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Abstract

This study investigated the problem of stagnation in career development for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force (NDF). The study examined the hypothetical assumptions that commissioned officers especially those who are educated regard career development and progression processes in the NDF as stagnant, and the implementation of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) Personnel Policies as inconsistent. Thus, they are likely to become frustrated and to resign, because of lack of a clear relationship between their academic qualifications and career opportunities in the institution. This problem is evident in the inconsistency between the personnel policies’ implementation and the academic qualifications of staff as far as training, appointments and promotional opportunities for commissioned officers in the NDF are concerned. The study used the descriptive-quantitative research method based on an analysis of the artillery brigade officers’ corps. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this thesis are based on the observed inconsistencies in career policy implementation in the NDF.

The general findings of this study suggest that there is no systematic linkage between academic qualifications and career professional requirements, regarding training, appointments and promotional opportunities for commissioned officers in the NDF. In this regard, it is still not certain how effective the career development/progression policy is in addressing the officers’ career needs in the NDF. The study recommends the implementation of MoD Personnel Policies to be improved in order to reconcile training and education with appointment and promotions for commissioned officers in the NDF. These findings and recommendations can hopefully assist the Ministry of Defence and
the decision-makers in the NDF in particular, to introduce measures and policies’
инstruments to address these inconsistencies.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background Information and the Orientation of the Study

Prior to independence in 1990, Namibia did not have an Armed Force of its own. The Namibian Defence Force (NDF), which consists of the Army, the Air Force and the Navy, was then established after independence (1990) under the statutory provision of Article 118 of the Namibian Constitution (Namibia’s Defence Act, 2002). In fact, there might be people who have little or no idea about the professional duties and the functions of the NDF. The Article 118 of the Namibian Constitution (1990) stipulates the mission of the Namibian Defence Force as to:

Defend the territory integrity and national interests of Namibia. To meet adequately the defence needs namely; by guaranteeing territorial integrity, safeguarding against external attack, (conventional or non-conventional), and to prevent violations of Namibia’s land, sea and airspace. Operate effectively in support of the civil authorities if required, undertake peacetime operations, provide challenge and opportunities for employees, utilising and enhancing skills abilities and creativity, develop a defence organisation with which the people of Namibia will identify and in which they will take pride, and operate safely and with respect for the environment.

Namibia’s Statement on Defence Policy (1993) indicated that since its inception, the NDF has experienced significant challenges through such influences as the continuing integration of technology at the workplace and the incorporation of technological advances in military operations. In a similar vein, Kitfield (1997, p.66)
stated that during this era of increased requirements and decreased resources, there is a need to develop a motivated and effective men-power, dedicated to maintain mission capabilities, and ensuring the soundness of their business decisions. On this notes, it can be emphatically stated that career development is an obligation of the Namibian Defence Force, to empower its service members in order to maintain a force that is well trained and competent to handle the situation, hence, it would be remaining a responsibility of the MoD to provide its officers with challenging opportunities by offering them information about current and future job experiences (Namibia’s Statement on Defence Policy, 1993). It was on this ground that the Ministry of Defence (MoD) intensified education and training programs to improve career progression as a matter of priority within the ranks and files of the NDF (Defence Annual Report, 2008).

This thesis is therefore a result of research carried out on career development policy for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force. The research study was undertaken in 2010 among the officers working in the Artillery Brigade at Otjiwarongo Military base. The main reason to confine the study to the Artillery Brigade was that the officers’ establishment of that Brigade consists of all necessary rank-categories/parameters (from the bottom ‘junior officer’ to the top ‘senior/general officer’) to study, hence, it’s (the study’s) findings and recommendations can be generally applied to the NDF as a whole.

A very important aspect in discussing career development for commissioned officers in the NDF is the existing career development policy in the NDF as an organisation. The report on the Ministry of Defence’s Strategic Workshop of 2007
indicated that the formation of the Namibian Defence Force at the end of the liberation war was a fast track event. Some military discourse attached to this hastiness was the prevailed politico-military situation in the neighbouring Angola at that time. Hence, the military planners had no time to design an appropriate career path for members of the NDF. Meanwhile, the MOD(2007) informed that, at the formative stage of the Defence Force, much attention was placed on the integrating of the two former warring forces, the People’s Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) and the South West Africa Territorial Force (SWATF). According to the MOD the selection of officers especially from former PLAN fighters who today form the majority part of the NDF officers’ corps was largely based on individuals’ wartime appointment and/or their contribution to the liberation war. The criteria used during the liberation struggle to select/appoint guerrilla officers (commanders) were political loyalty, length of service, battlefield achievements and military training. Considering the nature of the guerrilla army’s recruitment methods and human resources, it is not surprising that the educational qualifications and ages were not important factors in selection of a guerrilla commander, and this was to be carried forward into the NDF at the integration.

The filling of officers’ posts at the initial stages was a difficult exercise because of the qualifications required of a commissioned officer. As a solution to the commissioned officers’ corps manning problem, it was agreed that all lower level officers from PLAN and those from SWATF with officers potentials would have to attend a four weeks of standardisation course, run by the British Military Advisory Training Team (BMATT) from the United Kingdom. During this short course, these candidates’ leadership potentials were assessed depending on their performances, and commissioned officer
status was granted to a number of candidates at the end of the course (MOD 2007). According to the MOD the thoroughness of the assessment in this course is still open to debate since it largely depended on the individual instructor’s attitude and assessment ability. “One thing certain though is that, the candidates’ age and educational qualifications were not important factors in deciding what officer-status/rank a candidate was to be granted”, the MOD revealed.

MOD (2007) further informed that after many years of existence, the NDF has yet to have clearly laid down rules and regulations to regulate the implementation of the career development policy for its commissioned officers. The lack of rules and regulations seems to be a direct result of the situation under which the officers’ corps was established (covered briefly above), which hypothetically means that, the effectiveness of the career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF originates with an overall career strategy of commissioning officers in the Force and formation of the Namibian Defence Force in general. The situation that is presumed to have brought about disparities and/or variations in educational qualifications, training, appointments, and promotional criteria as well as in criteria used for selecting officers to career courses in the NDF. Hence, the need to review the impact and the influence that situation has on present and future career development system for commissioned officers in the NDF emerged.

1.2. Statement of the Problem
The NDF Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) stipulate Grade 12 as a minimum academic level for recruits potentially inducted as officers, but in most cases, grade 12 qualifications and other academic achievements are not utilised as criteria for career development after induction. Thus it is not likely that there is any relationship between academic qualifications and factors of career development, such as promotions, appointments and training opportunities for officers in the Namibian Defence Force. This situation leads to the problem of inconsistency in policy implementation at various levels in the Namibian Defence Force as far as career development strategy for commissioned officers is concerned. The assumption is that, at present, some officers in leadership positions do not believe that the civil/academic qualifications should play an important role in selecting candidates for officers’ further and/or advanced training, promotions and/or promotional examinations and advanced appointments, and that they stay put that civilian qualifications have no value in military services and thus to career progression. Operating from these mind-sets, units and formations have experienced dilemmas when appointing candidates to undertake training both, in NDF training facilities and abroad or when candidates are suggested for promotion opportunities. Consequently, some officers with lower military qualifications, but who hold high academic qualifications may become dissatisfied when they lose opportunities such as further and/or advanced training and promotion to senior positions. In this regard, these officers may see their military career as discouraging and they are more likely to become frustrated, or they may even resign from the force. This problem received serious attention during the 17th and the 18th Annual Training Conferences (2007; 2008) which suggested the urgent finalisation of the training syllabus that harmonises civil and military educational qualifications in the NDF.
These suggestions have still not been implemented, and thus this problem remains intact.
The contribution of this study is therefore based on achieving answers to the research questions.

1.4. Research Question

The study is guided by the following research questions:

(i) To what extent have the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) been effective to improve the career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF?

(ii) How does the NDF match civilian and military qualifications with career development opportunities such as training and promotions for its commissioned officers?

(iii) How does the NDF align the qualifications of its individual officers with career development opportunities of their choices?

1.3. Research Objectives

The purpose of the study is to:

1. Examine the extent to which the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) influence career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.
2. Explore the relationship between qualifications (both academic and military) and career progression of officers in the NDF.

3. Investigate the role of existing mechanisms geared for implementing the policy to reconcile the officers’ academic and military qualifications with career developments opportunities.

4. Examine challenges that individual commissioned officers may face in pursuit their career development goals in the NDF.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The study has experienced that little has been done in terms of research on career development for commissioned officers in the NDF, because the researcher identified only a single research study, which was carried out on the similar topic by Brigadier-General Karl Ndjoba in the year 2010. It is expected that the findings of this study will be of value to the policy makers, the education/training programme-developers and the commissioned officers in following aspects:

1. Findings of this study will assist policy-makers in the Ministry of Defence when re-analysing the effectiveness of the existing officer’s career-policies in the Namibian Defence Force.
2. It will give insight into commissioned officers’ opinions and assists them to conceptualise the importance for educational and training qualifications as related to career development/progression in the NDF.

3. The findings of this study will contribute significantly to the existing literature on career development in general, and will stimulate further research on the same topic.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

Difficulties in accessing useful information from various participants were experienced, since some of the informants were reluctant to provide information required for this study. The said limitations plus the research ethical issues discussed in Chapter 3 (Research Methodology) have affected the process of this study.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Below are selected terms and definitions aiming at the clarity of the thesis, especially to non-military readers who might not be familiar with the military terms as articulated in the NDF Staff Officers Operating Manual (1995, p. 8).
Army: Is the land-based armed forces of a nation.

Artillery: Artillery refers to any engine used for the discharge of large projectiles in war. The term also describes soldiers with the primary function of staffing such weapons and is used organisationally for the arm of a nation’s land forces that operates the weapons. This term includes coastal artillery, which traditionally defended coastal areas against seaborne attack and controlled the passage of ships. With the advent of powered flight at the start of the 20th Century, artillery also included ground-based anti-aircraft batteries.

Battalion: A battalion is an infantry unit of 500-1000 men usually consisting of between two and six companies and typically commanded by a Lieutenant-Colonel.

Battery: An artillery sub-division of the army units consists of 60-100 men organised in platoons, and typically commanded by a Major.
**Brigade:** A brigade is a military unit that is typically composed of two to five regiments or battalions, depending on the era and nationality of a given army.

**Commander:** A military officer entrusted with special and authoritative duty to exercise over a certain group of soldiers.

**Commissioned Officer:** A commissioned officer is a person to whom a commission has been conferred by the Head of State under Section 21 of the Defence Act, 2002 (Act 1 of 2002); or commissioned officers derive authority directly from sovereign power and as such, hold a commission charging them with the duties and responsibilities of a specific office or position. Commissioned officers are typically the only persons in a military environment able to exercise command (according to the most technical definition of the word) over a military unit.

**Company:** A company is a military unit, typically consisting of 75-200 soldiers. Most companies are formed of three to five platoons, although the exact number may vary by country, unit type, and structure.
Several companies are grouped to form a **Battalion** or a **Regiment**.

### Junior Officers:
Include Sub-Lieutenants, Lieutenants and Captain in the NDF.

### Order of Battle:
An order of battle (often abbreviated as ORBAT, OOB, O/B, or OB) is an organisational tool used by military intelligence to list and analyse enemy or own military units. The term is also used by historians and war gamers to list the organisation and unit structure of both sides in a battle.

### Platoon:
A platoon is a military unit typically composed of two to four **sections**, **squads** or crews and containing about 30 to 50 soldiers. Platoons are organised into a **company**, which typically consists of three, four or five platoons. A platoon is typically the smallest military unit led by a **commissioned officer**, the **platoon leader** or platoon commander, usually a **Lieutenant**. He/she is usually assisted by a senior **non-commissioned officer**, the **platoon sergeant**.

### Regiment:
A regiment is an artillery unit of amount 500-1000 men usually consisting of between three and four
batteries and typically commanded by a Lieutenant-Colonel.

**Senior officers:** Include Majors, Lieutenant-Colonel and Colonels in the NDF.

**Staff Officer:** An officer works as an assistant of the commander in his planning the activities of the force under command.

**Military rank-titles in order of seniority:**

**Lieutenant:** Conventionally, armies and other services or branches which use army-style rank titles have two grades of Lieutenant, but a few also use a third, more junior, rank. Historically the "Lieutenant" was the deputy to a "Captain", and as the rank structure of armies began to formalise, this came to mean that a Captain commanded a company and had several Lieutenants, each commanding a platoon.

**Captain:** The army rank of Captain is an officer rank historically corresponding to command of a company of soldiers. Some of the air forces and marine forces also use the rank. Today a captain is
typically the commander, or second in command of a company.

**Major:**

By World War I, Majors were often commanding independent Companies, Squadrons and Batteries, but those that were organically part of a Regiment or Battalion were still usually commanded by Captains. After World War II, Major became the usual rank held by Officers Commanding all Companies, Squadrons and Batteries, and remains so today.

**Lieutenant-Colonel:**

Lieutenant-Colonel is a rank found in the most of the land forces in the world. In the NDF, the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel is ranking above a Major and below a Colonel. Lieutenant-Colonel is often shortened to "Colonel" in conversation and in unofficial correspondence. A Lieutenant-Colonel is typically in charge of a battalion in the Namibian Army.

**Colonel:**

Colonel is a military rank of a commissioned officer, with corresponding ranks existing in almost every country in the world. It is also used in some police forces and other paramilitary rank structures.
A Colonel is typically in charge of a Regiment or second in charge of a Brigade in the army. Today, a Colonel is usually a military title rated as the highest, or the second-highest field rank below the general, or "flag" grades. In some small military forces, it can be the highest rank held.

**Generals**

These are field-ranked general officers at the crest of the defence forces’ hierarchies, and thus including Lieutenant-General, Major-General and Brigadier-General in the NDF.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

Chapter one contextualised the background information and orientation of the study, conceptualised the study by providing the rationale of the research problem and the relevance of the topic. Chapter two reviews the related literature in order to investigate and analyse the theoretical perspectives and previous research findings that has been done on topics of the same nature. In other words, this chapter reviews the existing literature and previous research work that has been done in the areas of career development/progression and the important issues associated with this concept. The study focused its research efforts on a narrows the researched area and restricting the research topic (LeBeau 1999, as cited in Chaala, 2005) to the Artillery Brigade at Otjiwarongo military base, and investigated the broader frame of literature related to career development/progression in general public and corporate sectors. This was due to the limited amount of publications available in Namibia, especially on career development and progression related to the security sectors in general and to the defence forces in particular.

It appears that not much research studies have been done on the subject: “Career Development” in the defence forces in general, and in the NDF in particular. In fact, and
as it alluded earlier on in chapter one of this thesis, the researcher has so far identified only one study on officers’ career, conducted by Brigadier-General Ndjoba in 2010, which is currently out and available in the MoD library. In Namibia, the only available career related literature and/or documents are general personnel management related literature, statutory policy documents or Acts and ministerial policy manuals on general-public and military regulations. However, this study did not only investigate the available literature associated with career development and progression concepts, but at the same time, the study also analysed the contents of the ministerial/NDF and the statutory policy sources, which stipulate guidelines and regulations for terms and conditions of service for men and women in the NDF and the public sectors. The ministerial/NDF policies sources include: the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007), the Namibia’s Statement on Defence Policy (1993) and the NDF Operational Training Doctrine/Training for War (1995), which provide guidelines that regulate terms and conditions of service including criteria for recruitment, training and education, promotion, appointment, remuneration and retirement for military personnel. The statutory policy sources include: The Namibian Constitution (1990), NDF Military Discipline Code (1992), the Namibia’s Defence Act (Act, No. 1 of 2002) and the Public Service Act 13 (1995), which make the provisions for the establishment of efficient Public Service management to manage and regulate the Public Service employment regarding the conditions of service, discipline, retirement and discharge of staff members of the Public Service, and other incidental matters. Despite the existence of the above manuals and/or documents, which provide the ministerial policies and statutorily provisions, none of these documents clearly stipulates the provisional benchmarks regarding career development and progression for either
members of the general Public Service or members of the Namibian Defence Force. Yet, Article 20 of the Namibian Constitution (1990) states that “all persons shall have a right to education...” This article provides a statutorily obligation for members of the NDF to be empowered in terms of their professional duties. Premised on the Article 20 of the Namibian Constitution, the Namibia’s Statement on Defence Policy (1993) prioritise education and training for all service members of the Ministry of Defence, hence, the Ministry of Defence Annual Report (2008, p. 17) reads:

“The NDF management is mandated to develop the institutional capacity regarding personal career development through training, education as well as through fostering expertise in the use of combat equipment/armaments. The appropriate policy interventions are therefore necessary to respond to the various needs of career development/progression in the NDF”.

