to serious crime, i.e. syndicate groups that have even involved members of the South African Police Service (SAPS).

This study seeks to examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers in the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality. This leads to the following research questions:

- What are the causes of deviant behaviour in retail establishments?
- What are the types of deviant behaviour in retail establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay?
- How does deviant behaviour affect grocery retailers in Nelson Mandela Bay?
- What should be done to minimise or if possible stop deviant behaviour in retail grocery establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay?

In an attempt to understand the DCB better, Fullerton & Punj (1997) created a structural model of aberrant consumer behaviour wherein they investigated demographic characteristics, psychological characteristics, social/group influences and consumers’ frames of mind.
1.2.1 Importance of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on South African grocery retailers. The study also seeks to establish measures that can minimize or put a stop to deviant behaviour in retail grocery establishments in South Africa. Therefore, the significance of this study emanates from the following:

- The study may enable grocery retailers to gain a deeper understanding of the causes of deviant consumer behaviour in retail establishments.
- An understanding can be gained of the nature of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retail establishments.
- Most importantly, the study may provide retailers with measures on how to minimise or put a stop to deviant consumer behaviour in retail establishments.
- The study may be used by policy makers, the business community and researchers as a source of reference.

1.3 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The main aim of the study is to examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers in Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality. It also seeks to establish measures that can reduce or stop deviant consumer behaviour in South African grocery retail establishments.

Therefore, in order to achieve these aims, the research will seek to meet the following objectives:

- To establish / examine the causes of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retail establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay.
- To explore the nature of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retail establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay.
• To examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers in Nelson Mandela Bay.
• To develop measures that can enable grocery retailers to minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour in their establishments.

1.4 DEFINITION OF RESEARCH VARIABLES

The following research variables are identified for the undertaking of this study.

1.4.1 The dependent variable

Deviant consumer behaviour: This refers to behaviour displayed by consumers that deviates from societal norms, and which is found unacceptable by the community, with some forms of DCB being illegal.

1.4.2 The independent variables

- Impact on profits: This refers to the impact that DCB has on profits of retailers.
- Impact on inventory: This refers to how DCB impacts on the inventory of retailers’ stores.
- Impact on grocer security: This refers to the impact DCB has on grocer security.
- Impact on employees: This refers to how employees are affected by DCB in grocery retail stores.
- Impact on customers: This refers to the impact DCB has on non-offending customers.
- Measures to stop or minimise DCB: This refers to measures that can be implemented to minimise or stop DCB-related behaviour.
1.5 THE HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses are formulated:

H1: There is a significant relationship between deviant consumer behaviour and independent variables (profit, inventory, security measures, employees, customers and measures to minimise or stop DCB).

H01: There is no relationship between retailer profits and deviant consumer behaviour.

H02: There is no significant impact on a retailer’s inventory and deviant consumer behaviour.

H03: There is no significant impact on a retailer’s security measures and deviant consumer behaviour.

H04: There is no significant impact on a retailer’s employees and deviant consumer behaviour.

H05: There is no significant impact on a retailer’s customers and deviant consumer behaviour.

H06: There is no significant impact on measures to stop or minimise deviant consumer behaviour and deviant consumer behaviour.
1.6 THE METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

According to Collis and Hussey (2003:55), methodology is concerned with the following main issues, which will be covered in the research:

- “why you collected certain data
- what data you collected
- from where you collected it
- when you collected it
- how you collected it
- how you will analyse it”

1.6.1 Research paradigms

1.6.1.1 Positivistic paradigm/approach

The positivistic paradigm/approach is used when the study seeks to explain and predict, confirm and validate, and is outcome-oriented, as explained by Leedy (1997). The positivistic approach seeks the facts or causes of social phenomena, with little regard to the subjective state of the individual. The positivistic research paradigm may also be referred to as the quantitative, objectivist, scientific, experimentalist and traditionalist research paradigm (Collis & Hussey 2003).

1.6.1.2 Phenomenological paradigm

A phenomenological study is a study that attempts to understand people’s perceptions, perspectives, and understandings of a particular situation (Leedy, 2010). This research paradigm normally involves lengthy interviews.
A typical interview is structured more like an informal conversation, with the participant doing most of the talking and the researcher doing most of the listening (Leedy, 2010). The phenomenological research paradigm may also be referred to as the qualitative, subjectivist, humanistic and interpretivist research paradigm.

For the purposes of this study, the positivist research paradigm will be implemented as the study will make use of statistics.

1.6.2 The sample

The study will adopt a convenience sampling technique. Zikmund (2003) refers to this technique as, sampling that makes use of units or people that are most convenient to collect data from. In this study, only managers, supervisors/team leaders, senior managers and owners were included in the sample.

1.6.3 Measuring instrument

For the purposes of the field research to be conducted in this study, a comprehensive questionnaire, based on a comprehensive review of available existing literature applicable to the purpose of the research, will be designed. The questionnaire will consist of two sections:

a) Section A, comprised of questions concerned with the demographic characteristics of the respondents

b) Section B, comprised of questions structured to measure the variables in the study. A Likert-type-five-point scale will be used, with questions ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

100 questionnaires will be distributed to 100 grocery retail stores in the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality.
1.6.4 Data collection

Data collection will be undertaken by means of the questionnaires designed. Sekaran & Bougie (2009) consider questionnaires an efficient data collection mechanism in cases wherein the researcher knows exactly what is required and how to measure the variables of interest. Questionnaires will be constructed and distributed to grocery retail management. Where possible, the questionnaires will be completed in the presence of the researcher in order for the researcher to probe for more information. Otherwise, they will be left at the stores and be collected at an agreed upon date by the researcher and the respondents. The data will be captured in Excel software programme.

1.6.5 Data analysis

Data analysis of the data collected will be conducted in three stages:

1. Measures of central tendency (within the variance of the results gleaned from respondents) are mean, median and mode. The mean, also known as the average, is the sum of all measurements divided by the number of observations. The median is the middle value - it separates the higher half to the lower half of the data set. The mode, is the most frequently occurring value in the data set. For the purposes of this study, the mean will be used as the chosen measure of central tendency, as the researcher deems it as is the most relevant measure for this particular study - due to its fair resistance to fluctuation between results.

2. Inferential statistics assist in generalising findings from the sample to the larger population (Struwig & Stead, 2001). In this stage of analysis, hypotheses will be
tested and inferences will be made pertaining to a larger population from the sample thereof.

3. Descriptive statistics comprise a group of statistical techniques used to summarise, describe or display quantitative data used in exploratory data analysis (Collis & Hussey, 2003). Data will be analysed with the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 20.0. The results of the data will be interpreted and conclusions and recommendations will be drawn therefrom.

1.7 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The chapters that document this study’s research are as follows:

Chapter 1: This chapter introduces the primary research problem and the importance of the study. It outlines the research questions and aims and objectives. The hypotheses are formulated. The research methodology, the sample, the measuring instrument, data collection and analysis are highlighted.

Chapter 2: This chapter focuses on the literature study that is presented to provide a literature review of the study and establish answers to the research problem. Examining the impact of deviant customer behaviour on Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality grocery retailers, the study also seeks to establish measures that can minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour.

Chapter 3: This chapter discusses the research methodology which includes the research paradigm, sampling design and measuring instruments. Issues of data reliability and validity are also discussed.

Chapter 4: This chapter presents the empirical results, data analysis and the resulting interpretation and summarisation of the findings.

Chapters 5: This chapter draws conclusions and effectively makes recommendations that can be used to minimise or stop deviant behaviour in grocery stores.
1.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, the aim of the study was introduced and the problem statement and the research questions were outlined. The importance of the study and research aims and objectives and the research design objectives were presented.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A literature study is presented here to establish the impact of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retailers. The chapter examines the concept of deviant consumer behaviour (DCB), factors influencing it, types of deviant behaviour, the effects thereof and measures taken by retailers to stop or minimise it.

2.2 DEViant CONSUMER BEHAVIOur

2.2.1 Deviant consumer behaviour defined

Durkheim (2004) as cited by Amine & Gicquel (2011) defines “normal behaviour” as that which is inherent in most individuals. Amine & Gicquel (2011) further characterise normal as:

- a set of rules forming a reference framework;
- an authority originating the standard; and
- a sanction, from which results an opposition between what is marginal and what is mainstream.

In the case of grocery retailers, ‘normal behaviour’ is going to the store, paying for the goods selected and leaving the retailer without committing any societally unacceptable, dysfunctional, inappropriate or illegal offences. Unfortunately, normal behaviour from consumers is not the case, some customers are deviant (Geurts 1975 - 1976).
According to Deutsch & Kraus (1965) and Sarason (1972), as cited by Moschis and Cox (1989:732), “behaviour is generally defined as *deviant* when it differs from some norm or standard. These standards or norms are in the form of customs, manners, rules and regulations, laws, and mores. To the extent the individual’s behaviour deviates from such norms it is considered by society to be undesirable, unacceptable, or dysfunctional, i.e. deviant”. According to Harris and Reynolds (2003), DCB has been given different terms, i.e. “aberrant consumer behaviour” (Fullerton and Punj 1993), “inappropriate behaviour”, (Strutton, Vitell & Pelton, 1994), “consumer misbehaviour” (Fullerton and Punj 1997), including “jay customers” (Lovelock 1994, 2001O, which refers to the consumers who commit DCB.

Fullerton & Punj (1993) further explain aberrant consumer behaviour as, behaviour in exchange settings which violates the generally accepted norms of conduct in such situations and is therefore held in disrepute by marketers and by most consumers. While Fowler III (2007), describes “aberrant behaviour” as behaviours that violate both cultural and institutional norms. Behaviours defined here as *aberrant* include a whole host of behaviours that affect marketers and consumers alike.


Harris & Reynolds (2003) prefer the neutral term, “dysfunctional customer behaviour” to refer to customers who intentionally or unintentionally, overtly or covertly, act in a manner that, in some way, disrupts otherwise functional service encounters.

In the context of this study, deviant consumer behaviour is undesirable, unacceptable or dysfunctional consumer behaviour which deviates from norms or standards is unethical and in some forms, is illegal.
2.2.2 Factors influencing deviant consumer behaviour

There are various factors that influence DCB, i.e. demographic characteristics, psychological characteristics, social/group influences and a consumer’s frame of mind.

2.2.2.1 Demographic factors

- **Age:** according to Fullerton & Punj (1993), more shoplifting, vandalism, and rowdyism is committed by adolescents, who are generally more prone to violent and overtly daring conduct than adults - while adults are more likely than adolescents to commit credit card or cheque fraud.

- **Gender:** both sexes participate fully in DCB but, again, the forms of DCB tend to vary between genders, i.e. males are more likely to vandalise (Fullerton & Punj 1993).

- **Economic status:** all income levels are guilty of DCB, but the motivations between them may be different. DCB in higher income groups is commonly motivated by greed (versus need), as these groups can afford to pay for the products. Poorer income groups are normally motivated by need, as they often cannot afford to pay for the products (Fullerton & Punj 1993).

- **Level of education:** in the study conducted by Isin et al. (2010), it was discovered that there is a core relationship between educational level and misbehaviour. Uneducated or less educated customers display more DCB compared to educated customers.

2.2.2.2 Psychological factors

a) **Personality traits**

Fullerton and Punj (1993) cite some of the traits that may influence misbehaviour:
- **Need for affiliation, compliance and dominance**: these traits could lead either towards or away from DCB depending on the dominant behavioural norms in the group which compliance is being sought (Fullerton & Punj, 1993).

