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ABSTRACT

This study examines and identifies evidence of employees’ perception of their supervisors’ influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction. This study provides an opportunity to understand how the extent of influence is impacted by the elements of role stress: ambiguity and conflict, performance and job satisfaction.

Evidence of employees’ perception was elicited using a quantitative survey instrument and administered to 300 respondents from participating stores. The responses were analysed using the Statistical package SPSS (version 19). The study found evidence of influence on elements of role stress (significant – ambiguity, but not-significant – conflict): with both job satisfaction and performance (significant). These findings contribute to the understanding of the perceived supervisor’s influence over role stress, job satisfaction and performance.

The study concludes that although there is evidence of supervisor’s influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction, the influence on role stress is balanced significantly between ambiguity and conflict compared to job satisfaction and performance. The role of employees is depending on the employees social and economic context and could determine ambiguity and conflict level without a supervisor. It would be incumbent on the supervisors to moderate their supervisory function according to the employee’s role and responsibility for an improved performance and satisfaction outcome.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The management style of a supervisor may have an influence on role stress, performance, and job satisfaction of employees. Employees’ own attitudes and behaviour could also work to aggravate the level of role stress, performance, and job satisfaction. The latter is supported by Gemma (2009) who states that employees’ behaviours might be viewed as political or self-enhancing and therefore not always associated with constructive work attitudes. This research is focussed on the influence of supervisors on role stress, performance, and job satisfaction.

A study conducted by Mariani, Gcaba and Dalton (2003), supports the view that an employee could interpret a supervisor’s management style as unprofessional, selective, and/or suppressive; identifying it as the main stressor and creating stress conditions or stimuli. When the employee reacts to this kind of condition, the nervous system may activate a fight or flight response. This kind of stress typically describes a condition (negative or positive) that can influence a person's mental and physical well-being. Job satisfaction is the satisfaction an individual derives from his or her job. This satisfaction may be cognitive or affective, encompassing pleasurable emotions around satisfaction with pay, pension arrangements, and working hours. It motivates performance in terms of the difference between effort expended and results achieved. A related study by Trivellas, Reklitis and Platis (2013), states that job satisfaction is considered a crucial individual outcome which drives performance.

The relationship between role stress, job satisfaction, and performance can be assumed to exist. However, it is not clear how the supervisor’s management style and employee’s personal attitude and behaviour may (or not) influence these assumed relationships. A study by Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2001) did indicate a strong relationship between individual performance and job satisfaction.

While these uncertainties persist, management and employees expect and prefer supervisors to apply a management style that motivates and encourages employees’ performance. It is expected that a high level of job satisfaction and performance can and should be taken as a product of the supervisor’s management style and employees’ attitude. A study by Okedij, Etuk and Nnedum (2011), indicated that support from supervisors has been shown to significantly influence job satisfaction. This means that supervisors influence
in the form of the level of support is a factor that influences job satisfaction. Such expected motivation due to the supervisor’s management style is not always easily obtained or sustained indefinitely.

In most companies today, the management style applied by supervisors could demotivate employees, leading to increased absenteeism and even resignations. Managements are trying their best to deal with absenteeism and low job motivation through work place remedies like improved recognition and rewards structures, and better fringe benefits such as medical aid, funeral cover, study bursaries, etc. Despite these efforts, the researcher is of the view that South African retailers still have much to do towards improving mechanisms that can increase job motivation.

In other instances, employees’ personal attitudes and behaviours may also contribute to role stress, low job satisfaction, and poor performance. The combined influence of management style and attitude is only acknowledged when it affects the company’s profitability and competitiveness. A research study conducted by Shanock and Eisenberger (2006), indicated that, when supervisors are supportive of subordinates, this treatment leads to favourable outcomes — such as reduced role stress and enhanced performance — for both employee and organization. Thus, an increase in employee performance can positively impact on the overall performance of the organization.

Workplace trends such as terminations, outsourcing, downsizing, limited working hours, and supervisors’ ability to manage employees effectively could threaten employees’ working environment or personal stability. It could also have a negative impact on an employees’ well-being. Not only can employees become less productive, but they can also become less committed to the values, goals, and future aspirations of the company. A study conducted by Besigwa (2011), concurred that employee performance is affected not only by employee morale but also by supervisor interaction with employees.

Due to a range of variables (i.e. management style, work environment, career growth opportunities, rewards and recognition, corporate culture) that affect employee behaviour, it is important for management to be aware of how they affect the operations entrusted to them (Fox, 2006:54). Early theorists argued that the best way to make employees happy was to reward them financially (Fox, 2006:61). This approach was only successful for a short while until it became clear that the fulfilment of one set of needs led to the appearance of a new set of needs — which are influenced by different factors. New research suggests that supervisors can have an impact on the well-being and satisfaction of employees.
A study conducted by Mariani, Gcaba and Dalton (2003) across several health clinics in South Africa found that 40% of health professionals intended to quit their current work setting because it lacked supervision. Their study further highlights the importance of the supervisor to the well-being and satisfaction of employees.

In another study Okediji, Etuk, and Nnedum (2011) investigated the influence of supervisors on job satisfaction amongst staff of Champion Brewery, Uyo. The aim was to observe the influence of supervisor influence on job satisfaction. The results concluded that supervisors do indeed influence job satisfaction and that supervisory support interacts jointly to influence job satisfaction. Botha (2007) found that supervisor influence and colleague support contributed to reductions in role conflict, ambiguity, and overload. This researcher concluded that the latter mentioned variables are major predictors of job satisfaction.

Mc Gilton, Mc Gillis, Woodcis and Petroz (2007) studied supervisory support, job stress, and job satisfaction amongst nursing staff providing long-term care. The objective was to investigate the effects of supervisory support provided by registered nursing staff on job stress and job satisfaction. The results of the study suggested that supervisory support for Nursing Aide(s) is an important determinant of a Nursing Aid’s job satisfaction. They also concluded that a supportive supervisor has a positive benefit to Nursing Aids. Mc Gillis, Mc Gilton, Petroz and Woodcis (2007) concluded that supervisory support has a positive effect on job satisfaction. The results of their study are supported by Okediji, Etuk and Nnedum (2011), who also concluded that supervisory support significantly influences job satisfaction.

For many people a job in the retail environment is their first work opportunity. Requiring relatively little experience, it is accompanied by low remuneration for positions such as cashiers, packers, and sales assistants (Berman and Evans, 1998:361).

Large numbers of inexperienced workers, long hours, highly visible employees, part-time workers, and variations in customer demands characterize the retail environment. In addition, absenteeism and labour turnover are some of the most common challenges experienced by retailers. Results from a well-known retailer who has outlets across South Africa and who took part in this research study indicated the following employee data (Table 1.1) in the Cape metropolitan area.
Table 1.1: Employee Retention Stats (Source: Labour statistics report, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Turn-Over</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO (New Employees)</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Labour Stats Report, 2014: Retailer 2)

Notably, over a consecutive period of more than 12 months, none of the targets for any of the variables in the table above was achieved. Both labour turnover and absenteeism were well over their respective targets. This suggests that the retail sector in South Africa may be characterised by low levels of job satisfaction, high levels of role stress, and low performance. While evidence of how supervisors’ influences role stress, job satisfaction, and performance has been provided in studies conducted in several sectors, no such influence has been investigated within the retail environment of South Africa.

A number of research studies were conducted across several sectors, and they share variables closely associated with those in this study. However no similar study could be found that focused specifically on the retail environment in South Africa.

Previous studies have made significant progress in establishing workplace behaviours and relationships, however, the researcher argues that some of the available information relating to this particular research topic could be outdated and that it does not accurately describe the challenges that employers, supervisors, and front-line employees are facing at present. As far as could be established, little has been done in the South African retail supermarket environment in this regard. Hence, this study will broaden the findings of previous research with particular focus on the South African retail environment. The findings of this research could help current retail practitioners broaden their understanding of how they can address challenges such as high absenteeism, labour turnover, and the causes of role stress, low performance, and job dissatisfaction.

1.2 Problem Statement

Little is known about supervisors’ influences on role stress, performance, and job satisfaction in the South African retail industry.
1.3 Purpose Statement

This study investigates the potential influence of supervisors on role-stress, performance, and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area. The study is conducted specifically from the perspective of employees, and thus relies on their perceptions of supervisors’ influences and how these affect role stress, performance, and job satisfaction.

1.4 Research Objective

- To understand the perceived supervisor’s influence on role stress, performance, and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area.

1.5 Research Question

- What kind of relationship exists between supervisors’ reported behaviour and employees’ role stress, self-rated employee performance, and job satisfaction?

1.6 Significance of the Research

The study will provide an understanding of the kind of potential influence of supervisors’ reported behaviour on employee role stress, performance, and job satisfaction. South African retail practitioners and academics can use it for a better understanding of how the supervisor influences role stress, performance, and job satisfaction. Even though the research specifically centred on the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area, the results of the study may be generalised to other regions of South Africa in which formal supermarket retail businesses operate. The findings of this study will expand current literature on the topic and will identify areas for future research. The study focusses on employees at lower employment levels, a demographic that is not usually investigated. Therefore, the study also provides a voice to a marginalized group.

1.7 Research Methodology and Design

The research plan adopted emanated from a positivist paradigm as the study was conducted using quantitative methods only. Because information was obtained concerning the status of the phenomena, a descriptive research design was used. A multi-stage sampling method was used to select the sample. Firstly, use was made of stratified sampling to select the retailers who would be invited to participate in the study. Secondly, a simple random
A non-probability sampling method was used to select the retail branches. Thirdly, a non-probability sampling method (convenience sampling) was used to select the respondents. The rationale for using the convenience sampling method was due to the respondents being easily accessible. Their availability also made it less time consuming and inexpensive to gather the research information.

Self-administered questionnaires were used. Respondents were asked to respond to various statements pertaining to the research question. Data was statistically analysed using the statistical package SPSS, version 19. The data analysis involved both descriptive analysis and inferential statistics. Results from the statistical tests allowed the researcher to gain valuable insights.

1.8 Delimitations of the Research Study

The study centred on the five major retail supermarket groups in the Cape Metropolitan area. Convenience retailers like Seven-Eleven and small to medium retailers did not form part of the research, nor did other types of retail industries (such as restaurants, hotels, etc.). This exclusion limited the level of feedback received through questionnaires and the generalisation of findings and discussions.

The selected variables contributing to role stress, performance, and job satisfaction might not be the only contributing factors that are important. Other variables such as morale, training, rewards, recognition, and other work-related factors have not been investigated. The latter might also be viewed as important but fall outside the scope of the present study.

1.9 Definition of Key Variables

**Supervisor:** A supervisor is an employee (and a member of the group called employees) who is responsible for the welfare, behaviours and performance of non-management employees – called workers (Greer and Plunkett, 2007:4). Berman and Evans (1998:370), refer to supervision as a manner of providing a job environment that encourages employee accomplishment. They further discuss that the role of supervision is to motivate employees to achieve company objectives and thereby harness human energy to the retailer’s needs (Berman and Evan, 1998:370-371).

**Role Stress:** Is a major source of two change related components, namely role ambiguity and role conflict (Hunt and Osborn, 2011:37).
**Role Ambiguity:** Is created when role expectations are not clearly understood and the employee is uncertain as to what he or she should do. It can result from an employee lacking information on how to properly action tasks assigned, or not properly understanding the supervisor's expectations (Robbins and De Cenzo, 2001:438).

**Role Conflict:** Occurs when a person is unable to meet the expectations of management and supervisors. Often the employee understands what needs to be done, but for some reason cannot do it. The resulting tension can be stressful for the employee and can affect the individual's performance and relationship with co-workers and superiors (Schermerhorn, Hunt, Osborn and Uhl-Bien (2011:185).)

**Job Satisfaction:** Is a result of employees' perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important (Luthans, 2005:212). Job satisfaction is in essence “the degree to which people feel negatively or positively about their jobs. It is an attitude or emotional response to one’s task as well as to the physical and social conditions of the workplace” (Hunt and Osborn, 2011:143).

**Performance:** Is referred to as the accomplishment of a given task measured against pre-set known standards. It further relates to all the activities expected of an employee and how well those activities are executed. It is generally determined by the employee's behaviour towards a given task and not what the employee has produced (Aguinis, 2009:78).

1.10 **Outline of the Study**

**Chapter 2: Literature Review**
This chapter will provide the theoretical framework which supports the objective of the study.