The NDF being a professional force, and indeed a state ultimate instrument of power, had until recently no well structured and consistent career development policy, which stipulates qualifications benchmarks that need to be met before an officer’s progression in a career path is considered (Ndjoba 2009, p.7). Defence Annual Report (2009) also put more emphasis on the lack of policy improvement to harmonise military and academic educational qualifications for officers to achieve quality and competitive qualifications in the Defence Force. “To date, the NDF is faced with challenges to ensure adequate and constant education and training of its personnel within the limits of available resources” the Defence Annual Report (2008) revealed.

2.2. Career Development as a Concept
There are many definitions of the term “career development” and they are all said in different words to convey the same idea. Mabhena (1990, p.2) notes that there exists an amount of confusion between the terms “career planning”, “career management” and “career development”. Meggison (1981, as cited in Mabhena, 1990) defined career planning as “A process of choosing occupations, organisations and routes one’s career will follow” (p.2), while described career management as “an effort to combine ways of achieving organisational goals and objectives, with an organisation assisting employees to advance their own careers” (p.2).

Alweendo (2009) defined “career development” as “a continued accumulation of experience and improvement of personal and professional skills supporting career progression” (p.11). For this study, a conclusion can be reached here that career planning is done by an individual officer to map-out his/her work-life, yet career management is done by the organisational management to help its employees to attain their individual career goals within the framework of the organisational objectives. In addition, Alweendo (2009, p.11) established that the term “career development”, is combination of the two: career planning and career management, that means a continuation in accumulation of experience and improvement of personal and professional skills, supporting career progression with the assistance of organisational management. According to Alweendo, the important issue is to realise the effectiveness of the career development policy for individuals within the organisational career development process, which requires a combination efforts of the individual employee and the organisation as an employer. It is therefore a requirement for the organisation, to intensify the career training for its members and to effect the implementation of the
organisational career development and progression policy successfully. According to Alweendo, this can only be achieved by providing individual members at all levels with sufficient training in human resources.

Literally, when the term “career development” is defined, it is referred to as a synonym to “career progression”, a progression through a sequence of jobs, involving continually more advanced or diverse educational activities, resulting in wider improved skills, greater responsibilities, prestige and higher income (Hall 1987, p.18). Hanna (2008, p.7) also established that, the term “career development” is synonymous to “career progression” which is the process of empowering or capacitating human resources in a distinctive class of learners, practitioners, intellectuals and scientists towards attaining high level of competencies and self-efficiency in one’s life through education, training and creativity. In support of Hall and Hanna, Waitly (1996, p.13) argues that “career development and progression” should be understood as a process of managing life through learning and work over the life span. Based on the conformity of these arguments, it is indisputable that the value of commissioned officers’ knowledge and skills, which should be gained through the NDF career path, is evident in the NDF officers’ career progression and that education should play a vital role in this process.

In a military sense, “career development” combines the terms career planning and career management, a process of empowering and capacitating military members’ progression throughout their services (Mabhena, 1990, p.2). However, one can hardly distinguish career planning from career management. For the reason that the meanings of the terms career planning and career management, are often if not always used to convey the same idea (Hall, 1987, p.18), and indeed, for the sake of this study, the term
“career development and progression” is used also to mean career planning and career management.

2.3. Planning the Career Path

Unlike smaller organisations, the army should not plan a specific career path for its individual officers. Instead, it designs a career system to which all of its individual officers should benefit. Military leaders at different levels should then implement that career strategy within the limit of their authorities and resources available (Mabhena, 1990, p.3). The minutes of the 18th Annual Training Conference (2008) cautioned that career training for commissioned officers should be prioritised to ensure the successful implementation of the career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF. According to the minutes, the NDF leaders at the management level should come up with officers’ overall career plan, and that commanders at different levels of NDF must carry-out that master plan, defined by Mabhena as a “career strategy” over the ranks of the commissioned officers in the NDF.

Karaevli and Hall (2008, p.384) opined that career development is an important variable in human resources equation of any organisation and that education, experience, professionalism and mentoring form the supporting basis for developing personnel in any career field. Karaevli and Hall further established that much literature on professionalism and career development emphasises flexibility in this era of rapid change and uncertain future. In a similar vein, Hall (1987, p.21) cautioned that:

During the nearest future time, career development opportunities and programs will be affected by technological, organisational and individual
changes. More organisations will experience pressure to decrease their sizes due to increased competition. Most organisations will need to be adaptable and employ a flexible workforce. Confronted with change and uncertainty, individuals will need to be adaptive, able to handle ambiguity and resilient in the face of career barriers.

Hall’s argument appears to have raised a significant awareness about the effects of global competitions on technological changes, experienced by all countries including Namibia and that the NDF is not exceptional. Hence, plans to tackle the challenges of competitive technological advances, as related to career development/progression for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force will be of paramount importance.

In planning career, the army should get the best from its commissioned officers for its own benefits, and that of the officers themselves (Mabhena, 1990, p.3). Mabhena further suggested that, for officers to be worthwhile in their fields of work, they should be carefully selected and prepared for competency. Preparing officers for competency comes in the form of training which might be expensive. With these expenses in mind, the army must benefit from the officers’ training so that its investment becomes worthwhile. To Mabhena, benefitting from officers’ training can only be achieved by employing them in the posts that fully exploit their newly acquired knowledge. If this is not done, training then ceases and become an investment, and become a waste of money. According to Mabhana’s arguments, frustration may set in, if the expensively and well-trained officers are under-employed, and if their training is a civilian-compatible, they may not hesitate to leave the army. If these officers leave the army because of the under-employment, it is the army that suffers the consequences, because it did not honour the benefits of those officers’ training. Mabhena’s arguments that are suggesting the importance of the retention of a well trained, informed and qualified officers’ corps was supported by Hall (1987, p.6) who recommends the establishment of career development services as an
important way in which organisations may hedge against the uncertainty of the future. To Hall, the continuity and success of the organisation is largely depending on its ability to attract, evaluate, develop, use as well as retain well-qualified employees.

2.4. Competition as an Essential Incentive in Career Development Process

Mabhena (1990, p.3) argues that human beings are an ambitious species by nature, and thus, it is the desire to fulfil their ambitions, which motivates them into doing things that they believe will reward them. An employer does not, therefore, have to instil them with ambitions, rather it must capitalise on it by making them aware that their desires are accomplishable. Having archived this awareness, Mabhena (1998, p.3) added that:

“The organisation should than introduce incentives among the employees. Introduction of incentives initiates an element of competition among the employees. Competition however, can be counterproductive if not well regulated. It is the duty of the organisational management to manage and regulate the competition, and to turn it into a fair game for all. Once it is introduced, it is also necessary to ensure that regulations of the competition are not benefiting its winners only, but benefit the organisation more than the winners’ benefits.

In addition, Hall (1987, p.18) viewed career development/progression as a progression through a sequence of jobs involving continually more advanced or diverse activities, resulting in a wider improved skills, greater responsibilities, prestige and higher income. It should therefore be deduced from Mabhena and Hall’s argument that, the element of competition in the NDF is as neutral as it comes in many forms. Its rewards are among other things; promotion to a high rank, appointment to a senior post, salary increment, etc. etc. These rewards are no doubt expensive to the NDF but are necessary and quite appropriate as well. An officer whom the NDF is promoting to a high
rank or appointing to a high position could benefit from that promotion or appointment, while the NDF as an organisation benefits from his/her improved performances.

2.5. Individuals in the Organisations’ Career Development Process

Individuals who are about 45 to 65 years old would either establish performance (career-maintenance), or decrease performance (career-stagnation). The essence of career development programs in the organisations should therefore to eliminate career plateau (Certo 2000, p.13), a period defined by Certo as a period of little or no apparent progress in the growth of a career. A common thread thorough the career development is the concept of mutual gain. Within the organisational context, career development represents the outcomes created by the integration of individual career-planning activities within organisational career management process, and thus the symbiotic relationship between an individual and the organisation is the simple basis for continued cooperation and reliance from both parties (Hall, 1987, p.55). Waitley (1995, p.9) argued that individuals have different experiences, talents and goals they retain as members of a group. Successful organisations, like their successful members recognise the individuals as the catalysts for meaningful career development. In support of these arguments, Peters (1994, p.66) wrote:

The individual is the primary force in the career development process. In the world where success depends upon brainpower and curiosity, the self-managed growth of the individual becomes paramount, and the wise corporation wittingly turns itself into a tool for fostering their successes towards organisational objectives.

A common agreement can be reached here with Hall (1987), Waitely (1995) and Peters (1994) that, it is very essential when the policy makers are re-visiting career development issues to consider the role of individual career progression within the
organisation. The necessary meshing of individual employees’ needs drives the organisation to develop its individual employees into striving to reach for their personal goals within the framework of the organisational objectives. Mabhena (1990, p.7) submitted the similar arguments by opining that officers should plan their individual career courses, while the army should direct their footsteps in persuasion of those courses. Hence, individuals should be supported by organisational investment in order to determine the courses and effects of their individual career goals within the confinement of the organisation’s aim objectives.

2.6. Mentoring

In general terms, mentoring can be defined as a developmental relationship between an experienced senior colleague, or mentor and a less experienced junior colleague, or protégé (Noe 1998, p.457). According to Noe, “the two primary functions of the mentoring process include: social functions such counselling, and human resources management functions such as coaching which help protégés to prepare for advancement” (p.472). Hunt (1983, p.483) stated that mentorship is generally recognised as a critical tool for successful development of junior members. According to Hunt, individual managers who engage in career planning activities are likely to have greater awareness of their subordinates’ strength, weakness and interests. Consequently, they may be more enthusiastic about participating in mentoring relationships and better prepared to effectively utilise the mentor. Katz (1995, as cited in Nel, et al., 2005) argued that, “interim progress review and coaching meetings are key elements in monitoring
employees’ performances” (p. 519). To Nel, et al., it is the responsibility of the organisational managements to ensure the professional development of all employees, and view mentorship as part of its efforts to provide challenge and guidance to its subordinates. The role of mentoring in any organisation is to ensure that all of its employees reach their full potentials, thereby enhancing their career professionals.

2.7. The Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of the Study

2.7.1 The “Constructivist” Theory

It should be necessary that appropriate career educational policies with clear benchmarks be designed in order to respond to various career development needs for commissioned officers in the NDF (18th Annual Training Conferences, 2008). In this respect, Vygotsky’s (1962, as cited in Garvett, 2005, p. 13) The constructivist theory urges policymakers when designing course contents to consider the role of shared understanding as elements to be included in the course programs. In essence, the strength of Vygotsky’s constructivist perspectives is emphasised on the accumulated experience as significant in the process of learning. Garvett refers to the role of understanding issues and events as an element that shapes the process of learning. It was for this reason that Garvett admits that the meaning-making activities of the individual do not take place in isolation, but instead are shaped by culture of understanding issues or events in a situation within which the learning process is taking place. According to Garvett, such issues or events are also regarded as key factors in the process of learning and serve as the
important functions aiming at the development of a learner. Garvett also stated that, as people develop and mature, they build experiences through which they evaluate and understand issues and events. In this process, learning is a way of constructing meanings derived from a learner’s evaluation and understanding of a particular issue or event, and this involves the ability of the learner to adapt to the environment within which a learner is operating. To Garvett, an understanding of the theory of constructivist would help organisations to shape the process of learning. Therefore, this study regards the theoretical concepts embedded in constructivist theory as important and relevance to analyse in order to understand the effectiveness of career development policy for commissioned officers in NDF.

2.7.2. The Concepts of “Specialist”

Peters (1994, p.34) has tackled the argument by demanding to know whether an individual should endeavour to be a specialist about the organisation’s particular industry. According to Peters, following the specialist as a conceptual approach to career successes, the time consuming pursuit of “hidden levers” is the key to successes. Yate (1993) argued that, “those who believe in specialists simply repeat years' worth of experience for a year after a year, and risk being pigeonholed into specific roles or duties” (p.274). For the purpose of this study, the submission by Peters and Yate implies that, each individual should be striving to master the details of one’s career for him/her to become indispensable to the organisation, and thereby ensure organisational success. There is no doubt that the specialist perspectives emphasised by both Peters and Yate
have brought to light some practical assumptions that, individual officers who have a thorough understanding of their roles in the NDF can contribute meaningfully, to the Defence goals, thereby becoming more valuable officers to the Namibian Defence Force. Therefore, the theoretical relevance embedded in Specialist concepts should be considered as useful to analyse policy issues affecting career development and progression for commissioned officers in the NDF.

2.7.3. The Concept of “Life-Long Learning”

According to Knapper and Cropley (1985), “career development is a life-long learning” experience (p. 20). Meanwhile Dento (1998) stated that “knowledge is a key antecedent for life-long learning and knowledge is power” (p. 78). According Dento, it is indisputable that the value of knowledge and skills gained through a career path is evident in one’s progression and that education plays a vital role in this process. The notion of life-long learning as noted by Knapper, Cropley and Dento strives to meet the practical and intellectual demands of the complicated professions by recognising the importance of education and training programs.

Alueendo (2009, p. 24) argued that, the life-long learning is a constructive response that rooted in concept of fostering learning through life. According to Alweendo, life-long learning as a concept is useful to identify the future strategies and decisions about the nature of information required to determine and define a specific goal and that goal is a reason why the learning is taking place. Knapper and Cropley opined that, capabilities of life-long learning must depend greatly upon personal competencies
and study skills of the individuals involved. Of particular interest here, are the psychological factors that influence officers’ capability and their willingness to engage in the process of learning through their life as part of career development. In addition, Dento argued that the theoretical concept found in the concept of life-long learning is relevant, which must be perceived as a construction of individuals’ knowledge through constructive meaning and transformation of their understandings by interacting with their environments. For the sake of this study, the theoretical concepts emphasised in the concept of life-long learning is made up of knowledge-based concepts that form the basics in a provision of useful scenarios to examine the effectiveness of the career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF. Therefore, this study regards the theoretical concept embedded in the concept of life-long learning as one of the concepts that is relevant to analyse and understand the effectiveness of career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.

2.8. Summary

Chapter two reviewed the available literature related to the theories and concepts of career development and progression issues. The aim is to present a fair judgment to the research problem from the literature’s perspectives, which may leads to the identification of new ideas and approaches that would help to visualise strategies needed to overcome these shortcomings encroaching on enhancing career needs for commissioned officers in the NDF.
Due to the limited publications on career development in Namibia, Chapter two contextualised the concept of career development and progression in the NDF into a broader frame of literature related to career development in general public and corporate sectors, hence the previous studies on general human resources management systems regarding career development practices and processes that can inform future policy decisions about career development for commissioned officers in the NDF were investigated.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter has analytically presented the investigation of the important theories and concepts found in the related literature, and needed to solve the research problem. This chapter outlines the research design, population, sample and sampling techniques, research instrument and procedures employed in the data collection and analysis process. The chapter further elaborates on the research ethics, a system of moral, and rules of behaviour that was considered to be the guiding principles throughout this study.

3.2. Research Design

This study is descriptive by nature, based on a case study research strategy. It has used quantitative research approach to determine factors and attributes perceived to be influential to achieve officers’ career goals. These factors were presumed to include; experience, expertise, professionalism and expectations for commissioned officers in the NDF. By adopting quantitative approach, the researcher was able to understand the objective reality from the perspectives of officers involved. Hence, the study has contextualised the research problem in a way that, the researcher ensured that the perceptions of the participants’ problems and challenges they faced regarding their persuasion of their career goals were exactly and factually captured. From these objective viewpoints, a quantitative research approach, which was used throughout the study,
permits the researcher to make relevant corrections and to adjust to new information and discoveries, thus the researcher was able to pick up facts that could prove pertinent to the inconsistence between the career policy requirements and academic qualifications for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force. In fact, the *quantitative* research method was used to enable the researcher to collect and analyse data, which in the research result report was expressed both in numbers and in percentages.

### 3.3. Population

Often the most valuable source of data related to human resource topics such as “career development” is the population of individuals directly affected by the issue (Alreck, 1995, p.5). Best and Kahn (2006) defined population as “a group of individuals who have one or more characteristics in common, that are of interest to the researcher” (p.13). The target-population of this research effort consisted of all NDF commissioned officers in the Artillery Brigade. Reasons to confine the study to the Artillery Brigade have already been discussed in chapter one. The total population of the commissioned officers at that Brigade was 110 officers (Order of Battle: Artillery Brigade, 2010). This was a particular population to which the researcher intended to generalise the research findings, and to the extent of the population of commissioned officers in Namibian Defence Force in general. Table 3.1 below summarises the details of the target population.
Table 3.1: Officers’ population according to gender and rank-group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank-group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Officers</td>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Population = 110


3.4. Sample and Sampling Technique

Studies by Best & Kahn (2006, p. 17), Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007, p. 100); Struwig and Stead (2001, p.111) suggested that, the ideal 10 - 20% sample is large enough to represent the population to which the researcher intends to generalise the research findings, and small enough to be selected economically. For this study, thirty (30) officers accounting for about 27% of the total population, with the gender division of 90% male and 10% female were selected to a sample, using both purposive, and stratified-random sampling research strategies. This implies that, commanders and key staff officers who are regarded as key informants were selected on purposive basis, while the rest of the respondents were selected on stratify-random sampling basis. The general sample characteristics of what formed the final sample of this study was basically based
on rank and rank-category, age, gender, appointment, year of commissioning and qualification (level of education and courses attended).