- **Need for aggression**: this trait heightens the possibility of violent forms of DCB such as physical and verbal abusiveness and vandalism (Fullerton & Punj, 1993).

b) **Level of moral development**

Depending on the consumer’s moral development, they may not differentiate between right and wrong, good and bad, and harmful and beneficial, regarding decisions and actions (Weiss, 2006) as cited by Van Greunen (2010). To complicate the matter even further, not everyone agrees on what is morally right or wrong, good or bad, ethical or unethical (Lewis, 1985). The societal reaction approach, which holds that deviance is in the eye of the beholder and the mouth of the labeller, is especially applicable to ambiguous situations in which norms are unclear (Palmer & Humphrey, 1990).

Customers who are intoxicated may benefit the retail stores, as they are more likely to buy merchandise that they do not need or would not have bought if they were in their sober state of mind. Unfortunately, intoxicated customers can also cause problems, by either shoplifting, making ‘drunken’ noise or being violent and threatening staff. The reasons for shoplifting could be to sell the merchandise to get a fix or for own consumption (Smith, 2003).

d) **Psychological problems**

Some DCB offenders have psychological problems and do not steal because of economic necessity, but rather as a way of asking for help (Kolman & Wasserman,
They may be deeply disturbed, depressed or going through a change of life, i.e. divorce. As a result, such people may not have control over their behaviour (Fullerton & Punj, 1993). According to Kolman & Wasserman (1991), the psychological problems in women associated with DCB, commonly include issues of anger, feeling sorry for themselves, frustration, stress, or revenge. These women are portrayed as lonely, isolated individuals with few support systems in their lives.

2.2.2.3 Social/group influences

Misbehaviour can be caused by peer pressure, particularly in teenagers, who will often commit DCB because their peers also do it, just to fit into the group. Misbehaviour helps promote group identity and cohesiveness, and can also serve as an initiation ritual (Fullerton & Punj, 1993).

2.2.2.4 Consumer's frame of mind

A consumer’s mood state or high anxiety level can sometimes increase their proneness to misbehave, through weakened self-control. In some cases, when this happens, consumers even attribute their actions to influences beyond their volition, including supernatural ones (Fullerton & Punj, 1993).

2.2.3 Types of deviant consumer behaviour

2.2.3.1 Shoplifting

Shoplifting is defined as, “taking or intentionally paying less for an item than the sales price, or otherwise manipulating merchandise with the intent of taking it or paying less for it” (Ifezue & Ama, 2013:112). It is important to note though, that for shoplifting to be labelled as such, the individual must have intent to permanently
deprive the retailer of the stock. Because of this difficulty to prove intent, not all shoplifters who are caught, are prosecuted (Consumer Goods Council South Africa (CGCSA), 2004). According to Steyn (2008) only one in every 40 shoplifters is apprehended. Kokemuller (n.d.) refers to shoplifting as, “a silent crime which parents do not want to believe, schools do not address, retailers do not want to talk about, police do not want to respond to, courts do not want to deal with”, further noting that the people who do the shoplifting either rationalise it as “no big deal” or are too ashamed or too afraid to admit to it. Steyn (2008) identifies shoplifting as a sad fact that costs companies millions of rands every year.

Shoplifting can be seen as a crime of concealment and distraction. Shoplifters use creative ways to conceal the act. Methods of concealment include, among others, dropping items from the shelves into open bags waiting at the shoplifter’s feet, putting items in handbags or baby carriages, hiding an item in wrapped-up newspapers and making use of false compartments within clothing (such as in jackets or soles of shoes). Some shoplifters cut away the lining of jacket pockets so that they can reach the shelves undetected when placing their hands through the holes (Steyn, 2008).

a) Types of shoplifters

According to Smith (2003), there are six main types of shoplifters:

The professional – is a skilful operator who knows all of the tricks of the trade. The professional shoplifter dresses, talks and acts so as not to attract attention or arouse suspicion. He or she is usually interested in small, high-value items, for which there is an easy resale market. The professional shoplifter is likely to be very cautious. Generally, the professional shoplifter steals for a living (Smith, 2003). Professional thieves are not the product of lower-class delinquency area backgrounds, Gibbons
and Garrity (1962). Roebuck (1963) describes this group as “career criminals”, “sophisticated criminals”, and “good crooks”.

The amateur – steals on impulse. The amateur shoplifter’s most important motive is a simple desire for the item itself. Usually, he or she takes food, clothing or other items that he actually intends to use. Generally, the amateur is nervous and self conscious, but cautious (Smith, 2003).

The juvenile – steals mainly for the thrills or to gain status in his or her peer group. Smith (2003) believes that most juvenile thieves are girls and that they usually work in groups, but not necessarily in organised gangs. This category of shoplifters accounts for 50% of all shopping and retail theft. They may steal on a dare or simply for a thrill. Normally they expect that store owners and courts will go easy on them, because of their youth (www.bizmove.com).

The drug user/addict – needs money to support his or her habit. When desperate, the user/addict steals in a brazen manner. This type of shoplifter is often frantic beyond reason and can be dangerous if you attempt to apprehend him or her (Smith, 2003).

The kleptomaniac – steals to relieve desires in his or her mind as he or she has a psychological urge to steal. According to Everhardt (n.d.) this group is sick and are difficult to apprehend, as they are very casual about their stealing. When apprehended, they do not experience any guilty feelings in relation to their actions.

The vagrant – steals because of need usually. Vagrant shoplifters take food, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and clothing for personal use. Often, the vagrant is under the influence of alcohol in such situations (Smith, 2003).
2.2.4 Reasons for rising Deviant Consumer Behaviour

2.2.4.1 Stolen merchandise easier to sell

Many thieves have found that selling their stolen items through various on-line auction sites, results in quicker sales and much higher prices than the traditional methods of selling items on the street or at a local flee market. This easy access to a much larger audience has resulted in shoplifting becoming a highly popular way in which to quickly obtain cash (25th annual retail theft survey, Hayes, 2013). Although the market for stolen grocery merchandise is just as easily accessible on the streets (as some thieves do sell on street corners) as for that of other goods, this is however, not necessarily the intended case in the grocery retail industry, as most of the merchandise is not sold and is normally for the shoplifter’s own consumption.

2.2.4.2 Reduced social stigma and low risk / non-offensive crime

While the amateur shoplifter is finding the social stigma of shoplifting to be lessening, many professional and hardcore thieves find shoplifting to be a highly profitable and low jail-risk endeavour. Shoplifters know that violent crimes can draw jail time, while the prosecution of non-violent crimes, such as shoplifting, is not always encouraged by law enforcement, and therefore seldom results in ‘jail time’ (25th annual retail theft survey, Hayes, 2013).

2.2.4.3 Fraud
According to Delamaire et al. (2009), Anderson (2007) explains and identifies different types of fraud, which are as many and varied as the financial institution’s products and technologies – as per Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1: Types of fraud

Source: Adapted from Anderson’s classification (2007) by Delamaire et al (2009:57)

The above diagram shows different types of fraud, but only those most common to grocery stores will be discussed, namely, credit card, debit card and counterfeit card fraud.
2.2.4.4 Credit card fraud

There are many different types of credit card fraud experienced by grocery retailers. These include a family member using the credit cards without authorisation. Customers pay using stolen cards or using cards that are acquired illegally. There are many ways to steal credit cards. Lăcrămioara and Mihai (2011) outline some of the methods:

**False applications** - Perpetrators might apply for a new card, using information stolen from a wallet, purse, or the trash; or stealing a pre-approved credit card application out of the mail or trash.

**Credit "doctors"** - is the term used for fraudsters who sell stolen credit card account numbers via newspaper ads to people unable to legally obtain credit cards.

**True name fraud** - New credit card accounts can be opened by individuals possessing a victim's true name identification, such as a driver's license or identity document. In such a case, the true identification was either obtained as a secondary objective in the commission of a more aggressive offence such as robber, or as the primary target of a lesser crime, such as pick-pocketing.

**Non-receipt fraud** – is a form of credit card fraud in which the perpetrator intercepts credit cards that are in transit between the credit issuer and the authorised account holder. Losses attributable to mail theft have declined significantly as a result of "card activation" programs, wherein the cardholder must call their financial institution and confirm their identity before the card is activated.

**Credit master** - is a software program, downloadable from the Internet, which allows the user to produce valid credit card numbers. Counterfeiters can then put these numbers to use on counterfeit cards.

The owners of these stolen or counterfeit cards usually go on spending sprees and buy luxury groceries. Sometimes, they work with cashiers in the stores in order to commit their fraud effectively.
2.2.4.5 Debit card fraud

Debit card payments have been in existence since 1988. They function similarly to credit cards in that debit cards can be offered for payment at any retail store. The customer signs a till-printed voucher detailing the card number and the amount of the transaction and signs the voucher. The customer retains the top copy of the voucher, and the cashier examines the signature and the transaction is then completed (Levi et al., 1991).

The advantages of debit cards are that they are quick and convenient to use, and that customers can also withdraw cash in some outlets (Levi et al., 1991). Fraudsters find debit cards easy to use, as the verification of authenticity is limited. There is no need to produce an identity document or proof of address and only the signature on the card is compared with the signature on the voucher. With the recent development of services like inContact – in which customers get smses for all transactions from R100,01 upwards on their accounts, and the location of those transactions, fraudsters also have to be more vigilant (www.fnb.co.za). They do not stay in one area for long, i.e. they would draw cash in one area and carry out in-store purchases in another area, etc. The grocery retailer is one of the main victims of this kind of crime, as are petrol stations, restaurants and clothing stores (Levi et al. (1991).

2.2.4.6 Counterfeit card fraud

Counterfeit card fraud involves illegally manufactured cards that use personal information stolen from the magnetic strip of a genuinely issued card. In other cases, lost and stolen cards or old cards are encoded with the new information that was stolen from a genuine card for purposes of committing counterfeit card fraud. Perpetrators usually use card skimming devices to steal the information needed for Counterfeit Card Fraud (The Banking Association South Africa, 2013).
2.2.5 Violence and threats (abusive behaviour)

Retail staff is at risk of physical violence, the threat of physical violence and verbal abuse which can injure them physically and psychologically (Fernie et al., 2003).

2.2.6 Sexual indiscretions

Sexual indiscretions by consumers are committed in different forms, ranging from comments made to employees (which are viewed as harassment) to sexual assault (non-consensual physical contact), Harris & Daunt (2011). This form of DCB is more common in the hospitality industry than in retail industry, particularly grocery retailers (Harris & Daunt, 2011).

2.2.7 Other forms of deviant consumer behaviour

Some DCB may be considered harmless, and the offenders may even justify it. Brinkmann (2004), offers the following examples:

- Drinking a can of soda in a supermarket without paying for it
- Giving misleading price information to a cashier for an unpriced item
- Receiving too much change and not saying anything
- Breaking a bottle of salad dressing in a supermarket and doing nothing about it
- Tasting grapes in a supermarket and not buying any

2.3 RETAIL

2.3.1 Retail defined
Poloian (2003) explains *retailing* as, “the selling of goods or services directly to the customer for personal, non-business use”. While goods or product retailers sell tangible products or goods to their customers in the stores, service retailers do not sell tangible products, but provide intangible services. Hotels, airlines, hospitals and banks have high degrees of customer contact, and with these types of services, customers’ satisfaction with those services depends critically on their perception of the quality of the service personnel (Kent and Omar, 2003).

Retailers are different from manufacturers and wholesalers, in that they sell to ultimate users, while manufacturers and wholesalers sell goods to other businesses that resell them in the same form or in different forms.

Terblanche (1998) takes note of non-shop retailing. The interaction with customers is not in a shop or retail outlet set-up, but is mainly by way of telephone, mail, television, newspapers, magazines and computers. Another form of non-shop retailing that has become popular in South Africa is on-line grocery shopping.

For the purposes of this study, field research pertaining to retailing is limited to the following leading stores, Shoprite/Checkers, Pick ‘n Pay, SPAR, Woolworths Foods, Makro and Game – all of which are chain stores.

