The Strategy Implementation Approach as an Alternative to Improving Programmes Implementation in Zimbabwe's Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs): The Case of a Selected Peace Building NGO

Samuel M.Gumbe (PhD)
Faculty of Commerce,University of Zimbabwe

Anesu W.Vere
Graduate School of Management,University of Zimbabwe

Abstract

Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in a majority of cases depend on donors for funding. However the global economic crisis has left many traditional donors with very limited financial resources to fund NGOs. As a way of ensuring that the little resources that are at their disposal are efficiently utilised, donors are now targeting NGOs that have sound corporate governance structures and are engaged in sustainable programmes that have the greatest impact on the communities that they serve. This has created intense competition among NGOs, including those operating in Zimbabwe, as they jockey for donor support. However the allocation that Zimbabwe's NGOs are receiving compared to other countries is relatively small. This paper proposes that the reason why Zimbabwe's NGOs are not receiving a large share of donor funding is that they are poorly implementing programmes. This poor implementation has resulted in programmes lacking sustainability and having little impact on communities. To assess the study's proposal, the study used the qualitative research approach. Semi structured interviews were conducted with management from a selected peace building NGO. The findings confirm that there are weaknesses in programmes implementation, mainly related to poor systems-poor programme planning processes, weak financial and human resources policies, and a weak organisational culture. The study recommends that the NGO institutes effective project planning and implementation, human and financial resources management systems. These recommended systems will inadvertently strengthen the organisation's culture.

Keywords: Implementation, sustainable, programme, Non-Governmental Organisation, strategy.

1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that in the majority of cases NGOs rely upon donors for financing. According to the Economist (2000), in recent years the increased number of NGOs that are competing for donor funds has resulted in constrained amounts and levels of funding available for the NGOs. The donor community have looked into financing arrangements; preference is now on formations of coalitions of "like minded donors" or in regional coalitions. This has meant that there is now additional effort for NGOs competing for the meagre funds to emerge as the leaders in best practice of governance, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, timelines and sustainability. One way that has been suggested as a definite route to receiving limited financial resources has been the adoption of strategic management practices in implementing community based projects. The argument has been that strategic management approaches create sustainable programmes and also promotes transparency in them.

This study sought to establish the strategic management variables that may be applied to enhance community based project implementation thereby creating winning NGOs.

2. Background to the study

Generally the socio economic and political conditions in Zimbabwe are unfavourable for NGO operations. The environment is characterised by a marked decline in the socio economic conditionswhich in turn has had a negative impact on the political climate (NANGO, 2013). As a result of these two factors operations of NGOs have been viewed with a lot of suspicion by the Zimbabwean government (NANGO, ibid). The situation has been further compounded by the heavily disputed plebiscites that have taken place in Zimbabwe since 2000 (Besada and Moyo, 2008) and theglobaleconomic recession. Traditional donor countries have not been eager to fund NGOs operating in Zimbabwe due to its perceived human rights abuses. Further to that the global economic recession has seen a significant decline in funds channelled to the United Nations, European Union or the USAID for aid to the developing countries. Thus local NGOs have been caught up in this web and funding has significantly dropped. NANGO in 2013 carried out a study on the challenges facing NGOs in Zimbabwe and their findings were that there was heavy financial dependence on foreign funding. The study also identifiesduplication of efforts among NGOs, lack of governance and leadership, poor management and

administrative systems inadequate project implementation systems and lack of sustainability in the community projects initiated by the NGOs as the other challenges.

3. Statement of the problem

The NANGO study reveals that donors are reducing their funding to Zimbabwe's NGOs; however the few donors that are still providing funding are being frustrated by the NGOs inability to come up with sustainable community projects due to their poor general management and project management systems.

This study therefore sought to investigate the factors that have affected effective implementation of project strategies. The study's specific objectives were to:

    a. identify the key elements required to effectively and sustainably implement community based projects;

    b. identify gaps that are being experienced by Zimbabwe's NGOs in implementing their community based projects; and

    c. recommendsteps or strategies that Zimbabwe based NGOs may adopt to ensure effective, sustainable and transparent project implementation.

4. Research Questions

To achieve the above objectives the study used the following research questions:

    a. howdo NGOs handle issues to do with project implementation?

    b. are the lines of communication in so far as project implementation clear in the organisation?

    c. what is the role of the internal and external stakeholders in project implementation?

    d. who controls the allocation of resources in the organisations?

