













**Table 1:** Demographic profile of respondents  
**Source:** Developed for this study

Demographic characteristics		Frequency	Per cent
<b>Gender</b>	Male	84	62
	Female	52	38
<b>Age</b>	19-29	68	50
	30-39	51	37
	40-49	13	10
	50+	4	3
<b>Educational qualification</b>	Below Matric	2	1
	Matric	9	7
	Diploma	77	57
	1 <sup>st</sup> Degree	33	24
	Masters' Degree	4	3
	Other (Specify)	11	8
<b>Management experience in years</b>	0 – 5	57	42
	6 – 10	30	22
	11 – 15	30	22
	16 – 20	11	8
	21+	4	3
	Not applicable	4	3
<b>Management level occupied</b>	Top level	3	2
	Middle level	44	32
	Supervisory level	77	57
	Not applicable	12	9

As per (Table 1), 57% (77 out of 136) obtained their national diplomas, 24% (33 out of 136) of the respondents have first degrees. Only a few 3% (4 out of 136) respondents have postgraduate qualifications, while the rest had had a variety of other qualifications which, were mostly of other lower level qualifications. The trend of stakeholders in the study in terms of experience indicates that the majority (42% (57 out of 136) of the respondents had less than 5 years of experience, which implies that the majority of the managers are relatively new to the institution. According to the findings, 57% (77 out of 136) of the participants were supervisors and 32% (44 out of 136) of the respondents were in the middle level.

## 4.2 Descriptive statistics

### 4.2.1 Stakeholders' perceptions on core competencies

Table 2, presents the findings relating to stakeholders' perceived core competencies in each of the 14 items and each of the two dimensions, and the effectiveness of each. A five-point Likert scale with 1 = 'Completely disagree' and 5 = 'Completely agree' was used to measure each item relating to perceptions on core competencies. Perceptions on each of the dimensions were calculated as summated averages of all the items. In this study it is important to note that mean values (2.51 – 5.0) indicate a higher perceived efficiency and effectiveness of core competencies, while those in the range (1.0 – 2.49) reflect lower perceived efficiency and effectiveness of core competencies. Hence, lower mean values below 2.5 represent lower perceived efficacy of core competencies.

**Table 2:** Perceived effect of core competencies on all respondents – description (n=136)  
**Source:** Developed for this study

	Dimensions and items	Mean	Standard deviation
	<b>Resources</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>.969</b>
<b>R1</b>	College objectives are clear to staff members	4.01	.816
<b>R2</b>	College is up to date with regulatory requirements of DHET and other bodies	4.04	1.101

<b>R3</b>	Resource allocation is adequate to all staff	3.65	1.058
<b>R4</b>	There are opportunities for personal development	3.44	.949
<b>R5</b>	Management style promotes good teaching-learning environment	3.54	.996
<b>R6</b>	Management is keen on attracting employees with relevant qualifications	3.71	.912
<b>R7</b>	College uses work teams to achieve organisational objectives	3.79	.952
	<b>Capabilities</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>.832</b>
<b>C1</b>	Staff members are equipped with the necessary technological expertise	3.19	.821
<b>C2</b>	Front line staff are properly qualified to execute their responsibilities	3.82	.910
<b>C3</b>	Lecturers possess relevant teaching/ education qualification	3.46	1.003
<b>C4</b>	Lecturers have adequate subject expertise to teach allocated subjects	3.95	.681
<b>C5</b>	Staff members are capable of directing and taking charge of their own work	3.88	.935
<b>C6</b>	Staff members' knowledge and skills base is continuously increasing	3.98	.694
<b>C7</b>	Staff members have the right attitude for their jobs	3.65	.784

Data (see Table 2) shows that all independent variables, namely (resources and capabilities) were perceived to be effective and efficient as deduced from their mean values of above 2.5. The highest perceived efficacy on core competencies was on resources (with mean score 3.784), followed by capabilities at (with mean score 3.70). Given that the two dimensions were perceived to be highly effective core competencies' variables, it is something that service providers should aim to strengthen going forward.