**Chapter 3: Research Methodology**
This chapter provides a detailed discussion of the methodology and research design. It includes descriptions of the sample design, questionnaire design, pilot study, data collection procedure, and data analysis methods. The chapter concludes with the limitations and ethical issues related to this study.

**Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Discussion**
This chapter presents the results of the study.

**Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations**
This chapter presents conclusions, recommendations, and proposes future research possibilities.

1.11 Summary

Chapter one presented the research problem addressed by the study, the research aims, and a brief definition of the key research variables. The research design, research approach, sampling method, data collection, and data analysis methods were also discussed. The last part of this chapter presented the significance of the research followed by an outline of all the chapters to follow.

In the following chapter (chapter two), a review of the most pertinent literature is provided.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the theoretical grounding that forms the basis of the study is presented. The global and South African retail industries are discussed and context is given to the current retail landscape in the 21st century. The variables that form the basis of the research are then discussed in detail.

This chapter will firstly give an overview of the global food retail landscape and shape an idea of how global food retailing compares with the South African food retail industry. The literature review then continues to review books and journal articles from several authors to obtain a better understanding and insight of the research topic.

2.2 The Global Retail Food Industry

Global food retailing has grown significantly over the past century and today reaches nearly every population group around the world. Global food retailers such as Wal-Mart and Tesco are only some of the many retailers who have store operations beyond their own borders. These established retailers have recognized that domestic sales growth is becoming more difficult to sustain and that expansion into new markets is necessary in order to remain competitive and to secure future profitability. Since international governments have loosened up their trade and investment policies, many food retailers have taken the opportunity to expand their global reach to international customers and suppliers (Global food retail industry n.d.). Retailers expand into international markets for various reasons, which include, saturated domestic markets, unique product offerings that cannot be found elsewhere, and the potential for increased profits (Diamond and Litt, 2009:88).

According to Levy and Weitzh (2007:11), food retailing continues to dominate amongst the largest retailers. Eight of the ten largest global retailers sell food and slightly over 50 percent of the 200 largest retailers have supermarket, warehouse, hypermarket, or cash-and-carry formats. The structure of the global food industry is continually changing as food suppliers, manufacturers and retailers adjust to meet the need of consumers who are increasingly demanding a wider range of higher quality products.

The global food retail industry is gigantic in size and turnover. Retail sales are about $4 trillion dollars annually with supermarkets and hypermarkets accounting for the largest share.
of the sales. Most of the leading global retailers are United States and European firms, as large multinational retailers expanded their presence in developing countries, and small retail firms increasingly account for the smaller share of total food sales. Retailers of fast moving consumer goods (FMCG) represent the largest product sector, accounting for more than half of all top 250 retailers and two thirds of top 250 sales in 2010.

Sixty-four of the 250 largest retail chains in the world are supermarkets and the largest retail chains in 14 countries around the world are supermarkets. Not only does the food retail industry dominate other industries in the U.S., the retail companies that are based in the U.S. also dominate the global retailing stage. Nearly one-third of the 250 largest retail organisations in the world are based in the United States. Of the world’s ten largest retail companies in the world, five of them are from the United States and five from Europe. These top ten retailers had combined sales of $1.5 trillion in 2009 (Deloitte and Touche, 2009). While their economies are recovering, many U.S. and European retail stores are expanding globally, opening stores in emerging markets and in countries with thriving economies. India, China and Dubai are amongst the few that global retailers are working to cultivate.

According to the (Food retail global industry guide, 2012) the global food retail industry grew by 5.9% in 2011, to reach a value of $5,338.8 billion. This indicates why this industry is referred to as one of the biggest in the world.

The global food industry is also one of the biggest employment industries. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 14.4 million people were employed in the U.S. retail food industry as of April 2010 (Retail Industry, n.d.).

**Table 2.1: Leading Global Retailers (2004-2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sales $ Billions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walmart</td>
<td>🇺🇸</td>
<td>446.24</td>
<td>They employ over 2 million people around the world in all shapes, sizes, ages, colours, religions and languages. The &quot;United Nations&quot; of retailing – North American sales account for over $310 billion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrefour</td>
<td>149.01</td>
<td>Not one to be outdone by Walmart or Tesco, they are often the first to enter new markets and if they prove unsuccessful they pull out. Recent ventures have seen them enter into Middle Eastern countries eg. Iraq, Iran, Syria and more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESCO</td>
<td>104.51</td>
<td>Still one of the most admired and respected retailers in the world, they stand for quality in retailing. Not just products but operations and innovation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO Group</td>
<td>102.27</td>
<td>In the industry we often hear the names of the top 3 as well as Ahold, Aldi, Delhaize, Lidl and Costco but not too often does one hear about Metro Group. They are possibly the biggest company that no one has ever heard of . . . and still growing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEON</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>In 2004 their mantra was &quot;Act Global, Think Local&quot; and look where it got them. They set their sights on becoming one of the top 10 global retailers and have well surpassed that goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN&amp;i HLDGS. Co.,Ltd</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>They have wide and varied holdings beyond supermarkets incl. the Dennys restaurant chain and unbeknown to many, the 7-11 convenience store chain in the U.S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [www.foodretailworld.com/leading retailers.htm](http://www.foodretailworld.com/leading retailers.htm)

Table 2.1, above, provides a list of selected leading retailers who have a footprint in several countries other than in their country of origin. This data is a compilation from a variety of
sources, which was accumulated through published rankings, annual reports, and corporate information. The sales figures presented in the rankings are only an estimate and was used to illustrate the size of the company's operations (Food Retail World, 2004-2012).

Global food retailers will continue to expand their footprint beyond their domestic borders into the 21st century. Emerging markets like India, Brazil, Indonesia and much of Sub-Saharan Africa offer the possibility of strong growth and new opportunities for the world's leading retailers.

2.3 The South African Food Retail Industry

A few major supermarkets like Shoprite, Checkers, Pick n Pay, Spar and Woolworths, have dominated the South African food retail market. These retailers have a modern infrastructure supporting relatively efficient distribution of goods to urban shopping centers, townships and rural areas throughout South African and Southern Africa. The retail food industry in South Africa can be regard as one of the most interesting retail platforms in Africa. It offers a full spectrum of formats, which include cafés, small general-dealers, and speciality stores (i.e. Wellness), boutiques, chain stores, department stores, cash and carry wholesale-retail outlets and “spaza” or mobile shops which operate predominantly in informal settings.

South Africa also offers globally competitive retail formats that are highly sophisticated, such as supermarkets and hypermarkets. The development and establishment of differing retail formats have changed the South African retail landscape. According to Terblance, (2002:35) this changing landscape has been brought about by the de-racializing of space in the post-apartheid era. Informal retailers, warehouse-style food traders such as the Old Biscuit Mill located in Woodstock, Cape Town, speciality stores and factory shops add to the retail choice in South Africa (Terblance, 2002:35). As the South African economy started growing, customers started having more disposable income available and the demand for convenience, speed and efficiency grew. Convenience stores like Spar and Seven Eleven became popular because of their location and so did supermarkets, which then started to offer several food and non-food items under one roof. Filling stations like BP and Engen also tapped into the growing customer demand for convenience by establishing forecourt retail outlets. This trend significantly grew post the year 2000, which has seen filling stations collaborating with national food retailers like, BP with Pick n Pay and Engen with Woolworth’s convenience food.

According to a report published by Deloitte and Touche, (2009) South Africa’s largest retailer, Shoprite Holdings rocketed from a global ranking of 130 into the 95th position. Other South
African retailers who were also reported to be on the 2011 list of top 250 retailers in the world are Pick n Pay, Massmart Holdings and Woolworths. South African food retailers like Shoprite, Pick n Pay, Spar and Woolworths are large in comparison to other food retailers around the world but, considering the lack of globalization, they do not have a presence on the global retail food stage yet. However, many South African food retailers have aggressively expanded their international operations and established their footprint in several African countries including neighbouring islands like Mauritius.

Table 2.2, below, highlights the fact that retail trade sales rose by 9.2 percent in 2011. Retail trade sales in February, March, May and June 2012 are significantly more compared to the same months in 2011. This could be signalling that the industry was then benefiting from the cuts in the REPO rate, leaving customers with more disposable income.

### Table 2.2: Year-on-year percentage change in total retail trade sales at current prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics SA (2012)

### 2.4 Supervisor Influence

A supervisor is an employee (and a member of the group called employees) who is responsible for the welfare, behaviours and performance of non-management employees – called workers (Greer and Plunkett, 2007:4). Berman and Evans (1998:370), refer to supervision as a manner of providing a job environment that encourages employee accomplishment. They further discuss that the role of supervision is to motivate employees to
achieve company objectives and thereby harness human energy to the retailer’s needs (Berman and Evan, 1998:370-371).

According to Hodgetts and Hegar (2008:240), supervisors perform an important role in providing employees with clear job directions and support to complete various tasks. The supportive role of supervisors has changed considerably over the years. Previously supervisors were only seen as the link between management and operational staff and the ones responsible for ensuring the job is done on time. Time has, however, changed this perception and the supportive role of the supervisor has become more important to management and organisations.

Greer and Plunkett, (2008:9) discuss how supervisors influence has shifted and now include:

- Providing adequate instruction and training,
- Enabling employees to do and give their best,
- Handling complaints from employees in a fair and just way,
- Safeguarding employees’ health and welfare while they are on the job,
- Praising and providing constructive criticism,
- Providing examples of proper conduct at work,
- Providing coaching, advice and training.

To minimise role ambiguity, supervisors must avoid misperceptions through explaining, in as much detail as possible, what their expectations are and give employees sufficient guidance on how to achieve the best results whilst completing a task. Employees must have a clear understanding of the task, the standards that will be use to evaluate their performance, and the level of quality expected.

Supervision and the role of supervisors have been extensively studied in various settings. In this study, supervisor influence is referred to as the degree to which employees’ rate the level of support they are receiving from their supervisors or line managers. According to Robbins and De Cenzo, (2011:132) research studies generally find that employee satisfaction increases when the immediate supervisor is understanding, friendly, offers praise for good performance, listens to the employee’s opinions and shows personal and genuine interest.
A research study conducted by Mc Gillis, Mc Gilton, Petroz and Woodcis, (2007) investigated the effects of supervisor influence by registered nursing staff on job stress and job satisfaction among nurse aides (NAs) working in long-term care. The results of their study suggested that supervisory support for Nursing Assistants is an important determinant of NA’s job satisfaction. In another study by Okediji, Etuk and Nnedum, (2011) they have concluded that supervisors’ significantly influence job satisfaction.

The findings of a study conducted by Shanock, (2006) suggest that supervisors make use of the opportunity to reciprocate by providing supportive treatment to subordinates, with positive consequences for subordinates’ performance.

Supervisors’ has a positive effect on job satisfaction as reported in two separated studies by Mc Gillis, Mc Gilton, Petroz and Woodcis, (2007) and Okediji, Etuk and Nnedum, (2011). A work environment, in which supervisors are perceived to be providing support in any form, could decrease a lot of uncertainty around job expectations simultaneously reducing role stress. Several research studies have found a positive relationship between supervisors’ and job satisfaction, however, as far as it could be established, the extent to which supervisors’ influence role stress, performance and job satisfaction in a retail setting has not been sufficiently established.

2.5 Role Stress

Work related role stress comprises two important related components, namely role ambiguity and role conflict (Hunt and Osborn, 2011:37). Role stress can pose a threat to the health of workers and in turn, to the well-being of the retail work environment. It is becoming a topic of concern for all retailers as absenteeism, diminished productivity, employee turnover, work accidents, late coming and violence in the work place are all associated manifestations of role stress. According to Hodgetts and Heger, (2008:243) job-related role stress is defined by NIOSH (National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health) as the harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resources or needs of the worker (Hodgetts and Heger, 2008:242). They go on to state that working conditions such as excessive work-load demands and conflicting expectations, are stressful to most people.

Employees who have too many responsibilities or ‘wear too many hats’, can feel overwhelmed with role stress. It is clear that employees need to work closely with their supervisors and get clarity on what is expected of them. They should frequently ask for
feedback on their performance so that their own misperceptions of their performance can be reduced.

The retail food environment largely relies on semi-permanent and non-permanent employees who often contribute to the high labour turnover experienced by retailers. Retail food stores are often a first job experience for many young people who are starting on their journey of independence or are just looking for a job to pass the time whilst seeking another job or studying. Many people taking up employment in food retail stores find out afterwards that they are often not able to cope with the demand, conflict and pressure offered by this industry.