### 2.3.2 Types of retail settings

There are many different types of retail settings, but only the major types will be discussed in this section, while some others will be introduced later in the chapter.

Major forms of retail settings include the following:

a) Department stores: these are very large stores offering a variety of retail categories, from clothing to cosmetics to groceries to homeware (for example, Edgars, Makro, etc.)
b) Discount stores: these stores have a variety of goods at cheaper-than-average prices (for example, USave).

c) Specialty stores: these stores offer specialised products, such as toys, shoes, books, clothing for fuller-figured women (for example, Toys “R” Us, Aldos, Exclusive Books, Donna Claire).

d) Boutique stores: these are normally small with unique clothes that are available in small quantities, and often target high income groups (for example, Rezanne, Don Marco).

e) Hypermarkets: these stores provide a variety of products and in high volumes at low prices (for example, Pick ‘n Pay, Shoprite, Checkers hypermarkets).

“The supermarket was historically the first format [of supermarket] used, with location and sales focused on upper-income consumers. While the number of supermarkets rose quickly over the 1990s, by the late 1990s the chains added hypermarkets (to extend to the middle and lower-middle-class urban consumers, with broad food and non-food selections and low prices). In the late 1990s and early 2000s chains added convenience stores on transport routes and in dense urban areas. During the second half of the 1990s and accelerating today, has been opening of small supermarkets in poorer areas as a means of franchising (such as the Family Stores of PNP)”, Weatherspoon and Reardon, 2003 pp 337. The supermarket came into existence in South Africa in 1947, when CTC Bazaars created the first supermarket in Johannesburg, Njomo (2011).

2.3.2.1 Forms of retail ownership

There are three different major forms of retail ownership:

a) Independent retailers or voluntary chains
The retailers in this category are independently owned. They are not part of a group of chain stores or a franchise. They are owned by an individual, a partnership or a family. Kent and Omar (2003) describe an independent retailer as, a single owner trading from up to 10 shops. Independent ownership is found attractive by some entrepreneurs because of: the ease of entry into the marketplace; limited capital requirements; and relatively limited licensing requirements which have to be met, Terblanche (1998). The owners have the freedom to conduct their trade in the manner in which they please, as there are none of the restrictions an owner would experience if operating within a group of chain stores or in a franchise.

Independent ownership offers many advantages. Terblanche (1998) mentions some of the advantages enjoyed by independent owners: direct contact with customers; flexibility which allows owner(s) to react quickly to opportunities or threats; and fast decision making.

Spar Group Limited operates according to the principle of voluntary trading through the SPAR and Build it Guilds (Spar Group Annual Report 2013). Other players in grocery retail are independent supermarkets which have also claimed a significant share, Metro Cash & Carry, Springbok and Broadways in Nelson Mandela Bay.

b) Corporate retail supermarket chains

A chain retailer operates multiple outlets (store units) under common ownership; it usually engages in some level of centralised (or co-ordinated) purchasing and decision making (Berman and Evans, 2013). Chain stores are the major players in the retail industry. Pick ‘n Pay, Shoprite and Woolworths are all under corporate ownership.

c) Franchising
Franchising involves a contractual arrangement between a franchisor (a manufacturer, wholesaler, or service sponsor) and a retail franchisee. The franchisor allows the franchisee to conduct business under an established name and according to a given pattern of business (Berman & Evans, 2013). Pick ‘n Pay and Shoprite are franchises.

2.4 NELSON MANDELA BAY’S LEADING GROCERY RETAILERS

2.4.1 Shoprite Group Holdings Limited

Shoprite Group Holdings Limited consists of the following grocery retailers: Shoprite; Shoprite Usave; Checkers; and OK Foods.

**Shoprite** is the original business of the Shoprite Group and remains the flagship brand - serving the mass middle class. The brand’s core focus is to provide the masses with the lowest possible prices on a range of groceries and some durable items. Specific emphasis is placed on basic commodities, which is critical to the core target market ([www.shopriteholdings.co.za](http://www.shopriteholdings.co.za)). Shoprite is the leading grocery retailer in Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality, boasting more than 10 stores.

**Usave** is a no-frills discounter, focussing on lower income consumers. This smaller format, limited range store is an ideal vehicle for the Group’s expansion into the rest of Africa and allows far greater penetration into under-served areas within South Africa ([www.shopriteholdings.co.za](http://www.shopriteholdings.co.za)). These stores are more common in rural areas and less common in suburban cities such as Nelson Mandela Bay. There are two Usave stores in the city, located in Korsten and Daku. The target market of Usave, as in the case of most stores in the Korsten and Daku areas, is the lower income group.
**Checkers** focuses on time-pressed, higher income consumers and differentiates itself from competitors through its offerings (and marketing thereof) of specialty ranges of meats, cheeses and wines. Its full range of groceries and household general merchandise items are all promised at the consistently good value for which the Group is famous for (www.shopriteholdings.co.za). There are five stores in Nelson Mandela Bay and situated in affluent areas, namely Metlife Plaza and Newton Park.

**Checkers Hyper** offers the same specialty food selections and great value as Checkers, but within large-format stores that encourage bulk rather than convenience shopping. The general merchandise ranges are far wider in Checkers Hyper stores than in Checkers stores, focusing on - apart from normal groceries - additional categories such as small appliances, pet accessories, garden and pool care, outdoor gear, home improvement, homeware, baby products, toys and stationery. Checkers Hyper stores operate in South Africa only and are found in areas with high population densities (www.shopriteholdings.co.za). There is one Checkers Hyper in Nelson Mandela Bay, situated in Greenacres Shopping Mall.

**OK Foods** has a diverse range of mostly smaller, convenience-oriented markets situated in rural towns, suburbs and neighbourhoods. The stores offer a wide range of fresh and non-perishable food items, as well as non-foods. Nelson Mandela Bay has two OK Foods stores in Linton Grange and Algoa Park. They both are located in very near proximity (within meters) to Spar stores.

### 2.4.2 Pick ‘n Pay Stores Limited

The Pick ‘n Pay Group is the second largest grocery retailer in South Africa and also in Nelson Mandela Bay. The Group was established in 1967, when Raymond Ackerman purchased the first few stores, and has been listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE) since 1968. It comprises of hypermarkets (William Moffet),
corporate-owned supermarkets (Newton Park, Walmer Park, Summerstrand, and others) and Franchise Stores which are owner-managed and which receive sourcing and operational support from Pick ‘n Pay and trade under the Pick ‘n Pay banner. In 2002, the Pick ‘n Pay Group bought the Boxer chain, which is a low-cost, low-margin operation, concentrating primarily on the local rural market (www.picknpay.co.za). Nelson Mandela Bay has two Boxer stores, situated in Sidwell and KwaZakhele, targeting low income customers.

2.4.3 SPAR Group Holdings Limited

The SPAR Group Limited (SPAR) is primarily a wholesaler and distributor of goods and services to independent retailers who trade under the SPAR brand as: Superspar; SPAR; Kwikspar; and SaveMor supermarkets. In 2013, Spar celebrated 50 years of existence in South Africa (Spar Group Annual Report, 2013).

Superspar is aggressively priced, offers a full range of value added services, and has a full range of groceries and general merchandise. It has extensive service departments, i.e. fresh produce, in-store bakery, butchery, deli and meal solutions. Superspar stores are almost double the size of a Spar store, i.e. the Superspar selling area is 1300+ square metres, while Spar is 700+, Kwikspar 300 to 700+ and Savemor 300 square metres (Spar Group annual report, 2013).

Spar is competitively priced and has a comprehensive range of products. Kwikspar focuses on convenience with emphasis on speed. SaveMor has a limited range of products and is competitively priced on commodity products (Spar Group annual report, 2013).

2.4.4 Woolworths Holding Limited
Woolworths was founded in 1931 by Max Sonnenberg. His belief was that success lay in providing customers with superior quality merchandise at reasonable prices – and has been instrumental in establishing Woolworths as one of South Africa’s leading retail chain, (www.woolworthsholdings.co.za). Woolworths Food offers customers good quality food and often well priced. In Nelson Mandela Bay, Woolworths Food stores are situated in Woolworths Clothing Stores (Greenacres and Walmer Park) and are also independently situated (Sunridge Park and Lorraine). Another store opened in October 2014 at an Engen garage in Linton Grange and at Mount Pleasant Engen garage.

2.4.5 Makro

Makro has 19 warehouse clubs in South Africa. Makro’s range includes categories of goods such as (including others): home entertainment; computers and communication; office furniture; stationery supplies and equipment; large and small appliances; hardware and DIY; home decor and soft furnishing; food; and liquor. Stores are located in major metropolitan areas and operate under a low cost / low margin trading philosophy. This ethos enables high volume distribution of merchandise at competitive prices. The value offering to all customers also includes quality brands and bulk volumes if required. The most differentiating feature of Makro is true one-stop shopping with everything available under one roof (www.makro.co.za).

The first Makro store was opened in 1971 in Germiston in the Gauteng Province. This was also a milestone for South Africa, as it became the first cash-and-carry store in the country making use of top-end technology for stock and sales tracking. The Port Elizabeth store was opened 25 years later, in 1996 and remains the only store in the Eastern Cape Province.

Makro’s grocery offerings are tailor-made to fit a variety of customer needs across merchandise offerings. The food offering caters to wholesale shoppers, ranging from informal traders and grocery store owners to hoteliers, restaurateurs, offices and schools. At weekends, the focus shifts to promoting good buys for retail food and
grocery shoppers who can achieve substantial savings on their monthly household basket, compared to other mass retail outlets (www.fastmoving.co.za).

2.4.6 Game Store

Game is a promotionally-driven discount retailer of predominantly general merchandise and non-perishable groceries for home, leisure and business use. Game is a subsidiary of the JSE-listed, Massmart Holdings. Massmart is Africa’s third largest distributor of consumer goods, (www.game.co.za).

The first Game store was opened in Durban in South Africa in 1970. It was born out of the belief by its founders that shopping had become a tedious and boring pastime. They wanted to create a fun shopping environment and so conceptualised retailing as a game. The signature shocking pink colour in the original logo prevails to this day.

Game stores pride themselves in reassuring their customers with three guarantees made in the following statement: “Found it cheaper? We beat any price! We will not be undersold!” - If you’ve purchased any item from Game and, within 21 days, find the identical product at a competitor for less, tell us and we will refund MORE than the difference” (www.game.co.za).

Nelson Mandela Bay has two Game stores, one in Newton Park (Greenacres) and one in Walmer (Moffett on Main).

2.5 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The dependent variable in this chapter deals with impact of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retailers. Independent variables are: impact on profit, impact on inventory, impact on grocer security, impact on employees and impact on customers and measures to stop or minimize DCB

2.5.1 Independent variables

2.5.1.1 Impact on profit

DCB has a negative impact on retailer profit through both direct and indirect financial costs. Direct costs include increased insurance premiums, property loss by theft,
costs incurred in recompensing customers affected by the DCB of others and negative effects on a retailer’s sales growth (Harris and Reynolds, 2003). Indirect costs include (a) increased workloads for members of staff who are required to deal with DCB, thus reducing employee time to serve functional customers effectively, and (b) negative financial implications for human resources department in terms of staff retention, recruitment, induction and training (Harris and Reynolds, 2003). This situation forces retailers to employ more staff both on a permanent and a part-time basis.