5. Study proposition

Zimbabwe's NGOs can enhance their ability to attract funding and improve their management and implementation of community based projects by adopting the strategy implementation approach.

6. Study justification

The study will enable Zimbabwe based NGOs developeffective and transparent project implementation methods thereby enabling them to attract donor support and satisfy stakeholder expectations. While the study primarily focuses on benefitting Zimbabwe's NGOs, other NGOs elsewhere but in similar circumstances also stand to benefit from the study.

7. Research methodology

The study used the qualitative approach and was a case study of one NGO that is involved in peace building through managing conflict. The case study method is recommended by Zikmund et al (2010) when he posits that case studies are used to provide a clear description of relationships that exist in reality among various factors. Zikmund et al (ibid) further argues that case studies allow one to have a clear and in-depth understanding of issues as they allow researchers to study the phenomenon in its natural setting. The case study NGO operates in 34 countries worldwide and is headquartered in Washington D.C. The Zimbabwe chapter of the NGO has a staff compliment of 15 eight of whom are managers. In Zimbabwe the organisation works through selected implementing partners in fulfilling its mandate. Since the study sought to establish the organisation's gaps in project implementation, the research targeted the managers in the NGO who are tasked with the responsibility of realising the organisation's vision and objectives. Thus the study's population and was all the organisation's managers and these were purposively selected. Given that they are only eight managers a census of the managers was therefore adopted in gathering data. The study used in-depth interviews through a structured interview guide in data collection.Wegner (2007) asserts that where one is interviewing a number of respondents it is better to use the structured interview as other forms of interview like semi-structured or unstructured interviews will yield inconsistent data. The data collected was processed using N-VIVO. Respondents were assured that their responses and identities would be kept confidential and would be used for purposes of this study alone.

8. Literature review

8.1 What is strategy?

Saravanan and Rao (2007) argue that strategy is a preferred path that an organization adopts to achieve its set objectives. He adds that this path is guided by the Vision (where it would like to reach) and the Mission (what it would like to do)"

        The term has been expanded in the recent years to incorporate in its connotation the managerial skills necessary in overcoming organisational difficulties and forces while at the same time steering the firm towards the attainment of its goals, (Mintzberg, Quinn and Goshal, 1995). Thus this approach in understanding strategy has given emphasis on the idea that strategy is a rational decision, which has been consciously chosen and

undertaken to bring into reality an organisation's desired goals (Artto and Dietrich, 2008).

8.2 What is Strategy Implementation?

According to Li, et al (2008) there is no universal definition of strategy implementation. Li, et al (ibid) asserts that in effect, there are three categories with which the definition of strategy implementation is grouped. These are the process perspective, the behaviour or action perspective and the combination of process and action which is termed as the hybrid perspective.

Under the process perspective, strategy implementation is defined as the process which, follows immediately after formal strategy selection, when broad objectives are translated into action plans, schedules, budgets and metrics (Claudiu, Flaviu and Georgeta-Madalina, 2008, p. 106). Harrington (2006) defined the concept as the process of an iterative *process* of executing strategies, policies, programs and action plans that give the organization the latitude to make use of its internal resource base to capitalize on the presented opportunities in the environment and economic sphere it operates in. Lehner (2004) arguesthat strategy implementation is not just a phase in an organisation's strategy. To him it is the response that the organization has to the stimuli which could be change in the external or internal variables that affect the organisation. Therefore strategy implementation forces organisations to continually learn and adapt to changes in the environment that they operate in.

On the other hand the behavior or action perspective views strategy implementation as encapsulating both internal and external actions done by the organisation with the primary objective of achieving the set strategic objectives (Varadarajan, 1999). Schaap (2006) posits that it is those *senior-level* leadership behaviours and activitiesthat will transform a working plan into a concrete reality. Noble (2009) views strategy implementation as a series of interventions concerning organisational structures, key personnel takingactions, and control systems designed to control performance with respect to desired ends.

Lastly the hybrid approach which in essence is a combination of the action and process views argues that strategy implementation isan action-oriented process which needs proper systems of controls and sound administrative structures and systems (Govindarajan, 1988). In other words, the perspective views strategy implementation as a combination of activities and actions undertaken to attain desired goals. These actions, however, are implemented step-by-step (Singh, 1998; and Smith and Kofron, 1996).