Generally, the sample was drawn from the commissioned officers, ranging from two rank-categories of officers in the NDF namely; junior officers and senior officers. Due to *purposive* and *stratified-random* nature of sampling techniques used, the total sample per officers’ rank-category was only been able to be finalised after the commencement of the study. Table 3.2 below provides the detailed sample selection technique employed for this study.

### Table 3.2: Sample selection technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
<th>Rank-group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposive &amp; Stratified-Random</td>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Officers</td>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Sample = 30

*Source: Interviews (2010)*

### 3.5. Research Instruments

3.5.1. Questionnaires
Questionnaires were utilised as the major and primary instruments of collecting data. In the process, a set of questionnaire reflected as Appendix A: Questionnaire - Junior and Senior Officers of the Artillery Brigade – Otjiwarongo was used. Questions contained in a questionnaire were directly informed by the research questions and objectives outlined in chapter one. A set of Questionnaire consists of items organised into the following sections:

Section A: Demographical and biographical information.

Section B: Effectiveness of career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.

Section C: The role of existing mechanisms geared for implementing career development policies and the impact of ministerial efforts to improve career for commissioned officers.

Section D: Challenges in career development for commissioned officers.

3.5.2. Face-to-Face Interviews and Observations

The use of multiple techniques of data collection known as triangulation of data permits the data verification in order to achieve data reliability and validity, and that face-to-face interviews are efficient data mechanism when a researcher knows exactly what is
required, by designing questions that are characterised by facts of research interest (Best & Kahn, 2006; Robson, 1993 and Henning, 2004). In addition, observations studies can be used in support of any other methods during the data collection process (Struig & Stead, 2001). For this study, the inclusion of open-ended questions in the face-to-face interviews schedule enabled the researcher to further elicit the respondents’ unique views on career related issues, while the observations methods facilitated the researcher not only to be relying on the willingness of the participants to provide accurate data, as provided in the research questionnaire alone. It is based on these reasons that, this study used face-to-face interviews and observations research approaches in support of the questionnaire to permits the data verification in order to achieve data reliability and validity.

3.5.3. Focus Group

To achieve additional data and data verification, the study also used focus group interactions as another forum to generate data. In the process, the study once focused its research efforts on gathering all participants from all rank-categories, and introduced group discussions, designed to obtain officers’ perceptions on career development and progression policies in NDF.

Additional data were achieved and verified by introducing the examination of officers’ personal records/files and their orders of battle from the personnel division at the Brigade Headquarters and other personnel branches at the Regimental levels. A sample of 60 personal records/files was examined; 20 files from the senior and 40 files from the
junior officers’ rank-categories. These personal records/files were selected regardless as to whether the owner has participated in the study or not. The data captured from these records/files were analysed to assess the progression of individual officers in terms of qualifications appointments, promotions and other career related issues.

3.5.5. Pilot Study

Alreck (1995) described the aim of the pilot study as to test trustworthiness, consistency and credibility of the research instrument designed for data collection in addressing the requirements of the study. It was against this background that a pilot study was conducted before the actual data collection process began. The three major reasons why the pilot study was conducted before the actual research could be carried out were:

1. To establish whether there are any ambiguities in the research items.

2. To confirm the trustworthiness of the instruments of data collection.

3. To determine the exact data required in relation to the stated research questions.
The pilot study was conducted in the Defence Headquarters in Windhoek, targeted the same rank-groups used for the actual study. Five (5) prospective candidates from both, junior and senior commissioned officers’ rank-categories were selected to participate in the pilot study. The purpose of the pilot study was explained to the respondents and informed consent was obtained before the commencement of the pilot study.

The results of the pilot study indicated that the designed instruments were valid for the study, and thus the research instruments and the research sampling technique were adopted to be used during the actual data collection exercise with no major modifications or changes.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

Permission to enter the territory of Artillery Brigade and conduct interviews with selected respondents was obtained from the office of the Chief of the Namibian Defence Force before the data collection process commenced (see Appendix B). The Brigade commander was requested to nominate and gathers participants from all rank-categories. The researcher then used focus group interactions to motivate participants to discuss how they perceive the career development for commissioned officer in NDF. In the process, information about the nature of the study and dates
and venues for administering questionnaires and conducting of face-to-face interviews were set.

The researcher first and purposively administered questionnaires to six (6) senior officers at the Brigade Headquarters (Bde HQs) as key informants, the rest of the respondents from the senior and junior officers’ rank-categories were randomly selected, based on stratified-random sampling research technique.

The Questionnaires were personally and directly administered by the researcher and to the participants respectively. In the process, the researcher read questions to the respondents and ticked the chosen response from the response sheet. In case of and/or where respondents were required or asked to provide reasons for their answers, responses were written down verbatim in the allotted spaces. To maintain confidentiality, participants were advised not to reveal their names, and that they had the choice to remain anonymous.

In addition, sample of personal files were selected from each rank-category for records examination. Files were randomly selected regardless whether the owner participated or not. Only personal records/files for members who have been in service since and before the year 2005 were examined.

3.7. Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed in a descriptive-statistics and percentages forms, using a simple manual design by integrating and arranging/tabulating the data according to the units of the same meaning. In other words, after data were collected, all questionnaires and interviews records were edited, categorised into the officers’ rank-categories and then
synthesised to establish the units of corresponding responses. Each unit of corresponding responses was compared with other units of corresponding responses and was placed in appropriate category. In this way, the similarities of units of corresponding responses were identified and the senses of those responses were then drawn and concluded. Graphical figures and tables were generated to describe the meanings of the data.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Any research study should respect participants’ right to privacy. In general terms, the researcher must keep the nature and the quality of the participants’ performance strictly confidential, (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Stead & Struwig, 2001).

For the purpose of this study, respondents were asked to sign a “Participants’ Consent Form”, attached as Appendix B to this thesis, which was administered to them by the researcher himself. The form stipulated various ‘code of ethics’, a list of principles and regulation guiding the researcher’s behaviours, and explains the rights of the participants to be observed throughout and after the study. The main aim was to acquire the informed consent from the participant. The researcher first informed the participants about the approval for conducting a research study, which was obtained from the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF) before the study commences (see Appendix C). The participants were further informed that, the information gathered for the study was anonymous for the sake of protecting their dignity. It was also assured to them that the purpose of the study is to generate information that will be used for academic purposes
only and that it will solely be shared to intended beneficiaries. The participants were promised to be provided with a detail of the research findings upon its completion, should they request them. Information about the researcher’s individual office that the participant could conduct him should they have questions or concerns about the study was also provided. Furthermore, participants were notified that their involvement in the research was voluntary and were not obliged to divulge information. They would prefer to remain private and that they might withdraw from the study at any time.

3.9. Summary

This chapter described the research design regarding the methodology, which the study has used as related to the data needed to address the research problem. The study used quantitative research approach, focused on analysis of the effectiveness of the existing mechanism and the impact of the ministerial efforts on training and education, postings/appointments, rewards/promotions and mentoring, and that the quantitative research approach was used to enable the researcher to achieve data needed for this study, which in the research result report was expressed both in numbers and in percentages.

Chapter three further defined the population targeted by this research effort, which consisted of 110 NDF commissioned officers in Artillery Brigade. Thirty (30) officers accounting for about 27% of the total population, with the gender division of 27 (90%) male and three (10%) female were selected to a sample, using a combination of purposive and stratified-random sampling research strategies.
Questionnaires which were supported by face-to-face Interviews, observations, focus group discussions, and personal records analysis were utilised as the major instruments of collecting data.

The pilot study was conducted as indicated in chapter three. The purpose of conducting a pilot study was to test the trustworthiness of the instrument used in the process of collecting data. The results of the pilot study indicated that the research instruments were valid for the study.

Data analysis was also conducted as covered by chapter three. First data were organised into categories, synthesised to establish the units of meaning. Senses of meaning were identified and conclusions were drawn. Graphical figures and tables were generated to describe the meanings of the data.

Chapter three finally discussed the consideration of the ethical issues. Thus the respondents were asked to sign a “Participants’ Consent-Form”, attached as Appendix B to this thesis. The form stipulated the “codes of ethics”, a list of principles and regulations guiding the behaviours of the researcher. The researcher further explained the right of the participants to be observed throughout and after the study.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

4.1. Introduction

Chapter 3 conceptualised this study by describing the research design regarding the methodologies that the study has used as related to the data needed to address the researched problem. In this chapter, the researcher presents the report of the data
obtained from respondents. The aim is to bring out the respondents’ views and to discuss the interested issues and comments emerged from the interviews regarding the effectiveness of career development and progression policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.

The data analysed in this chapter was the outcome of the interviews posed to the selected junior and senior officers of the Artillery Brigade at Otjiwarongo Military Base, and they are discussed in the subsequent paragraphs as outlined in questionnaire attached as Appendix A.

Generally, the chapter presents, discusses and interprets the results of the study in relation with the research questions and objectives outlined in chapter 1. Apart from providing possible implications on the career development/progression policy for commissioned officers in the NDF, it also summarises the results and findings of the entire study and setting the ground for chapter 5, which summarises conclusions and draws recommendations from the findings of this study. Questions and answers obtained as data from potential respondents are properly analysed and interpreted in this chapter using tables and graphical figures.

4.2. Demographic and Biographic Information

4.2.1. Analysis According to Gender
The respondents were asked to provide information regarding their gender. In response, 27 respondents, accounting for 90% of total respondents, were males. Other three respondents, which accounting for 10% of the total sample were females. Table 4.1 below illustrates the numbers and percentages of respondents by gender respectively.

Table 4.1: Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank-group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Gender in Numbers and in Percentages</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Interviews (2010)*

The gender results have indicated that, male participants were more by 90% compared to only 10% of female participants. The sample seems to be biases in favour of males. This could be best interpreted by the fact that there are more males than females in the ranks of commissioned officers in artillery division in particular and the entire NDF in general. The implication of this situation is that, female officers may feel dominated in the force due to their numerical disadvantage. This dominant complex may negatively affect their career progression. It is important to
recommend that the NDF should be gender sensitive in its officers’ recruitment policy.

4.2.2. Analysis According to Age

The age of the participants were revealed for demographical understanding of the study. Figure 4.1 below, illustrates the summary of percentages for the respondents by age.

Figure 4.1: Age

Source: Interviews (2010)

Data in Figure 4.1 above are showing that, 16.6% representing Lieutenants were the youngest, aged between 20 and 30 years, followed by the total of 20%, comprises of: 6.6% representing Majors and 13.3% representing Captains who
were between 31 and 40 years of age. Other 30% comprises of: 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 13.3% representing Majors and 13.3% representing Captains were aged between 41 and 50 years. The rest 33.3% comprises of: 6.6% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 6.6% representing Majors and 13.3% representing Captains, were aged between 51 and 60. No respondent from above 60 years of age was interviewed.

It was assumed from Certo’s (2000, p.13) point of view (as reflected in Chapter 2) that individuals who are about 45 to 60 years old show either established performance (career-maintenance), or decreased performance (career-stagnation). The researcher took the augment by Certo into account, to analyse the domination of officers’ corps by a number of offices from the former fighters. It was concluded from the personal records/files examination that the age of the former fighter who constituted quite a number of the officers at the Artillery Brigade, were ranging from above 40 years old, the age-generation in proximity with an age-period defined by Certo as an age-period characterised by either established performance (career maintenance), or decreased performance (career stagnation). The essence of career development programs in NDF should therefore be to eliminate career plateau, defined by Certo as a period of little or no apparent progress in the growth of a career. This situation could arguably be resulted from the age of the ex-fighters at the time of integration. Personal records/files further revealed that, the age of the former artillerists at the time of integration could have ranged from 30 to 40 years, and that there might be no younger artillery officer than 30 years of age at that time, and for quite a number of years (until 1997) after the integration in 1990.

In addition, data reflected in Figure 4.1 above have further revealed that, no matter what, a considerable number of senior officers will start retiring as from 2011 and beyond. In other words, it is evident that, all Colonels, most of the Lieutenant-Colonels and the number of Majors interviewed must soon be leaving the Force.

The study further found through records that; since the days when the first officers was inducted in 1990, the next intake of young-junior officers were only conducted in 1997, followed by three intakes, which was conducted in 2000, 2002 and 2004 respectively. Thirteen (13) years since 1997 up to now (2010), only two (2) (6.6%) officers participated in this study were promoted to the rank of Majors (see Figure 4.1 above, ‘Majors’, 31-40 years of age). The problem with this scenario is that the present most experienced officers will retire, leaving the yet to be promoted and inexperienced ones in service, and as times goes on; the NDF will have few officers who will be experienced and capable of assuming increased (senior ranks) responsibilities.
4.2.3. Analysis According to Ranks

Respondents were asked to provide their ranks and rank groups. Percentages of respondents according to their current ranks are summarised in Figure 4.2 below.

![Figure: 4.2: Ranks](image)

Source: *Interviews (2010)*

Data in Figure 4.2 above revealed that, 6.6% of respondents held the rank titled ‘Colonel’. Other 10% were holding the rank titled ‘Lieutenant-Colonel’; 26.6% were from the rank title of ‘Major’. Forty (40%) of the respondents were from the rank titled ‘Captain’, while 16.6% were from the ranks called ‘Lieutenant’.

In fact, the majority (17) of officers participated, and accounting for 56.6% of the sample population were from the ranks-category of junior officers (Captains
+ Lieutenants), compared to 13 which is accounting for 43.3% from the rank categories of senior officers (Colonels + Lieutenant-Colonels + Majors) in Artillery Brigade. This was due to the structural nature of the officers’ corps at the Artillery Brigade and the nature of the data required for this study.

4.2.4. Years of Experience in Current Ranks.

The respondents were asked to disclose their year of experience in the current ranks. This question was asked to determine as to how long participants have served in their current ranks as opposed to their promotion. The respondents’ years of experience in current ranks is summarised in Figure 4.3 below.
Source: Interviews (2010)

Based on data in Figure 4.4 above, the study concluded that, 23.3% which includes: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 3.3% representing majors, 3.3% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants participated in this study have a record of accomplishment in their current ranks for less than a year. Other 40% comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 23.3% representing majors, and 6.6% representing Lieutenants have track records of serving in the same rank for a period of between one and five years.
The longest serving participants were 11 (36.6%) officers from a rank of Captains who served in their current rank for a period of between six and 10 years. It was also discovered through individuals’ personal records and when comparing Figure 4.1, Figure 4.2 to Figure 4.3 that amongst commissioned officers who served for more than 16 year in active military services, there are some officers who are now aging while still holding junior ranks despite that not all of them were under-educated. Some of the respondents were claiming to have qualifications equivalent to that of secondary education, having military qualifications, acquired necessary professional experience and working skills. The implication of this scenario is that, quality of service might be compromised when service members have long service with appropriate military qualifications and they are not recognised (not promoted). It (the MoD) should have a clear-cut policy in place to ensure that the long serving officers in the same rank and who are holders of qualifications are accordingly rewarded.

4.2.5. Analysis as per Current Ranks Vis á Vis Present Appointments

To examine and determine their present job description/appointments/posts as opposed to their rank held, the respondents were asked to reveal their current job descriptions/appointments/posts and positions they held in the structures of the Defence Force as opposed to their present ranks. Table 4.2 below illustrates the numbers and percentages as per ranks-categories vis á vis appointments of the participants.
Table 4.2: Current ranks vis-à-vis present appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment as per Rank-Category</th>
<th>Job Description/Appointments</th>
<th>Senior Officers</th>
<th>Junior Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments for Senior Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Brigade Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unit Commander)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1 Staff Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Unit Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 Staff Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments for Junior Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Battery Commander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Staff Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings as indicated in Table 5 above shows that, among the sample of senior commissioned officers interviewed: one (3.3%) of the two (6.6%) Colonels have indicated to have held a Deputy Brigade Commander’s appointment, while the other one (3.3%) had no post, since there is only one post corresponding to the rank of Colonels in the Brigade. One officer (3.3%) from rank of Lieutenant-Colonels was employed as a Unit Commanding Officer. One (3.3%) Lieutenant-Colonel was holding the appointments of grade 1 staff officers at the Brigade HQs, while the Lieutenant-Colonel had no posts.