According to Certo, (2008:353) supervisors’ own behaviour can also be a source of stress for employees. Certo, (2008:353) makes mention of the following supervisory behaviours: demonstrating a lack of concern for employee well-being, checking up on every detail of an employee's work, poor communication, vague work instructions and continuous task interruption. In order to minimise the impact of role stress and its associating components (role conflict and role ambiguity) it is recommended that supervisors should behave in esteem-enhancing ways. This includes, the generous use of praise and feedback to employees about how their efforts add value to the work group or organisation as a whole (Certo, 2008:353).

Kickul and Posig, (2001) examined the role of a supervisor between specific job stressors (role conflict and time pressure) and a component of employee burnout (emotional exhaustion). They have concluded that an association exists between the latter mentioned stressors and adverse employee behaviours, which are moderated by supervisor’s influence – both emotional and instrumental – given to him/her through daily interactions in the work environment.

Role stress comprises two important related components namely, role ambiguity and role conflict. These interrelated components of role stress will be discussed and referred to separately.

2.5.1 Role Ambiguity

According to Luthans (2005:451), role ambiguity occurs when the individual employee is unclear about the dictates of a given situation or, in common terms, “doesn't know what s/he’s supposed to be doing.” He stated that unclear job descriptions, incomplete job orders given by a manager/supervisor, and inexperience – all contribute to role ambiguity. He goes
on to say that, such ambiguity can affect the employee’s ability to function effectively in a group or a team.

Robbins and De Cenzo, (2001:438) find that role ambiguity is created when role expectations are not clearly understood and the employee is not sure what is expected of him/ her. In support of the latter definition, Schermerhorn, Hunt, Osborn and Uhl-Bien, (2011:237) also argue that role ambiguity normally occurs when the communication of task expectations is unclear or upsetting in some way, such as a team member receiving different expectations from different sources.

The confusion that employees experience because of a lack of job direction or job description, often leads to great uncertainty amongst employees who do not know whether they have completed an assigned task correctly or followed the correct process. Often, this uncertainty can lead to a great amount of stress and increased confusion. In many cases employees who do not have a clear job description tend to follow their own assumption or tend to rely on what they have heard or seen from peers. Co-workers who have, over time, generated their own perceptions of processes and procedures tend to pass on role and task clarity to their new colleagues and often fill the space created by role ambiguity. The negative effect of the latter is that most employees can end up with misperceptions and self-beliefs on how company policies and procedures should be completed and followed.

According to Hodgetts and Hegar (2008:133), job descriptions provide the initial basis for determining one’s role. The employee can read and follow this description to obtain a general idea of what he or she is supposed to be doing. One of the most serious and most common role-related problems occurs either when job duties are unclear because the job description is vague or because no description has ever been written for the work. Greer and Plunket, (2007:13) discuss the fact that role ambiguity results from unclear or non-existent job description, orders, rules, policies, or procedures. When role ambiguity exists, employees may do things they should not do, may fail to do things they should do, and may find it hard to distinguish where one supervisor’s job begins and another end (Greer and Plunket, 2007:13). It is therefore important that employees are given as much clarity and constructive feedback as is possible in order to reassure the employee that his/ her interpretation was indeed performed correctly.

2.5.2 Role Conflict

Role conflicts create expectations that may be hard to reconcile or satisfy (Robbins and De Cenzo, 2001:438). In order to get better clarity from Robbins and De Cenzo’s view on role
conflict, Greer and Plunkett, (2007:13) discuss and describe role conflict as follows: when conflicting and contradictory demands are made on supervisors, they may find themselves in awkward or difficult positions. How they react to such pressures and precisely what they do to cope with such conflicts depend on their own values and perceptions and on the circumstances of the role conflicts (Greer and Plunkett, 2007:13). In the food retail environment role conflict is a common phenomenon. Supervisors are often expected to discipline and reprimand employees while at the same time motivating them in order to decrease customer complaints and to increase positive service feedback. According to Greer and Plunkett (2007:13), role conflicts create tension and job dissatisfaction. "Conflict is likely when individuals or teams are placed in ambiguous situations where it is difficult for them to understand just who is responsible for what, and why" (Schmerherhorn, Hunt, Osborn and Uhl-Bien, 2011:237).

The researcher is of the same opinion – the lack of involvement from supervisors’ can motivate and encourage tension, role stress, poor productivity and job dissatisfaction. If the occurrence of role conflict and role ambiguity is not effectively attended, it could have a negative impact on the overall success of the retail operation and could lead to ongoing employee turnover. It is therefore necessary that adequate support, training and work tools be given to supervisors and first line managers to cope with the challenges of role ambiguity and role conflict.

2.6 Job Satisfaction

According to Luthans, (2005:212) job satisfaction is generally recognized in the organizational behavioural field as one of the most important and frequently studied attitudes. Job dissatisfaction accounts for a host of contemporary societal workplace problems, which include low employee productivity, sabotage, employee theft and absenteeism, low levels of commitment, internal shrinkage and reduced overall quality of life (Luthans, 2005:210). Although the retail supermarket environment has become more sophisticated in the 21st century, with improved technological advances, it is still critical that retail managers ensure that they create a work environment that leads to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is in essence “…the degree to which people feel negatively or positively about their jobs. It is an attitude or emotional response to one’s task as well as to the physical and social conditions of the workplace” (Hunt and Osborn, 2011:143). According to Luthans, (2005:212) job satisfaction is a result of an employees’ perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important. Although retailers have no control
over employees’ emotions, they can, however, build relationships and create working conditions that foster and stimulate employee and job satisfaction.

Osborn and Hunt (2011:143) argue that “The importance of job satisfaction can be viewed in the context of two decisions that people make about their work: Firstly, to remain a member of the organisation and secondly, the decision to perform, that is, to work hard in pursuit of high levels of task performance”. The decision to belong to an organisation concerns an individual's attendance and longevity at his/ her place of work. In light thereof, job satisfaction can influence absenteeism and an employee’s behaviour towards their job and the surroundings in which the employee works. In general, employees who are satisfied with their jobs have more regular attendance and punctuality and are less likely to be absent for unexplained reasons compared to dissatisfied workers. According to Osborn and Hunt (2011:143), low job satisfaction can affect the turnover of employees and their likelihood for quitting their jobs. Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (2001:77) states that a number of factors have been associated with job satisfaction which include, the extent to which co-workers are friendly, competent, and supportive.

Research conducted by Okediji, Etuk and Nnedum (2011) amongst staff of a Brewery in Uyo, indicated that supervisors has a significant influence on job satisfaction. Schroffel, (1999) reported that workers were generally more satisfied with their jobs when they were more satisfied with their supervisor and liked their supervisor better when it matched their preferred style.

Employees in the retail supermarket environment can spend up to 45 hours per week in a store. This is generally far more compared with the time they spend on any other activities outside work. It is therefore important that retailers consider this when trying to create a work environment in which they aim to achieve greater levels of job satisfaction.

2.7 Performance

In the retail food environment an employee’s performance level is measured against his or her performance contract, which determines a set of standards and expectations to which an employee needs to perform. Customer compliments, sales and stock management are just a few of the measures used by retailers to determine performance. According to Berman and Evans (1998:666), among the performance measures frequently used by retailers are total sales, average sales per store, sales by department, sales per square foot, and lastly, profitability. Aguinis (2009:78) shows that an employee’s performance is determined by the employee’s behaviour towards a given task and not by what the employee has produced.
Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (2011:182) defined performance as a set of employee work-related behaviours designed to accomplish organizational goals.

2.8 Chapter Summary

The chapter provided a theoretical background of the main constructs of this research study. The chapter started by giving a broad overview of the global as well as the South African food retail environment and depicted some of the similarities between these.

The following chapter discusses the research and design approach that was used to collect and analyse data.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research method and research process that was used. The research instruments as well as the methods of data collection will be addressed, including the procedures used to analyse the data. A positivist paradigm approach was used, since the study was done from a quantitative perspective only. The methods chosen for data collection and data analysis are thus in line with the quantitative approach.

3.2 Research Design and Methodology

According to Huysamen (2001:10), research design is the blueprint according to which data is to be collected to investigate the research question in the most economical manner. A positivist paradigm approach was used because the study employed a quantitative methodology. O’Leary (2004:6) states that positivists generally want their findings to have a broad application to the whole population and findings are generally quantitative. One of the main purposes of using a quantitative research method is to quantify the extent of variation in a phenomenon (Kumar, 2011:20).

A descriptive research design, best applied to this type of research as information, was obtained concerning the status of the phenomena. The goal of the descriptive research design is to obtain a description of the characteristics of a specific group of individuals (Gravetter and Forzano 200:149). The descriptive research design was regarded as the most suitable design to answer the research question and to meet the objective of this research study. This type of research design enabled the researcher to understand the perceived supervisors’ influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction.

A multi-stage sampling approach was employed to select the sample and the respondents. Firstly, the researcher applied a stratified sampling approach to select the retailers at which the study was going to be conducted. Jackson (2009:423) describes stratified random sampling as a technique designed to ensure that subgroups or strata are fairly represented. Secondly, a simple random sampling was used to select the retail stores/branches. This approach allowed each element to be given an equal and independent chance of being selected (Kumar, 2011:203). Thirdly, a non-probability sampling method was used to select the respondents. In this approach, the convenience sampling method was considered appropriate to gather data. Jackson (2009:417) refers to convenience sampling as a technique in which participants are obtained wherever they can be found and typically
wherever it is convenient to do so. The rationale for using the convenience sampling method was due to the respondents being easily accessible, their availability as well as the process being both less time consuming and inexpensive to gather the research information.

In the section below, the procedure used for data collection and data analysis is briefly discussed.

3.2.1 Data Collection

Self-administered questionnaires were disseminated in which respondents were asked to answer various statements pertaining to the main research constructs, namely supervisor influence, performance, role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict) and job satisfaction. The feedback allowed the researcher to formulate a better understanding of what many employees report on doing in their particular work settings. Mitchell and Jolley (2007:217-218) point out the following advantages and drawbacks in terms of self-administered questionnaires:

- It can easily be distributed to a large number of people
- It allows of anonymity
- It can be cheap and easy to gather data from a lot of people; adversely so,
- It can have a low return rate and,
- Problems with the questionnaire cannot be corrected.

3.2.2 Data Analysis

The research data was statistically analyzed by means of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V19). The data analysis involved descriptive analysis, providing descriptive and inferential statistics. The raw data was collected, through questionnaires, in the form of numbers representing values of variables measuring the characteristics of respondents. The first approach was to systematically display data in the form of various tables, charts and other statistical tests with the aid of the SPSS data analysis program. Results from the various statistical tests allowed the researcher to identify relationships between variables. It also enabled the researcher to discuss and answer the research question.
3.2.3 Population and Sample

The larger group of interest to a researcher is called the population and the small set of individuals or group of people, who participate in the study, is called the sample (Gravetter and Forzano, 2009:128). Jackson (2009:16) refers to the population as all the people about whom a study is meant to generalize. The population applicable to this research study was all the food retailers within the Cape Metropolitan area.

A sample is a set of individuals selected from a population and is usually intended to represent the population in a research study (Gravetter and Forzano, 2009:128). Sampling is the process of selecting a few people (a sample), from a bigger group (the sampling population), to become the basis for estimating or predicting the prevalence of an unknown piece of information, situation or outcome regarding the bigger group (Kumar, 2011:193).

Through a stratified sampling method, a specific sub-group (sample) was selected from the total population. Findings and conclusions from the selected sample were then generalised back to the total population. In this research study, the sample that represented the population was the five biggest food retailers in the Cape Metropole. Only these food retailers were included in the sample because they are characterised as the biggest food retailers based on sales, employment, number of stores and other shared characteristics.

3.2.3.1 Sampling Process

Firstly, a stratified random sampling approach was used to select specifically related food retailers from the population. According to Kumar (2011:203), in stratified random sampling the researcher attempts to stratify the population in such a way that the population within a stratum is homogeneous with respect to the characteristics on the basis of which it is being stratified. Hence, the sampling population consisted of all employees working for the five biggest food retailers in the Cape Metropolitan area. The research study only included the five biggest retailers because they are regarded as the largest food retailers based on number of stores, store size, sales and number of employees.

Secondly, a simple random sampling technique was applied when selecting the six branches/stores (sample unit) from each food retailer. These selected stores were representative of all the suburbs within the Cape Metropolitan Area. According to Flick (2011:72), a simple random sample results when every element in the sample is drawn independently in a random process from the population.