H01: There is no relationship between retailer profit and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.5.1.2 Impact on inventory

The impact on inventory on the retail operation, due to DCB is the loss of stock. There is less inventory for legitimate customers to purchase, thus affecting sales negatively (Lister, n.d.). This leads to a decline in profitability and an increased expenditure to curb these losses (Chapman, et al., 2003). Inventory shrinkage also leads to an increase in costs, since the retail operation will be forced to budget for replacing the lost stock (Steyn, 2008). This is especially the case in smaller stores as they are sometimes not as well-established as bigger stores, in their measures to address the impacts of DCB. These losses also handicap the retailer’s efforts to meet fixed financial obligations, impacting on the corporate results of a retail operation (Chapman, et al., 2003).

Inventory shrinkage can also cause the depletion of products without such a depletion registering on the sales data, with the result that shelves become, and remain, empty until someone orders new stock manually or the until inventory records are corrected (Chapman, et al., 2003). This leads to shopper dissatisfaction, as the sought products are unavailable (Chapman, et al., 2003). Any retail operation
is dependent on its customers for success, and if the customers are not satisfied with the services offered by the grocery retailer, they will go to another grocery retailer. With the rife competition between grocery retailers, a retailer cannot afford to lose customers because of a bad or poor reputation (Chapman et al., 2003).

H02: There is no relationship between the impact on customers and deviant consumer behaviour. There is no significant impact on a retailer’s customers and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.5.1.3 Impact on grocer security

Fernie, et al. (2003) cites three main types of security measures for retail crime prevention: human; mechanical; and electronic.

a) Human

A crucial way in which to prevent shoplifting is to have well-trained and alert employees who know how to spot a potential shoplifter. Retailers are making use of well-trained professional security staff, loss prevention officers, store detectives and so forth whose sole responsibility is the protection of that business’ assets (Steyn, 2008). Such staff should know the general shoplifting-prevention techniques which include: staying alert at all times; greeting all customers; asking lingering customers if they need help; knowing where shoplifting is most likely to occur; and using a log to share suspicion about shoplifters among employees (Ifezue & Ama, 2013). To intensify security, some grocery retailers have security guards at their doors, to compare slips with the contents of packets or the goods that customers leave with. Other methods include: customers being required to check any packets they have on them when they enter the store, in at the entrance for collection upon their leaving; and customers’ bags of existing purchases being sealed with security tape at the store entrance.
b) Mechanical

The following are some of the mechanical deterrents used: mirrors; screens and grilles; shutters; bells; security cases; and security doors/glass (Fernie et al. 2003). Retailers need to invest more in these DCB deterrents.

c) Electronic

Loop alarms, scanners, lighting, CCTV cameras, dummy cameras, radio links, secure payment applications (to prevent online fraud) fall into the category of electronic forms crime prevention security. These technological aids are, however, only as effective as the people who monitor and react to them. It is therefore imperative to train personnel in the use of the electronic aids used, in order for them to be effective (Steyn, 2008).

H03: There is no relationship between impact on a grocer’s security and deviant consumer behaviour. There is no significant impact on a retailer’s security measures and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.5.1.4 Impact on employees

According to Harris & Reynolds (2003), rude, threatening, obstructive, aggressive or disruptive behaviours by customers may negatively affect the mood or temper of personnel. DCB may also lead to feigned emotional display, most often to pacify disruptive, aggressive or intoxicated customers (Harris & Reynolds, 2003). The employees may have to apologise while they do not mean it or may have to fake a smile, when they actually feel the opposite. Although many of the resulting behaviours by employees in their interaction with customers are commonly considered natural features of customer service - extensive feigning of their true
feelings negatively impacting on an employee’s natural mood or temper, can impact on the quality of customer service they are able to provide.

According to Harris & Reynolds (2003) shoplifting also has indirect influence on employee morale and the work culture in general. Employees may feel a sense of paranoia if they constantly hear that the store has a shoplifting issue. The negative measures taken to deter shoplifting can impede employee instincts toward a positive and welcoming attitude with customers. Employees also may become overly suspicious of customers and get overzealous in their efforts to protect the store's inventory. Workloads are also increased by the necessity to deal with law enforcement agencies, affected staff and distressed customers (Harris & Reynolds, 2003).

H04: There is no relationship between impact on employees and deviant consumer behaviour. There is no significant impact on a retailer’s employees and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.5.1.5 Impact on customers

Law-abiding citizens who make their purchases without falling into the temptation to "get something for nothing" often pick up the tab for a shoplifters’ larceny, due to rising costs in stores - as more money needs to be invested in security measures, which forces stores to raise prices (Kokemuller, n.d.). In cases wherein customers perceive that store personnel could control DCB better (i.e. in the case of noisy customers, personnel could ask them to keep their voices down), the affected customer will feel less satisfied, less willing to shop at the store, and more likely to engage in word-of-mouth complaining, than when they believe the store has no control over the behaviour (Huang, et al., 2009). The negative word-of-mouth could cause the store to lose more customers, as it may be spread to friends and families and also on social networks.
According to Harris & Reynolds (2003), DCB has a domino effect on other customers, wherein DCB has a knock-on effect on the conduct of other customers who witness incidents of such behaviour. Such effects can manifest in two forms (Harris & Reynolds, 2003:153), “a) The collective expression of sympathy toward the frontline employee who has been a victim of “unreasonable” customer behaviour and b) the contagion of dysfunctional customer behaviour by witnesses of the customers’ behaviour, particularly vociferous or illegitimate complaining”. The former customers can often be sympathetic to an extent of apologising for the behaviour of the customers who display DCB. While the latter can make the situation even more uncontrollable in the form of imitated complaints (Harris & Reynolds, 2003).

H05: There is no relationship between impact on customers and deviant consumer behaviour. There is no significant impact on a retailer’s employees and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.5.1.6 Measures to minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour in retail establishments

Suquet (2010) agrees that deviant behaviour is not just a simple issue managers should be aware of, but a complex phenomenon requiring investigation. They have to keep asking questions about their clients’ behaviour:

“Which objectives are appropriate regarding clients’ behaviour? Does the company tolerate certain deviant behaviour? How does it react to them? Are there some contradictions between service and control behaviours? Have the agents encountered some new behaviour? Can our deviant customers be turned into regular clients (Suquet 2010:473)?”

Reflection by store management on the aforementioned questions and possibly the answers thereto, may enable them to manage DCB better.
Measures to reduce or stop DCB in retail outlets are in some considerations, specific to the different forms of DCB they are intended to reduce or prevent. The DCB forms of shoplifting and abusive behaviour are thus approached differently.

a) Shoplifting

DCB can affect the larger community in various ways. Supermarkets can close down due to DCB and this may result in loss of jobs. Those that are convicted of DCB related criminal offences, resulting in their having a criminal record, will have their future employment opportunities negatively impacted. Prices may increase due to the additional security measures required to be put into place. It is therefore important that communities are schooled concerning DCB and its consequences.

More floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or juveniles who come in groups may assist in preventing DCB. It is therefore imperative, that staff is well-trained to be able to spot possible offenders and offer assistance without offending them, as engaging them in this way may distract them from their possible intention to commit DCB.

Identification of items stolen most often and of high-risk areas can enable the implementation of increased and correspondingly applicable security measures, i.e. increased surveillance near specific products. Verifications of till slips and contents on exit points may also be applied by those who haven’t. This method has proven useful for Makro, Game and selected other stores.

b) Abusive behaviour (violence and threats)

It is important that customers are treated with respect at all times and that they are given the best service possible.
Korczynski & Evans (2013) encourage the enchanting myth of “customer sovereignty” during the service interaction. This argument encourages the use of ‘Sir/Madam’ and also giving customers space, and suggests that by doing so, customers are less likely to demonstrate deviant behaviour. This approach is essentially, treating customers in the manner in which the store and its employees wish to be treated - making use of common sense and the basic principles of natural human nature.

H06: There is no relationship between measures to minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour and deviant consumer behaviour. There is no significant impact on a retailer’s measures to stop or minimize deviant consumer behaviour and deviant consumer behaviour.

2.6 CHALLENGES FACED IN MINIMISING OR STOPPING DEVIAN
T CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR

The following are the challenges faced in minimising or stopping deviant consumer behaviour.

2.6.1 Ineffectiveness of arresting and prosecuting deviant consumer behaviour offenders

According to Clarke & Petrossian (2013), there is little hard evidence, that apprehending, arresting, and prosecuting DCB offenders results in reduced DCB - by either those arrested or by others who learn about the arrests. Studies of criminal sanctioning have consistently failed to show any clear deterrent effects. In regard to shoplifting, the chances of getting caught are low, and the risks of severe punishment are small – and thus most researchers believe offenders pay little attention to the possible costs of their actions (Clarke & Petrossian, 2013).
2.6.2 Problem in banning known deviant consumer behaviour offenders

A DCB-related practice entails banning offenders from, and posting their pictures in stores. Little is known about the effectiveness of this practice, but as it publicises offenders’ identities, it might have some limited value. However, where courts have not convicted those identified, both the retailers and the police engaged in the practice are vulnerable to criticism and legal challenge (Clarke & Petrossian, 2013).

2.6.3 Decline in moral standards of the society

According to an annual retail theft survey conducted, Hayes (2013) claims that the morals of the society have declined over the years. Almost daily we hear of business, government, law enforcement, celebrities, sports figures, and even church leaders being caught up in questionable activities. Such events make it easier for customers to steal and to rationalise their theft acts (25th annual retail theft survey, Hayes, 2013). Due to the decline in morals, DCB offenders have increased over the years as society sometimes finds nothing wrong in the behaviour.
Figure 2.2: Conceptual framework model

- Impact on Profit (HO1)
- Impact on Inventory (HO2)
- Impact on Grocer Security (HO3)
- Impact on Employees (HO4)
- Impact on Customers (HO5)
- Measures to Stop or Minimise Deviant Customer Behaviour (HO6)

Deviant Consumer Behaviour
In this chapter, the literature on deviant consumer behaviour has been reviewed and discussed. The chapter addressed factors that influence DCB, the types of DCB, the impact of DCB, what retailers are doing to minimize DCB and the challenges faced. Retail was also discussed extensively. The chapter addressed the background, importance and determinants of each variable and how the independent variables impact deviant consumer behaviour. The following chapter will discuss the research methodology used in measuring and analysing the variables used to construct the conceptual framework.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two of this study presented the literature review on the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay.

This chapter will discuss the research design, the research methodology and research paradigms. The data collection, the sample, sampling method used, the measuring instrument and data analysis will also be discussed. Lastly, the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments used will be established.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Vogt (1993) as cited in Collis & Hussey (2003) describe research design as, “the science and art of planning procedures for conducting studies so as to get the most valid findings”. In this context, research design concerns how the research will be conducted. According to Blumberg, Cooper & Schindler (2008), research design has the following characteristics:

- It is an activity and time-based plan
- It is always based on the research question
- It guides the selection of sources and types of information
- It outlines procedures for every research activity

The research design also answers the following questions: What kind of answers is the study looking for and which methods could be applied to find them? What
techniques will be used to gather data? What kind of sampling will be used and how will time constraints be dealt with?

### 3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Collis & Hussey (2003), methodology refers to the overall approach to the research process, from the theoretical underpinning to the data collection and analysis thereof.

### 3.4 RESEARCH PARADIGMS

“The term paradigm refers to the progress of scientific practice based on people’s philosophies and assumptions about the world and the nature of knowledge; in this context, about how research should be conducted, Collis & Hussey (2003:46).