However a limitation with these perspectives is their silence regarding the value of the contribution of non-managerial workers toward the achievement of the goals of the firm (Li et al, 2008).

Despite the identified weakness of the perspectives, the truism about strategy implementation is that, whether it is deemed as an action, activity or process, it recognised and adopted by organisations for the attainment of a particular goal or vision and for their survival in the competitive global market.

8.3 Key Factors in Strategy Implementation

Okomus(2001); Li et al, (2008) and Artto& Dietrich (2008) all agree that organisations that seek to establish a 'fit' between themselves and the external environment thereby providing them with opportunities for gaining competitive advantage that is quantified through increase market share and growth need to recognise the following variables.

a. *Strategy formulation.* Strategy formulation is considered as the initial phase or the first element in strategy implementation (Van der Merwe, 2002). It is postulateda clear strategy provides the conceptual framework within which the strategy is to be undertaken (Singh, 1998). Good execution or implementation of strategy cannot overcome bad planning or shortfalls in strategy formulations (Hbereniak, 2006). A good strategy is therefore defined as one that is flexible enough to allow change when it is necessary.

b. *Relationship among different units/ departments and different strategy levels.* The importance of the relationship among the different units or departments rests on the supposition that each department/unit performs a particular function and addresses a specific need that is integral in attaining the success of the strategy implementation. In this regard, functional competencies, resource allocation, decision-making participation, coordination, possible conflicts and interdepartmental functional dependency are clearly manifest in the existing relationship among the units (Walker and Reukart, 1987). The interdependence among the departments creates synergy while maintaining the autonomy of each department as information and knowledge are shared among the departments. However, there are cases wherein departmental competition is encouraged by the organization itself (Berger, 2003). However studies have shown that while this increases individual departmental productivity, the practice has no significant positive effect in the overall productivity of the organization. Instead, it fosters fragmentation in the inter-organisational structure which, in the long run is detrimental to the firm as each department pursues its own agenda resulting in uncoordinated and establish a

hostile working environment as each department competes with one another (Berger, 2003). Implementation success is harnessed by coordination and communication among the departments and is hampered by conflict (Chimhanzi, 2004). In fact, lack of linkage among the departments is considered as one weakness that has to be addressed (Loch, 2000).

c. *Organisational structure.* Organisational structure is the "sum total of the ways in which the organisations divides its labour into distinct tasks and then achieves co-ordination among them" (Mintzberg, 2003, p. 66). The structure presents the integration and differentiation of the various works involve in the tasks (Van Der Merwe, 2002). Integration because it is requisite that co-ordination among those who are involved in the work be maintained while at the same time it differentiates and demarcates one function from another as the work requires being broken down to several tasks each contributing differently toward the fulfillment of the work or goal. The structure of the organization is normally seen in the organisational chart. This is important in the strategy implementation since it shows the "authority relationship in the chain of command, formal channels of communication, formal work groups and formal lines of accountability" (Van Der Merwe, 2002, p. 403).

However, this factor is also considered as the second most important barrier in implementation if the structure cannot and is not willing to adapt to changes (Heide, Grønhaug and Johannessen, 2002). In this regard, the structure can be described as rigid and tall. Recognising the truism that one of the most important ingredients for survival of organisations in a global market is flexibility, organisations are now more open to undergoing structural changes (Heide, Grønhaug and Johannessen,ibid).

d. *Administrative systems.* These considered as the concrete applications of the underlying philosophy or principles that guide the organization (Gupta and Govindarajan, 1984). Administrative mechanisms can be determinative as organisations cope with uncertainties. They help in determining structural changes like decentralization; resolve budget constraints and issues through for instance budget evaluation; etc. Likewise, administrative systems go as far as the selection of human resources selection including management, which is the locus of control in organisations (Li et al, 2008).

e. *People.* In the context of strategy implementation, discussion pertaining to people revolves around the question of who are the people involved in the implementation (Harrington, 2006). Li et al (ibid) argue that it is ideal that everybody in the organisation be involved in the implementation of the strategy. This is based on the view that workers play a key role in the attainment of the organisation's goals as they are the ones who execute tasks. However the authors agree that there are varying degrees of participation required from the people involved in the strategy formulation and implementation.