#### 4.2.2 Stakeholders' perceived effects of core competencies on organisational performance

The data illustrated in Table 3 provides findings on stakeholders' perceived effects of core competencies on organisational performance. A five-point Likert scale was also used as in item 4.2.1 above.

**Table 3:** Perceived effect of core competencies on growth and profitability (n=136)

**Source:** Developed for this study

	<b>Dimensions and items</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
	<b>Growth</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>.825</b>
<b>G1</b>	College's operations system rapidly reallocates resources to address demand changes	3.73	.765
<b>G2</b>	College's system rapidly adjusts capacity to address demand changes	3.43	.908
<b>G3</b>	College' student retention is better than competitors'	4.29	.631
<b>G4</b>	Enrolment growth position is relatively higher than competitors	4.15	.891
<b>G5</b>	College has a superior student enrolment compared to competitors	3.91	.931
	<b>Profitability</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>.837</b>
<b>P1</b>	College has the ability to meet its financial obligation timeously	4.17	.615
<b>P2</b>	Students enrol and graduate much faster than other private colleges	3.65	.848
<b>P3</b>	The return on corporate investment is better than competitors'	3.65	.881
<b>P4</b>	There is a continuous increase in the college's total assets	3.68	.957
<b>P5</b>	The financial liquidity position is stronger than competitors'	3.68	.884

The dependent variables, namely (growth and profitability) were perceived to be highly affected by core competencies as they produced equally above average mean values of above 2.5, similar to Table 3 above. The perceived effects of core competencies on growth and profitability were deemed equally high with mean values of (3.90 with mean score) and (3.76 with mean score) respectively.



### 4.2.3 Overall perceived efficacy of core competencies and organisational performance

Table 4 presents the efficacy of each of the four variables. Majority (58% (79 out of 136) of the respondents agree that resources have a significant and positive effect on organisational performance while 8% (11 out of 136) completely agree to the statement. Data shows that 1% (1 out of 136) disagrees and 33% (45 out of 136) of the participants are neutral. None of the respondents completely disagreed with the statement. With regards to capabilities, results indicates that, most of the participants (66% (89 out of 136) agree that capabilities have a significant effect on organisational performance while 27% (37 out of 136) of the responses were neutral. Only a few of the participants (4% (6 out of 136) disagree and none of the participants completely disagrees with the statement.

**Table 4:** Frequencies and percentages on perceptions

Source: Developed for this study

Variables	Completely disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Completely agree
<b>Resources</b>					
Frequency	0	1	45	79	11
Percent	0	1	33	58	8
<b>Capabilities</b>					
Frequency	0	6	37	89	4
Percent	0	4	27	66	3
<b>Growth</b>					
Frequency	0	2	22	92	20
Percent	0	1	16	68	15
<b>Profitability</b>					
Frequency	1	7	41	71	16
Percent	1	5	30	52	12
<b>Overall perceptions</b>					
Frequency	0.25	4	36.25	82.75	12.75
Percent	0.18	2.93	26.66	60.84	9.39

Most of the respondents who participated in the survey 68% (92 out of 136) agree that growth is highly affected by core competencies, while 15% (20 out of 136) completely agree with the statement. Only a few 1% (2 out of 136) disagree and only 16% (22 out of 136) are neutral about the statement. With regards to profitability, results indicate that the majority of the participants agrees 52% (71 out 136) with the statement that college profitability is influenced by core competences and 12% (16 out 136) completely agree with the statement. Data indicates that only a few completely disagree 1% (1 out of 136) and disagree 5% (7 out of 136) with the statement, while 30% (41 out of 136) were neutral.

To sum up, most of the stakeholders perceive that all the variables are effective and efficient measures with 60.84% of the responses agreeing, 26.66% to neutral, 9.39% completely agreeing, 2.39% disagreeing and only 0.18% completely in disagreement. All variables show the least number of respondents completely disagreeing with the per cent only representing one respondent of 136.