There are two main paradigms, namely, the positivistic approach (quantitative) and the phenomenological paradigm (qualitative). The following choices determine which paradigm to work with, Bertram & Christiansen (2014:22):

- a) “What kind of questions are supposed to be asked
- b) What can be observed and investigated
- c) How to collect data
- d) How to interpret the findings”

#### 3.4.1 The positivist (quantitative) approach

According to Collis & Hussey (2003), the positivistic approach seeks facts or causes of social phenomena, with little regard to the subjective state of the individual. Logical reasoning is applied to the research to ensure that precision, objectivity and accuracy replace hunches. Kerlinger (1986) in Collis & Hussey (2003:125) suggests that good research questions for a positivistic study should:
a) “express a relationship between variables
b) be stated in unambiguous terms in question form
c) imply the possibility of empirical testing”

3.4.2 The phenomenological (qualitative) approach

“The phenomenological paradigm is concerned with understanding human behaviour from the participant’s own frame of reference”, Collis & Hussey (2003:52). In phenomenological approach, the product is:

d) phenomenological descriptions
e) gathering descriptions
f) making sense of those descriptions, and
g) writing up those descriptions (O’Leary, 2010:120).

3.4.3 Positivistic approach versus phenomenological approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective / Purpose:</th>
<th>Qualitative / Phenomenological Research</th>
<th>Quantitative / Positivistic Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To gain an understanding of underlying reasons and motivations. To provide insights into the setting of a problem, generating ideas and/or hypotheses for later quantitative research to uncover prevalent trends in thought and opinion</td>
<td>To quantify data and generalise results from a sample to the population of interest. To measure the incidence of various views and opinions in a chosen sample. Sometimes followed by qualitative research which is used to explore some findings further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Usually a small number of non-representative cases.</td>
<td>Usually a large number of cases representing the population of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents selected to fulfil a given quota</td>
<td>Respondents selected to interest. Randomly selected respondents</td>
<td>Structured techniques such as on-street or telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured or semi-structured techniques e.g. individual depth interviews or group discussions</td>
<td>Non-statistical</td>
<td>Statistical; data is usually in the form of tabulations. Findings are conclusive and usually descriptive in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exploratory and/or investigative. Findings are not conclusive and cannot be used to make generalisations about the population of interest. Develop an initial understanding and sound base for further decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Used to recommend a final course of action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Qweleka (2009:85)

Even though the paradigms differ, they are both important and useful (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie: 2004). In this study, the researcher has used positivistic approach. This approach does not come without its weaknesses (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004:19):

h) The researcher's theories that are used may not reflect local constituencies' understandings.

i) The researcher may miss out on phenomena occurring because of the focus on theory or hypothesis testing rather than on theory or hypothesis generation (called the confirmation bias).
j) Knowledge produced may be too abstract and general for direct application to specific local situations, contexts, and individuals.

k) Knowledge produced may not generalise to other people or other settings (i.e., findings may be unique to the relatively few people included in the research study).

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

In the section that follows, an overview of the sample will be considered, the sampling method, description of the sample, and the measuring instrument and data analysis will be discussed.

3.5.1 The sample

A sample is critical when conducting a research. According to Collis & Hussey (2003:155), “a sample is made up of some of the members of a population. A population may refer to a body of people or to any other collection of items under consideration for research purposes”. The basic idea of sampling is that by selecting some of the elements in a population, conclusions can be drawn about the entire population, Cooper & Schindler (2003).

Convenience sampling was used in the study. A convenience sample is chosen on the basis of availability. Accessible and articulate respondents are selected, Struwig & Stead (2001).

Major grocery establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay were used as a sample, i.e. Checkers/Shoprite/OK, Pick ‘n Pay/Boxer and Spar. Due to time constraints, the researcher could not use Woolworths Foods as a sample. Woolworths Foods’ public relations policy requires that an application be made with their head office before any kind of research can be conducted on their operations, i.e. questionnaires and interviews.
The research sample included supervisors / team leaders, managers and others – senior management / owners of the stores. The stores in which the research was conducted were in Nelson Mandela Bay. They were both within the suburbs and the townships. The participation by research respondents in the study was voluntary and participants were 20 years and older, and from all racial groups.

### 3.5.2 The measuring instrument and data analysis

According to Leedy & Ormrod (2005:21), “measurement is limiting the data of any phenomenon—substantial or insubstantial, so that those data may be interpreted and, ultimately, compared to an acceptable qualitative and quantitative standard”. They further explain the definition:

- **a)** *measurement is limiting the data* – the limit is set that restraints the data
- **b)** *of any phenomenon—substantial or insubstantial* – nothing exists that the researcher cannot measure, substantial (observable objects) or insubstantial (concepts, ideas, opinions, feelings, or other intangible entities)

For the purposes of this study, a questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire was developed as per guidelines by O’Leary (2010):

- **a)** Operationalise concepts, going from abstract concepts to variables that can be measured / assessed.
- **b)** Draft questions – questions were concise and as clear as possible
- **c)** Review – each question was carefully read and response choices were stated for respondents to choose from
- **d)** Order questions – questions were put in an order that would be logical and ease respondents into the survey
- **e)** Rewrite questions – questions were rewritten and were submitted to a supervisor for assessments
f) Written instructions – written instructions were made as clear and as unambiguous as possible

g) Lay out – a clear, logical, professional, and aesthetically pleasing layout and design was constructed

h) Cover letter – the cover letter introduced the researcher, briefly defined the research topic and its aims and objectives and made it clear that participation by respondents was voluntary and that respondents could withdraw at any stage

The questionnaire was in English and divided into two sections:

i) Section A consisted of demographic characteristics

j) Section B consisted of statements based on the impact of DCB on business, namely; impact on profit, inventory, grocer security, employees and possible measures to stop or minimise DCB.

A Likert-type five-point scale measuring instrument was used, ranging between 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree). Data analysis was undertaken using Statistical Package for Social Sciences 20.0. The questionnaires were hand-delivered to the respondents and were collected from the respondents by the researcher. Some were emailed to the researcher. One hundred (100) questionnaires were distributed. Of these, eighty-two (82) questionnaires were returned (having been responded to), while seventy (70) of these completed questionnaires were usable for the research.

3.6 THE RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Leedy (2005) describes reliability as the consistency with which a measuring instrument yields a certain result when the entity being measured has not changed. Reliability is concerned with the findings of the research and is one aspect of the credibility of the findings (Collis & Hussey, 2003). This means that if the research finding can be repeated over a period of time (i.e. six months), it is reliable. “It suggests that the same thing is repeated or recurs under the identical or very similar
conditions”, Neuman (2011:2008). Reliability is tested by Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, with which, if the values are 0.70 or higher, it is reliable. Below is a summary of different forms of reliability estimates.

Table 3.2: Summary of reliability estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>What is measured</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Reliability of a test or instrument from examinee scores. Same test is administered twice to same subjects over an interval of less than six months</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel forms</td>
<td>Equivalence</td>
<td>Degree to which alternative forms of same measure produce same or similar results</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>Internal consistency</td>
<td>Degree to which instrument items are homogeneous and reflect the same underlying construct(s)</td>
<td>Specialised correlational formulas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted: Cooper & Schindler (2003)

3.7 THE VALIDITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Validity is the extent to which the research findings accurately represent what is really happening in the situation – it refers to the truth and trustworthiness of the findings (Collis & Hussey, 2003). Validity suggests truthfulness; it refers to how well an idea ‘fits’ with actual reality (Neuman, 2011). Validity of a measurement instrument is the extent to which the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Leedy, 2005).

In quantitative research, validity includes the application of statistics to questionnaire construction as well as the use of statistical testing (Struwig and Stead, 2001). According to O’Leary (2010), validity is concerned with truth value - i.e. whether conclusions are correct - and also considers whether methods, approaches, and
techniques actually relate to what is being explored. Below is a summary of validity estimates.

**Table 3.3: Summary of validity estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>What is Measured</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Degree to which the content of the items adequately represents the universe of all relevant items under the study</td>
<td>Judgemental or panel evaluation with content validity ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion-related</td>
<td>Degree to which the predictor is adequate in capturing the relevant aspects of the criterion.</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent</td>
<td>Present - criterion data are available at same time as predictor scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive</td>
<td>Prediction - criterion data are measured after the passage of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Answers the question, &quot;What accounts for the variance in the measure?&quot; Attempts to identify the underlying construct(s) being measured and determine how well the test represents it (them)</td>
<td>Judgemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation of proposed test with established one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convergent-discriminant techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multitrait-multimethod analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted: Cooper and Schindler (2003)
3.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, research design was discussed, which included research methodology, research paradigms, data collection, and the sample and sampling method used in the study. The measuring instrument and data analysis methods were presented. The reliability and validity of the measuring instrument were discussed.

In the next chapter, Chapter Four, the findings of the study will be presented.
CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of the study was to examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers. It also sought to establish measures that can minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour in Nelson Mandela Bay grocery retail establishments.

In this chapter the researcher presents the findings of the study. Data was captured through the use of a questionnaire and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 20.0. In the analysis, all strongly disagree and disagree responses were combined to comprise a single response category of “disagree”. Equally, strongly agree and agree responses were combined to comprise a single response category of “agree”.

This chapter is divided into four sections. Section A presents the demographic information of the respondents of the study. Section B is comprised of respondents’ perceptions on the effects of DCB on retailers. In Section C, an overall comparison of the response rates (in percentages) under each section is presented. Section D imparts a discussion on the managerial and future research implications of the study.

4.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Section A of the questionnaire comprised several items concerning the demographic information of the respondents. Figures 4.1 to Figure 4.5 present a summary of all demographic information pertaining to the respondents.
4.2.1 Gender

Figure 4.1: Response rate by gender

Figure 4.1 shows that fifty-three percent (53%) of respondents were male and forty-seven percent (47%) were female. This shows that there was no gender bias in the sampling procedure, because the percentage difference between male and female respondents is small (6%), given that the total sample size was seventy people.

4.2.2 Age

Figure 4.2: Response rate by age group
Figure 4.2 shows that the majority of respondents were aged between 30 and 39 years of age (51%), followed by a portion of twenty-nine percent (29%) aged between 40 and 49 years of age. The remainder of respondents per age group are as follows: 20-29 years – sixteen percent (16%); and 50 years and older - four percent (4%). The older generation is transferring knowledge and skills to younger generations. This result is highly expected, because the highest number of the working class is usually more concentrated in the “middle” ages than peripheral ages. This also reflects that youth is given more opportunities in the retail industry, as more supervisors and managers are youth, which is a good sign for the future of Nelson Mandela Bay and for the country at large, as government encourages empowerment of youth and women.

4.2.3 Race

Figure 4.3: Response rate by race

Figure 4.3 shows that the highest number of respondents were White (50%), followed by twenty-nine percent (29%) of respondents being Coloured, seventeen percent (17%) African with four percent (4%) comprised of Asian respondents. This shows that there was an improper distribution of race among the respondents. This is caused by the fact that most employees in supervisory and management levels in supermarkets are Whites followed by Coloureds. Even though the majority of
supermarket staff is African, they hold junior positions. In terms of races in Nelson Mandela Bay and Eastern Cape, Asian is the least represented race with only 4%.

4.2.4 Position

**Figure 4.4: Respondents’ positions**

![Frequency of Position](image)

In Figure 4.4, the highest number of respondents was managers (57%), followed by supervisors (39%). Those who occupied other positions comprised three percent (3%) of the sample. Team leaders comprised just one percent (1%) of the sample.

4.2.5 Experience

**Figure 4.5: Respondents’ experience**

![Experience](image)
Figure 4.5 shows that the majority of the respondents had a working experience of 6 to 10 years (47%), followed by those within a range of 11 to 15 years experience (23%). Respondents with 5 years or less working experience were proportioned at nine (9) out of seventy (70) – thirteen percent (13%), while those within the range of 16 to 20 years of experience totalled three (3) comprising four percent (4%) and those with 20 years or more working experience were only 2 out of 70 (3%). The study found that eighty-seven per cent (87%) of the respondents had worked with the same supermarket for over 6 years. This shows that the grocery retail industry has a good retention record in comparison to other retail industries (clothing) in South Africa wherein staff attrition is very high.