f. *Communication.* The importance of communication in organizations is unquestionable. Surprisingly, there is minimal literature pertinent to the influence and connection between communication and strategy implementation (Li et al, 2008). However, despite this reality, scholars are in agreement that communication is vital for implementation of the strategy (Schaap, 2006; Sterling, 2003; and Heide, Grønhaug and Johannessen, 2002; and Andersen, 2006). Communication, whether vertical or horizontal, facilitates sharing of information and knowledge. This is critical in many ways including training and learning, building consensus, encouraging group dynamics and fostering shared values and attitudes. Communication therefore enhances organisational performance and affects relationships not only with the external stakeholders of the organisation but also with the internal stakeholders (Schaap, 2006; Sterling, 2003 and Heide, Grønhaug and Johannessen, 2002)

g. *Consensus.* Consensus is the agreement among the top management, middle management and operational managers regarding strategy implementation. Sharing ideas does not imply that there is an agreement. Consensus, on the other hand, is built on common understanding and creates a common commitment for the strategy (Floyd &Woolridge, 1992). Consensus is necessary as it establishes unanimity in action which opens the door for co-coordination, commitment and superior performance. Consensus does not necessarily speed up implementation but it ensures a more effective implementation of the strategy (Dooley, Fryxell and Judge, 2000). More than that, organization benefits from consensus through greater functional and organisational performance (Li et al, 2008).

h. *Commitment.* Li et al (2008) argue that strategy implementation will fail if there is no commitment from non-managerial employees and lower level and middle managers. The authors posit that the only way to gain commitment from the mentioned categories of employees is to involve them at strategy formulation.

While Jones and Hill (2013) accept the variables discussed above as influencing strategy implementation they

add three more variables.

a) *Shared Values.* These are the values and beliefs that all employees, regardless of their position, in an organisation share. Robbins and Coulter define shared values as the acceptable way of doing things in an organisation. De Wit and Meyer (2010) concur with Hill and Jones (2013) when they postulate that there is a significant correlation between strategy implementation and organisational culture. In recognising the importance of organisational culture in strategy implementation, Lehner etal (2004) assert that a culture that encourages communication among employees and that questions fundamental beliefs results in a more favourable working atmosphere which will impact positively on strategy implementation.Therefore managers must ensure that all dimensions of the organisation's culture are taken into consideration for successful strategy implementation.

b) *Skills.* These are the technical abilities possessed by employees in the organisation. Skills enable employees to execute their tasks efficiently and effectively. Jones and Hill (2013) argue that it is the responsibility of management to ensure that employees are adequately skilled.

c) *Staff.* This refers to the adequacy of staff within the departments that are to execute the strategy. Jones and Hill (ibid) argue that organisations/departments that are inadequately staffed will not effectively implement strategy as there will be overstretching of the human resources which leads to shoddy performance.

9. Findings
9.1 Structure
Discussions with respondents revealed that the organisation under study had a sound structure that clearly defined and separated the roles of the different units of the organisation, their implementation partners and the communities (beneficiaries) that the organisations works with. However the respondents expressed concern at the way in which the external partners, in this case that implementing tended to breach the structure particularly when it came to implementing projects. An example was cited where a youth skills training programme's funding was diverted to dairy farming by the Training Center. The correct procedure should have been to refer the matter back to the programme officer in the organisation who would have consulted with the organisation's hierarchy before such diversion.

9.2 Style
All respondents agreed that the organisation's used a participatory management style. They said that both internal and external stakeholders were involved in needs identification and the generation of projects that addresses the identified needs. Thus the organisation uses an inclusive bottom-up approach in the needs and project identification. However the respondents expressed concerns at whatthey referred to as "manipulation" of agreed projects by politicians, donors and some managers. This manipulation was attributed to mainly the need to self-aggrandise by the concerned parties. In particular politicians were accused of not trusting NGOs and also competing for space with them particularly during election periods which makes it difficult for NGOs to continue with the identified projects. Donors were particularly accused of favouring particular projects despite the fact that outcome mapping points at a different project. The organisation is then left with no option but to adopt what the donor favours lest they lose out on the funding. Lastly some managers within the organisation were accused of interfering with the implementation of projects by favouring certain suppliers of inputs in return for favours like financial rewards. This was cited as the main cause of many projects failing to meet the sustainability test as the inputs may be substandard or too expensive resulting in the project overrunning its budget hence not being completed.