Thirdly, respondents (sample element) were selected based on non-probability. Their details were therefore unknown and they could not be individually identified. The sample element
was the primary level of investigation and consisted of workers employed at the pre-selected food retailers in the Cape Metropolitan area. The convenience sampling method was employed to select respondents. Employees were approached and asked to participate in the research study at their own convenience and within their own time.

The multi-stage sampling approach was applied as follows:

1. The five largest food chain retailers in the Cape Metropolitan area was identified. The five retailers form part of the retail food industry and were selected through a stratified random sampling approach.

2. All stores situated in the Cape Metropole area of the above-mentioned food retailers were listed and, a simple random sampling technique was applied to identify stores at which the questionnaires should be handed out. This sampling method gave each store an equal chance of being selected. Six branches of each retail group were selected.

3. 300 self-administrated questionnaires were distributed between six branches i.e. 10 questionnaires per branch (10 x 6 branches = 60 x 5 stores = 300). The questionnaires were collected after they had been completed by the respondents.

4. A non-probability sampling approach was used to select the respondents i.e. employees (sample). Through the convenience sampling method, respondents were selected based on their availability, i.e. being at the right place at the right time and their willingness to complete the questionnaire.
Below is a table depicting the number of food retail stores from the participating retailers in the Cape Metropolitan area.

**TABLE 3-1: Summary of retailers and their stores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>RETAILER 1</th>
<th>RETAILER 2</th>
<th>RETAILER 3</th>
<th>RETAILER 4</th>
<th>RETAILER 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bellville</td>
<td>Belvedere</td>
<td>Bellville</td>
<td>Melody Walk</td>
<td>Tokai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Blue Route</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
<td>Steenberg</td>
<td>Weltevreden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td>Century City</td>
<td>Station Plaza</td>
<td>Meadow ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De Tyger (Parow)</td>
<td>Caversham</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
<td>Mitchell's Plain</td>
<td>Khayelitsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Khayelitsha</td>
<td>Plumstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elsie's river</td>
<td>Dean street</td>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>Wynberg</td>
<td>Gugulethu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kromboom</td>
<td>Kromboom</td>
<td>Glen Garry</td>
<td>Mfuleni</td>
<td>Blue Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td>Old Bakery</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Maynard Mall</td>
<td>Rondebosch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Milnerton</td>
<td>Mynard Mall</td>
<td>Graanendal</td>
<td>Phillipi</td>
<td>Parow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>Meadowridge</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>Hanover Park</td>
<td>Century City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Observatory</td>
<td>Miner road</td>
<td>Khayelitsha</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
<td>N1 City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pinelands</td>
<td>Palmyra Road</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td>Gugulethu</td>
<td>Oakdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Plumstead</td>
<td>Pine lands</td>
<td>Mitchell's Plain</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Protea Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tygervalley</td>
<td>Steenberg</td>
<td>N1 City</td>
<td>Blue Downs</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Uitzicht</td>
<td>Vangate Mall</td>
<td>Nyanga</td>
<td>Gatesville</td>
<td>Willowbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
<td>Westgate Mall</td>
<td>Observatory</td>
<td>Athlone</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Parow</td>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>Ottery</td>
<td>Belhar</td>
<td>Cobble Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rondebosch</td>
<td>Grass Park</td>
<td>Panorama</td>
<td>Bishop Lavis</td>
<td>De Granendal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wynberg</td>
<td>Cape Town Airport</td>
<td>Parow</td>
<td>Mowbray</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Canal Walk (FL)</td>
<td>Phillipi</td>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
<td>Pinelands</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cobble Walk</td>
<td>Plattekloof</td>
<td>Maitland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>Plumstead</td>
<td>Eerste River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Edgemeade</td>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>Goodwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Glen Garry</td>
<td>Rondebosch</td>
<td>Vasco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>N1 City</td>
<td>Tokai</td>
<td>Elsies River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Panorama</td>
<td>Athlone</td>
<td>Belhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Welgeomoed</td>
<td>Parow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Willobridge</td>
<td>Shoprite Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a table depicting the number of questionnaires that were handed out per retailer:

**TABLE 3.2: Number of questionnaires per retail store**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stores each retailer has in the Cape Metropolitan area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of selected branches per store</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires to be handed out at each retailer store in order to meet quota of 300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size in this study was 300 respondents.

The questionnaire design will be discussed in the following section.

### 3.3 Questionnaire Design

Several methods exist for obtaining information about people. A survey using questionnaires is only one way of obtaining information from people and contains a series of questions for gathering data from a specific group of respondents. According to Frink (2009:1), surveys are information-collection methods used to describe, compare, or explain individual and societal knowledge, feelings, values, preferences and behaviour.

In this research study, self-administered questionnaires were used. According to O’Leary (2004:154), these surveys can offer anonymity and therefore confidentiality. They also allow coverage of a wide geographic area and give respondents the opportunity to complete questionnaires in their own time. The questionnaire was made up of three pages and contained three subsections.

The first page provided the respondents with an overview of the research study, why the data was being collected and the purposes that it would be used for. This section in particular emphasized that the information provided in the questionnaire would be anonymous and would not be shared with any organisation or for any other purposes other than academic use.
The second section of the questionnaire consisted of 38 questions from five categories. Items from subscales forming part of the Work Environment Scale (WES) were used to assess supervisor influence. This scale measures the social environment of all types of work settings (Moos, 1981). The first dimension of the questionnaire related to the influence of supervisors. In this section the employee was asked to assess the extent to which supervisors are supportive and provide encouragement. It included statements such as, “my supervisor shares information with others that may influence my career path” and “my supervisor provides me with specific feedback on my performance”.

This dimension (performance) focused on employees’ performance. Two major related components of role stress are role ambiguity and role conflict. The aforementioned constructs were assessed using items from Rizzo et al (1970). Statements from these constructs requested respondents to indicate whether they are clear about their role and duties, including such statements as: “I know what my responsibilities are” and seek to understand the level of role conflict experienced by employees, i.e. “Often I get asked to start with another job without finishing the first task”.

The last construct measured was job satisfaction and included statements from Brayfield and Rothe (1951). In this section, participants were asked to state their personal satisfaction with their job and included items such as, “I am satisfied with my current job” and “I find real enjoyment in my job”.

One means of determining whether the instrument you are using is effective is to assess its reliability. According to Jackson (2009:65) reliability refers to the consistency or stability of a measuring instrument. Somekh and Lewin (2005:216) discusses that reliability refers to whether the same results would be achieved if the test or measure were applied repeatedly. In order to understand the internal consistency reliability of each section, which made up the questionnaire, a Cronbach’s alpha test was run in SPSS. The alpha coefficient for the five sections of the questionnaire was between 0.657 and 0.778. The results suggested that the questions in each section had a moderate to relatively high internal consistency, taking into account that a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered to be “acceptable” in most social research situations.

The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for supervisor influence (0.693) was close to 0.070. This was regarded as acceptable. The overall reliability coefficient of performance (0.727), role ambiguity (0.778), role conflict (0.723) and job satisfaction (0.766) were above 0.7 which is regarded as more than acceptable. The results of the Cronbach’s reliability coefficient found the questionnaire used in this study to be reliable overall. Responses to statements in the questionnaire were assessed using a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly
disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The last part of the questionnaire solicited demographic information such as gender, age, job, family, length of service and qualifications.

3.4 Pilot Study

It is almost impossible to get a questionnaire right the first time around. The development of a questionnaire requires you to operationalize concepts, formulate questions, decide on response categories, provide background information and clear instructions, and decide on the length, the layout and design (O’Leary, 2005:186). A pilot questionnaire was done before the final questionnaire was completed and printed. The pilot questionnaire intended to identify opportunities to restructure statements in order to solicit responses that were more accurate. It also aimed at looking at the wording and layout of statements and whether they could be understood clearly. One employee from each of the major food retailers included in this study was randomly approached and asked to complete a questionnaire. In total, six pilot questionnaires were completed. The pilot study was done two weeks before the final questionnaire was printed to allow for sufficient time for amendments.

The pilot questionnaire highlighted the following concerns, which influenced the final version:

- Grammar of statements;
- Length of some statements was confusing because they were viewed as not being concise or to the point;
- Use of language in some statements was not easy enough to understand;
- Pre-conceived answers were generated, based on the sub categories, before actual statements are read.

The layout of statements within the questionnaire was changed and sub categories were removed, taking into account findings from the pilot study and to allow a better reading flow. After the changes were made, the questionnaires were distributed to employees working in the food retail stores situated in the Cape Metropolitan area.

3.5 Procedure used to collect data

Over a period of six weeks from 23 May 2011 until 30 June 2011, 300 self-administered questionnaires were handed out to employees working in selected food retail stores across the Cape Metropolitan area. Employees were randomly approached whilst being on a lunch break and asked to participate in the research study by completing the questionnaire. All employees who were approached willingly accepted a questionnaire and conveniently completed it during their lunch break. A few stores were visited on more than one occasion to
approach a larger representation of the store staff and to issue questionnaires to employees not previously approached. Questionnaires were collected from employees immediately after they had completed it.

The stores in the table below are representative of the stores in the Cape Metropolitan suburbs.

### Table 3.3: Survey Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Retailer 1</th>
<th>Retailer 2</th>
<th>Retailer 3</th>
<th>Retailer 4</th>
<th>Retailer 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
<td>Milner Road</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
<td>Bellville</td>
<td>Meadowridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goodwood</td>
<td>Glen Garry</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td>Mynard Mall</td>
<td>Kenilworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td>Steenberg</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monte Vista</td>
<td>Cobble Walk</td>
<td>Parow</td>
<td>Kuilsriver</td>
<td>Oakdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cape Gate</td>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>Goodwood</td>
<td>Brackenfell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bellville</td>
<td>Vasco</td>
<td>Cobble Walk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Data Analysis

The research data was statistically analyzed using SPSS. The data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistics. The raw data was collected by means of questionnaires in the form of numbers representing values of variables, measuring the characteristics of respondents. The first approach was to systematically display the data in the form of various tables and charts with the aid of the SPSS data analysis program.

Quantitative data is normally subjected to statistical analysis. For the purposes of this study, some commonly used analysis methods were used.

#### 3.6.1 Inferential Statistics

Statistical significance refers to a ‘p-value’ that assesses the actual probability that your findings are more than coincidental whilst inferential statistics is about conducting statistical tests that can show statistical significance which allows one to assess the probability that an observed difference is not just a fluke or chance finding (O’Leary, 2004:192).

In order to obtain additional information that could allow conclusions to be drawn beyond the immediate data, the following analyses and tests which forms part of inferential statistics were done.
3.6.2 Reliability Statistics (Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients)

Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test can be used when test items have more than two alternatives, such as a Likert scale that has five response choices. It produces values between 0 and 1.00, with a higher value indicating a higher degree of internal reliability (Gravetter and Forzano, 2009:461). Each statement within the questionnaire was measured to a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". In order to understand whether the questions in this questionnaire all reliably measured the same, a Cronbach's alpha test was run in SPSS.

The alpha coefficient for the five sections in the questionnaire was between 0.657 and 0.778. The results suggested that the questions in each sub-section had a moderate to relatively high internal consistency, taking into account that a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered to be “acceptable” in most social research situations.

3.6.3 One-way ANOVA

The one-way ANOVA test is done when the groups are defined by a single factor with more than two variables. The results of this test are called the F ratio (Gravetter and Forzano, 2009:450). Somekh and Lewin (2005:229) show that the F ratio compares the variability between groups to the variability within groups and tells the researcher whether or not there is a significant difference in the means of the overall group. In this study, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to determine whether there were any significant differences between the means of the independent groups. The one way-ANOVA examined the effect of demographic factors (age, job family, length of service and qualification) on the variables (performance, role ambiguity, role conflict, job satisfaction and supervisor influence).

3.6.4 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics form the basis of practically every quantitative analysis of survey data and include frequencies of central tendency (the mean, median and mode) and measures of variation (Arlene Fink, 2009:78). According to Fink (2009:78), descriptive statistics provide simple summaries about the sample and the responses to some or all questions and they form the basis of practically every quantitative analysis. Spector (2003:41) finds that descriptive statistics provide ways of reducing large amounts of data to summary statistics, such as means or variances. The main function of descriptive statistics is to provide measures of central tendency used to describe and summarise basic features of the data in a study and to present quantitative description in a manageable form (O'Leary, 2004:189).
The descriptive statistics used in this research study analyzed demographic data, frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations.