SECTION B: IMPACT OF DEVIANT CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR ON GROCERS

This section presents a summary of the responses to Section B of the questionnaires on how DCB affects grocery stores. Table 4.1 – Table 4.6 and Figure 4.6 to Figure 4.11 summarise the respondents’ perceptions of the: impact on profit (RPROF); impact on inventory (INV); impact on security (SECU); impact on employees (EMPL); impact on customers (CUST); and possible measures to stop or minimise DCB (STOP). The respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement/disagreement with the statements in the questionnaire, relating them to what they experience personally, in the stores they own or in which they work.

(a) Impact on Profit

The statements in this section were aimed at determining how DCB affects stores’ profits. Table 4.1 and Figure 4.6 are graphical illustrations of the impact of DCB on the profit of grocers (in percentages). The reason for only fifty-one percent (51%) of respondents agreeing that shoplifting causes difficulty in meeting financial obligations of the store, is attributed to that only major supermarkets were considered in the study. Even though they are negatively affected, they are not as badly affected as smaller supermarkets might be, to the point that they are not able to meet their financial obligations. For instance, the study found that ninety-three percent (93%) of respondents reported that more money is spent on security measures against deviant behaviour, hence a reduction in the profit margin of the company. However, six percent (6%) of the respondents disagreed that enhancing
security measures leads to a decline in the company's profitability, while one percent (1%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics on impact on profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPROF1</td>
<td>Difficulty experienced in meeting financial obligations due to shoplifting</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF2</td>
<td>Staff turnover increased</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF3</td>
<td>More money spent on recruiting (replacing staff who have left due to DCB)</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF4</td>
<td>More money invested on training newly appointed staff</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>82.86</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF5</td>
<td>More money spent on training related to DCB, i.e. training staff on how to be vigilant and spot possible offenders</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF6</td>
<td>More money spent on increasing security measures</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 3.74
(b) **Impact on Inventory**

Table 4.2 and Figure 4.7 are graphical representations of the impact of DCB on inventory (in percentages). According to sixty-three percent (63%) of respondents, inventory shrinkage deprives legitimate customers of needed products. However, twenty-three percent (23%) of respondents maintained that shrinkage does not have any effect on legitimate purchases. Sixteen percent (16%) of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that legitimate customers are affected by reduction in stock caused by deviant behaviour. The sixty-three percent (63%) of respondents who agreed is considerably lower than the percentage of those who agreed on the other related items (77%, 79%, 80% and 83%). This variance is attributed to the fact that the bigger stores mostly buy in bulk and do not run out of stock as often as smaller stores (which the research sample did not include). Eighty-three percent (83%) of
respondents agreed that shoplifting causes increased expenditure to replace lost stock, while eleven percent (11%) neither agreed nor disagreed. Only six percent (6%) disagreed. The average mean score of 3.71 shows a high degree of consistency in the responses.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics on impact on inventory (INV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INV1</td>
<td>Less inventory for legitimate customers to purchase</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV2</td>
<td>Increased expenditure to replace lost stock</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>82.86</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV3</td>
<td>Shopper dissatisfaction due to unavailable stock</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV4</td>
<td>Customers lost due to unavailability of stock</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV5</td>
<td>Stock unavailability for extended periods as they need to be ordered from suppliers</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 3.71**
In Table 4.3 and Figure 4.8 below, the researcher presents the effects of DCB on grocer security (in percentages). Generally, an average of eighty-one percent (81%) of the respondents reported that DCB adversely affects the overall general security standards of the store and the business as a whole. Only fifty percent (50%) of respondents agreed that DCB had resulted in the necessity to train staff to be able to use technological aids. This is attributed to the fact that most security personnel (who are outsourced) are trained by their respective employers before they work in grocery stores. Although only fifty-nine percent (59%) of respondents agreed that DCB sometimes causes injury to other customers, when respondents were interviewed in person, it was revealed verbally, that a larger percentage of security personnel are injured by DCB offenders than that indicated by the written-response questionnaire results. The standard deviation is the highest on both of the above...
(1.43 and 1.21 respectively), meaning that there is more variability in the responses in comparison with other statements, which showed high percentages of agreement.

Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics on impact on grocer security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECU1</td>
<td>Employment of security personnel</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>95.71</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU2</td>
<td>Visibility of staff on floors</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU3</td>
<td>Use of technological aids, CCTV, mirrors, alarms, etc.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>95.71</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU4</td>
<td>Training staff to be able to use the technological aids</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU5</td>
<td>Increased use of mechanical deterrents, i.e. screens and grilles, security doors, etc.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU6</td>
<td>DCB sometimes causes injury on other customers</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 3.96
Table 4.4 and Figure 4.9 show the response rate (in percentages) to the questions concerning the impact of DCB on employees. Eighty-one percent (81%) of respondents agreed that DCB has a negative impact on employees, while only five percent (5%) disagreed. This reflects that DCB has a major negative impact on supermarket employees. The average mean score of 3.99 displays a high degree of consistency in the results on the impact of DCB on employees.
Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics on impact on employees (EMPL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPL1</td>
<td>DCB offenders affecting the mood or temper of employees</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL2</td>
<td>Decreased employee morale</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL3</td>
<td>Overly suspicious of customers</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL4</td>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>87.14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL5</td>
<td>Psychological effects on employees</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 3.99

Figure 4.9: Impact on employees – descriptive statistics

(e) Impact of DCB on customers
Table 4.5 and Figure 4.10 show the responses (in percentages) to the questions on the impact on customers. On average, sixty-five percent (65%) of respondents agreed that DCB has an impact on other customers. Only thirty-seven percent (37%) of respondents agreed that DCB causes price increases (and thus affecting non-offending customers). The study attributes this finding to that those researched were major stores and prices were preset and thus not affected by DCB. DCB has a different effect on a smaller store in this regard as smaller stores in some cases have to increase their prices as a result of DCB in order to survive.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics on impact on customers (CUST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUST1</td>
<td>Price increase due to shoplifting, thus affecting innocent customers</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST2</td>
<td>Customers who have witnessed DCB offenders less likely to shop at the store again</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST3</td>
<td>The customers mentioned in 5.2 spreading negative word of mouth to families, friends and also on social networks and thus the store loses more customers</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST4</td>
<td>Customers sympathetic when they witness &quot;unreasonable&quot; customer behaviour</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST5</td>
<td>Contagion of DCB on other customers, i.e. illegitimate complaining</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>17.143</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 3.45
Figure 4.10: Response rate on the impact on customers

(f) Measures to minimise or stop DCB

Table 4.6 and Figure 4.11 show the response rates (in percentages) to the questions under the, “measures to stop or minimise DCB?” section thereof. Figure 4.11 shows similar results to those observed on the other variables. Ninety percent (90%) of respondents agreed with the suggested ways to stop or minimise DCB. These
included: consumer education on the consequences of DCB on communities; more floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or to juveniles who come in groups; trained staff who are able to spot possible offenders and offer assistance without offending; increased surveillance for frequently stolen items and high risk areas and; verification of till slips and contents at exit points. For instance all (100%) respondents agreed that increased surveillance on frequently stolen items and high risk areas would definitely help. Those who are considered to be professional thieves targeted expensive products, i.e. facial products (Nivea and Oil of Olay), shaving products, Mitchum roll-on, cheese loaves and lamb trays, etc. It was reported by respondents to the researcher that professional shoplifters tend to operate in pairs, dressed in expensive clothes and driving expensive cars (i.e. Toyota Fortuner, Chevrolet Captiva, Toyota Corolla, etc). Respondents noted that these thieves steal to sell to their customers. In comparison, it was also reported that the poor [shoplifters] target different products as they steal food for their own consumption (i.e. mealie meal, sugar, meat, etc).

The response as to whether verification of till slips and contents on exit points would assist was quite varied. Respondents who agreed to verification of till slips and contents at store exit points, as an effective possible measure to minimise or stop DCB, was seventy percent (70%), which is fairly low compared to the other factors. In some stores, it is well accepted by customers (i.e. Game and Makro) as they sell expensive merchandise. Also, in supermarkets in the townships, the practice is a norm and accepted by customers. Respondents who disagreed (17%) were mostly from upmarket suburbs, wherein they said this could not be practiced as customers would feel insulted.

**Table 4.6: Descriptive statistics on measures to stop or minimise DCB (STOP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STOP1</td>
<td>Consumer education on consequences of DCB on communities, i.e. loss of jobs, criminal record, increase in prices,</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MLR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP2</td>
<td>More floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or juveniles who come in groups</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>95.71</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP3</td>
<td>Trained staff (to be able to spot possible offenders) and offer assistance without offending</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>95.71</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP4</td>
<td>Increased surveillance on frequently stolen items and high risk areas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP5</td>
<td>Verification of till slips and contents on exit points</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE MEAN SCORE = 4.20

FIGURE 4.11: Measures to stop or minimise DCB – descriptive statistics

4.3 RESULTS OF THE VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY FOR THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
(a) Impact on Profit

To measure the factor *Impact on Profit*, 6 items were developed and loaded (RPROF1, RPROF2, RPROF3, RPROF4, RPROF5 and RPROF6). Factor loadings between 0.68 and 0.81 were reported for this factor. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for *Impact on Profit* is 0.78, suggesting that the scale measuring this factor is reliable – any alpha coefficient above 0.70 is considered reliable.

Table 4:7 Validity and reliability of Impact on Profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPROF1</td>
<td>Difficulty experienced in meeting financial obligations due to shoplifting</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF2</td>
<td>Staff turnover increased</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF3</td>
<td>More money spent on recruiting (replacing staff who have left due to DCB)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF4</td>
<td>More money invested on training newly appointed staff</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF5</td>
<td>More money spent on training related to DCB, i.e. training staff on how to be vigilant and spot possible offenders</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPROF6</td>
<td>More money spent on increasing security measures</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cronbach: 0.78**

(b) Impact on Inventory

To measure the factor *Impact on Inventory*, 5 items were developed and loaded (INV1, INV2, INV3, INV4 and INV5). Factor loadings ranging between 0.72 and 0.82 were reported for this factor. The average Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for *Impact on Inventory* is 0.81 showing a strong internal consistency.
Table 4.8: Validity and reliability of Impact on Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INV1</td>
<td>Less inventory for legitimate customers to purchase</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV2</td>
<td>Increased expenditure to replace lost stock</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV3</td>
<td>Shopper dissatisfaction due to unavailable stock</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV4</td>
<td>Customers lost due to unavailability of stock</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV5</td>
<td>Stock unavailability for extended periods as they need to be ordered from suppliers</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cronbach: 0.81

(c) Impact on Security

To measure the factor Impact on Security, 6 items were developed and loaded (SECU1, SECU2, SECU3, SECU4, SECU5 and SECU6). As seen in Table 4.9, all items were loaded. Factors between 0.51 and 0.62 were reported for this factor. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for Impact on Security is 0.61. According to Tharenou (1993), alpha values of more than 0.50 are acceptable in basic research such as a treatise, therefore 0.61 is reliable.

Table 4.9: Validity and reliability of Impact on Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECU1</td>
<td>Employment of security personnel</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECU2</td>
<td>Visibility of staff on floors</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of technological aids, CCTV, mirrors, alarms, etc

Training staff to be able to use the technological aids

Increased use of mechanical deterrents, i.e. screens and grilles, security doors, etc

DCB sometimes causes injury on other customers

Total Cronbach: 0.61

(d) Impact on Employees

To measure the factor Impact on Employees, 5 items were developed and loaded (EMPL1, EMPL2, EMPL3, EMPL4, EMPL5 and EMPL6). Table 4.10 shows that factor loadings of between 0.58 and 0.71 were reported for this construct. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.70 was returned, showing that the scale used for measuring this construct is reliable.