#### 4.4 Correlation and regression analyses

The underlying assumptions of conducting correlation and regression analysis were met in this study. Responses utilised in the questionnaire were continuous in nature since they were in the form of a five-point Likert scale. In order to test the hypothesised relationships between core competencies (capabilities and resources) and organisational performance (profitability and growth) with the private college mentioned in chapter 1, correlation and regression analyses were performed. Note that the organisational performance as a dependent variable was measured as a summated average of two items, namely ‘profitability and growth’. A five-point Likert scale with 1 = ‘Completely disagree’ and 5 = ‘Completely agree’ was also used to measure items relating to organisational performance.

##### 4.4.1 Correlation analysis, among core competencies variables

Correlation analysis was used to measure the strength of relationships between core competencies’ and organisational performance variables. Table 5 presents a summary of the results of the correlation analyses. The Pearson correlation (r) indicates the strength and direction (negative or positive) of the correlation, while the p-value indicates the probability that a certain given r-value is seen only by chance. Positive coefficients in Pearson correlation indicate that organisational performance is positively influenced by the level of core competencies.

**Table 5:** Correlation analysis  
**Source:** Developed for this study

Dimension	Organisational performance		
		Growth	Profitability
Resources	R	0.384	0.268
	P	0.000	0.000
	N	136	136
Capabilities	R	0.456	0.526
	P	0.000	0.000
	N	136	136

It is evident from Table 5 that there was a strong and positive relationship between resources and the two dependent variables of growth and profitability. It was determined from positive Pearson correlation values ( $r = 0.38$ ) and ( $r = 0.27$ ) respectively. Data shows that the relationship of capabilities to growth and capabilities to profitability is strong and positive with r-values of 0.46 and 0.53 in the same order. In addition, the results show that the p-value is less than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) for all relationships. The findings also showed a one hundred percent response rate with ( $n = 136$ ) across all relationships.

#### 5. HYPOTHESIS TEST AND REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The data shown in (Table 6) below were used to test the hypotheses after regression analysis had been conducted using IBM SPSS version 24.

**Table 6:** Summary of hypotheses and major results  
**Source:** Developed for this study

	Hypotheses	Results
H <sub>1</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between resources and growth of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.268$ , $\beta = 0.384$ )
H <sub>2</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between resources and profitability of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.384$ , $\beta = 0.620$ )
H <sub>3</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between capabilities and growth of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.526$ , $\beta = 0.458$ )

H <sub>4</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between capabilities and profitability of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.456$ , $\beta = 0.452$ )
------------------	--	---

The hypotheses were tested and the findings were as follows:

### 5.1 Organisational resources have a positive effect on organisational growth

Based on these results ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.268$ ,  $\beta = 0.384$ ), hypothesis H<sub>1</sub> which states that there is a positive relationship between resources and growth at the private college and can be accepted  $p < 0.000$  significant level. There is a positive correlation between resources and growth as depicted by the findings. The beta coefficient shows that resources strongly lead to profitability. This is consistent with Agha, Alrubaiee and Jamhour's (2012) findings, which means that resources are important in achieving growth of the organisation.

### 5.2 Organisational resources have a positive effect on organisational profitability

Based on these results ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.384$ ,  $\beta = 0.620$ ), hypothesis H<sub>2</sub> which states that there is a positive relationship between resources and profitability at the private college can be accepted at  $p < 0.000$  significant level. The beta coefficient of 0.62 is highest of the four research hypotheses. Hence, an increase in resources can lead to an increase in overall organisational performance. This is in line with Jabbouri and Zahari (2014) studies who found that resources are significantly related to profitability. The finding also reinforces the belief that adequate resources, increase the likelihood of improved organisational profitability. In other words, a well-balanced supply of resources greatly influences profitability.