The descriptive statistic most commonly used to assess correlation is the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Spector, 2003:42). The main emphasis of a correlation study is to establish the existence of a relationship or association between two or more aspects of a situation or phenomenon (Kumar, 2011:10-11). Jackson (2009:16) holds that correlations assess the degree of relationship between two measured variables. If two variables are correlated with each other, then we can predict from one variable to the other with a certain degree of accuracy. In addition to the latter, Flick (2011:144) states, “…the change in the value of one variable is associated with a change in the other variable”. Three forms of correlations can be distinguished. A positive correlation (when variable 1 has a high value, variable 2 also has a high value), a negative correlation (when variable 1 has a high value, variable 2 has a low value and vice versa), and the absence of a correlation (you cannot say what will be the value of variable 2 if the value of variable 1 is high or low) (Flick, 2011:144). The Pearson correlation coefficient has the advantage of ranging from -1 to +1 depending on whether two variables move together or in opposite direction (Treiman, 2009:91-92).

The results of the above-mentioned tests and analyses are reported in Chapter 4.

3.7 Limitations of Research Design and Methodology used

The research only included the five major biggest supermarket groups in the Cape Metropolitan area. Convenience retailers like Seven Eleven and small- to medium-sized food stores were not included in this study and therefore their feedback did not form part of this research. Another limitation of this study is that employees could not express or explain themselves in relation to the statements in the questionnaire. The format of the questionnaires did not allow additional comments to be added and provision was only made for "strongly agree to strongly disagree" answers. Additional answers or comments and behavioural observations whilst expressing themselves, could have provided additional information to the research study.

3.8 Ethical Statement and Considerations

Prior to handing out the questionnaires, participants were informed of the reasons and intentions of the research study, what the data would be used for, and also what rights they had. There rights included:

- The right to privacy - which includes the right to refuse participation, to refuse to answer any questions, and the right not to be interviewed for a long period.
• The right to confidentiality – which their names and identities will not be revealed but will be kept secret. All the information gathered through the questionnaire will be kept confidential.

• The right to know what the research is about – full disclosure of the aims of the research.

In addition to the letter of consent, this study also received ethical clearance from the CPUT Ethics committee.

3.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the research methodology that was used in this study, the nature of the sample and the procedure used to collect the data. The chapter also addressed issues concerning confidentiality and described the measuring instrument that was used.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis and discusses the results of a survey that has been conducted among staff at several retail food stores across the Cape Metropolitan area. It discusses details of the data analysis and presents findings in order to understand the perceived supervisor’s influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction. The aim of the research instrument was to solicit data from employees working in retail food stores and to use the data to meet the research objective and answer the research question below.

Research Objective: To understand the perceived supervisor’s influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area.

Research Question: What kind of relationship exists between supervisors’ reported behaviour and employees’ role stress, self-rated employee performance, and job satisfaction?

The findings of the survey are presented in two sections:

The first section of this chapter analyses and discuss the demographics of the respondents in the form of bar charts. The demographics of the respondents include age, gender, job family, length of service and qualification. The purpose of obtaining the demographic information was to provide a profile of the respondents.

The second section relates to five sub categories that made up the 38 questions in the questionnaire. The findings are presented in five sub-headings that presents data that was collected for each statement. For ease of understanding, the outputs from the analysis are presented in frequency tables and bar charts.
4.2 Demographic Analysis

4.2.1 Gender

The results indicated that 71% of respondents were female while 29% were male.

![Gender Split](image)

**Figure 4.1: Gender Classification of Respondents**

The results could indicate that females dominate most of the job areas within retail food stores. In addition, retailers could be unaware about the gender split and unprejudiced when recruiting new employees. However, the results are definitely noteworthy.

4.2.2 Age Group

The results depicted in the following table show that more than two thirds (67%) of front line employees in the retail food industry are 30 years of age and younger. For many young employees, a job in the retail environment is their first exposure to real employment. They often use this opportunity to either save money or gain work experience. Only 10.3% of employees who participated in the study were older than 40 years. The latter could be long serving employees who have been employed for several years, and who could be seeing their job as a career, as opposed to a short term "stepping stone".
Figure 4.2: Age Group Classification of Respondents

4.2.3 Job Category

In the job category segment, as seen in the following table, 34.7% of respondents were till operators, 11.7% administrative staff, 31.3% sales floor employees, 13.3% in customer service areas (service departments), 6.3% stockroom staff and, 2.7% worked in store operations. As seen from the results, close to 80% of front line employees' work directly with customers every day. Front line employees represent the retailer to its customers and are required to comply with basic customer service standards. Working with customers can often be a difficult task for front line employees, as customers frequently tend to display a demanding and arrogant attitude when confronted with unpleasant circumstances such as: products being out of stock, expired or goods of inferior quality as well as an unpleasant shopping environment. Because front line employees are often the first representative in sight, customers are likely to vent their frustrations on them first. As employees are often unable to deal with conflict with customers, customer conflict could demoralize an employee and could lead to role conflict. It is for this reason, therefore, that conflict management should be considered by retailers as one of its main training needs.
4.2.4 Length of Service

Length of employment often depict the level of experience. 67.7% of respondents indicated that they had been working in a retail store for less than 4 years. Of this number, 28.7% of employees employed indicated that they have less than one-year’s retail work experience. A small percentage of respondents (4.7%) indicated that they had been working in the retail food environment for more than 15 years. The retail environment is generally categorized as an environment with a high labour turnover and, in which re-employment is a common phenomenon. Berman and Evans (1998: 360-361) find that retailers face a special human resource environment which is characterized by a large number of inexperienced workers, long hours, highly visible employees and part-time workers. The greatest personnel difficulty for retailers is probably the relative inexperience of many of their part-time workers; they may be more apt to be lackadaisical, late, absent or quit their jobs and therefore require close supervision (Berman and Evans 1998:361).
4.2.5 Education

The results indicated that 2.7% of participants only have primary education while 30.7% of employees have completed school up to grade 9. Employees who have completed their grade 12 made up 55.7% of the respondents while 10.3% of respondents indicated that they are in possession of a post-school national diploma. Only 0.7% of respondents indicated that they have a degree. The results indicate that a large part of the retail frontline workforce represents employees who have just finished school or their grade 9. For many employees in this category, a part-time job in retail is their first chance of getting exposure and experience in the job market. Because retailers are faced with such a high labour turnover, they find themselves constantly re-hiring willing and potential employees. At first, potential job candidates appear to be eager to take up their first job opportunity but reconsider their employment after being exposed to long trading hours and working conditions generally associated with supermarket retailing.
4.3 Data Analysis

4.3.1 Supervisor Influence

Supervisor influence is important to ensuring employees effectively meet the requirements of their job and behave within the values and interest of the retailer. Berman and Evan (1998: 370-371) define supervision as a manner of providing a job environment that encourages employee accomplishment. They further indicate that the role of supervision is to motivate employees to achieve company objectives and thereby harness human energy to the retailer’s needs (Berman and Evan, 1998:370-371). Supervisor influence therefore plays an important role in the success of both the employees’ career and the success of the retail store. This section contains 11 statements that aimed to test supervisor influence.
Statement 1: My supervisor tends to talk down to employees

![Bar Chart for Statement 1](image1.png)

**Figure 4.6: My supervisor tends to talk down to employees**

In this section, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the above statement. The data reveals that 33.3% of the respondents agreed that their supervisors talk down to them, while 23% disagreed. A small scale of 13.3% of respondents had no view to this statement.

Statement 2: My supervisor usually gives full credit to ideas contributed by employees

![Bar Chart for Statement 2](image2.png)

**Figure 4.7: My supervisor usually gives full credit to ideas contributed by employees**

Figure 4.7 shows that 23% of the respondents disagreed while 39.7% agreed. It is clear from the above feedback that the majority of the employees are of the view that credit is given by supervisors for employee contributions.
Statement 3: My supervisor often criticizes employees over minor things

The majority of the respondents (30.7%) disagree with the statement that their supervisor criticizes them over minor things while 27% agreed with the statement.

Statement 4: My supervisor expects far too much from employees

The graph depicted in figure 4.9 shows that 32.3% of respondents disagree that their supervisor expects far too much of them while 31.7% agreed. The respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement was 14.3%. The view of the respondents is more or less balanced, their views could be influenced by their own perception or that of a group. Their length of experience and maturity could also negatively or positively influence it.
Statement 5: My supervisor really stands up for people

![Bar chart showing percentages of responses to the statement](chart.png)

**Figure 4.10: My supervisor really stands up for people**

Results indicated that 24% of the respondents disagreed while a majority of 37.3% agreed that their supervisors really stand up for them.

Statement 6: I am comfortable discussing my skills and weaknesses with my supervisor

![Bar chart showing percentages of responses to the statement](chart.png)

**Figure 4.11: I am comfortable discussing my skills and weaknesses with my supervisor**

Even though 23.3% of respondents disagreed with this statement, the overwhelming majority 41.7% agreed that they are comfortable discussing their skills weaknesses with their supervisors. This could indicate that employees feel confident about their growth and development within the company, hence their increased comfort.
Statement 7: My supervisor shares information with others that may influence my career path

![Figure 4.12: My supervisor share information with others that may influence my career path](chart)

The results indicated that 27% of the respondents disagreed while 24.3% agreed. A balance of 19.3% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Statement 8: My supervisor gives me coaching and guidance to help me achieve my work objectives

![Figure 4.13: My supervisor gives me coaching and guidance to help me achieve my work objectives](chart)

Results showed that 19.7% disagreed while the majority of respondents (42.7%) agreed that their supervisors are giving them coaching and guidance to achieve their work objectives.

Statement 9: I do not hesitate to inform my supervisors of a training need
Figure 4.14: I do not hesitate to inform my supervisors of a training need

In figure 4.14, 22.3% of the respondents disagreed while 46% of the respondents agreed that they do not hesitate to discuss their training needs with their supervisors. The respondents who neither agreed nor disagreed was 14%.

Statement 10: My supervisor ensures that I get the training and development needed for job effectiveness

Figure 4.15: My supervisor ensures that I get the training and development needed for job effectiveness

The results show that 27.7% disagreed while 35.3% agreed that their supervisor ensures that they get training and development for job effectiveness.
Statement 11: My supervisor provides me with specific feedback on my performance

![Bar graph showing responses to the statement](image)

**Figure 4.16: My supervisor provides me with specific feedback on my performance**

In the above figure, 33.3% of respondents disagreed and 32.7% agreed, 7.3% neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement. The results from the graph is closely balanced between agree and disagree.

### 4.3.2 Performance

Eight performance statements were included in the questionnaire. Employees had to measure their own performance relative to that of their co-workers. By comparing one’s own performance against that of other employees working in the same environment and, under the same conditions, can provide an important average. Items included addressed behavioural aspects and a review of self-performance.

Statement 12: I perform better than most of my colleagues

![Bar graph showing responses to the statement](image)

**Figure 4.17: I perform better than most of my colleagues**
Results from the above show that 7% of employees disagreed that they perform better than their colleagues do, while 28.7% neither agree nor disagree with the statement. The majority of the respondents (44%) reported that they perform better than most of their colleagues.

Statement 13: I am in the top 5 best serving employees

![Figure 4.18: I am in the top 5 best serving employees](image)

It was found that 14.3% of respondents disagreed while 33.7% agreed that they see themselves in the top five best performing employees. Quite a large percentage (30.3%) neither agreed nor disagreed which could indicate that they were relatively uncertain as to how their performance is being assessed or perceived by their supervisors and management.

Statement 14: I manage my work and time better than most

![Figure 4.19: I manage my work and time better than most](image)
Findings revealed that 8.3% disagreed while 48.7% of participants indicated that they manage their work and time better than their colleagues do.

Statement 15: I know more than other employees regarding what is going on with promotions

Figure 4.20: I know more than other employees regarding what is going on with promotions

The above results reflect that 13.7% of respondents disagreed while 42% agreed they are more aware of promotions than their fellow employees.

Statement 16: I know more than other employees regarding new company initiatives or developments

Figure 4.21: I know more than other employees regarding new company initiatives or developments
The majority of respondents rated their own awareness level pertaining to company initiatives/developments higher than that of their colleagues. A total of 19.7% disagreed with the statement while 31.3% agreed.