The study further concluded that four officer (13.3%) participated from the ranks of Major held appointments of grade 2 staff officers at the Brigade Headquarters, while other two (6.6%) Majors have occupied the posts of Battery Commander. The rest two (6.6%) Majors are Deputy Unit Commanders.

Data related to junior officers revealed that three Captains accounting for 10% of the sample population indicated to be serving as Deputy Battery Commanders. Another three (10%) of them of them was a grade 3 staff officers, while six (20%) Captains indicated to have occupied the Platoon Commanders’ posts. Five (16.6%) participants from the rank of Lieutenant were all held Platoon Commander’s appointments.

4.2.6. Years of Experience in Current Posts/Appointments
Yate (1993), as reviewed in Chapter two, argued that “those who believe in specialists theory simply repeats years worth of experience for year after year, and risk being pigeonholed into specific roles or duties” (p.274). There is no doubt that the argument by Yate have brought to light theoretical assumptions that, the individual officer can only gain more experience by serving the NDF from deferent appointments/posts/positions. This would enhance the officer’s contribution to the defence goals, thereby becoming a more valuable officer to the Namibian Defence Force. Based on that theoretical assumption, each respondent was asked to reveal his/her years of experience in the current post and/or appointment. The aim was to determine the extent to which the current career development policy has on posting/positioning of commissioned officers (for them to gain more experience and perhaps advanced qualifications) is effective. Figure 4.4 below summarised the detailed percentages according to the respondents’ years of experiences in their current posts/appointments.

Figure 4.4: Years of experience in the current post/appointments
The results have shown that, 33.3% of the respondents indicated to have served for ‘less than one year’ in the current post, this includes: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 10% representing Majors, 6.6% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants. Other 50% which comprises of; 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 16.6% representing Majors, 23.3% representing Captains and 6.6% representing lieutenants have indicated to have served their current posts for a period of between one and five years. Other 6.6% of the respondents, which include: 3.3% representing Colonels and another 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels revealed that they have no experience in the current appointments as they were not posted. The longest serving officers were three Captains accounting for 10% of the sample who claimed to have been serving their appointment/post for a period between 11 and 15 years. The implication of this scenario remains crucial, and tantamount to the situation discussed above for
officers over staying in the same rank (refer to section 4.2.4 and Figure 4.3). The MoD should investigate and institute corrective measures to units where officers serve for such a long period without being rotated. In view of the said situation, such deserving members should be appointed to any other posts in the NDF where they would have accumulated more experience needed for their career improvement.

The study conducted by Mabhena (1990) suggested that, an officer should at least stay for three years in one appointment in order to accumulate enough experience for promotion. Only in exceptional circumstances should an officer be posted before completing three years. Job rotation is essential in military career. It is linked to rank progression and must be progressive such that in one rank one should hold successively senior posts. This will provide opportunity to widen one’s experience in as many fields as possible, while in the same rank. With Mabhena’s argument in mind, one could have concluded that the appointments held by officers on completion of integration were neither part nor a product of well designed job rotation plan. Because of this, those who started holding the most senior positions have experienced job stagnation (an example of 6.6% senior officers without appointment as shown in Table 4.2 above is justified here). Job rotation is necessary to avoid frustration. In the present circumstances of the NDF, it will be necessary to implement it realistically, although lack of rank progression is the main hindrance to a progressive job rotation (refer to section 4.2.4 and Figure 4.3). This study relates the case of an officer who was removed from the post just after his promotion. Surprisingly this officer has just left the post for another officer who was (just) promoted at the same time. The question remains, why there were
promotions. The benefit of promotion often put as disadvantage of job rotation (appointments or posting) in NDF.

4.2.7. Academic Qualifications

The respondents were requested to reveal their standards of educational qualifications in order to measure the levels of academic qualifications required to do their job. Table 4.3 below summarises the number and percentages of respondents’ educational qualifications by rank categories.

Table 4.3: Academic qualifications as per rank-categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Respondents By Rank-Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school Qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school Qualification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reflected in Table 4.3 above, the data related to the senior officers’ rank-category revealed that; eight (26.6%) of the participants from the senior rank-group, have indicated to have completed only primary school education (grade 10 or standard 8). Three (10%) participants from the same rank-category claimed to have undergone secondary educations (grade 12 or standard 10). Only one (3.3%) of the senior officers participated have accomplished diploma at tertiary level, while another one (3.3%) has attained B degree.

For junior officers, five (16.6%) officers are recorded to have attained educational level up to primary education. Eleven (36.6%) participants indicated to have attained secondary school qualifications certificates. Only one (3.3%) of the participants from the junior officers has succeeded to obtain a high diploma.

The overall results in Table 4.3 above indicated that one (3.3%) of the senior officers participated have obtained tertiary certificates, while eight (26.6%) from senior ranks indicated to have obtained only primary school qualifications compare to five (16.6%) from junior officers rank-category. Only 10% from the senior
officers were indicated to have achieved secondary school qualifications, compared to 36.6% of the respondents from the junior ranks. Meanwhile, two (6.6%) of the respondents that includes; one (3.3%) from junior ranks (Captain) and another one (3.3%) from senior ranks (Major) have attained B degrees. A comparison made between, current ranks in Figure 4.2 above and current ranks vis á vis present appointments in Table 4.3 above plus the personal records analysis revealed the existence of variations in level of educational qualifications, and that some of the junior officers were academically better qualified than their bosses. It goes without saying that, academic qualifications are not very important in NDF and thus the physical structure and military prowess of an individual are important attributes that may determine the career propensity of officer.

It was empathically indicated in the minutes of the 15th Annual Training Conference (2005) as reflected earlier on, in chapter one of this thesis that all officers from the first intake in 1990 were from the ranks of ex-combatants, and that the main criteria used during the integration to select officers (commanders) where loyalty, length of service, battlefield achievements and military training. According to the minutes, educational qualifications were not a factor to be considered during the integration. Because of that, more than 40% (see Table 4.3 above) of the officers indicated to have attended only up to lower of primary education, while others did not get opportunity for schooling before Namibia’s independence in 1990, as part of the colonial legacy. As a result they did not posses secondary school certificates, which should be a minimum educational requirement for commissioned officers. So far, some might have advanced themselves academically but others might have failed to do so. Some officers might have
failed military courses because of their very poor educational background. Although the
detailed officers’ educational statistics were not easily accessible at a time of this study,
but based on the data in Table 4.2 above, it is safe to conclude that some officers, (mostly
senior officers) did not go as far as grade eight in their schooling. With such un-educated
officers, it is easy to conclude that, the force is on the wrong end of literacy rules. While
it is appreciated that there is no easy solution to this problem, this mistake must not be
repeated with the future generation of officers.

Another problematic issue of concern, with regards to the existing inconsistencies
found between the career policy requirements and academic qualifications in the NDF
was; some officers in leadership positions believe that civil qualifications have no value
in military services and career progression. Because of this, there is confusion in criteria
used for appointing candidates for training or courses and promotion opportunities. Some
appointments are made on the basis of experience and military qualifications only
without taking civil qualifications into account. Consequently, some officers with less
military qualifications, but hold high academic qualifications may become dissatisfied
when they lose opportunities such as further training and promotion to senior positions.
In this regard, these officers may see their military career discouraging and they may be
frustrated and quit NDF employment. It is still not certain as to how the career policy
matches academic and military qualifications in the NDF. Under normal circumstances, a
qualification below Grade 12 for an officer does not meet the requirements as articulated
in the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007). They would be regarded as
unsophisticated to digest more complex subjects presented on advanced career
progression training and educational courses. Yet, they are selected for officers’ cadet to become officers.

Nowadays, armies are bustling with state of art regarding technologies, which require a decent standard of education for everyone, especially for officers to understand and execute their duties professionally. It is on this ground, that the researcher concurs with the study made by Meggison (1981, as cited in Mabhena, 1990, p.2) and Alweendo (2009, p.11), supported by Hall (1987). These literatures (as reviewed in chapter two) suggested for the individual members to plan their future careers, while career management remains a responsibility of the organisation by assisting its members to attain their career goals towards the organisational objectives. Within the context of the NDF, career development represents the outcomes created by the integration of individual officers’ career activities within the MoD’s career management process. The combination of the Ministerial efforts to manage its officers’ career activities, and the individual officer’s performance towards the MoD strategic goals and objectives benefits both the officer as an individual and the Defence Force. Development and progression of commissioned officers’ career in the NDF is therefore not only a requirement, but also a necessity for the continued existence of the Defence Force.

4.2.8. Military Qualifications

The Minutes of the 18th Annual Training Conference (2008) as reflected in Chapter one reads: the training in man-management should be given the priority to effect the implementation of the career development policy for officers successfully. Based on these Minutes, each respondent was asked to reveal his or her military
qualification/s in order to relate them to the level of competiveness of professional and expertise amongst the junior and senior officers in the NDF. The detailed breakdown of respondents’ responses according to their military qualifications is summarised in Figure 4.5 below.

Figure 4.5: Military qualifications

Source: Interviews (2010)

The data in Figure 4.5 above reveals that; all of the respondents have undergone career military training and obtained military professional qualifications in various fields. The findings indicated that, 6.6% from rank of Colonels and another 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels have completed the Senior/Command and Staff course, a course that all Majors must complete before promoted to the next substitutive rank/s. Other 3.3% of the respondents, representing Lieutenant-Colonels have indicated to have completed the battalion
commanders’ course, a course that a battalion commander must complete before the appointment of commanding a battalion. Other 10% representing Majors have indicated to have completed the Battery Commanders’ course, the course that is one of the requirements for one to become a Major, while other 16.6% also representing Majors indicated to have only completed a platoon Commanders’ course, which is one level lower than the rank of Majors (platoon commanders’ equivalence). Other 16.6% representing Lieutenants have undergone a Platoon Commander’s course, a course, which is appropriate for their job, while 33.3% representing Captains indicated to have only undergone the same (Platoon Commander’s) course. The other 6.6% (two Captains) indicated to have completed “any other (career) career course/s’, and the course has been revealed to this study as a “Defence Management Course”. This course was completed within three academic years (2006-2009) in the Federal Republic of Russia. The course normally only meant for Management Cadres/Generals. These junior officers were claimed to have gained the necessary military-professional experience, and felt that they were not properly deployed. None of the participants has undergone the Junior Staff Course so far.

A comparison of data in Table 4.2 and Figure 4.5 above supported by personal records examination disclosed the considerable number of senior officers who did not meet the requirement to be senior officer. In most cases, both military and academic qualifications obtained by these officers were far lower than the rank and appointments they held. Judging from their current ranks, to their current appointments, as reflected by Figure 4.2 and Table 4.2 respectively, the study concluded that the respondents’ military qualifications as reflected in Figure 4.5
above, were in most cases lower than either their present ranks or appointments. This may also lead to the conclusion that the officers’ career progression policy in NDF is ineffective.

4.2.9 Years since Last Promotion

To familiarise this study with the state of promotion for the officers under study, and to determine the extent of the perceived disparities or variations in relation to the promotional criteria for officers, the participants were asked to provide the year since their last promotion. The summary of the results as per question stated above are reflected in Figure 4.6 below.

Figure 4.6: Years since last promotion
Results in Figure 4.6 above indicated that 23.3% of the respondents, which is a composition of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 3.3% representing Majors, 3.3% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants were promoted within a period of less than a year. About 43.3% of the sample, which comprises of: one 3.3% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Lieutenant-colonels, 23.3% representing Majors, 3.3% representing Captains and 6.6% representing Lieutenants were promoted during the period of one to five years. Other 33.3% representing Captains have indicated to have received their last promotions within a period of six to 10 years, and no one was recorded to have been promoted in a period beyond 10 years.

Although most of the respondents indicated to have held appointments relevant to their ranks when previously asked to reveal their current ranks as opposed to their present post/appointments (refer to section 4.2.5/Table 4.2), the study established that almost all posts for officers at the Artillery Brigade were occupied, and since the Artillery Brigade is not expanding, a situation of rank stagnation was experienced. It was also observed and noted by this study that the NDF policy of promoting on vacancy could not manage the rank stagnation problem, also due to natural wastage, which is at a slow pace and other reasons; promotions are very few since the establishment is almost full. Few as they are, promotions are done in an unsatisfactory manner because the rules governing promotions are not followed, the study established. Through a lack of promotional criteria some officer could be raising very high very quickly while some are yet to be
promoted, despite the fact that there have been promotions (compare Figure 4.3 to Figure 4.6 above).

Moreover, the problematic situation affecting mostly senior officers regarding officers without portfolios (see Table 4.2 above), age/rank-matching (compare Figure 4.1 to Figure 4.2 above) over staying in the same rank (see Figure 4.3 or Figure 4.6 above) and rank/appointment/qualification-matching (compare Table 4.2 to Figure 4.3/Table 4.3 was found to be emerged from the structural problem, originated from the establishment of the officers’ corps at the integration, (refer to chapter one). The said problem has resulted in a situation of rank-stagnation. Rank-stagnation was a result of lack of vacancies, while lack of vacancies was a result of rank inflation, and rank inflation was due to the lack of a clear-cut personnel policy to inform/direct the promotional policy in accordance with the retirement policy. If no solution that creates significant post/appointment, rank progression and promotion aspects for every officer is found, the officers’ corps may largely be frustrated and its efficiency decline.

4.2.10. Frequencies of Attendance of Career Course/s

The respondents were asked to indicate as how often they have attended the career courses, which needed to enhance their career progression in NDF. The aim of this question is to determine how frequently the individual officers’ attendance of career courses required for his/her career progression. The summary of the results from this question are reflected in Figure 4.7 below.
The data in Figure 4.7 above indicate that, all participants have undergone different career courses since they joined the NDF. The data revealed that, 20% of the respondents, which comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Major, 3.3% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants have indicated to have completed career progression courses in less than a year. Another 20% of the respondents, which comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Majors, 6.6% representing Captains and 6.6% representing Lieutenants have accomplished their career courses in one to two years. Other 36.6% comprises of; 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 13.3% representing Majors and 20% representing Captains indicated to have completed the career course in three to five years back. Other 3.3% representing Majors indicated to have attended a career course within six (6) to 10 years. The other 20% of the sample that comprises of: 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 3.3%
representing Majors and 10% representing Captains has revealed to this study that they have never attended any career course for as far back as 11-15 years ago, despite the fact that they have not completed all career courses required for their ranks and appointments.

It will be remaining a factual argument that, regular attendance of career course for military officers would be serving as an aid to determine as to who is better prepare than other is. Regular attending of the course symbolises the continuation of knowledge that officers have to accumulate from time to time in order to reflect their ability to get things done. Courses attendance should therefore be regarded as a preparatory process for officers to assume the increased responsibility (Mabhena, 1990).

4.2.11. Career Qualification Vis-à-Vis Present Appointments

In order to determine the perceived disparities or variations related to their levels of their qualifications as opposed to current appointments, the respondents were asked to compare their qualifications with their current appointments. Figure 4.8 below
summarises the details of the respondents’ ratings of their qualifications as opposed to their posts/appointments

Figure 4.8: Qualifications vis á vis current appointments

Source: Interviews (2010)

Data in Figure 4.8 above, used to compare the qualifications to the appointments of the respondents revealed that: the total of 6.6% of the sample, and representing the rank of Captains have registered their dissatisfaction with their current appointment and rated their qualifications ‘higher’ than their current appointments. The majority (60%), of the respondents includes: 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 13.3% representing Majors, 26.6% representing Captains and 16.6% representing Lieutenants was satisfied with their appointment, and rated their qualifications to be equivalent to their appointments. Other 26.6% respondents, which comprises of; 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing
Lieutenant-Colonels, 13.3% representing Majors and 6.6% representing Captains raised their concerns regarding the low standard of their qualifications, and felt that their qualifications were ‘lower’ than their present appointments. The rest 6.6% representing two senior officers: a Colonel and a Lieutenant-Colonel could not determine the balance between their qualifications and their current appointments, citing the reasons that; they have nothing to compare with, since they were only employed, but not deployed.

Interestingly, and as it was also indicated in section 4.2.8 (military qualifications), was a disclosure of two officers from the rank-band of Captains, and who rated their qualifications as ‘higher’ than their current appointments claimed to have completed a Defence Management Course for three years in the Federal Republic of Russia (2006-2009). These curses are normally only meant for Management Cadres/Generals. The same officers were claimed to have gained the necessary military professional experience and felt that they were underutilised. This scenario is counter-productive and deprives the NDF of optimal utilisation of the officers’ full potential. Inequitable distribution of labour could become the order of the day, since the well trained officers would end up doing some or the entire jobs of the ill-trained ones as part of team effort. The implication of this scenario is that quality of service might be compromised, when service members have high and appropriate military qualifications and they are not recognised for proper posting. The MoD seems to have no clear-cut policy that ensures that officers who have better qualifications are accordingly utilised.
4.3. Effectiveness of the Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

4.3.1. Awareness of the Content of the MoD Personnel Policies

The participants were asked as to whether they were aware of the content MoD Personnel Policies, revised (2007). The aim of this question is to determine the rate at which policies that make career provisions in terms posting and promotion as well as other conditions of service have been publicised amongst the commissioned officer in the Namibian Defence Force. Figure 4.9 below presents the data as per respondents’ awareness of Personnel Policies.