9.3 Staff and skills
Respondents said that in their organisation there was a shortage of staff resulting in staff being allocated more responsibilities than they would normally effectively shoulder. This work overload, they argued, tended to make them perform poorly. Closely related to inadequate staff and work overload, respondents also said in most instances they were being allocated tasks that they were not qualified to handle. Respondents cited the example of the finance department in which some staff was not skilled in their areas as contributing to failure to enforce financial controls leading to abuse of the resource.

9.4 Systems
Respondents agreed that the organisation had poor systems in place. They said that this was evidenced by the failure to deal with diversion of funds meant for youth skills training to a dairy project, failure to ensure that identified and agreed projects come to fruition and failure to enforce systems that ensure transparency in the utilization of both financial and material resources. An example was given of the finance department receiving budgets from programmes officers but failing to carry out cost analysis resulting in projects overrunning their

budgets or the organisation paying more than what is reasonably available on the market.

9.5 Culture

Respondents affirmed that the work ethic in the organisation is poor. They said the culture in the organisation was that of selfishness. The respondents argued that some individuals including management always focused on self when making decisions instead of focusing on service delivery to satisfy the beneficiaries. They also argued this is further compounded by the fact that some implementing partners including donors were also guilty of the same work ethic.

10. Conclusions

This study concludes that the most significant factors for project implementation failure are lack of harmonious stakeholder engagement, unskilled and inadequate project staff, an absence of sound systems governing resource utilisation; communication- both internally and externally and ensuring that agreed policies and projects are executed and lastly an ill-embracing organisational culture.

11. Recommendations

In light of the foregoing findings and conclusions, the followingrecommendations are being suggested:

- That the organisation puts in place a proper project planning process. This involves not only involving all key stakeholders to participate in the planning process but allowing all stakeholders benefiting from the intended project to have their needs stated. There is also need at the planning stage to communicate to all the planning members the expected deliverables like the budget and the milestones and activities to be performed to achieve intended results. A feedback system to allow members to air their concerns should be put in place before implementation. This process will increase transparency as it allows members to clear all outstanding issues before reaching a consensus. That way planning members will share a common goal and commit them to it.It is also imperative that the organisation deploys qualified and competent individuals to participate in the planning process as it is clear that proper planning has a direct bearing on effective implementation of strategies (Thompson and Strickland, 2014).
- Thestudy recommends that the organisation sets up a monitoring/supervision system that oversees the implementation process. This could take the form of a project implementation committee made up of the representatives of the planning members. The implementation committee should meet regularly to assess progress in project implementation and recommending corrective action where there are deviations. There is also need to complement these monitoring systems with other systems like financial management systems to enhance resource utilisation and create accountability. Another system that could be considered is the reward management system to enhance both managers' and employees' commitment to performing their roles. This is in line with the arguments presented by De Wit and Meyer (2010) in strategy implementation.
- There is need for the organisation to institute a comprehensive and effective human resources policy that guides areas like recruitment and selection, employee training and development, employee compensation, etc. This will enable the organisation to recruit employees based on competency, need and merit.A comprehensive human resources policy will also allow the organisation to professionally train and develop its employee and key external stakeholders.
- The institutionalisation of the above systems and processes will ultimately change the way the organisation implements its projects, thereby creating an organisational culture that is focused on results, professionalism and transparency.

12. Area of further study

This study was limited to a selected NGO which was operating in Zimbabwe, a country that is generally considered a high political risk internationally. The study also assumed that the reduction in funding for NGOs in Zimbabwe is a result of poor programmes management and the weak global economic environment. The high political risk categorisation of Zimbabwe could be influencing the drying up of donor funding.It would therefore be very informative if a study was to be carried out to assess the extent to which donor funding is influenced by the political risk associated with Zimbabwe.

References

Artto, K. A. and Dietrich, P. H.(2008). Strategic business management through multiple projects.TheWiley Guide to Project, Program & Portfolio Management, New York: Sons & Wiley,pp. 1 – 33.

Berger, A. N. (2003). The Economic Effects of Technological Progress: Evidence from theBanking Industry. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, Vol.35, pp. 1 – 43.