Table 4.10: Validity and reliability of Impact on Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPL1</td>
<td>DCB offenders affecting the mood or temper of employees</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL2</td>
<td>Decreased employee morale</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL3</td>
<td>Overly suspicious of customers</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL4</td>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL5</td>
<td>Psychological effects on employees</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cronbach: 0.70

(e) Impact on Customers
Five items were developed and loaded to measure the factor *Impact on Customers*, (CUST1, CUST2, CUST3, CUST4 and CUST5). As seen in Table 4.11, all items were loaded. Factor loadings between 0.54 and 0.73 were reported for this construct. *Impact on Customers* returned a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.71, showing that the scale used to measure this construct is reliable.

**Table 4.11: Validity and reliability of Impact on Customers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUST1</td>
<td>Price increase due to shoplifting, thus affecting innocent customers</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST2</td>
<td>Customers who have witnessed DCB offenders less likely to shop at the store again</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST3</td>
<td>The customers mentioned in 5.2 spreading negative word of mouth to families, friends and also on social networks and thus the store looses more customers</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST4</td>
<td>Customers sympathetic when they witness &quot;unreasonable&quot; customer behaviour</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST5</td>
<td>Contagion of DCB on other customers, i.e. illegitimate complaining</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cronbach: 0.71**

(f) Measures to stop or minimise DCB

In order to measure the factor *Measures to Minimize or Stop DCB*, 5 items were developed and loaded (STOP1, STOP2, STOP3, STOP4 and STOP5). As shown in Table 4.12, all items were loaded. Factor loadings of between 0.39 and 0.79 were reported for this construct. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.55 was returned, showing that the scale used to measure this construct is reliable.
### Table 4.12: Validity and reliability of measures to stop or minimise DCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-total correl.</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STOP1</td>
<td>Consumer education on the consequences of DCB on communities, i.e. loss of jobs, criminal record, increase in prices, etc.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP2</td>
<td>More floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or juveniles who come in groups</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP3</td>
<td>Trained staff (to be able to spot possible offenders) and offer assistance without offending</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP4</td>
<td>Increased surveillance on frequently stolen items and high risk areas</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP5</td>
<td>Verification of till slips and contents on exit points</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cronbach: 0.55**

### 4.4 THE EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In the section that follows, the results of the descriptive statistics of the variables will be presented. The Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations that were undertaken to establish the relationships between the various factors under investigation will be discussed. A T-test and ANOVA tests were conducted to assess the influence of selected demographic variables on respondents’ perceptions regarding the independent, intervening and dependent variables will also be highlighted.'
4.4.1 Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations

Table 4.13: Pearson’s correlations coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Reduced Profit</th>
<th>Impact on Inventory</th>
<th>Impact on Security</th>
<th>Impact on Employees</th>
<th>Impact on Customers</th>
<th>Measures to Minimise or Stop DCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Profit</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red indicates statistically significant correlations at p<0.05

The factor Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB reported a weak positive correlation with the independent variables investigated in this study, Impact on Inventory (r=0.26), Impact on Security (r=0.30), Impact on Employees (r=0.31) and Impact on Customers (r=0.25)

Impact on Inventory reported a moderate positive correlation with the factor Impact on Security (r=0.33) while it reported a strong positive correlation (r=0.58) with Impact on Employees. In other words, an increase on Impact on Inventory leads to an increase on Impact on Employees.

Overall, the Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation calculation indicates that there are positive correlations between the factors.

4.5 RESULTS OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC DATA T-TEST AND ANOVA
The primary objective of this study was to investigate the impact of DCB on grocers. An analysis was however conducted to assess the influence of selected demographic variables on the respondents’ perceptions regarding the independent variables. Therefore, a T-test and an ANOVA were undertaken for this purpose, and the results are tabled and discussed in the section that follows.

4.5.1 Results of the T-test

A T-test was undertaken to assess whether respondents’ perceptions of the independent variables differed as a result of the respondents’ gender.

The following hypotheses have thus been formulated:

H01: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Impact on Profit.

H02: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Impact on Inventory.

H03: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Impact on Security.

H04: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Impact on Employees.

H05: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Impact on Customers.

H06: There is no difference between the means and standard deviations scores of Gender and Measures to Minimise or Stop DCB.
Table 4.14: The influence of gender on perceptions regarding independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-tests; Grouping: Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean t-value df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Profit</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.8993</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.3275</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.1682</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.7311</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.1375</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.3961</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences (all p-values > 0.05))

Table 4.14 depicts that there are no significant differences in responses due to the gender of the respondent. Therefore, whether the respondents were male or female made no significant influence on their perceptions regarding the independent variables. As a result, all six null hypotheses (H01 – H06), as stated above, are accepted.

4.5.2 Results of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

In Section A of the measuring instrument, the respondents were requested to provide demographic information. This included information relating to their age and...
race. They were also requested to provide data relating to their position and their experience in the supermarket.

An ANOVA was undertaken in order to determine whether the perceptions of the respondents were influenced by demographic variables.

a) Demographic variable - age

Table 4.15 shows the ANOVA results for the age demographic variable.

Table 4.15: Demographic variable - age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Profit</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.3494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.5233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.4038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.6946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimize DCB</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.8974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences (all p-values > 0.05)

The results of the ANOVA showed that there is no significant association between the demographic variable, age, and the independent variables, as all p-values > 0.05.

b) Demographic variable - race

Table 4.16 depicts the ANOVA results for the race demographic variable.

Table 4.16: Demographic variable – race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Profit</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.9515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.5179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.8349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.3627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.8265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.4566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences (all p-values > 0.05)
The results of the ANOVA displayed that there is no significant association between the demographic variable, age, and the independent variables as all p-values > 0.05.

c) Demographic variable - experience

Table 4.17: portrays the ANOVA results for the experience demographic variable.

Table 4.17: Demographic variable – experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Sig.(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Profit</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.3224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.4414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.3326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No statistically significant differences (all p-values > 0.05)

As seen in Table 4.18, the results of the ANOVA show that there is no significant association between the demographic variable positions to any of the independent variables, as all p-values > 0.05.

In this section, an overall comparison of the response rate (in percentages) under each section will be performed. Table 4.7 shows the overall response rate for each section and Likert scale variable. It also shows the mean and standard deviations for these variables. Figure 4.12 was then plotted using the values from this table.

SECTION C: COMPARISON

From Table 4.7 and Figure 4.12, it is shown that the questions in the ‘impact on customers’ and the ‘impact on employees’ sections received the highest and lowest ‘disagree’ answers respectively than any other section. On the other hand, the questions under the ‘impact on customers’ and ‘measures to stop or minimise DCB’ sections received the highest and lowest ‘disagree’ answers respectively than any
other section. Similarly, the questions under the ‘impact on customers’ and ‘measures to stop or minimise DCB’ received the highest and lowest ‘neutral’ answers respectively than any other section. However, the questions under the ‘impact on profit’ and ‘security measures’ sections received the highest and lowest ‘agree’ answers respectively than any other section. Finally, the questions under ‘measures to stop or minimize DCB’ section received the highest ‘agree’ answers than any other section, while the ‘impact on inventory’ and ‘the impact on customers’ sections both received the lowest.

Generally, the ‘agree’ response dominated all the other responses with an overall average response rate of 80%, followed by ‘neutral’, and ‘disagree’ with 14% and 6% respectively.

**Figure 4.12: Response rate on comparisons between the independent variables**

![Comparison chart showing response rates for different categories]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on profit</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on inventory</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on grocer security</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on employees</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on customers</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to minimise or stop DCB</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on employees</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on customers</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to minimise or stop DCB</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on inventory</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on customers</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.18: Response rate comparisons (%)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Profit</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>77.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Inventory</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>76.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Security</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>80.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Employees</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>80.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Customers</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>64.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Stop or Minimise DCB</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>89.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>78.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Discussion

It is clear from the above discussion, that DCB remains a threat in Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality grocery establishments. Even though it is not a big threat on bigger stores,, it still has a negative impact on stores' well-being. Management of the stores have put measures in place to deter deviant consumer behaviour, but this is however, not enough to minimise or stop the behaviour.

There was a general consensus that security is not as tight as it should be and that staff provided by the security companies from which they are outsourced, are not as well-trained as they should be. A training need on customer service and being able to spot possible offenders was also identified for internal staff. This will enable them to be more vigilant. It was also suggested by many respondents that stricter security measures should be used for monitoring the security of high risk items.

There was an overwhelming agreement that if the security measures recommended by the researcher were put in place, DCB would be minimised. These measures are the following:

- Consumer education on consequences of DCB on communities - 86% were in agreement.
- More floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or juveniles who come in groups - 96% of the respondents were in agreement.
- Trained staff (to be able to spot possible offenders) and offer assistance without offending - 96% of the respondents agreed

- Increased surveillance on frequently stolen items and in high-risk areas - all respondents agreed (100%).

- Verification of till slips and contents on exit points, even though lesser respondents agreed (70%), those stores wherein this practice is a norm, found it very useful.

4.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, the researcher analysed the findings of the study. The chapter initiated by providing a summary of the demographic information collected from the respondents. The results of the independent variables were also presented and the respondents generally agreed with the statements they were asked to respond to, on the questionnaires.

The following and final chapter of this study, Chapter Five, will provide a summary of the entire study. The contributions of the study will then be highlighted, the limitations of the study provided and the recommendations for future research presented.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Five is the final chapter and will provide an overview of the study. The empirical findings of the study will be discussed and recommendations to the grocery retail store management will be made. Recommendations for future research will also be provided.

5.2 OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

On a national and international level, retailers are one of the major employment providers - in particular grocery retailers. In the Eastern Cape, which is one of the poorest provinces in the country, grocery retailers remain one of the main employers provincially. Nelson Mandela Bay is no different from the rest of the province, relying heavily on this industry for its citizens’ survival. The grocery retail industry offers permanent full-time employment, permanent part-time employment and casual work. DCB is one of the threats to this industry. The research aim of this study was to examine the impact of DCB on the grocery retail industry in Nelson Mandela Bay. The impact of DCB was measured against independent variables, namely, impact on: profit; inventory; employees; grocer security; customers; and measures to stop or minimise the behaviour. A hypothetical model presenting the possible relationships between DCB and the independent variables was proposed.

To help achieve the main research aim, the following objectives were formulated:

- To establish or examine the causes of DCB in grocery retail establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay
- To explore the nature of deviant consumer behaviour
- To establish / examine the causes of deviant consumer behaviour in grocery retail establishments in Nelson Mandela Bay
- To examine the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers in Nelson Mandela Bay
- To develop measures that can enable grocery retailers to minimise or stop deviant consumer behaviour in their establishments

A literature review was presented in Chapter Two. The chapter examined the concept of deviant consumer behaviour, factors influencing DCB, types of DCB, reasons for increasing DCB, the effects of DCB, measures taken by retailers to stop or minimise DCB and the challenges faced in stopping or minimising deviant consumer behaviour. Retail in general and forms of ownerships were discussed. Leading grocery industry participants in Nelson Mandela Bay were introduced. Finally, the independent variables were also discussed.

Chapter Three of this study discussed the research design, the research methodology and research paradigms. The data collection, the sample, sampling method used, the measuring instrument and data analysis were also discussed. Finally, the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments were established.

Chapter Four presented the findings of the study. The sample size was one hundred respondents (100) and of these, seventy (70) respondents were able to participate effectively as seventy (70) usable forms were returned to the researcher. Data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences 20.0. The demographic information of the respondents of the study was analysed. Respondents' perceptions pertaining to how DCB affects grocery retailers were analysed and an overall comparison of the response rate under each section was interpreted.