Figure 4.9: Awareness of the content of the Personnel Policies

Source: Interviews (2010)
According to the data summarised in Figure 4.9 above, the study concluded that, 83.3% of the respondents which includes 6.6% representing Colonels, 10% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 23.3% representing Majors, 30% representing Captains and 13.3% representing Lieutenants were aware of the content of the policies under discussion. The rest 16.6% of the respondents that comprise of: 3.3% representing Majors 10% representing Captains and 3.3% representing Lieutenants have indicated to this study that they were not aware of the content of these policies. Suffice to state that the content of the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007), which stipulates general “terms and conditions of service” for the NDF seems to be not known by a number of commissioned officers. This implies that the policy is not completely publicised and made known to all members of the Defence Force, particularly amongst the commissioned officers’ corps, which is regarded as an essential component of the functional mechanism of the Defence Force.

4.3.2. Effectiveness of Personnel Policies on Career Development Issues

Participants were asked to determine the extent to which the existing MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) are effective in addressing their training and educational needs. Table 4.4 below presents a detailed summary of the responses.

Table 4.4: Effectiveness of Personnel Policies on career issues
As reflected in Table 4.4 above, 33.3% that includes: 6.6% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Majors, 10% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants of the sample population described the MoD Personnel Policies as ‘less effective’. About 63.3%, which comprises of: 10% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 20% representing Majors, 26.6% representing Captains and 6.6% representing Lieutenants described the MoD Personnel Policy as ‘not effective’, while one (3.3%) Captain was not aware as to whether the policy was effective or not, due to the reason that its implementation programs and procedures were not made known to the respondent. This on its own was a clear indication that the policy was not implemented nor was it in existence, and thus implies that, the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) have never been commonly exercised over the ranks and files of the commissioned officer in the NDF.

The total of 33.3% and 63.3% of the respondents who described the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised as ‘less effective’ and ‘not effective’ respectively, were further asked to provide their views as to why they thought the policies are ineffective. The responses indicated that the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised were ineffective because of several reasons. These included the application of the policies, which does not address officers’ career training and educational needs. The
respondents further argued that the policy in its current form does not specify career development benchmarks for the ranks and files of officers in the NDF, hence, a need to develop training and educational policy that is specifically deals with career progression issues. These include the career policies and directives that regulate its implementation for the current and the future generation of officers with regards to their career development and progressing, as this study concluded that there is of policy implementation; administration and management processes in the system itself.

Challenges expressed by the 33.3% and 63.3% of the respondents who rated the policies ineffective include; the selections for advance career courses, which are not offered to officers who qualify and meet physical and professional requirements. These were the views of some officers who had slim chances of attending advanced career courses required for their professional skills.

In general, the respondents attached high priority to career development and progression opportunities and were dissatisfied with the process of how professional development opportunities are being handled. That situation necessitated an appropriate policy intervention in responding to the needs of career development/progression system for commissioned officers in the NDF.

4.3.3. Extension of MoD Personnel Policies’ Implementation
The respondents were asked to determine as to what extent the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised is being exercised to promote their career progressions. The majority of the respondents’ indicated that, the policies do not responding to the career progressions’ needs and requirements for commissioned officers, for example; academic education, specialist training, promotion, posting, appointment, and other career related benefits. Data summarised in Figure 4.10 below represent how the respondents have rated the policies implementation.

Figure 4.10: Extension of MoD Personnel Policies’ Implementation
As reflected in Figure 4.10 above, about 30% that includes: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 10% representing Majors, 10% representing Captains and 3.3% representing Lieutenants interviewed indicated that the MoD Personnel Policies have been exercised to ‘some extent’. The other 63.3% which comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 16.6% representing Majors, 23.3% representing Captains and 13.3% representing Lieutenants interviewed felt that the existing policies has been exercised to ‘lesser extent, while two (6.6%) Captains interviewed were optimistic that the policies have been largely exercised.

Meanwhile, the findings indicate that, there was a general impression from the majority composed of 63.3% and 30% of those rated that the policies is being exercised to ‘some extent’ and to the ‘lesser extent’ respectively that, career development programs are not being accomplished in the NDF. The general expression of the said majority of the respondents is that the MoD Personnel Policies
Policies, as revised (2007) do not respond to the needs and career requirements of commissioned officers, and that the policies should cater across a wider spectrum of officers’ requirements for example, academic education, specialist training, promotion, posting, appointment, and other career benefits. The fact that the majority of the sample population were optimistic that policies have not been exercised largely, as indicated in Figure 4.10 above, prompted the researcher to deduce that the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) were not effectively implemented by those in positions of doing so.

The respondents further argued that, the career policy does not address officers’ career needs. In its current form, the policy does not specify career development benchmarks for officers’ ranks and files of the NDF, hence, a need to develop a training policy that specifically deals with career development issues. According to the respondents, the absence of training policy on career progression has negatively affected the effectiveness of career development in the force. There is no effective career planning to design strategies that overseeing the implementation and evaluation of the outcome of the career training. If there are no effective career strategies to guide the implementation of these noble duties, the policy on career development and progression will not be able to set criterions on training and education, posting/appointments, reward/promotions, as well as mentoring for commissioned officers. The respondents suggested that, the NDF needs to create a capable system to monitor, evaluate and re-adjust officers’ training needs. Moreover, the policy on career progression would become effective only if the system is capable to run courses by itself without depending on offers from abroad.
4.3.4. The Extent to which the Policies have Improved Career Qualifications

It has been argued from the constructivist theory’s point of view that, as people develop and mature, they build a frame of reference that act as a perpetual filter through which they observe, experienced, evaluate and understand events. In this process, learning is a way of constructing meaning derived from the learners’ action in the humankind. It involves the ability to adapt to and shape the environment so that it fits better with one’s skills, interests and values (Vygotsky 1962, as cited in Gravett 2005). In essence, the strength of constructivist perspective, it is emphasised that accumulated of experience is a significant process of learning. Garvett once refers to the role of understanding issues and events as an element that shapes the process of learning. Garvett also admits that the meaning-making activities of the individual do not take place in isolation, instead are shaped by culture of understanding issues or events within the learning situation. It was based on these theoretical assumptions that, the respondents were asked to describe how they view their career qualifications progressing, and to indicate as to whether their qualifications have improved since they joined the Namibian Defence Force. Data summarised in Figure 4.11 below represents how the respondents have rated their improvement on career qualifications.
According to the results reflected in Figure 4.11 above, it is illustrated that 33.3% that includes 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 3.3% representing Majors, 10% representing Captains and four 13.3% representing Lieutenants interviewed have rated the existing career policy to have improved their qualification and professional skills just to a ‘some extent’. Other 60%, which comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonel, 6.6% representing
Lieutenant-Colonels, 23.3% representing Majors, 23.3% representing Captains and 3.3% representing Lieutenants interviewed indicated that the policy has improved their professional qualifications to ‘lesser extent’. Only 6.6% of the respondents from the ranks of junior officers (Captains) have indicated to have gained professional skills and expertise largely.

Besides differences in responses received on this particular question, the majority from both senior and junior officers’ rank-categories have informed this study that, the system has not done as much as it was suppose to do regarding the improvement of their career professional skills, cited the lack of study bursaries, lack of adequate training facilities and lower educational background as the main challenges to the improvement of career progression opportunities (academic and military educations) towards career achievements like promotions and/or appointments to high ranks and/or posts. The study further took it from 33.3% and 60% of the respondents who rated the existing career policy to have improved their career qualification to ‘some extent’ and to ‘lesser extent’ respectively that they have not attended the career courses required to improve their career because there are no such courses available at training institutions in Namibia. As a result, the NDF is largely depending on foreign courses that are being offered by its friendly countries and that the offers that they get from the friendly countries are very few. Few as they are, selection process to such offers are flawed because it is being done haphazardly. The respondents further informed the study that, some ineligible officers are selected to take up such slots, as a result, they under-perform and fail dismally after the course. There is really a need for the NDF to change the status
quo and to enhance its own capacity and capability to develop and run own courses. This group of respondents suggested that, the force need to improve its selection process to career courses, and only competent members should attend such courses. Taking the expressions of respondents into account, the researcher deemed it necessary to take notes of all these issues as sources of the backlog that necessitate the urgent policy intervention. Besides, all these factors imply that the existing implementation of the current MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) have not done as much as it was suppose to do regarding the improvement of the career professional skills for commissioned officers in the NDF.

4.4. The Role of Policies’ Implementing Mechanisms

In this section, respondents were asked to express their views on the effectiveness of the existing mechanism and the impact of the ministerial efforts on improvement training and education, posting/appointments, reward/promotions and other career related issues for commissioned officers in the NDF.

4.4.1. Awareness of the existence of the Career Courses Required

The respondents were further asked if they were aware of the existence of all career courses required for their promotions and appointments up to their present ranks and appointments. This question was posed to the participants in order to determine officers’ understanding of qualifications required doing their job professionally. Figure 4.12 below
summarises the percentages on the respondents’ awareness of the professional courses required.

Figure 4.12: Awareness of the existence of career courses required

The data in Figure 4.12 above indicates that the majority (96.6%) of respondents indicated that they knew exactly what qualifications were required of them to do their job professionally. Only 3.3% of the respondents indicated to have been un-aware of the existence of the courses to be attended for ones’ promotion or appointment. The participant gave no comment nor was any reason provided for the answer. Although most of the respondents indicated to be aware of the existence of the career courses they should take to increase the levels of competencies required for the positions they occupy, lack of opportunities to undertake these courses is another issue they indicated.

4.4.2. Completion of Career Courses Vis á Vis Posting and Promotion
The respondents were asked to reveal as to whether they have successful completed all the career courses required for promotion up to their current ranks and present appointments. This question was posed to determine their levels of training qualifications as opposed to their current ranks and job descriptions. Data presented in Figure 4.13 below provide the detailed summary of responses to this question.

Figure 4.13: Completion of courses vis-à-vis current ranks and/or appointments

Source: Interviews (2010)

The results summarised in Figure 4.13 above indicate that, 56.6% of the respondents, which includes: 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 6.6% Majors, 30% representing Captains, and 16.6% representing Lieutenants interviewed have indicated to ‘have completed’ the courses required for their current ranks. When asked to provide reasons for their answers, the respondents submitted their great satisfaction with the successful completion of career courses that they undertook. In
this context, the respondents also opined that, in a matured career progression, officers are required to undergo different career courses that enabled them to rise from junior to senior ranks. This group of respondents further related to this study that they rose through ranks after a successful completion of the relevant courses, and that their qualifications have largely improved their performances, resulted in their promotions and appointments to their current ranks and posts. In contrast, 26.6% of the respondents that comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, four 13.3% representing Majors and 6.6% representing Captains interviewed have indicated that they ‘have not’ completed the career courses required for their ranks and/or appointments, and that have a negative impact to their ranks progression. This group of the respondents suggested that all promotions or appointments should only be done in relation to the courses successfully attended. Currently, because NDF seems to have a lack of merit-rating capability, such procedure is not followed and that has affected the progression of some effective and able officers, while some unproductive officers have benefited. By implication, junior officers were the least dissatisfied with the process of selection to career courses and criteria employed for promotion. Some felt that the selection for courses particularly for junior officers, which is being conducted at lower levels of headquarters, was not necessary done based on merit. This created an impression amongst them that their selection criteria for courses do not exist. Just as shown by the responses to the question as to what extent the policy has improved the officers’ career qualifications above, (see section 4.3.4/Figure 4.11) it is seemed to be a unique concern. In addition, a concern was amongst the respondents that there is a need to
introduce a “follow-up in-built data capturing mechanism” within the NDF. The
system could take care of the provision of personnel selection, monitoring and
evaluating career development and progression courses continuously and effectively
in the force, rather than (a current fire and forget system) random and spontaneous
exercise, which is easy to forget and its course achievement nullified immediately
after its completion.

The rest of the respondents and accounting for 16.6% that comprises of:
3.3% Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 6.6% representing Majors
and 3.3% representing Captains interviewed indicated ‘don’t know’ as their answer
to the question mentioned above, citing the reason that they did not know as to
whether they have successful completed the entire career courses required for
promotion up to their current ranks and present appointments or not, as they
equally were not aware of the criteria used to promote or to select an officer to a
career courses. Professionals have it that, promotions or appointments in military
are practices that only come into play after merit and eligibility have been
determined by courses successfully attended. Merit and eligibility also serve as
factors to be evaluated in judging who is better prepared than others do. Course
attendance for officers should therefore symbolises the knowledge that officers have
accumulated, while promotions and appointments are reflections of their abilities to
indicate as to which officers have been prepared for assuming increased
responsibilities than others do (Mabhena 1990, P.17).
4.4.3. Availability of Opportunities for Advanced Career Courses

The respondents were asked to indicate as to how often the career progression opportunities were available to them and to provide reasons thereof. The aim was to determine the level of disparities or variations (if any) in terms of availabilities of career progression courses for commissioned officers and to ascertain the extent to which individual officers is involved in professional career training. Figure 4.14 below summarises the detail of data captured from the respondents on the question.

Figure 4.14: Availability of opportunities to advanced career courses

Source: Interviews (2010)

The results summarised in Figure 4.14 above indicate that, 16.6% of the respondents that comprises of: 3.3% representing Lieutenants-Colonels, 10%
representing Majors and 3.3% representing Captains indicated their dissatisfaction and were convinced that, the opportunities to advanced career courses were ‘not at all’ available. Other 33.3% of the respondents, which is a composition of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Lieutenants-Colonels, 13.3% representing Majors and 10% representing Lieutenants felt that study opportunities in officers’ career progression were ‘rarely’ and inadequate. Meanwhile the majority (40%) of the respondents, which is comprising of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Majors, 26.6% representing Captains and 6.6% representing Lieutenants shared more or less similar sentiments of dissatisfaction and were convinced that, study opportunities in career progression of commissioned officers are not always, but ‘some times’ available, citing a number of challenges faced career development/progression opportunities. These include:

1. Lack of highly qualified instructors, specialists, and training facilitators to run career courses.

2. Unfairness in the process of selection of officers to undergo career courses which is influenced by discrimination and favouritisms.

3. Lack of training slots to cater for officers’ training needs.

4. Lack of sufficient funds to offer for bursaries and scholarship.

In contrast, 10% of the respondents representing Captains suggested that advanced career progression courses in NDF are ‘frequently’ provided. This group of the respondents was satisfied with the frequency at which career courses are
provided and conducted. The respondents further registered their satisfaction with the opportunities provided for furthering academic skills through tertiary institutions of higher learning in Namibia and elsewhere abroad, where scholarships for an advance careers in military as well as in academic studies were provided. The respondents applauded the Ministry of Defence for providing them with opportunities to attend short career courses such as workshops and seminars, mostly organised at national, sub-regional, regional and universal levels [Namibian Inter-departmental level; Southern Africa Development Community (SADAC) level; African Unity (AU) level; and at the United Nations (UN) level]. The respondents opined that, these kinds of courses are necessary to impart the joint-operational knowledge into all officers of the Namibian Defence Force.

4.4.4. Career Motivations that Officers Received From their Superiors

The researcher is concurring fully with a study made by Mabhena (1990), as reflected in Chapter 2 of this thesis, who submitted that the human beings are ambitious by nature. It is the desire to fulfil their ambitious which motivates them into doing things which they believe will reward them. An employer does not therefore have to instil them with ambition. Rather it must capitalise on it by making them aware that their desires are accomplishable. Mabhena added that to archive this awareness, the organisation should than introduce incentives to create an element of competition among the employees. Competition however, can be counterproductive if not well regulated. It is the duty of the organisational management to regulate the competition, and to turn it into a fair game for
all. For the sake of this study, it could be deduced from Mabhena’s argument that, the element of motivation for competitive career approaches in the NDF is as neutral as it comes in many forms. Its rewards are among other things are promotion to high rank, appoint to a senior post, increasing the income, etc. These rewards are no doubt expensive to the NDF but are necessary and quite appropriate as well. Officers who the NDF is promoting/appointing to a high ranks/positions, benefit from their promotions/appointments, while the NDF as an organisation benefits from their improved performances. Based on these arguments, the respondents were asked to declare kinds of motivations they received to advance their career and to motivate or provide comments for their answers. The data in Table 4.5 below presents the detailed numbers and percentages as per kind of motivation provided to enhance career development/progression skills for commissioned officers in the NDF.