### 5.3 Organisational capabilities have a positive effect on organisational growth

Based on these results ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.526$ ,  $\beta = 0.458$ ), hypothesis H<sub>3</sub> which states that there is a positive relationship between capabilities and growth of the private college and can be accepted  $p < 0.000$  significant level. Hypothesis 3 shows the highest correlation and it can be confirmed that an improvement in capabilities can likewise lead to an improved growth. This is consistent Jabbouri and Zahari (2014) where the strength of the relationship between capabilities and growth is equally high.

### 5.4 Organisational capabilities have a positive effect on organisational profitability

Based on these results ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $r = 0.456$ ,  $\beta = 0.452$ ), hypothesis H<sub>4</sub> which states that there is a positive relationship between capabilities and profitability with a private college can be accepted  $p < 0.0000$  significant level. The correlation and beta coefficient are closed tied at between 0.452 and 0.456 respectively, this means that an increase in capabilities will lead to an increase in profitability which is consistent with the findings in studies by Hastjarjo *et al.* (2016) and Agha, Alrubaiee and Jamhour (2012) who found that capabilities are significantly related to business profitability. This finding implies that changes in organisational capabilities impacts directly on profitability.

The hypotheses above are based on the outcome of regression analysis conducted as shown in Table 7 below. The table contains alpha and regression coefficients, SEB, which is the standard error of the coefficient of determination, and  $\beta$  which is the standardised beta coefficient as used to measure the explanatory power of predictor variables (core competencies) to the dependent variable (organisational performance).

**Table 7:** Regression analysis  
**Source:** Developed for this study  
**Dependent variable: Growth**

	B	SEB	B	T	Sig
(Constant)	2.428	0.309		7.859	0.000
Resources	0.394	0.082	0.384	4.815	0.000
(Constant)	2.071	0.310		6.685	0.000
Capabilities	0.494	0.083	0.458	5.960	0.000

**Dependent variable: Profitability**

	B	SEB	$\beta$	t	Sig
(Constant)	0.71	0.22	0.620	3.30	0.0000
Resources	0.86	0.08		11.20	
(Constant)	1.591	0.375		4.247	0.000
Capabilities	0.587	0.100	0.452	5.862	0.000

The significance level and t-statistics are also shown in the table. The  $\beta$  is used to measure the strength of the relationship between dependent and independent variables in the study.

## 6. RESULTS

The findings from descriptive statistics show that the perceptions of stakeholders towards the efficacy of core competencies at private TVET colleges were above expectation. Results from correlation and regression analysis show that core competency dimensions, namely capabilities and resources can lead to an improved overall organisational performance at private TVET colleges. A summary of the study's hypotheses and practical findings is listed in Table 8.

**Table 8:** Summary of hypotheses and major results  
**Source:** Developed for this study

	Hypotheses	Results
H <sub>1</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between resources and growth of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.268$ , $\beta = 0.384$ )
H <sub>2</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between resources and profitability of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.384$ , $\beta = 0.620$ )
H <sub>3</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between capabilities and growth of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.526$ , $\beta = 0.458$ )
H <sub>4</sub> :	There was a positive relationship between capabilities and profitability of private TVET colleges.	Accept ( $p < 0.05$ , $r = 0.456$ , $\beta = 0.452$ )

The next section discusses the implications of the findings of this study to theory.

### 6.1 Implications for theory

This study assessed investigated how the attributes of core competence influence organisational (TVET college) performance. The results revealed that resources expressed by stakeholders of the private college are an important element that contributes to organisational performance. Furthermore, the findings of the present study revealed that there is a correlation between resources and organisational performance, which is consistent with the results from previous studies (Agha, Alrubaiee & Jamhour 2012).

The study also showed that the capabilities of an institution are an important factor of organisational performance. This is consistent with Jabbouri and Zahari (2014) studies. This means that there is a correlation between capabilities and organisational performance. The empirical findings revealed that core competencies are crucial in determining the success of an educational institution. A positive correlation exists between core competencies and organisational performance (growth and capabilities).