Statement 17: I know what customers expect from me

Figure 4.22: I know what customers expect from me

Only 2.3% of respondents disagreed with the statement whilst the majority of respondents (50.3%) confidently stated that they agree. This could indicate that most of the employees are unambiguous when it comes to knowing what customers expect from them.

Statement 18: I am good at my job

Figure 4.23: I am good at my job
From the results, 4.3% disagreed that they are good at their job while an overwhelming 44% of respondents agreed that they were good at their job. From the results, 8% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed.

Statement 19: I get more recognition for doing a good job than others

![Bar Chart](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Figure 4.24: I get more recognition for doing a good job than others**

Figure 4.24 reports that 16% of employees disagreed that they get more recognition that others while 35% of employees agreed. The results also showed that quite a large percentage of employees had no opinion on the above statement by neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

4.3.3 Role Ambiguity

Together with role conflict, role ambiguity is one of the components that relates to role stress. In this section, five items relating to role ambiguity were included in the questionnaire to assess the extent of employees understanding of their duties and role.
Statement 20: The goals and objectives of my job are clear

From the results, 13% of employees disagreed with the statement or indicated that they are unclear on the goals and objectives of their job while 53.7% of respondents indicated that they agree with the statement. Only 9.3% of the respondents indicated that they neither agree nor disagree.

Statement 21: I know what my responsibilities in the store are

From the above figure, 10.0% of respondents do not know the responsibilities of their job while 49.7% of respondents agreed with the statement. The results revealed that the majority of employees are less ambiguous about their responsibilities. Based on the results, it is
concerning that a combined percentage of 11.3% (both agreed and disagreed) don’t know what their responsibilities in the retail store entail.

Statement 22: I know exactly what is expected of me

Figure 4.27: I know exactly what is expected of me

Findings revealed that 13.7% of respondents disagreed while 44.3% agreed with the statement.

Statement 23: Explanations and tasks given to me are clear and easy to understand

Figure 4.28: Explanations and tasks given to me are clear and easy to understand

Responses to the above statement were very much in line with the preceding results and statements. Most respondents (47.3%) agreed that explanations given to them are clear and easy to understand, only 14.7% of respondents disagreed while 9.7% neither agreed nor disagreed.
Statement 24: I am often confused and unsure regarding my exact responsibilities

Figure 4.29: I am often confused and unsure regarding my exact responsibilities

In comparison to the preceding results, there is a higher degree of response to the uncertainty and confusion about exact responsibilities. Despite this, results in the above figure indicates that 32.3% of respondents disagree while 29.3% of respondents indicated that they agree with the statement.

4.3.4 Role Conflict

Role conflict occurs as a component of role stress together with role ambiguity and occurs when two conflicting demands compete with one another and the employee is unable to fulfil both sets of expectations (Schultz, Bagraim, Potgieter, Viedge and Werner, 2003:210). In the following graphs, the results of five statements are revealed.

Statement 25: I sometimes bend a company rule or policy in order to carry out a task more effectively

Figure 4.30: I sometimes bend a company rule or policy in order to carry out a task more effectively
Results from the above figure shows that 28.3% of respondents disagreed with the statement while 29.7% of respondents agreed that they sometimes bend a company rule in order to carry out a task more effectively. The scale of respondents that neither agreed nor disagreed was quite high (21.3%).

Statement 26: I sometimes receive tasks by more than one supervisor without them knowing that a task has already been assigned to me

![Figure 4.31: I sometimes receive tasks by more than one supervisor without them knowing that a task has already been assigned to me](image)

The above results clearly indicate that most of the respondents are of the same view that they sometimes receive tasks from more than one supervisor. A large percentage of respondents (45.3%) agreed with the statement while 19% disagreed.

Statement 27: I complete tasks in a way that might be acceptable to one person (e.g. supervisor) and not others

![Figure: 4.32: I complete tasks in a way that might be acceptable to one person (e.g. supervisor) and not others](image)
In the table above, 43% of participants surveyed agreed that they complete tasks in way that is acceptable to one supervisor but not another. Only 19.3% of respondents disagreed while 16.7% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Statement 28: I receive tasks or assignments without adequate resources and materials to execute it.

![Figure 4.33: I receive tasks or assignments without adequate resources and materials to execute it](image)

From the results, 25% disagreed while 31.3% agreed that they receive tasks without resources and materials to execute it.

Statement 29: Often I get asked to start with another job without finishing the first task

![Figure 4.34: Often I get asked to start with another job without finishing the first task](image)
Pertaining to the above statement, 24.7% of respondents disagreed while a majority 31.0% agreed.

### 4.3.5 Job Satisfaction

Although retailers have no control over employee’s emotions, they can, however, build relationships and create working conditions that foster and stimulate employee and job satisfaction. Nine items measuring job satisfaction formed part of the questionnaire. The results from these items is shown below.

**Statement 30: I consider my job rather unpleasant**

![Bar chart showing responses to Statement 30]

**Figure 4.35: I consider my job rather unpleasant**

Results from the above statement shows that 36% of respondents disagreed with finding their job unpleasant while 18.7% agreed.

**Statement 31: I am often bored with my job**

![Bar chart showing responses to Statement 31]

**Figure 4.36: I am often bored with my job**
The results show that 55.6% of employees disagreed with the above statement while 20.7% agreed.

Statement 32: I am satisfied with my current job

![Figure 4.37: I am satisfied with my current job](image)

While only 14.7% disagreed with this statement, 40.3% agreed and reported that they are satisfied with their current job. The feedback generally reveals a high level of job satisfaction amongst employees that participated in the study.

Statement 33: Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work

![Figure 4.38: Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work](image)

Most of the respondents disagreed with the above statement (31%) while 16.7% agreed. Having 16.7% of employees agreeing with the statement is concerning.
Statement 34: I definitely dislike my work

![Bar chart for Statement 34](image)

Figure 4.39: I definitely dislike my work

Results showed that the majority of respondents (39%) disagreed with not enjoying their work while 10.3% agreed with the statement.

Statement 35: Most days I am enthusiastic about my job

![Bar chart for Statement 35](image)

Figure 4.40: Most days I am enthusiastic about my job

From the results, 56% agreed with the statement while 23.7% disagreed.
Statement 36: My job is pretty uninteresting

Figure 4.41: My job is pretty uninteresting

It was found that 33.7% of respondents disagreed with the statement while 15% agreed that their job is uninteresting.

Statement 37: I find real enjoyment in my work

Figure 4.42: I find real enjoyment in my work

The results show that a large percentage of respondents have indicated that they find real enjoyment in their work by agreeing with the statement (42.3%) while only 11.3% disagreed.
Statement 38: I am disappointed that I ever took this job

Figure 4.43: I am disappointed that I ever took this job

The results from the above figure reported that 33% of respondents disagreed and 14.7% of respondents agreed.

4.4 Results from Statistical Analysis

4.4.1 Correlations between variables

The relationship between supervisor influence and role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict)

In order to establish whether there was a relationship between supervisor influence and role stress (role conflict, role ambiguity), the researcher correlated the individual averages on each of these variables.

Table 4.1: Correlation between supervisor influence and role conflict, role ambiguity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Influence</th>
<th>Role Ambiguity</th>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.378*</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results showed the following:

A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and role ambiguity ($r = .37$, p-value < 0.001). The findings indicate that an increase in supervisor influence increases role ambiguity. A negative correlation and no significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and role conflict, $r = -0.09$, p = 0.11. The findings of this study indicate that as supervisor influence increases, role conflict decreases. Role conflict is a phenomenon in the workplace that is expected to decrease with the increased influence from supervisors.

The relationship between supervisor influence and job satisfaction

In order to establish whether there was a relationship between supervisor influence and job satisfaction, an average was calculated for each participant. These averages were correlated using the Pearson correlations.

Table 4.2: Correlation between supervisor influence and job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Influence</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed the following:

A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and job satisfaction, $r = 0.28$, p < 0.001. The findings indicate that as supervisor influence increases, job satisfaction also increases.

The relationship between supervisor influence and performance

In order to establish whether there was a relationship between supervisor influence and performance, an average for this category was calculated. The score for the category was correlated with supervisor influence.
Table 4.3: Correlation between supervisor influence and performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Influence</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed the following:

A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and performance, $r = 0.26$, $p < 0.001$. The findings indicate that as supervisor influence increases, so does employee performance increase.

4.5 Reliability Statistics

Each statement within the questionnaire was measured on a 5-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". In order to understand whether the questions in this questionnaire all reliably measured the same, a Cronbach's alpha was run in SPSS.

Results of the Cronbach’s alpha reliability measure for the questionnaire:

Table 4.4: Results of Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Measure for the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions/ Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Influence</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alpha coefficient for the five sub-sections in the questionnaire was between 0.657 and 0.778. The results suggest that the questions in each sub-section had a moderate to relatively high internal consistency, taking into account that a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered to be "acceptable" in most social research situations.
4.6 One-way ANOVA

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to determine whether there were any significant differences between the means of the independent groups. The one way-ANOVA examined the effect of demographic factors (age group, job family, length of service and qualification) on the variables (performance, role ambiguity, role conflict, job satisfaction and supervisor influence). The results of the variables showed a significant interaction/relationship is reported on in greater detail below.

ANOVA by Job Category

Table 4.5: Anova by Job Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Influence</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results, as shown in the table above, indicate that there is a significant relationship between role ambiguity and job category. It also indicates a significant relationship between supervisor influence and job category.

Figure 4.44: Mean of Role Ambiguity
The first figure shows that those who belong to job family (Tills, Sales Floor and Stock room) are more likely to experience a lower degree of role ambiguity and more certainty towards their job functions. The second figure suggests that those who belong to job family (Admin, Sales Floor and Operations) perform better with increased supervisor influence.

ANOVA by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Influence</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this test indicated no significant relationship or interaction between any of the five variables and age group.
ANOVA by Length of Service

Table 4.7: Anova by Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Influence</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the above figure indicate that there is a significant interaction between role conflict and length of service and job satisfaction and length of service. The results suggest that different categories of lengths of service experience significant differences in role conflict and job satisfaction.

Figure 4.46: Mean of Role Conflict
The first figure shows that the age group, from 20 to 41 years old, experience a lesser degree of role conflict as opposed to the age group, over 41 years old, who experience a higher level of role conflict. In the second graph, employees at a younger age group experience the lowest level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction moderately increases in the age group older than 20, and then again decreases in the age group 31-40 years old. Job satisfaction significantly increases from 40 years old and moderately decreases again from 50 years and older.

**ANOVA by Qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Influence</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.504</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results indicate a significant interaction between role ambiguity and qualification, role conflict and qualification and job satisfaction and qualification.
Figure 4.48: Mean of Role Ambiguity

Figure 4.49: Mean of Role Conflict
In the above three tables, the results report a significant interaction/relationship between the variables. The first figure (role ambiguity) indicates that role ambiguity is very low with employees who have a primary education but increases as the education level increase and moderately stabilize amongst those employees who have a diploma. The second table indicates that role conflict is high in people who have attained a primary school level education but steadily decreases amongst employees who have a national diploma. In the third table, job satisfaction seems to be low amongst employees with primary education only. Job satisfaction thereafter gradually increases.

4.7 Discussion of the Results

4.7.1 Discussion of Demographics

The sample consisted of 300 employees from the retail food industry in the Cape Metropole. Evidence from the results indicated that females made up 71% of respondents while 29% of participants were males. The study revealed that more than two thirds (67%) of front line employees in the retail food industry are 30 years of age and younger. For many young employees, a job in the retail environment is their first exposure to real employment. Only 10.3% of employees who participated in the study were older than 40 years. The latter could be long serving employees who have been employed for several years and who could be seeing their job as a long-term career as opposed to being a short term "stepping stone".
According to the results, close to 80% of front line employees’ work directly with customers every day. Front line employees represent the retailer to its customers and are required to comply with basic customer service standards. Working with customers can often be a difficult task for front line employees as customers sometimes tend to display a demanding and arrogant attitude when confronted with unpleasant circumstances such as: out of stock products, expired or products of inferior quality, and an unpleasant shopping environment. Because front line employees are often the first representative in sight, customers are likely to vent their frustrations on them first. Often employees are unable to deal with conflict with customers. Customer conflict could demoralize an employee and could lead to role conflict. It is therefore vital that conflict management should be considered by retailers as one of its main training needs.