Table 4.5: Career motivations

*Source: Interviews (2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivating Factors</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Officers</td>
<td>Junior Officers</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>Lt</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study bursary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance professional courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further academic studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall results as shown in Table 4.5 reflect the very high level of encouragement, motivation and satisfaction in terms of provision for ‘in-service training’ as indicated by the majority (100%) compared to other kinds of motivation queried by the same question. Officers from all rank-categories were happy with the programs of in-service training they are receiving from the Artillery Brigade administration. These results created an impression that the provision of the Artillery Brigade’s in-service training for its commissioned officers in different duties and assignment is highly encouraging and enhanced career development and progression skills. With well-trained and motivated officers, the Artillery Brigade is likely to perform well. It must be however realised that while on job training provided by the Brigade authority, it is also important to notice that other conditions of service like ‘study leave’ and the ‘advance professional courses’ which received 20% and 10% respectively are equally provided. Besides the above stated motivational provisions, only 6.6% of the respondents indicated to have had an access to ‘further academic studies’ (see Table 4.5). This again could be interpreted that officers’ career progression in terms of further academic studies opportunities would be affected.

Once more, a solution to the lack of motivation could be sought from Mabhena (1990)’s point of view as reviewed in chapter two of this study, that benefitting from an officers’ training can only be achieved by employing them in the post that fully exploits their newly acquired knowledge. Under-employed of the well qualified members may result in frustration and discontent and they may not hesitate to leave the organisation. The MoD should therefore come up with the proper mechanisms to attract, evaluate, develop, use and retain well-qualified officers, as the professional and academic
advancement of the career for the commissioned officers remains a success to the Namibian Defence Force.

Some participants have indicated to this study their concern about the lack of coaching and mentoring in NDF. In general terms and as indicated in chapter two, the two primary functions of mentoring process include: social functions such as counselling, and career functions such as coaching which help protégés to prepare for advancement (Noe 1998). It can be drawn from Noe’s argument that the role of mentoring in NDF is to ensure that all the commissioned officers reach their full potential, thereby enhancing their overall professionalism in the NDF. The condition of service such as motivation, coaching and mentoring should therefore be regarded as priorities to improve officers’ career development in the Namibian Defence Force.

An emphasis was put on performance rating and feedback in a personal reporting process, known as a “Confidential Report” (CR) in the NDF. The respondents identified the lack of implementation of CR in the NDF as a contributing factor to the deterioration of career progression for officers, among other things. There was an impression amongst the respondents that, the implementation of the confidential report could not be detached from serving as a motivating factor to improve the the career progression for officer in the sense that the business of the day to day of the individual officer is characterised by the requisites of professional performance, which can only be achieved by a well career motivated officer. Since the issue of CR was raised, a discussion of them with the respondents was also necessitated.
Some of the participants argued that a confidential report and feedback should serve as a measuring tool for officers who qualify for promotion, based on their performance records and achievements or qualifications. Performance of officers should therefore be measured every year through annual CRs. According to the participants, the problem in judging performance through confidential reports is that, they are not always submitted every year, and when submitted (that year), they are being influenced by the personal and working relationship between the officers being reported and the reporting officers. If one has an excellent performances year, but gets no CR filled on him/her, such excellent performances would never be on record. It was also a concern of some of the respondents that, if one has a bad/weak performances year, such performances will never been left unrecorded, using informal recording approaches by avoiding the CR system of which initials should be put by the reported officer after its content was made known to him/her. The participants further argued that the personal relationship between the reporting officer and the officer being reported may affect the CR of by virtue of the fact that the business of assessing an officer’s performances may be subjective. The participants felt that the only way to avoid subjectivities is job rotation, for officers to be reported on by different reporting officers. If this could been done before, the logical approach to inaccuracies in performance judging of the past, as experienced by some of the participants would have been found. The participants have identified the need to consider the introduction of a proper system of performance rating for commissioned officers which should be observed and realised on a yearly basis as a measuring instrument in the processes of all performance appraisals, appointments, postings and promotions. Literature has it that, in 1813, General Lewis Cass Commanding Officer of
the 27th Infantry regiment, United States Army submitted to war department what has since become famous as the earliest recorded instance of a formal evaluation report. Since then, it has been cited frequently as a classic example of performance rating for each of General Cass’ subordinates (Lopez 1968 p.27). It is interesting to note that the military are credited with the first recorded formal performance report. Since the days of General Cass, performance rating in any defence force has been improved and more formalised to the present many system, and the NDF should not be an exceptional. Of more than one rating systems used today, the three most popular ones are: “Management by Objectives” (MBO), “Paired Comparison Scale” (PCS) (Nel et al., 2005, p.524-526) and “Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales” (BARS) (Scheneir & Beatty 1979). It shoud be important to analytically consider all three of the performance rating systems in order to select among them the rating system/s with the NDF compatibilities. In addition, there were dissatisfactions among the respondent regarding the provision of study bursaries, as none of the respondents has referred to them as kinds of motivating they have received from their superiors. (See data in Table 4.5).

The general findings on the confirmation of the kinds of career motivations that the officers use to receive from their superiors, have suggested that morale boosting and motivation of career development education among the ranks of commissioned officers investigated appeared to be an obstacle to the improvement and provisions of higher ranks/positions towards the achievement of the NDF objectives.

4.4.5. Standard of Military Training and Educational Programs in NDF
To determine the effectiveness of the training and educational programs offered in the local military training institutions in addressing of the officers’ career progression issues, the respondents were asked to rate the standard of professional education in the local military training institutions as per illustration of Figure 4.15 below.

Figure 4.15: Standard of military training and educational programs in NDF

Source: Interviews (2010)

The data in Figure 4.15 above suggest that 43.3%, which comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 3.3% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 16.6% representing Majors, 13.3% representing Captains and 6.6% representing Lieutenants of the respondents rated the military training and educational programs offered in military institutions in Namibia as generally ‘good’. Followed by 36.6%, that comprises of: 3.3% representing Colonels, 6.6% representing Majors, 16.6% representing Captains and 10% representing Lieutenants interviewed who rated the
military training and educational programs offered in military institutions as ‘average’. The rest 20%, which comprises of: 6.6% representing Lieutenant-Colonels, 3.3% representing Majors and 10% representing Captains interviewed have rated the training and educational programs offered in military institutions as ‘poor’. None of the respondents rated the standard of military training and educational programs offered in military institutions as ‘excellent’ or ‘very good’.

In fact, the total 43.3% of the sample who rated the average standard of military training and educational programs offered in local institutions as ‘good’ applauded the MoD for played an important role in empowering and capacitating human resources development, mobilizing training requirements and attaining high standards of training facilities for competitive training in Namibia. However, these respondents also acknowledged the fact that there were still some challenged ranging from un-qualified instructors, specialists and directing staff at these training institutions. The shortage of these capabilities affected the outcome of the training. Unless these capabilities are addressed, the military training institutions in Namibia will continue to perform under average.

The respondents further argued that, the lack of qualified instructors has resulted in the situation that up the time that this study was conducted, certification of specialist qualifications for professionals obtained through the local military training institutions are not publicly recognised as career professionals in Namibia. Hence increasing the public/national and international doubt on the value of military qualifications in Namibia. Some of the respondents however describing the level of military training in these institutions as credible and meeting the basic
professional standards in military drills, the certification of military qualifications obtained from these institutions are yet to be accredited to the high learning institutions in the country for them to be recognised and validated by the National Qualifications Authority (NQA).

Other 36.6% of the respondents, who rated the average standard of training and educational programs offered in military training institutions in Namibia as ‘average’, supported their ratings by describing the military training and educational programs offered in military institutions in Namibia as being faced with numerous shortcomings. These include shortage of qualified instructors and training facilities. They felt that some of the instructors are very far behind the state of Namibia National Medium of Instruction, thus rendering instructions ineffective. They have also expressed themselves about the long outstanding issue concerning military certificates they obtained from the local military institutions, which are yet to be recognised by the NQA.

20% of the respondents, who have rated the standard of training and educational programs offered in military training institutions in Namibia as “poor”, elaborated that the level of training was poor because of lack of capacity and limited capability in terms of training facilities and qualified instructors respectively. The shortage of these capacity and capability negatively influenced the result of the training at these institutions. Unless the required capacity and capability are achieved, the military training institutions in Namibia will continue to be under-performing.
Generally, the respondents’ rated the standard of military training and education in the Namibian military institutions between ‘good’, ‘average’ and ‘poor’. Coupling these ratings with the fact that, none of the respondent has rated the standard of military training and education at the military institutions in Namibia as ‘very good’, the average responses to this question could be interpreted to have rated the standard of military training and education at the military institutions in Namibia as below the required standard.

4.4.6. Computer Literacy as a Requirement for Career Progression

Literature surveyed as reflected in chapter 2 revealed the relevance to the findings of this study to the remarks made by Hall (1987, p.21), Hall cautioned that:

During the nearest future time, career development opportunities and programs will be affected by technological, organisational and individual changes. More organisations will experience pressure to decrease their sizes due to increased competition. Most organisations will need to be adaptable and employ a flexible workforce. Confronted with change and uncertainty, individuals will need to be adaptive, able to handle ambiguity and resilient in the face of career barriers.

Hall’s argument appears to have raised a significant awareness about the effects of global competitions on technological changes experienced by all countries including Namibia, and that the NDF is not exceptional. Hence, plans to tackle the challenges of competitive technological advances, as related to career development/progression for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force will be of paramount importance.

In response to the question if computer literacy is a requirement for career development/progression for officers in the NDF, the respondents put their emphasis on
the urgent requirement of computer education and its application amongst the commissioned officers in the Defence Force. According to the respondents, computer education and its application are regarded as important tool to enhance career development and progression in today’s technological advancement era. The data in Figure 4.16 below summarises the detailed responses on the question of computer literacy.

Figure 4.16: Computer literacy as a requirement in the NDF

Source: Interviews (2010)

The data in Figure 4.16 above is a reflection of positive responses captured from 100% of the respondents who suggested and believed that computer literacy nowadays is a requirement and necessary to execute day-to-day duties and responsibilities. The whole of the sample population have commended the application of computer facilities in this technological era. When asked to provide reasons for their answer, the participants stated
that, officers should be in the position of processing their own administrative, training and operational documents with help of a computer. Some argued that, the duties of each and every officer include expanding and enriching current knowledge. Respondents also argued that any professional officer should be capable of using a computer, and most of the staff duties can only be properly executed with the application of computers, as it was also argued that technology, scientists-research and industrial development had originated from military, therefore, these innovations cannot be realised without the knowledge of computers.

All participating officers emphasised the importance of computer literacy, which should be regarded as a priority for officers in the Namibian Defence Force. The participants felt that, provision of accessing these facilities should be enhanced across all the structures of officers in the NDF.

Given the importance of computer literacy and the complimentary role it plays in enhancing Information Communication and Technology in military, it was felt that computer skills be made a prerequisites to all the junior and senior commissioned officers in their career professions.

The question if computer literacy is one of the career requirements raised a common concern particularly amongst those commissioned offices with anticipations for participation in local, regional and international peace operations influenced by generations of newly introduced technology and effects of globalization, whereby computer education is not exceptional. All of the respondents supported the notion that computer literacy remains as necessary as a requisite for technological development in NDF.
4.5. Challenges of Officers’ Career Development Policy

In this section, respondents were required to provide information on challenges that individual commissioned officers may face in the persuasion of their career development goals.

4.5.1 Inconsistencies in between Ranks, Appointments and Academic Qualifications

The participants were asked to confirm or deny the existence of the inconsistencies in academic qualifications with regards to the same ranks and appointments of commissioned officers in the NDF. The aim of this question is to determine the causes of the discrepancies/variations (if any) in academic qualifications for officers holding the same rank, posts and/or appointments have affected the officers’ career development and progression in the NDF. Figure 4.17 below illustrates the detailed summary of responses to this question.

Figure 4.17: Inconsistencies in between ranks, appointments and academic qualifications
The results as detailed in Figure 4.17 above shows that 100% of the respondents confirmed the existence of disparities/variations in the level of academic qualification for commissioned officers of the same rank and the same appointment in the NDF. Despite the fact that one of the basic requirements for officers’ cadet intake is grade 12, the respondents felt that this and other civil qualifications are not recognised after intake in NDF. The trend has made career development strategy for commissioned officers in the NDF inconsistent and unconventional. Some felt that there is confusion between military and civil qualifications especially when selecting candidates for training, posting or promotion. There are also some officers who believe that civil qualifications have no value in military services and career progression. According to the respondents, in some instances, academic qualifications were not treated differently from other achievements like technical or professional military qualifications for officers holding the same ranks and/or same appointments. Some of the respondents were of the opinion that, despite the
requirement of military-professional qualifications in NDF, there are a considerable number of commissioned officers with academic (civil) qualifications that should be treated differently in terms of career benefits. For that matter, the respondents have experienced a policy problem in appointing officers for career training/courses, promotion opportunities and other career benefits. Some appointments are made on the basis of experience and military qualifications only, without taking civil qualifications into account. Consequently, some officers with less military qualifications, but hold high academic qualifications may become dissatisfied when they lose opportunities such as further training and promotion to senior positions. This created dissatisfaction amongst the officers especially who saw their military career discouraging because of their academic qualifications which were not considered. In this regard, these officers may be frustrated and their morale decline, which may resulting in resignations.

4.5.2. Inconsistencies in Promotions’ Criteria

The participants were asked to confirm or deny the existence of the inconsistencies in promotions’ criteria for commissioned officer in the NDF. The aim was to determine if promotions for commissioned officers in the NDF are done in
accordance with the set standard and procedures as stipulated in the MoD Personnel Policies, revised (2007). The data in Figure 4.18 below reflects the summary of the respondents’ views.

Figure 4.18: Inconsistencies in promotions’ criteria

Source: Interviews (2010)

Figure 4.18 above quantitatively interprets the confirmation of the respondents on the existence of policy inconsistencies in terms of criteria used to promote commissioned officers in the NDF. All participants had no reservations in confirming the inconsistencies in question. The respondents, who all selected their responses as “yes”, have supported their answers by disclosing cases of irregularities in criteria used for promotion of officers in the NDF. The identified irregularities in the promotional policy implementation are that, promotional criteria as outlined in the MoD Personnel Policies, revised (2007) are not strictly adhered to.
Participants from the ranks of ex-combatants demanded to know if the current MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) were applicable to their generation of officers or not. They have taken their point further by disclosing the very serious situation affecting the younger officer from the group of former fighters. For example, a young former fighting officer joined the NDF as Lieutenant in 1990, at the age of 24. After eight years of service, say in 1998, the same officer was promoted to the next substitutive rank of a Captain. Within other nine years, say 2009 the officer became a major. For more than 20 years in 2010, the same officer turned 46 years of age, and is jet to be promoted to the next rank of a Lieutenant-Colonel. To the contrary, another officer (new blood) was just recruited and commissioned as a Second-Lieutenant in 1997. After 18 months, in 1999, the same officer became a Lieutenant. After five years, the same officer again became a Captain, and again a Major at a time this study was conducted. Participants from the ranks of ex-combatants demanded to know, as to where the different lies between the officers from the ex-combatant and the officers from new blood in terms of policies’ application. According to them, the MoD Personnel Policies seems to have been applicable only to one generation of officers, while to other not, despite the age difference which might be very little and possible the qualifications that might be in favour of the one who is an ex-combatant. It may happen that within another period set by the policy, (which seems to be not applicable to the ex-combatants, regardless of how young or qualified they are) the officer commissioned in 1997 may benefit from another promotion before and on the expenses of the long served ex-fighter. If this young (blood) officer is promoted to the next substantive
rank (to Lieutenant-Colonel), the young ex-combatant will be left in the rank of a Major, simple for no other reason rather than of being an ex-combatant. The MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) seems to be automatically applicable only to the new generation of officers, leaving out the qualifications and age factors. It was also experienced by this study that some officers from the ranks of new blood have raised from the rank of a Lieutenant to Major, just on, experience they obtained from the officers’ cadet’s course, and no other career course was attended.

Generally, this study concluded that the MoD Personnel Policies, revised (2007) have been declared un-applicable to the ex-combatant without considering the age, education and military qualifications for officers from the ranks of former fighters. There is a general feeling of unfair treatment to former combatants in terms of promotion. They (former combatants) felt that young soldiers (new recruits) are being favoured. This has affected long serving soldiers morally, and has caused discontent among this group of officers. The question remains that; “is the Ministry of Defence doing anything to help this situation”? Seriously, an independent investigation is needed on this issue, of which its results might be used to put an end to this situation. Based on these findings, it could be deduced that there are inconsistencies in the way promotions are being handled in the NDF. Thus, it is far enough to call for an urgent policy intervention.