The findings of the present study are in line with results from the previous researches (Jabbouri & Zahari, 2014).

In summary, core competencies variables which are resources and capabilities are critical in organisational performance. They need to be incorporated by policy makers due to their positive influence on organisational performance. Caliskan (2010) states that, in order to create and sustain competitive advantage in this type of environment, organisations must continually improve their business performance.

### **6.2 Recommendation for future study**

Future research can be a comparative study between private TVET colleges and Public TVET colleges. Another consideration can be conducting a mixed research method utilising a longitudinal study that would look at how core competencies influence college performance over a period.

### **6.3 Conclusion**

This study found that stakeholders had a positive perception towards the efficacy of core competencies in organisational performance of the institution. The results provided evidence that all two predictor variables (resources and capabilities) influenced profitability and growth of the organisation. Thus, a positive correlation was observed to directly influence organisational performance. Hence, the results demonstrate that competencies in services sector play an important role for both individual and organisational performance (Zaim, Yasar & Unal, 2013).

## **REFERENCES**

AGHA, S., ALRUBAIEE, L. & JAMHOUR, M. 2012. Effect of core competences on competitive advantage and organisational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1): 192-204.

ASAMOAHA, E.O. & ARKOR, P.N. 2021. Core Competence and Competitive Advantage. Weser Books. Zittau, Germany.

ASHKENAS, R. SIEGAL, W. & SPIEGEL, M. 2013. "Mastering Organizational Complexity: A Core Competence for 21st Century Leaders" In *Research in Organizational Change and Development*. 29-58.

BANERJEE, P. 2003. Resource dependence and core competence: insights from Indian software firms. *Technovation*, 23: 251–263.

BARNEY, J.B. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive. *Journal on management*, 17: 99-120.

BESLER, S. & SEZEREL, H. 2011. Core Competences in Non-Governmental Organizations: A Case Study. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24: 1257-1273.

CEBRIÁN, G., JUNYENT, M. & MULÀ, I. 2020. Competencies in Education for Sustainable Development: Emerging Teaching and Research Developments. *Journal of Sustainability*, 12(579) 2-9.

CHANG, J & SHIH, H. 2020. What is the core competency of EECS students in technological higher education? *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, 0(0) 1–13

CLULOW, V., GERSTMAN, J. & BARRY, C. 2003. “The resource-based view and sustainable competitive advantage: the case of a financial services firm”, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 27(5): 220-232.

DEMIRTAS, O. 2013. Evaluating the Core Capabilities for Strategic Outsourcing Decisions at Aviation Maintenance Industry. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99: 1134-1143.

DJOUDI, M.R. & DJOUDI, A. 2021. The Impact of Core Competencies Building in Improving Company Performance - Case Study of Al-Beskriah Cement Company. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 8(1): 1244 – 1253.

EDEN, C. & ACKERMANN, F. 2015. Competences, distinctive competences, and core competences In a Focussed Issue on Identifying, Building, and Linking Competences. 3-33.

GAVREA, C., ILIES, L. & STEGEREAN, R. 2011. The determinants of organisational performance. *Management & Marketing Journal*, 6(2): 286-300.

GOKKAYA, O. & OZBAG, G.K. 2015. Linking Core Competence, Innovation and Firm Performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 7(1): 90-102.

HASTJARJO, K., YHYA, D.K., AFIFF, F. & RUFDAIDAH, P. 2016. Core competence on real estate industry in globalisation phenomenon: A contemporary approach. *International Journal of Economics and Financial issues*, 6(5): 14-19.

HELFAT, C.E. & WINTER, S.G. 2011. Untangling dynamic and operational capabilities: strategy for the (N)ever-changing world. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 1243-1250.

HINE, D., PARKER, R., PREGELJ, L. & VERREYNNE, M. 2013. Deconstructing and reconstructing the capability hierarchy. *Industrial and corporate change Journal*, 23(5): 1299-1325.