The main empirical findings with recommendations will be presented in the section to follow, succeeded by recommendations for future research.
5.3 MAIN EMPIRICAL FINDINGS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter Five, various factors were reported to have a significant impact on DCB. To follow, is a discussion of the significant relationships that will be presented and recommendations for grocery retail management response to DCB will be made.

5.3.1 Impact of DCB on profit

The literature review in Chapter Two revealed that DCB impacts negatively on the stores’ profit due to direct and indirect financial costs. Direct costs included increased insurance premiums, recompensing customers affected by DCB and negative effects on a retailer’s sales growth (Harris & Reynolds, 2003). Indirect costs included a burden on human resources department for staff recruitment, induction and training (Harris & Reynolds, 2003).

The findings of this study showed that the respondents agreed with that DCB: causes difficulty in meeting financial obligations; causes an increase in staff turnover; that more money is spent on recruitment (replacing staff lost due to DCB); causes more money to be invested in training newly-appointed staff and on training related to DCB (in staff vigilancy for spotting possible offenders); and causes more money to be spent on increasing security measures. However, responses that DCB causes difficulty in meeting financial obligations received the lowest rating (i.e. 51 %). The reason attributed to this rating is that only major supermarkets were considered in the study, and these are not as badly affected as smaller stores, which do not have financial back-up.
In order for supermarkets to remain competitive and for the impact of DCB on profits to be kept minimal, the following recommendations are made:

- Grocery retailers should motivate and provide more support to staff members in order to reduce the impact of DCB on profits. This will decrease staff turnover and less money will be spent on recruiting, inducting and training new staff.

- Continuous in-house training should be provided to staff on being vigilant and to enable them to spot possible offenders before they commit an act of DCB. In-house training would be considerably cheaper than appointing external service providers to offer the training.

### 5.3.2 Impact of DCB on inventory

Chapter Four revealed that DCB causes inventory shrinkage, which results in less inventory for legitimate customers, increased expenditure to replace lost stock and stock unavailability for extended periods, as stock needs to be ordered from suppliers. These lead to shopper dissatisfaction and loss of customers due to unavailability of stock.

In Chapter Two, it was demonstrated that one of the main impacts of DCB on inventory, is that shoplifting causes depletion of products without them being registered on the sales data, and this results in shelves becoming and remaining empty until someone orders new stock manually or until the inventory records are corrected (Chapman, et al., 2003). The empirical results showed an average mean score of 3.71, as shown in Table 4.2, which reflects a high degree of consistency in the responses on the impact of DCB on inventory.

- It is important for management to cater for losses resulting from DCB, so that they do not run out of stock for extended periods of time and as a result lose customers.
- Random stock should be carried out on a more regular basis and particular attention should be paid to high risk items and those stock that are the most frequently purchased by customer or which is more expensive.

5.3.3 Impact of DCB on grocer security

In the measuring instrument, there were six questions under this variable. The responses were quite varied. Two of the questions received very low ratings, while the other four question items received very high ratings:

- Training of staff to be able to use the technological aids received the lowest rating (50%). This rating is attributed to the fact that the security staff are trained by the security companies, so the training is not the responsibility of the stores’ management.

- ‘DCB sometimes causes injury to other customers’ received the second lowest rating (59%) for this category of investigation. However, this does show that management are in general, not implementing sufficient measure to ensure the protection of other customers.

- The other four items, ‘employment of security personnel’; ‘visibility of staff on floors’; ‘use of technological aids’; and ‘increased use of mechanical deterrents’ received. an average of ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents agreed that the application of these measures assists in preventing DCB.

It can then be concluded that if security measures were tighter in grocery establishments, the problem of DCB would not be as bad as it is. It is therefore important for grocery stores to apply tighter measures in order to reduce the impact of DCB. This can be done by appointing good, reputable security companies with competent personnel who are able to use the in-store technological security aids effectively. Visibility of staff on floors is another security measure that can be applied by supermarkets.
5.3.4 Impact of DCB on employees

As stated in the literature review in Chapter Two, rude, threatening, obstructive, aggressive or disruptive behaviours by customers may affect the mood or temper of personnel (Harris and Reynolds, 2003). They may also become overly suspicious and become overzealous in their efforts to protect the store’s inventory and this may cause an increased workload and psychological problems for employees (Harris and Reynolds, 2003).

The average mean score of 3.99, as outlined in Table 4.4 led to the conclusion that respondents were in agreement that DCB has a significant impact on employees. Management must ensure that employees are well-trained. As advised by Ifezue & Ama (2013) in Chapter Two, employees should be trained in shoplifting-prevention techniques. These include; staying alert at all times; asking lingering customers whether they need help; knowing where shoplifting is most likely to occur; and using a log to share suspicions concerning shoplifters among employees. Employees are a company’s best asset and must be treated as such. Management should thus invest in their training and - where need arises - they should pay for employee counselling or incur any costs that may result from DCB.

5.3.5 Impact of DCB on customers

Chapter Two revealed that DCB has an impact on other customers. Those customers who do not fall into the trap of “getting something for nothing” suffer for a shoplifter’s larceny, due to rising costs in stores in which more money needs to be invested in security measures (Kokemuller, n.d.). Customers who experience DCB and feel that the store could have better controlled the behaviour (i.e. in case of a noisy customer), may feel less willing to shop at the store and spread the word to their friends, families and social networks (Huang, et al., 2009). Some customers may feel sympathetic towards the frontline staff who are being victimized or the
behaviour may be contagious, particularly vociferous or illegitimate complaining (Harris & Reynolds, 2013).

The empirical findings of the study showed that on average sixty-five percent (65%) of respondents agreed that DCB affects other customers. This is a high percentage, considering that the effect could be avoided. Management should make sure that there are strict measures in place for dealing with noisy and rowdy customers.

### 5.3.6 Measures to stop or minimise DCB

The findings of the study proved that the security measures applied by the grocery establishments are insufficient to stop or minimize DCB and that better measures could be applied. The following measures are recommended:

- Consumer education on the consequences of DCB for communities. Job losses, criminal records and price increases are some of the consequences. If communities are made aware that they are the ones who will suffer the consequences, DCB would be reduced.

- More floor staff presence closer to customers who appear to be intoxicated or troublesome, lingering customers and juveniles who come in groups.

- Supermarkets should invest in training for staff should to enable them to spot possible offenders and to offer assistance without offending, which could distract potential offenders from committing their intended offences.

- Frequently stolen items and high-risk areas should be identified and be placed under increased surveillance.

- Verification of till slips against contents on exit points would further assist to minimise or stop DCB.

### 5.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS
As demonstrated in the literature review and in the empirical results, it can be concluded that deviant consumer behaviour in the retail grocery industry, mainly has an impact on profit, inventory, grocer security, employees and customers. Areas of improvement were identified, particularly in grocer security - as the main problem lies with security. Recommendations on putting a stop to or minimising DCB were presented.

The sample size of the field research was one hundred (100) members of management teams in the major grocery supermarkets in Nelson Mandela Bay. Of this sample, only seventy (70) usable questionnaires were returned. This sample size does not provide for accurate generalisation of the population in Nelson Mandela Bay. It is therefore recommended that future studies be conducted on a larger sample and within a larger geographic area (i.e. throughout the Eastern Cape or South Africa). Future studies could examine the impact of shoplifting by employees as shoplifting by employees costs supermarkets even more than shoplifting by customers.
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Dear Respondent

I am studying towards my MBA (Masters in Business Administration) degree at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Business School. I am conducting research on the impact of deviant consumer behaviour on grocery retailers in the Nelson Mandela Bay area. Deviant Consumer Behaviour can be described as undesirable, unacceptable or dysfunctional consumer behaviour. The behaviour deviates from norms or standards. Examples of such behaviour in a retail setting are, vandalism, rowdyism, abuse of staff/other customers, fraud, shoplifting, etc.

I believe that my study may enable grocery retailers to have a deeper understanding of the causes of deviant behaviour and also have an understanding of the nature of deviant behaviour in their establishment. Most importantly, the study may provide retailers with measures on how to minimize or stop deviant behaviour in retail establishments.

You are part of our selected sample of respondents whose views we seek on the above-mentioned matter. We would therefore appreciate it if you could answer a few questions. It should not take more than fifteen minutes of your time and we want to thank you in advance for your co-operation.

There are no correct or incorrect answers. Please answer the questions as accurately as possible. For each statement, tick the number which best describes your experience or perception. For example, if you strongly agree with the statement, tick the number 5. If you strongly disagree with the statement, tick the number 1. **Tick only one answer for each statement and answer all questions please.**

Please note also that your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you have the right to withdraw from the study at any stage.

Thank you very much.

Babalwa Shauza
bshauza@gmail.com or 072 816 9614

To verify the authenticity of the study, please contact Dr LM Njomo at 041-504 4906 or louis.njomo@nmmu.ac.za.
SECTION A

Demographic characteristics

Please mark your selection with an (X)

1 Please indicate your gender
   Male 1
   Female 2

2 Please indicate to which age category you belong (this is for statistical purposes only)
   Less than 20 years 1
   20 - 29 years 2
   30 - 39 years 3
   40 - 49 years 4
   50+ 5

3 Please indicate to which population group you belong (this is for statistical purposes only)
   African 1
   Coloured 2
   White 3
   Asian 4
   Not willing to say 5

4 Please indicate your position in the business
   Team leader 1
   Supervisor 2
   Manager 3
   Other: specify 4

5 How long have you been working for the supermarket? __________ years

SECTION B

Please answer the following questions based on your own perceptions.

There are no wrong or right answers

Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.
   (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree

Deviant Consumer Behaviour (DCB) is undesirable, unacceptable or dysfunctional consumer behaviour. The behaviour deviates from norms or standards. Examples of such behaviour in a retail setting are, vandalism, rowdyism, abuse of staff/other customers, fraud, shoplifting, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Difficulty experienced in meeting financial obligations due to shoplifting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Staff turnover increased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 More money spent on recruiting (replacing staff who have left due to DCB)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 More money invested on training newly appointed staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More money spent on training related to DCB, ie training staff on how to be vigilant and spot possible offenders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 More money spent on increasing security measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Inventory</th>
<th>Disagree --- Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Less inventory for legitimate customers to purchase</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Increased expenditure to replace lost stock</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Shopper dissatisfaction due to unavailable stock</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Customers lost due to unavailability of stock</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Stock unavailability for extended periods as they need to be ordered from suppliers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Grocer Security</th>
<th>Disagree --- Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Employment of security personnel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Visibility of staff on floors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Use of technological aids, CCTV, mirrors, alarms, etc</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Training staff to be able to use the technological aids</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Increased use of mechanical deterrents, ie screens and grilles, security doors, etc</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 DCB sometimes causes injury on other customers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Employees</th>
<th>Disagree --- Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 DCB offenders affecting the mood or temper of employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Decreased employee morale</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Overly suspicious of customers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Increased workload</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Psychological effects on employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Customers</th>
<th>Disagree --- Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Price increase due to shoplifting, thus affecting innocent customers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Customers who have witnessed DCB offenders less likely to shop at the store again</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 The customers mentioned in 5.2 spreading negative word of mouth to families, friends and also on social networks and thus the store loses more customers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Customers sympathetic when they witness “unreasonable” customer behaviour</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Contagion of DCB on other customers, ie illegitimate complaining</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures to Stop or Minimize DCB</th>
<th>Disagree --- Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Consumer education on consequences of DCB on communities, ie loss of jobs, criminal record, increase in prices, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 More floor staff presence closer to customers who seem intoxicated or juveniles who come in groups</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Trained staff (to be able to spot possible offenders) and offer assistance without offending</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Increased surveillance on frequently stolen items and high risk areas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Verification of till slips and contents on exit points</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>