4.5.3. Other Common Challenges
Respondents were probed into expression of themselves on what they thought were the common challenges for career progression in the NDF. The aim was to soliciting views of the commissioned officers on challenges that faced the ministerial efforts to implement the policy of career development in the NDF.

In response to the question, the respondents revealed several challenges facing the officers’ career development/progression achievements. These challenges were directly or indirectly linked to a number of constraints faced the process of career policy implementation. Lack of proper career planning from above on acquisition of proper academic qualifications was the main challenge of common concern. As a result among other things, the budgetary allocation, was particularly identified to have a negatively impacted the selection of candidates to career progression courses, in a way of limiting courses programs and financial allocations for officers’ career progression. The respondents were of the opinions that the provision of sufficient funds will address/improve the officers’ attendance career courses in either public or private institutions.

In addition, the participants has observed a lack of proper courses and/or training programs in the country, which made the Defence Force to depend on offers from foreign countries. A lack of industrial-advanced technology and a shortage of highly qualified instructors, which resulted in that certificates obtained from the local military institution not to be recognised by the NQA, was also some of the challenges identified. Low educational background (primary to secondary school levels) is another identified shortcoming that has slowed down the pace of career development and progression in NDF.
4.5.4. Additional Comments

In an attempt to find ways to overcome existing challenges and shortcomings, the researcher probed the respondents into positions of suggesting the best options to address the challenges to implementation of the career development and progression policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.

In response, several views were expressed by respondents which they felt needed intervention of the authorities concerned. Among other things, some respondents felt that there is a need to strictly revisit the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) which makes provision for officers’ recruitment, posting, promotion and other conditions of service in the NDF. The respondents have also suggested several options that form part of the recommendations of this thesis to tackle the identified challenges. Furthermore, the respondents have suggested strategies they considered to be essential in promoting incentives for development of training institutions, which includes; recruitment of officers with high academic qualifications in order to ensure efficiency and professionalism among the commissioned officers in the Defence Force.

The studies further captured the expressions among the respondents, particularly in relation to qualifications of the lower aged officers from the former PLAN. There were calls to devise the career-policies and the related strategy for these officers in order to improve their career progression in the Force.
In fact, among other comments made by the respondents, some of them suggested the building of human capacity by recognising academic qualifications in selecting candidates for in-service training and other career opportunities. Other Officers were unpleasant with the negative tendency of some officers who believe that civil qualifications have no value in military services and career progression, resulted in the situation that civil qualifications are in most cases not considered for available opportunities for career development such as further training and promotions in the NDF.

4.6. Summary

Chapter 4 presented a detailed account of results obtained from the research interviews. The results were of analytically evaluation of data regarding the effectiveness of career development/progression policy for commissioned officers in the NDF. The chapter presented the results emerged from the discussions and interpretation of the statistical data achieved. The results suggested that the major setback on enhancing career progression for officers in the NDF is lack of well-articulated policy on career development and progression issues. The situation is compounded by lack of proper career planning, i.e. inadequate training facilities; poor procedures for selecting candidates to career courses; and a lack of high qualified instructors, resulted in a situation of very poor academic achievements.
Generally, in this chapter respondents critically focused their recommendations on enhancing the improvement of both military and academic training qualifications, harmonised military training courses and improved career development for the ex-combatants. The next Chapter deals with the conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

The problem identified in Chapter 1 of this thesis was that the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) stipulate Grade 12 as a minimum academic level for recruits potentially inducted as officers. This and other academic qualifications are
not likely to be fully recognised or used as criteria for career development after induction and thus it is not likely that there is any relationship between academic achievements and factors of career development such as promotions, appointments and training opportunities for officers in the Namibian Defence Force. The thesis was geared to seek answers to the following questions:

- To what extent have the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) been effective in improving the career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF?

- How can the career development policy challenges in terms of training, promotion and appointment for commissioned officers be tackled?

- How does the NDF match civilian and military qualifications with career development opportunities such as training and promotions for its commissioned officers?

- How does the NDF align the qualifications of its individual officers with career development opportunities of their choices?

The thesis geared to achieve the following objectives:

- Examine the extent to which the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007) influence career development policy for commissioned officers in the NDF.
Explore the relationship between qualifications (both academic and military) and career progression of officers in the NDF.

Investigate the role of existing mechanisms geared for implementing the policy to reconcile the officers’ academic and military qualifications with career developments opportunities.

Examine challenges that individual commissioned officers may face in pursuit their career development goals in the NDF.

5.2. Conclusions

Chapter one of this study indicates that there is a problem in the NDF of inconsistency between policy requirements and academic qualifications. The trend has brought about disparities and/or variations in educational qualifications, training, appointments and/or promotional criteria as well as in selections for officers to career courses in the NDF. This problematic situation was found to have emerged from a lack of career planning to improve accessibility to competitive education, training and technocratic skills, that has made the officers’ career development strategy in the NDF inconsistent and unconventional. This thesis is therefore a result of critical examination (interviews) of officers’ personal opinions and understanding of challenges and problematic issues
related to career development policies for commissioned officers in the Namibian Defence Force.

It was also indicated from Mabhena (1990) in Chapter two of this study that, unlike smaller organisations, the army cannot plan a specific career path for its individual commissioned officers. Instead, it designs a career strategy to which all of its individual commissioned officer should benefit. Military leaders at different levels should than implement that overall career strategy within the limit of their authorities and resources available. In a similar vein, the minutes of the 18th Training Conference (2008) urged leaders of the NDF to come up with officers’ overall career plan; and the commanders at different levels of the NDF must implement that master plan, defined by Mabhena as a “career strategy”. Also, in attempt to achieve the purpose of this study, the researcher contextualised recommendation made by Hall (1997) as reviewed in chapter two, for establishment of career development services as an important way in which organisations may hedge against the uncertainness of the future. Therefore, the continuity and success of the NDF must be largely depending on its ability to attract, evaluate, develop, use, as well as retaining well-qualified officers. Meanwhile, the researcher conceptualised the theoretical concepts embedded and emphasised in the constructivist theory by Vygotsky (1962, as cited in Garrett, 2005); specialist concepts by Peters (1994) and Yate (1993); and the concept of Life-long learning by Dento (1998), Knapper and Cropley (1985) as provisions for comparable theoretical approaches to career development and progression issues affecting commissioned officers in the NDF, has made this research study a success.
In terms of methodology presented in Chapter 3, it was concluded that this study was more of descriptive-quantitative and it was based on case study strategy; hence, the data needed for this research design were more of descriptive nature. The adoption of quantitative approach enabled the researcher to understand objective reality from the perspectives of the officers involved. The fact that the researcher conceptualised the research problem in a way that the officers’ perceptions on problems and challenges they faced were factually and exactly captured, has positively facilitated the researcher to reach at the objectives of this research study.

In chapter 4, the thesis has drawn these conclusions from the data acquired:

- There are inconsistencies in career development and progression policy implementation process, and thus career progression in NDF could not easily be defined due to the lack of firm rules governing the implementation of the MoD Personnel Policies, as revised (2007). This implies that the NDF posting/appointment, promotion and other career related policies’ regulations are not being adhered to, because there are no monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure that the implementation of these policies is done as provided in the policies’ manuals.

- More than 40% of the participants (see Table 4.3) indicated to have attended only up to lower primary education, while others did not get opportunity for schooling before Namibia’s independence in 1990, as part of the colonial
legacy. The situation, which requires a sense of national commitment and adequate resources to be tackled.

- There are unfair practices in the policy practice regarding the selection of officers to career courses. The situation of relatively 20% of the respondents who indicated that they have not been considered for attending any career course since 11-15 years back, despite the fact that they have not accomplished all career courses required (see Figure 4.7), and 23.3% of the respondents who felt that their qualifications were ‘lower’ than their appointments (see Figure 4.8) can be regarded as a result of lack of fairness and equity in the process of selecting candidates for career courses.

- Despite the fact that not all officers are in possession of a good grade 12 certificates, which should be a minimum education for a commissioned officer, there is confusions between military and civil qualifications in NDF, especially when selecting candidates for training, posting or promotion. Academic qualifications (for example diplomas or degree) are not treated differently from other achievements in military profession for officers hold the same ranks or same appointments in terms of career benefits. Moreover, there is no adequate financial (budgetary allocations, including bursaries) support and scholarships to cater for qualifications’ needs for commissioned officers in the NDF.
There is a lack of training facilities, under average quality of instructors, and poor educational background of officers undergoing various training programs in NDF. This resulted in the un-harmonised education system, and thus brought about the situation that the certificates acquired from the NDF’s own training institutions not being recognised by the NQA. This on its own is a lack of opportunities to empower the commissioned officers with career specialists in various skills.

There is a need to introduce a follow-up in-built data capturing mechanism within the NDF career system. The mechanism could take care of the provision of personnel selection, monitoring and evaluating career development and progression courses continuously and effectively in the NDF, rather than random and spontaneous exercise, which is easy to forget and its course/s achievement/s ignored immediately after the completion of the course.

There is no inadequate access to computers literacy and internet facilities as part of career development on technological advancement.

There are problems of officers without posts, non-rank-age matching, non-rank/appointment matching, non-rank-qualification matching and over-staying in the same rank, post, and/or appointment. The problem was found
to have originating with the overall career strategy of commissioning officers in the Force and formation of the Namibian Defence Force in general.

- There is an ongoing ignorance in terms of annual confidential reports (CRs) in NDF. The problem with CRs is that, they are not submitted every year. When submitted (that year), they are being influenced by the personal and working relationship between the reported officer and the reporting officers. Reporting officer and reported officer’s relationship may affect the records of performance by venture of the fact that the business of assessing officer’s performance may be subjective.

- There is an unfair treatment in the application/implementation of NDF Personnel Policy, revised (2007), especially for middle aged and better qualified former PLAN combatants on the one hand, and the new blood (recruits) on the other. Officers from the PLAN feel that; officers who joined the Force after the liberation struggle (new blood) are receiving a favourable treatment at their (former fighters’) expenses.

Furthermore, the general finding of this research suggested that the career development and progression problem centres on the Defence Force’s historical factors and the lack of initiatives to strategise the career path from above, resulted in unconventional, inadequate and ineffective officers’ career progression training and education.

The NDF being a professional force, and indeed a state ultimate instrument of power, had until recently no well structured and consistent training regime that stipulates qualifications benchmarks that need to be met before an officer’s progression in a career path is being considered The shortcomings are believed to have derived from
unconventional, inadequate and ineffective officers’ career progression training and education and the deficiency noted to be more prevalent among officers with a subsequent result of problems, which may possibly cascading down to other ranks in the Defence Force. Should these shortcomings continue unchallenged, they will accumulate potentials of gradually repeating themselves, and in the process, they will have a detrimental effect to the NDF’s professional efficiency and fighting capability.

These findings necessitated the recommendation to revise the existing MoD Personnel Policies and to work out realistic strategies for the improvement of officers’ career development and progression. To overcome these career policy challenges, the study has suggested some recommendations.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions above, this thesis provides the following recommendations:

- The NDF management should be empowered to implement the policies and guidelines in developing their careers within the ranks of officers in the Namibian Defence Force. In as much as officers are made to pursue the route and guidelines of the NDF’s career training, academic education programmes, posting/appointments, promotions/rewards and other career related issues, they should also be fully equipped with the qualifications requirements from each of the career courses they should accomplish before any promotion and/or appointment to any officers is affected.
The MoD Personnel Policies should be fully exercised over the ranks and files of the commissioned officers regarding career development and progression issues. More comprehensive career strategies with detailed focuses on training, education, posting/appointments, promotions/rewards, mentoring, selection to courses and other career related benefits for the commissioned officers should be designed.

Duo to the military training at the military institutions in Namibia, which is below the required standard, the improvement of training and educational skills-transfer programs to update its instructors in order to bring them to the standard of national medium of instruction are necessary. This will address the long outstanding issue of military certificates, which are yet to be recognised by the NQA. There is a need to overhaul the current training and education system in the NDF in order to be customised and/or synchronised with the national educational system so that it meets the requirements of the ranks to which it applies.

The MoD/NDF must initiate training programs within its local training establishments in association with Namibian educational establishment and in conformity with the international military and academic education, capable of providing adequate training and education opportunities to enable all its officers to attend their career progression courses in Namibia. Provided that, the officers should not only be aware of the existence of the NDF career courses provided in these establishments, but they should
also be fully equipped with what is expected of them in term of their professional training and the relevance of each content of the course program they should attend for the roles of each rank in career progression. This will help them to be conversant with routes and guidelines to follow in pursuing their careers goals within the framework of the organisational objectives of the Namibian Defence Force.

- **Academic achievements/qualifications should be taken into consideration,** especially, when selecting candidates for training, posting or promotion. Civilian qualifications must have value in military services. Academic achievements should be treated differently from military qualifications for officer holding the same ranks and/or same appointments. This will encourage all members of the officers’ corps to advance themselves academically towards the overall improvement of all officers’ career and progression. However, adequate financial support and scholarships to cater for qualification needs for officers should be provided.

- The NDF policy of promoting on vacancy must be revised to avoid over-staying in the same rank and/or appointment. A clear-cut policy for officers’ promotion should be formulated and adhered to. Promotions for officers should be strictly governed by merit, age, seniority and courses attended. In exceptional cases, like when the competition for promotion is very high, promotional examination must be imposed. Those officers who failed to be promoted during their period of
eligibility should be retired so that they do not block others. In all instance, only the “best among others” must be promoted.

- There must be a progression in appointments of officers and not regression or a mixture of both. To avoid favouritisms and discrimination, when an officer is removed from a post on the ground of incompetency, a written report signed by a responsible officer must be presented for an officer to know what the shortcomings are. This would also avoiding victimisation and personal conflicts between the commanders and their subordinates. If an officer feel that his/her posting/appointment was unduly or un-procedural, or his /her removal from the post was un-ceremonial, the officer may seek redress of wrong. All posting must be done based on “best person for the demanding job”.

- While it is the current provision that officers should be promoted on the basis of the training that they have achieved and in line with the laid down promotional requirements in the MoD Personnel Policies, there is need for the NDF to further explore the correlation between the required competency for different officers’ ranks and appointments. This would ensure consistency and offers credibility in posting and appointments for officers in the NDF. (A suggested “Military Officer’s Career” is attached as Appendix D).
A solution to the officers without posts, non-rank-age matching, non-rank-appointment matching, non-rank-qualification matching and over staying in the same rank, post, and/or appointment, is to voluntary retire (redundant) all former PLAN fighters on full pension and give them adequate notice of termination of service. Such redundant scheme should be based on the recognition of the pre-independence services. That is to grant all former PLAN officers 10-20 years of pre-independence service for pension purposes. In so doing, MoD should consider eliminating first from its ranks those officers who do not measure up to the standard. It would be better for the NDF to start retiring those officers who are over 50 years and want to voluntarily retire, or those who are too old for their rank or simply not competent enough before the introduction of the scheme. This would help to create vacancies to be filled by the officers of the right calibre and appropriate age.

Confidential reports are to be completed for every officer, every year in order to have records for the performance of the entire officers’ corps. It should be very essential if officers are formally reported on a yearly basis, so that their performance could be assessed. In order to minimise personal conflicts, all reporting officers should do counselling after each CR. Counselling should also be an effective way of informing officers about the NDF’s career policies and its objectives. In the process, officers must be made aware of their rights to redress of wrongs, and encouraged to use those rights when and where inaccurate or biased reports were initiated against them. However, Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) are more job oriented that reduces the margin of the reporters’ errors. For that reasons, BARS can be considered to be more suitable for use by NDF performance rating officers.
Finally, while there is no easy solution to the current generation of officers’ training and educational qualifications, promotions, posting, appointments and rank-stagnation problems, care must be taken that the same problem should not be allowed to be carried into the next generation of officers. Once the problem of the present generation of officers is over, the NDF would have to take care in implementing the career policies for next officers’ generation. A comprehensive career policies instruments need to be designed to address the current policy inconsistencies.

5.4. Recommendations for Further Research

As indicated in the limitations of the study, this thesis could not address all issues in the field of career development therefore; it recommends that further study is required on:

- Career Development Policy in respect of Ex-Combatants
- Officers’ Age, Rank and Experience-Gap Problem
- Accreditation of Military Qualifications to the Namibian Educational Establishments
• Academic Qualifications Vis á Vis Career Benefits for all Members of MoD and NDF
• Performance Ratings and Feed Back in the NDF
• Policy Implementation Process on Promotional Criteria in the NDF
• Policy Implementation Process on Appointments Criteria in the NDF
• Policy Implementation Process on Selecting Members to Courses in the NDF
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Appendices A: Questionnaire
Informants: Senior and Junior Commissioned Officers of the Artillery Brigade: Namibian Defence Force (NDF).