Length of employment often also depict the level of experience. 67.7% employees indicated that they had been working in a retail store for less than 4 years. The retail environment is generally categorized as an environment with a high labour turnover and, in which re-employment is a common phenomenon. The greatest personnel difficulty for retailers is probably the relative inexperience of a lot of their part-time workers: they may be more apt to be lackadaisical, late, absent or quit their jobs and therefore require close supervision.

Findings from the results indicate that 2.7% of participants only have primary education while 30.7% of employees have completed school up to grade 9. The results indicate that a large part of the retail front-line work force represents employees who have just finished school or their grade 9. For many employees in this category, a part-time job in retail is their first chance of getting exposure and experience in the job market. Because retailers are faced with such a high labour turn-over they find themselves constantly re-hiring willing and potential employees. At first, potential job candidates appear to be eager to take up their first job opportunity but re-consider their employment after being exposed to long trading hours and working conditions generally associated with super market retailing.

4.7.2 Discussion of Research Constructs

4.7.2.1 Supervisor influence

Effective supervisor influence is without doubt important to ensuring that front line employees efficiently, effectively and cohesively work together to achieve the day-to-day and operational objectives of the retail company. Front line staff highly valued the influence and involvement from supervisors across several statements in this sub-category, however, respondents have
largely indicated that their supervisors lack sharing and influencing their career paths. The majority of respondents have indicated that their supervisors do not share specific feedback with them on their performance or tasks assigned to them. As result of the latter, supervisor influence on employees’ development and partial lack of specific feedback on performance related outcomes could have a negative impact on role ambiguity and job satisfaction, especially if it can negatively influence employees career paths. Interestingly, respondents had a more or less balanced view on the amount of expectations supervisors expect from them and, the manner in which supervisors tend to talk to employees, i.e. (Statement 1: My supervisor tends to talk down to employees).

Converting the responses into an average score, which would indicate the extent to which the employees experience the overall level of influence from their supervisor, obtained an average of 3.08 (SD: 0.59) for females and 3.13 (SD: 0.69) for males. This corresponds closest to the option ‘Neither agree nor disagree’. This suggests that employees are moderately happy/ unhappy with the support they receive. The average was calculated by taking into account whether the statement was phrased as negative or positive, and converting the responses accordingly. The same was done for the averages calculated below.

### 4.7.2.2 Performance

The majority of respondents are of the opinion that they are more knowledgeable when it comes to promotions and company initiatives. The high agreeable self-performance measurement scores could have been foreseeable as employees are more likely to assess themselves more favourably compared to their colleagues. Greenberg and Barron (2008: 106) found that people’s ratings of others performance depend on the extent to which that performance is consistent with their initial expectations. Employees often attempt to make themselves look good to their superiors (Greenberg and Barron 2008:107).

The results indicated an average 3.08 (SD: 0.615) for female respondents and 3.61 (SD 0.523) for males' respondents both of which correspond closest to the option 'Neither agree nor disagree'. This suggests that employees are moderately certain about their own performance. The average was calculated by taking into account whether the statement was phrased as negative or positive, and converting the responses accordingly.
4.7.2.3 Role Stress (Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict)

Role ambiguity

In all of the above statements, respondents have reported that they are unambiguous on statements such as, exact job responsibilities, knowing what is expected from them by both their supervisors and customers, and that tasks issued to them are both clear and easy to understand. The results reported an above 50% average for all agreeable statements. However, the results for the disagreed statements cannot be ignored as it reveals an important task to managers and supervisors.

Furthermore, the results indicated an average 3.83 (SD: 0.742) for female respondents and 3.58 (SD 0.819) for male respondents which corresponds closest to the option ‘Neither agree nor disagree’. This suggests that employees are fairly certain about their functions. The average was calculated by taking into account whether the statement was phrased as negative or positive, and converting the responses accordingly.

Role conflict

Results from the above statements revealed that role conflict commonly occurs in the retail work environment. More respondents agreed with the statements as opposed to respondents that did not agree while, on average, more than 10% of respondents across all the statements in this section neither agreed nor disagreed. The results indicated an average 3.13 (SD: 0.813) for female respondents and 3.22 (SD 0.828) for male respondents which corresponds closest to the option ‘Neither agree nor disagree’. This suggests that employees are certain about the impact of conflicting tasks and the stress it creates. The average was calculated by taking into account whether the statement was phrased as negative or positive, and converting the responses accordingly.

4.7.2.4 Job satisfaction

This section reported on nine statements that formed part of the questionnaire. Overall, an above average level of job satisfaction was evident from the results reported in the above findings. Well over 50% of respondents are pleased that they took a job in a retail food store and find real enjoyment in their work. Respondents with no specific opinion were considerably high and averaged above 15% over all of the above statements. The results indicated an average of 3.58 (SD: 0.697) for female respondents and 3.49 (SD 0.777) for male respondents which corresponds closest to the option ‘Neither agree nor disagree’. This
suggests that employees are, above average, satisfied with their jobs. The average was calculated by taking into account whether the statement was phrased as negative or positive, and converting the responses accordingly.

4.7.3 Discussion of results pertaining to the research question

What kind of relationship exists between supervisors’ reported behaviour and employees’ role stress, self-rated employee performance, and job satisfaction?

The Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine what kind of relationship exists between supervisors’ reported behaviour and employees’ role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict), self-rated employee performance, and job satisfaction. A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and role ambiguity ($r=0.37$, $p$-value $<0.001$). The findings indicate that an increase in supervisor influence increases role ambiguity. Employees who rely on supervisory guidance and who are used to supervisory staff providing them with resources and support to complete tasks could perform poorly if they perceive the support to be inadequate. In the absence of the supervisor, employees may react uncertain and may even be afraid to complete certain tasks. This could mainly be because of their fear that disciplinary action might follow if tasks are incorrectly implemented. The findings are supported by Babin and Boyles (1996) who argued that supervisory support can actually have a negative impact on role ambiguity in the long term. In fact, they state: “too much support might diminish an employee’s performance creativity since he or she becomes unwilling to breach any management procedures in fulfilling his or her perceived role” (Babin and Boyles, 1996).

The latter and the findings are further supported by a study conducted by Mariani, Gcaba and Dalton, (2003) who suggest that an employee could respond to the management style of a supervisor perceived to be unprofessional, selective and/or suppressive, identified as the main stressor – creating stress condition (role ambiguity and role conflict) or a stimulus. An increase in supervisor influence is, therefore, not always ideal as employees could find the increased level of influence overwhelming and possibly see it as limitation to their ability to work independently as well as the supervisor's trust in them.

A negative correlation and no statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and role conflict, $r=-0.09$, $p=0.11$. The findings of this study indicate that as supervisor influence increases, role conflict decreases. Role conflict is a phenomenon in the workplace that is expected to decrease with increased influence from supervisors. This study supports a research study conducted by Botha (2007) who found that an increase in
supervisory support contributed to a reduction in role conflict. This is further supported by a study by Shanock and Eisenberger, (2006) who found that when supervisors are supportive of subordinates, this treatment leads to favourable outcomes for the employee, and the organization, such as reduced role stress.

A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and job satisfaction, \( r= 0.28, p<0.001 \). The findings indicate that as supervisor influence increases, so too does job satisfaction increase. Employees who regard supervisors as being concerned about their careers and their development may be more satisfied with their job. The findings of this study are corroborated by study by Mc Gillis, McGilton, Petroz and Woodcis, (2007) who concluded that supervisors have a positive effect on job satisfaction. The results of their study are supported by the study conducted by Okediji, Etuk and Nnedum (2011) who also concluded that supervisors significantly influence job satisfaction.

A positive correlation and statistically significant relationship was found between supervisor influence and performance, \( r= 0.26, p<0.001 \). The findings indicate that as supervisor influence increases so too does employee performance increase. The researcher was expecting this result because it is generally expected that more supervisor influence would increase performance. This result thus indicates that an employee’s performance is indeed increased by increased supervisor influence. A supportive study by Okedij, Etuk and Nnedum, (2011) indicated that supervisory support has been shown to significantly influence job satisfaction. With the increase of job satisfaction, performance is generally expected to increase. The latter is supported by a study by Trivellas, Reklitis and Platis (2013) who state that job satisfaction is considered to be a crucial individual outcome which drives performance. The supervisor plays an instrumental role in the level of job satisfaction which evidently increases performance amongst employees who are more satisfied with their jobs.

The findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between supervisor influence and role ambiguity, and no significant relationship between supervisor influence and role conflict. Furthermore, the findings revealed a significant relationship between supervisor influence and job satisfaction and, performance. The research question was answered based on the above findings.
4.8 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the data analysis and discussed the results of a survey that has been conducted in several retail food stores across the Cape Metropolitan area. It discussed details of the data analysis and presented findings in order to establish the extent of supervisors’ influence on role stress, performance and job satisfaction.

The findings gave insight into the respondents’ views on several statements pertaining to specific but, related components that made up the questionnaire. It specifically related to the influence of supervisors on constructs such as role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict), performance and job satisfaction. The following chapter presents conclusions, recommendations and future research possibilities.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter the data was analysed and discussed. The research question was answered referencing the statistical results. This chapter concludes the study. Based on this, recommendations for further study on role stress, performance and job satisfaction are provided. It is hoped that the findings contained in this study would be useful for practitioners and academics who seek further understanding of the supervisors' influence in the retail environment. It is important to note that throughout this research study role stress is understood to be comprising two important related components, namely role ambiguity and role conflict, which is consistent with the stated objective of this study.

5.2 Conclusions with regards to the research objective

- The results of the survey have indicated that supervisors have significant influence on role stress: ambiguity and conflict. Supervisor influence on role stress comprises an interplay, in varying degrees, between the two elements of role ambiguity and role conflict. This balance depends on the types/nature of influence offered by the supervisor.
- The results also indicate that supervisors have significant influence on employee performance. The mediating variable (influence) suggest that an increase in supervisor influence leads to increased job satisfaction; influencing of this variable (influence) determines the degree of influence by supervisors’.

Based on the results presented in chapter four, this study finds that supervisors have notable influence on some elements of role stress (significant for ambiguity, but not significant for conflict), job satisfaction (significant) and performance (significant). These findings contribute to the understanding of the perceived influence of the supervisor over role stress, job satisfaction and performance. This understanding is represented as follows:

**Role Stress (ambiguity and conflict)** - The increase in supervisors’ influence leads to increased role ambiguity, however, an increase in supervisors’ influence also leads to a decrease in role conflict. It can therefore be concluded that perceived supervisor influence on role stress is balanced in this instance.

**Job satisfaction** - Increased supervisor influence leads to increased job satisfaction. It can therefore be concluded that an increase in perceived supervisor influence has a positive effect on employees’ job satisfaction.

**Performance** - Increased perceived supervisor influence also conclusively leads to increased performance levels. It can therefore be concluded that perceived supervisor influence
positively impacts on performance. Increased job satisfaction and increased performance are both generally good for the retail organization and its customers as they stand to benefit from the increase in employee performance and employees who are satisfied with their jobs, i.e. service will generally be more efficient with a friendlier and a positive employee attitude.

**Supervisor influence**

From the results, a combined percentage of 54.7% (with 41.7% agreeing and 13% strongly agreeing) responded positively that they are comfortable with discussing their skills and weaknesses with their supervisors. Supervisor influence is, without doubt, important in ensuring that employees efficiently, effectively and cohesively work together to achieve the day-to-day and operational objectives of the retail company and to meet customer expectations. From the perspective of the employee, the results gave particular insight into the important role that supervisors fulfil. It is therefore important that retail organizations should consider placing emphasis on continuously providing support to supervisors, to upskill them to be able to effectively influence the supervisor-employee relationship, and to meet the demands of the supervisory role.

**Role Stress (Role ambiguity and Role conflict)**

From the results presented in chapter four, several respondents have reported that that they are unambiguous and clearly understand their exact responsibilities and know what is expected from them by their supervisors. Although the average for all agreeable statements was above 50%, the results for the disagreed statements cannot be ignored as it reveals an important task to retail organizations, particular to the influence of supervisors. Based on the findings from the descriptive statistics, role conflict is a common occurrence in the retail setting which decreases with the increase of supervisor influence. The increased influence of supervisors can therefore be seen as positive especially if it results in role conflict decreasing. The findings further contribute to a better understanding of the perceived supervisors’ influence on role stress.