Besada, H. and Moyo, N. (2008), 'Zimbabwe in Crisis: Mugabe's Policies and Failures'. The Centre for

International Governance Innovation

Chimhanzi, J. (2004). The impact of marketing/HR Interactions on Marketing Strategy Implementation. European Journal of Marketing, vol. 38, pp. 73-98

Claudiu, B., Flaviu, M. &Georgeta-Mădălina, M. (2008).Strategy Implementation - Case of the European Telecommunication Providers. Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series, vol. 17 (4), pp.106-113

De Wit, B. and Meyer, R. (2010) Strategy: Process, Content, Context. An International Perspective. Zrinki, Croatia

Dooley, R.S., Fryxell, G.E., and Judge, W.Q. (2000).„Belaboring the Not-So-Obvious:Consensus, Commitment, and Strategy Implementation Speed and Success‟. Journal ofManagement, 26, 1237–1257.

Economist Magazine (2000)

Floyd, S. W. & Wooldridge, B. (1997).Middle Managements Strategic Influence andOrganisational Performance. Journal of Management Studies, vol. 34, pp. 465-485.

Govindarajan, V. (1988).A Contingency Approach to Strategy Implementation at the Business Unit Level Integrating Administrative Mechanisms with Strategy. Academy of Management Journal, vol. 31, pp. 828-853

Gupta, A. K. & Govindarajan, V. (1984).Business Unit Strategy, Managerial Characteristics, and Business Unit Effectiveness at Strategy Implementation. Academy of Management Journal, vol. 27 (1), pp. 25 – 41.

Harrington, R.J. (2006). The Moderating Effects of Size, Manager Tactics and Involvement on Strategy Implementation in Food Service. Hospitality Management, vol. 25, pp. 373-397

Hbereniak L, (2006), Obstacles to Effective Strategy Implementation, Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 35.

Heide, M., Grønhaug, K. & Johannessen, S. (2002).Exploring Barriers to The Successful Implementation of a Formulated strategy. Scandinavian Journal of Management, vol. 18, pp. 217-231.

Jones, G.R.; and Hill, C.W.L. (2013). Theory of Strategic Management: With Cases. South-Western.CENGAGE Learning.

Lehner, J. (2004). „Strategy Implementation Tactics as Response to Organizational, Strategic, and Environmental Imperatives‟. Management Revue, 15, p 460-480

Li, Y. Guohui., S. &Eppler, M. J. (2008).Making Strategy Work: A Literature Review on the Factors influencing Strategy Implementation. ICA Working Paper

Mintzberg, H. (2003). Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations, Prentice-Hall,

Mintzberg, H., Quinn, J. B. &Ghoshal, S. (1995). The strategy process. London: Prentice Hall.

NANGO (2013), Baseline Assessment of the Legal and Policy Framework in the Operational and Regulatory Environment of Civil Society Organisations in Zimbabwe.

Okumus, F. (2003).A framework to Implement Strategies in Organizations Management Decisions, vol. 41.9.

Saravanan, R. and Rao,K.S.P. (2007) "The impact of total quality service age on quality and operational performance: an empirical study", The TQM Magazine, Vol. 19 Issue: 3, pp.197 - 205)

Schaap, J. I. (2006). Toward Strategy Implementation Success: An Empirical Study of the Role of Senior-Level Leaders in the Nevada Gaming Industry. UNLV Gaming Research and Review Journal, vol.10, pp. 13-37.

Singh, D.T. (1998).Incorporating Cognitive Aids intoDecision Support Systems: the case of the strategy execution process. Decision Support Systems, vol. 24, pp. 145–163.

Smith, K. A. and Kofron, E.A. (1996).Toward a Research Agenda on Top Management Teams and Strategy Implementation. Irish Business and Administrative Research, Vol. 17, pp. 135-152.

Sterling, J. (2003).Translating strategy into effective implementation: dispelling the myths andhighlighting what works. Strategy & Leadership, vol. 31(3), pp. 27-34.

Thompson, A.A. and Strickland 111, A.J. (2014). Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases, Pearson Education.

Van De Merwe, T.E.; Potgieter,R.P., (2002). Assessment in the Workplace: ACompetency-based Approach, Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology University of Port Elizabeth

Wegner T, (2007).Applied Business Statistics: Methods and Excel-Based Applications, JUTA

Zikmund, W.G.; Babin, B.J.; Carr, J.C. and Griffin, M. (2010).Business Research Methods.South-Western College Publications.