HOFMEYR, J. & LEE, S. 2002. Demand for private education in South Africa: Schooling and higher education. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(4).

HOUGH, J., THOMPSON, A.A., STRICKLAND, A.J. & GAMBLE, J.E. 2011. *Crafting and executing strategy: Creating sustainable high performance in South Africa*: text, readings and cases. McGraw-Hill.

HUNT, S. D. & MORGAN, R.M. 1996. The resource-advantage theory of competition: Dynamics, path dependencies, and evolutionary dimensions. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(4): 107-114.

JABBOURI, N.I. & ZAHARI, I. 2014. The role of core competencies on organisational performance: An empirical study in the Iraq private banking sector. *European scientific journal*, 14(1):1857-7431.

KANDAMPULLY, J. 2002. Innovation as the core competency of a service organisation: the role of technology, knowledge and networks. *European Journal of innovation management*, 5(1): 18-26.

KOONTZ, H. & DONNELL, C. 1993. Introduction to Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

KRUSS, G. 2005. Distinct pathways: tracing the origins and history of private higher education in South Africa, Globalisation, *Societies and Education*, 3(3): 261-279.

LEVY, D.C. 2004. Commercial private higher education: South Africa as a stark example. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(4).

KUO-MING, C. & HUI-CHUN, C. 2020. A Study of Dynamic Service Innovative Capabilities, Core Competencies, and Sustainable Competitive Advantages of Taiwan's Fasteners Industry. *International Journal of Organisational Innovation*, 13(4): 235 – 246.

LJUNGQUIST, U. 2007. Core competency beyond identification: presentation of a model. *Management Decision*, 45(3): 393-402.

LJUNGQUIST, U. 2008. "Specification of core competence and associated components: A proposed model and a case illustration". *European Business Review*, 20(1): 73-90.

MABIZELA, M. 2002. The evolution of private provision of higher education in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(4).

MAKHOULFI, L. & ABU AL-ERJAL, H.M.E. 2017. The effect of core competence on the sustainable competitive advantage of Malaysian SMEs. *Journal of Humanities, Language, Culture and Business (HLCB)*, 1(3): 90-99.

OXBRIDGE ACADEMY. 2014. Why FET colleges are changing their names to TVET colleges. *Bizcommunity* [Online], September 20. Available from: <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/98/121709.html> [Accessed: 13/9/2016].

PRAHALAD, C.K & HAMEL, G., 1990. The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3): 79-91.

POWELL, M. 2001. A comparative study of TVET projects - implementation experiences from Jamaica and The Gambia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21: 417-431.

ROTHAERMEL, F.T. 2013. *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*. International Student Edition. McGraw-Hill. Irwin.

RUKUNI, T. F. 2015. Service quality and students' satisfaction at a private college in the city of Tshwane. M.B.A. dissertation, Tshwane University of Technology.

SHENG, M.L. 2017. A dynamic capabilities-based framework of organizational sensemaking through combinative capabilities towards exploratory and exploitative product innovation in turbulent environments. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 65: 28-38.

TAMPOE, M. 1994. Exploiting the Core Competences of Your Organization. *Long Range Planning*, 27(4): 66-77.

TASHAKKORI, A. & TEDDLIE, C. 2003. *Handbook of Mixed Methods in social and behavioural research*. London: Cassel.

UYSAL, G. 2007. Core competence: a competitive base for organizational success. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 1(1): 5-16.

WANG, Y., LO, H., & YANG, Y. 2004. The constituents of core competencies and firm performance: evidence from high-technology firms in China. *Journal on Engineering Technology Management*, 21(4): 249-280.

ZAIM, H., YASAR, M.F. & UNAL, O.F. 2013. Analysing the effects of individual competencies on performance: A field study in services industries in Turkey. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 7(2): 67-77.

ZIKMUND, W.G., BABIN, J.B., CARR, J.C. & GRIFFIN, M. 2013. *Business Research Methods*. South-Western. Cengage Learning.