**Job satisfaction**

Based on the descriptive statistics, well over 50% of respondents are pleased that they have taken a job in a retail setting and have indicated that they find real enjoyment in their work. This further supports the hypothesis that job satisfaction increases with increased supervisor influence. It can therefore be concluded that supervisors have a positive influence on job satisfaction which is good for the retail organization because, employees who are
experiencing increased job satisfaction could also positively contribute to a decrease in absenteeism, an increase in job retention and a positive work culture.

**Performance**

From the results, it can be seen that performance increases with increased supervisor influence. This finding thus leads to a better understanding of the supervisors’ influence on performance. Employees who perform better are generally more productive. The increased productivity is positive for the retail organization and its customers and could yield better work outputs and improved results.

**5.3 Recommendations**

The findings from the demographic information obtained in this study is noteworthy. It is recommended that retail managers take a closer look at the information and incorporate it into their training and recruitment plans/strategies. It is widely known that the workforce has changed since 2000. Findings from the study indicate that 67% of employees are below 30 years old and 67.7% have less than 4 years’ work experience. Human resource practices, training and communication strategies are key areas that retailers need to evaluate in order to more effectively appeal to a younger work force.

More than a quarter of the participants in the study only had a qualification up to grade 9. Retailers should consider prioritizing and offering employees the opportunity to complete their grade 12 or national senior certificate. By doing this, retailers could greatly benefit by possibly seeing a more committed and dedicated employee that could be willing to work for the organization for much longer. This would also meet key developmental and transformational needs for South Africa at this current time. This would also be in support of education and lifelong learning. An educated, motivated workforce would be a key driver of improved service levels and growth in the Retail Sector.

Working with customers can often be a difficult task for front line employees, as customers frequently tend to display a demanding and arrogant attitude when confronted with unpleasant circumstances such as: out of stock items, expired or goods of inferior quality and an unpleasant shopping environment. Because front line employees are often the first representative in sight, customers are likely to vent their frustrations on them first. Customer conflict could easily demoralize an employee. With rising reported levels of, for example, road rage and violence towards women it is clear that employees will increasingly be exposed to these situations of conflict. It is therefore important that conflict management should be considered by retailers as one of its main training needs when new employees
start with the company and continued through with subsequent support mechanisms where employees can vent or express their frustrations experienced during difficult customer interactions. The results of this study indicated that 80% of employees in a retail store setting directly work with customers on a daily basis.

Front line supervisors are often employees who are promoted to supervisory positions. The new roles that they are required to fulfil dramatically changes from that of a general employee. Every newly appointed supervisor should be accredited with a nationally recognized supervisory certificate within the first six months of being in the new position. This will greatly set up the supervisor to be able to deal more effectively with the challenges that s/ he would be facing with employees, managers, customers and the day-to-day demands of the retail environment. Considering the influence that supervisors have on role stress, job satisfaction and employee performance, induction, training and coaching should serve as priority for every retail organization. In house Brand Awareness Programmes Would also not go amiss.

5.4 Future Research Possibilities

This study has focussed on food retail stores in the Cape Metropolitan area. A similar study may be conducted in other provinces to determine the consistency of findings from this study. In this study only, the influence of the supervisor was considered, however, there could be more influencing factors (i.e. work environment, line managers and co-workers) that might have an influence on role stress, job satisfaction and performance. Future research should take this into consideration and conduct further studies to develop this field of study.

Another future research possibility is to investigate the perspective from the supervisor’s themselves, and to determine what they perceive to be their need in order to be equipped to motivate and support employees.

5.5 Limitations of the study

One of the limitations was finding retail stores to participate in this study. Not every store that was contacted by telephone was willing to participate. In some cases, the researcher had to personally visit some stores to explain the context of the research before access was granted to employees.

Not all of the respondents were available at the same time. Often the researcher had to wait for an ideal opportunity to conduct the survey. The most appropriate time was either before/after shifts or during employees’ lunch time. The venues were not always controlled as
meetings were conducted in the cafeteria/dining room section. This could have impacted the quality of answering the statements due to the uncontrolled noise levels.

5.6 General Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to investigate the potential influence of the supervisor on role-stress, performance and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area. Specifically, the study was conducted from the perspective of employees and relied on their perception of supervisors’ influence and how this affected role stress, performance and job satisfaction. Generalisations further made below is beyond the findings are stated qualitatively from the perspective and experience of the researcher.

Employees who tend to rely on supervisory guidance and who are used to supervisory staff providing them with resources and support to complete tasks could perform poorly if they don’t receive on-going support. In the absence of the supervisor, employees may react uncertainly and may be afraid of starting or completing a task. This could mainly be because of their fear that disciplinary action might follow if tasks are incorrectly implemented. Increased supervisor influence is therefore not always ideal as employees could find the increased level of influence overwhelming and possibly see it as limitation to their ability to work independently and may perceive this as proof of the supervisor’s lack of trust in them. In light thereof, the supervisor should be cognisant of the degree of involvement provided to employees as too much influence can be damaging to the employee.

The supervisors’ influence might not be the only factor that influences the increase in employee ambiguity. Ambiguity could also be as a result of the employee’s own lack of competence to perform instructions from the supervisor. The employee’s personal level of confidence in him/herself to be able to effectively interpret or understand what is required could also determine why ambiguity tends to increase.

Furthermore, the work environment itself could also be an influencing factor resulting in the employee experiencing an increase level of ambiguity (i.e. long working hours, unclear job descriptions, lack of training, peer pressure). The influence from supervisors’ might not be the only influencing factor resulting in an increase in employee ambiguity as there are many other factors that can also be considered. For the purpose of this study, supervisor influence was concluded as an influencing factor that increased employee ambiguity as stated above.

Earlier in this study, it was indicated that the majority of employees agreed that supervisors are often unaware that a task has already been assigned to the employee and tend to issue
additional instructions without checking first. This put the employee under pressure as s/he could possibly be reluctant to challenge or inform the supervisor of the current task at hand. It may therefore be concluded that role conflict is generally expected to decrease with increased supervisor influence.

Based on the findings of this particular study, it is therefore concluded that supervisors have a significant influence on employee performance. As supervisors’ influence increase, so too does employee performance. The employee could be looking at the supervisor for different types of support and by giving support, it provides a degree of stimulus which could encourage the employee to perform better. If retailers want to increase productivity of their employees, they can encourage and train the supervisor to assess whether an employee might require a degree of support. The supervisor plays an instrumental role in the level of job satisfaction which evidently increases performance amongst employees who are generally more satisfied with their jobs.

Employees who regard supervisors as being more concerned about employees’ careers and their development may be more satisfied with their job. Employees who are satisfied in their jobs not only perform better but, can also feel more encouraged to provide a better level of service to customers. Retailers can see this as a positive sign as this can potentially influence additional sales and increase the frequency of customers returning to the retail store because of the service received from employees who generally experience a higher degree of job satisfaction. Supervisors play an important role in stimulating employees’ degree of job satisfaction. It is therefore important that supervisors must have the ideal skill set to be able to motivate, effectively guide and coach employees.

The literature review clearly outlined the retail environment in South Africa in comparison to the global retail environment. Chapter 2 formed the framework of the research study and explored the research constructs in relation to the title of this study. A considerable amount of literature was found on closely related research studies but, it was evident that very little literature explored the topic of this research in the context of the South African retail environment.

The methodology used for data collection and analysis of the study is discussed in chapter 3. A quantitative research method was used and structured questionnaires’ that aimed to collect data from employees were handed out randomly to participants.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis and discussion of results. The results of the data collected were computed using the SPSS computer program. The results answered the
research question of this study which was also presented in this chapter. The Pearson correlation analysis determined that there was a significant relationship between supervisor influence and role ambiguity, and no significant relationship between supervisor influence and role conflict. Furthermore, the findings reveal a significant relationship between supervisor influence and job satisfaction and performance.

Chapter 5 presented conclusions in support of the research objective and gives recommendations to retail practitioners and academics. It also presents future research possibilities which can be explored to add value to existing studies and available literature. It is concluded that supervisors have a statistically significant influence on role ambiguity, performance and job satisfaction and no significant influence on role conflict.
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APPENDIX A: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH

Title: The Influence of Supervisors on Role Stress, Performance and Job Satisfaction in the Retail Food Industry in the Cape Metropolitan area

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jacques Oostendorf, from the Business Faculty of the Cape Peninsula University of Technology. You were selected as a possible respondent in this study because you are currently employed within the retail food industry which makes you ideally suited to participate.

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to attempt filling the research gap by investigating the potential influence of supervisors on employees’ role-stress, performance and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape Metropolitan area.

2. PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you would be requested to do the following:

- Carefully read the instructions of the questionnaire
- Complete it to the best of your ability (taking approximately 8 – 10 minutes)
- On completion, please hand it directly back to the researcher

3. POTENTIAL RISK AND DISCOMFORTS
There is no foreseen risk to either yourself or your company in completing the questionnaire.

4. POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO THE RETAIL FOOD INDUSTRY
The results of the study will be made available to students studying Retail Business Management, Human Resource Management and anyone that would like to access it through the CPUT library for further research may do so. The major findings will also be disseminated to participating companies.
5. **PAYMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION**
Each participant will receive a free pen as a token of appreciation for completing the questionnaire.

6. **CONFIDENTIALITY**
The questionnaire is completely anonymous and confidential and will not require you to reveal your personal identity or your company's operational details. This study is purely for academic purpose and not for any government or company investigation. The information supplied by you will be kept confidential and will be used for the purpose of the research investigation only.

7. **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**
You can choose whether to participate in this study or not. If you volunteer to participate, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study.

8. **IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS**
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact:

**Researcher:** Jacques Oostendorf  
Cell: 072 7339090  
Email: jacquesoostendorf@gmail.com

**Supervisor:** Mr. Onojaefe Darlington  
Tel: 021-460 9019
CAPE PENINSULA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

TITLE: The influence of supervisors on role stress, performance and job satisfaction in the retail food industry in the Cape metropolitan area

Dear Respondent

The attached questionnaire is for a research investigation in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of a Master’s Degree (M. Tech) in Business Administration at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology in Cape Town.

The questionnaire is completely anonymous and confidential and will not require you to reveal your personal identity or your company’s operational details. This study is purely for academic purpose and not for any government or company investigation. The information supplied by you will be kept confidential and will be used for the purpose of the research investigation only.

For further enquiries feel free to contact me or alternatively you may also contact my supervisor, Mr. Onojaefe Darlington on (021) 460 9019.

The questionnaire should take approximately 8 to 10 minutes to complete.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

Yours Sincerely,

JACQUES OOSTENDORF
Cell: 072 733 9090
Email: jacquesoostendorf@gmail.com

SECTION ONE
**INSTRUCTION:** Kindly read each statement carefully and indicate your level of agreement by marking with an X in the appropriate box. Please give only one response for each statement. Ratings 1 indicates that you strongly disagree with a statement and ratings 5 indicates that you strongly agree with the statement.

### CATEGORY: SUPERVISOR INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor tends to talk down to employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor usually gives full credit to ideas contributed by employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor often criticizes employees over minor things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor expects far too much from employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor really stands up for people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable discussing my skills weaknesses with my supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor share information with others that may influence my career path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gives me coaching and guidance to help me achieve my work objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not hesitate to inform my supervisors of a training need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor ensure that I get the training and development needed for job effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor provides me with specific feedback on my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY: PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I perform better than most of my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am in the top 5 best serving employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I manage my work and time better than most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know more than other employees regarding what is going on with promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know more than other employees regarding new company initiatives or developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what customers expect from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get more recognition for doing a good job than others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CATEGORY: ROLE AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The goals and objectives of my job are clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I know what my responsibilities in the store are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I know exactly what is expected of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Explanations and tasks given to me are clear and easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I am often confused and unsure regarding my exact responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY: ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I sometimes bend a company rule or policy in order to carry out a task more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I sometimes receive tasks by more than one supervisor without them knowing that a task has already been assigned to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I complete tasks that may be acceptable to one person (eg. supervisor) and not others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I receive tasks or assignments without adequate resources and materials to execute it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Often, I get ask to start with another job without finishing the first task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATEGORY: JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I consider my job rather unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am often bored with my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am satisfied with my current job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I definitely dislike my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Most days I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My job is pretty uninteresting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I find real enjoyment in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I am disappointment that I ever took this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION TWO – DEMOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>What is your age?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Please indicate your job family (tick where you spend most of your time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Till operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other: (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>How long have you been employed by your current employer?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 – 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Please indicate your highest level of educational qualification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Senior Certificate (Grade 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s Degree or above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>