The Effectiveness of Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the Namibian Defence Force: An Analysis of the Artillery Brigade - Otjiwarongo

Note: This questionnaire is to be personally and directly administered to the respondents by the researcher and under no circumstances be read and/or filled by the respondent themselves. Respondents who have difficulties in completing/understanding the questionnaire on the ground of language barrier, this questionnaire will be read and interpreted for them by the researcher and other people who have been requested to render such assistance.

Name of researcher: JOAB AMAKUTUWA
Date: ____________________________________________
Please note that the following contact information for the respondent is optional.

Name of respondent: _________________________________

Contact information: _________________________________

Unit ____________________________________________

Department: _______________________________________

Introductory Remarks

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this interview. I wish to assure you that you will remain completely anonymous and no record of this interview will be kept for any purpose other than research.

There are neither right nor wrong answers to questions contained in this document. Please feel free to respond to questions as candidly as possible. I shall be very happy if you can find time to answer all the questions for me.

I would like to thank you in advance for your voluntary participation

1. Section A: Demographical and Biographical Information

In this section I would like to know some information about yourself and the career progression programs you are involved in. Mark with X in the appropriate box or write an answer in the space provided where applicable.

1.1 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 – 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3. Rank

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Maj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Capt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Lt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4. How many years have you served in your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>16 years and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5. What is your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Deputy Brigade Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Senior Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Commanding Officer (Unit Commander)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Deputy Unit Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Grade 1 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Grade 2 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Deputy Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Grade 3 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Platoon Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6. How many years have you served in your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7. Which of these academic qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>No formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Primary school qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Secondary school qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Tertiary certificate/s or equivalent qualification/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Under-graduate degree/s/diploma/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Post-graduate qualification/s (degree/s/diploma/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Other academic honour/s (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8. Which of these military qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Platoon Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Junior Staff Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Battery Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Battalion/Battle Group Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Senior Command and Staff Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Any other military course (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.9. When was your last promotion? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10. When did you last attend the career progression course/s? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.11. How do you match/or compare your qualification with your current appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Non-comperable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Section B: Questions on the Effectiveness of the Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

In this section, I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the Career Development/Progression Policy in the NDF with regard to what is required for commissioned officer doing their job.
2.1. Are you aware of the content of MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007), which makes provision for officers’ recruitment, posting, promotion and other conditions of service in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. In your view, do you think the existing MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007) is effective in addressing career progression, training and educational needs for commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Less effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. If the policy is effective, to what extent the policy is implemented in promoting career development and progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a some extent</th>
<th>To a lesser extent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the policy is not effective, give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
2.4. Since you joined the NDF, to what extent do you think the current policy on career development/progression have advanced or improved your qualification and professional skills? (Mark with an X where applicable)

Give reasons for your answer:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>To a some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>To a lesser extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Section C: The Role of Implementing Mechanisms and the Impact of the Ministerial Efforts on Commissioned Officers’ Career Development

In this section I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the existing mechanism and the impact of the Ministerial efforts on training and education, posting/appointments and reward/promotions, mentoring and performance rating for commissioned officers in the NDF.

3.1. Are you aware of the existence of career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank?
3.2. Have you successfully completed all career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

3.3. In your professional experience, how often are opportunities of advance career progression courses readily available to you? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Never at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer: .................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
3.4. In advancing your career development/progression, what kind of motivation have you received? (Mark all kinds of motivation with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>In-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Study leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Study bursary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Advance professional courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Further academic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Coaching and mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide any comment on your answer:

3.5. How do you rate the level of training and educational programs within your military training institutions in addressing career progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:
3.6. Does your job require you to be computer literate? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

............................................................
............................................................
............................................................
............................................................

4. Section D: Questions on challenges of Career Development/Progression Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

In this section you are required to provide information on challenges that commissioned officers are faced with in pursuance of their career development goals in NDF.

4.1. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in academic qualifications for commissioned officers holding the same rank and same posts/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

| a Yes |         |
| b No  |         |
| c Don’t know |       |
Give reasons for your answer:

..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................

4.2. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in terms of criteria used to promote the commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................

4.3. What are the common challenges or shortcomings have you observed regarding career development/progression of commissioned officers in your Unit?

..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................
4.4. Give any additional comments/opinions on how challenges of career development/progression for Commissioned officers in NDF can be managed.
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## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bde (HQ/s)</td>
<td>Brigade (Headquarter/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bty</td>
<td>Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Chief of the Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Confidential Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA-SSS</td>
<td>Master of Art in Security and Strategic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>Military Disciplinary Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDF</td>
<td>Namibian Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQA</td>
<td>National Qualifications Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAPO</td>
<td>South West Africa People’s Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>People’s Liberation Army of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWATF</td>
<td>South West Africa Territorial Force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices A: Questionnaire

Informants: Senior and Junior Commissioned Officers of the Artillery Brigade: Namibian Defence Force (NDF).

The Effectiveness of Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the Namibian Defence Force: An Analysis of the Artillery Brigade - Otjiwarongo

Note: This questionnaire is to be personally and directly administered to the respondents by the researcher and under no circumstances be read and/or filled by the respondent themselves. Respondents who have difficulties in completing/understanding the questionnaire on the ground of language barrier, this questionnaire will be read and interpreted for them by the researcher and other people who have been requested to render such assistance.

Name of researcher: JOAB AMAKUTUWA
Date: __________________________________________

Please note that the following contact information for the respondent is optional.

Name of respondent: __________________________________________
Contact information: __________________________________________
Unit: __________________________________________
Department: __________________________________________
Introductory Remarks

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this interview. I wish to assure you that you will remain completely anonymous and no record of this interview will be kept for any purpose other than research.

There are neither right nor wrong answers to questions contained in this document. Please feel free to respond to questions as candidly as possible. I shall be very happy if you can find time to answer all the questions for me.

I would like to thank you in advance for your voluntary participation

1. Section A: Demographical and Biographical Information
In this section I would like to know some information about yourself and the career progression programs you are involved in. Mark with X in the appropriate box or write an answer in the space provided where applicable.

1.1 Gender

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a | Male |
b | Female |

1.2. Age

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a | 30 – 40 |
b | 41 – 50 |
c | 51 – 59 |
d | 60 and more |

1.3. Rank

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a | Col |
b | Lt-Col |
1.4. How many years have you served in your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Maj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>Capt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>Lt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td>16 years and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. What is your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Brigade Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Senior Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>Commanding Officer (Unit Commander)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Unit Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td>Grade 1 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g</strong></td>
<td>Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h</strong></td>
<td>Grade 2 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j</strong></td>
<td>Grade 3 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k</strong></td>
<td>Platoon Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>l</strong></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6. How many years have you served in your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7. Which of these academic qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>No formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Primary school qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Secondary school qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>Tertiary certificate/s or equivalent qualification/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>Under-graduate degree/s/diploma/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td>Post-graduate qualification/s (degree/s/diploma/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g</strong></td>
<td>Other academic honour/s (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8. Which of these military qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Platoon Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Junior Staff Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Battery Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
<td>Battalion/Battle Group Commanders’ Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong></td>
<td>Senior Command and Staff Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong></td>
<td>Any other military course (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.9. When was your last promotion? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10. When did you last attend the career progression course/s? (Mark with X where applicable)

- **A**: Less than 1 year
- **b**: 1–2 years
- **c**: 3–5 years
- **d**: 6–10 years
- **e**: 10–15 years

1.11. How do you match/or compare your qualification with your current appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

- **a**: Higher
- **b**: Equal
- **c**: Lower
- **d**: Non-comparable

2. Section B: Questions on the Effectiveness of the Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

In this section, I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the Career Development/Progression Policy in the NDF with regard to what is required for commissioned officer doing their job.

2.1. Are you aware of the content of MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007), which makes provision for officers’ recruitment, posting, promotion and other conditions of service in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

- **a**: Aware
- **b**: Not aware
2.2. In your view, do you think the existing MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007) is effective in addressing career progression, training and educational needs for commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Very effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Less effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Not effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. If the policy is effective, to what extent the policy is implemented in promoting career development and progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>To a some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>To a lesser extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the policy is not effective, give reasons for your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

2.4. Since you joined the NDF, to what extent do you think the current policy on career development/progression have advanced or improved your qualification and professional skills? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>To a some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>To a lesser extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Section C: The Role of Implementing Mechanisms and the Impact of the Ministerial Efforts on Commissioned Officers’ Career Development

In this section I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the existing mechanism and the impact of the Ministerial efforts on training and education, posting/appointments and reward/promotions, mentoring and performance rating for commissioned officers in the NDF.

3.1. Are you aware of the existence of career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Have you successfully completed all career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)
Give reasons for your answer:
................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

3.3. In your professional experience, how often are opportunities of advance career progression courses readily available to you? (Mark with X where applicable.)

Give reasons for your answer: .........................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
3.4. In advancing your career development/progression, what kind of motivation have you received? (Mark all kinds of motivation with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>In-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Study leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Study bursary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Advance professional courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Further academic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Coaching and mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide any comment on your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

3.5. How do you rate the level of training and educational programs within your military training institutions in addressing career progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
3.6. Does your job require you to be computer literate? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Not required</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

4. Section D: Questions on challenges of Career Development/Progression Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

In this section you are required to provide information on challenges that commissioned officers are faced with in pursuance of their career development goals in NDF.

4.1. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in academic qualifications for commissioned officers holding the same rank and same posts/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
4.2. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in terms of criteria used to promote the commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

4.3. What are the common challenges or shortcomings have you observed regarding career development/progression of commissioned officers in your Unit?

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

4.4. Give any additional comments/opinions on how challenges of career development/progression for Commissioned officers in NDF can be managed.
Appendices A: Questionnaire
Informants: Senior and Junior Commissioned Officers of the Artillery Brigade: Namibian Defence Force (NDF).

The Effectiveness of Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the Namibian Defence Force: An Analysis of the Artillery Brigade - Otjiwarongo

Note: This questionnaire is to be personally and directly administered to the respondents by the researcher and under no circumstances be read and/or filled by the respondent themselves. Respondents who have difficulties in completing/understanding the questionnaire on the ground of language barrier, this questionnaire will be read and interpreted for them by the researcher and other people who have been requested to render such assistance.

Name of researcher: JOAB AMAKUTUWA
Date: __________________________________________________________

Please note that the following contact information for the respondent is optional.

Name of respondent: _______________________________________
Contact information: _______________________________________
Unit ___________________________
Department: ___________________________
**Introductory Remarks**

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this interview. I wish to assure you that you will remain completely anonymous and no record of this interview will be kept for any purpose other than research.

There are neither right nor wrong answers to questions contained in this document. Please feel free to respond to questions as candidly as possible. I shall be very happy if you can find time to answer all the questions for me.

I would like to thank you in advance for your voluntary participation

**1. Section A: Demographical and Biographical Information**

In this section I would like to know some information about yourself and the career progression programs you are involved in. Mark with X in the appropriate box or write an answer in the space provided where applicable.

**1.1 Gender**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.2. Age**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>30 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>41 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>51 – 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>60 and more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3. Rank**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Lt-Col</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. How many years have you served in your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>16 years and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. What is your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Deputy Brigade Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Senior Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Commanding Officer (Unit Commander)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Deputy Unit Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Grade 1 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Grade 2 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Deputy Battery Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Grade 3 Staff Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Platoon Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6. How many years have you served in your current post/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7. Which of these academic qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

| a | No formal education |
| b | Primary school qualification |
| c | Secondary school qualification |
| d | Tertiary certificate/s or equivalent qualification/s |
| e | Under-graduate degree/s/ diploma/s |
| f | Post-graduate qualification/s (degree/s/diploma/s) |
| g | Other academic honour/s (specify) |

1.8. Which of these military qualifications, if any, do you have? (Mark with X where applicable)

| a | Platoon Commanders’ Course |
| b | Junior Staff Course |
| c | Battery Commanders’ Course |
| d | Battalion/Battle Group Commanders’ Course |
| e | Senior Command and Staff Course |
| f | Any other military course (specify) |

1.9. When was your last promotion? (Mark with X where applicable)

| a | Less than 1 year |
1.10. When did you last attend the career progression course/s? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>10 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.11. How do you match/or compare your qualification with your current appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Non-comperable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Section B: Questions on the Effectiveness of the Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

*In this section, I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the Career Development/Progression Policy in the NDF with regard to what is required for commissioned officer doing their job.*

2.1. Are you aware of the content of MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007), which makes provision for officers’ recruitment, posting, promotion and other conditions of service in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Not aware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. In your view, do you think the existing MoD Personnel Policy, as revised (2007) is effective in addressing career progression, training and educational needs for commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Less effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.3. If the policy is effective, to what extent the policy is implemented in promoting career development and progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a some extent</th>
<th>To a lesser extent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If the policy is not effective, give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

2.4. Since you joined the NDF, to what extent do you think the current policy on career development/progression have advanced or improved your qualification and professional skills? (Mark with an X where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a some extent</th>
<th>To a lesser extent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Give reasons for your answer:

3. Section C: The Role of Implementing Mechanisms and the Impact of the Ministerial Efforts on Commissioned Officers’ Career Development

In this section I would like to know how you view the effectiveness of the existing mechanism and the impact of the Ministerial efforts on training and education, posting/appointments and reward/promotions, mentoring and performance rating for commissioned officers in the NDF.

3.1. Are you aware of the existence of career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Have you successfully completed all career courses required for your professional duties, promotion and appointment up to your current rank? (Mark with X where applicable)
3.3. In your professional experience, how often are opportunities of advance career progression courses readily available to you? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer: 

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................
3.4. In advancing your career development/progression, what kind of motivation have you received? (Mark all kinds of motivation with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>In-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Study leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Study bursary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Advance professional courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Further academic studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Coaching and mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide any comment on your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

3.5. How do you rate the level of training and educational programs within your military training institutions in addressing career progression of commissioned officers? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
3.6. Does your job require you to be computer literate? (Mark with an X where applicable)

- Required
- Not required
- Not sure

Give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................

4. Section D: Questions on challenges of Career Development/Prongression Policy for Commissioned Officers in the NDF

In this section you are required to provide information on challenges that commissioned officers are faced with in pursuance of their career development goals in NDF.

4.1. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in academic qualifications for commissioned officers holding the same rank and same posts/appointment? (Mark with X where applicable)

- a Yes
- b No
- c Don’t know

Give reasons for your answer:

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
4.2. In your profession, have you experienced inconsistencies in terms of criteria used to promote the commissioned officers in the NDF? (Mark with X where applicable.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give reasons for your answer:

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

4.3. What are the common challenges or shortcomings have you observed regarding career development/progression of commissioned officers in your Unit?

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

4.4. Give any additional comments/opinions on how challenges of career development/progression for Commissioned officers in NDF can be managed.
Appendix B: Participants Consent Form

Research Title: An Investigation into the Effectiveness of Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the Namibian Defence Force: A Case Study of the Artillery Brigade - Otjiwarongo

Project Leader’s Surname: Joab Amakatuwa

Address: Ministry of Defence
Telephone Number:  061-2049111

Cell Number:    0811277637

Your cooperation and willingness to be interviewed for this research project is highly appreciated. The project leader/researcher wants to take this opportunity to introduce the following list of ethical principles and regulations guiding this research project to you:

Your involvement in this research is voluntary and is not obliged to divulge information, you would prefer to remain private and you may withdraw from the study at anytime.

Be assured that the purpose of this study is one and only single, to generate information that would be used for academic purposes only, and that it will solely be shared to intended beneficiaries of this study. Also, informed authorisation to conduct this study was obtained from the Chief of the Namibian Defence Force. All relevant authorities have also been informed about this study.

The information gathered in this study will be treated as confidential and anonymous for the sake of protecting your dignity. You will not be identified in any research document by your name, and when identification need arise, you will be referred to in the research documents under a code name.

The research findings will be made available to you, should you request them.

Should you have any queries about the research, now or in the future, you are welcome to conduct the project leader at the above address.

I understand the content of this document and agree to participate in this research.

Name………………………………………………..
Signature………………………….Date……………………..

Appendix C: Permission Request

Cell: 0811277637    Ministry of Defence
Enquiries: Lt-Col Joab Amakutuwa    Private Bag 13307

May 2010

The Chief of the Defence Force
Ministry of Defence
Dear General Sir,

Re: An Application for a Permission to Carry out a Qualitative Field Research to be Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement of the Degree of Master of Arts in Security and Strategic Studies (MA-SSS) With the University of Namibia – Unam

This letter serves to request the Chief of the Namibian Defence Force to grant a permission of conducting a field research at the Artillery Brigade – Otjiwarongo.

The applicant is Lieutenant Colonel Joab Amakutuwa, a MA-SSS student at Unam. Hence he is required to undertake a field research on the topic titled: “An Investigation into the Effectiveness of Career Development Policy for Commissioned Officers in the Namibian Defence Force: A Case Study of the Artillery Brigade - Otjiwarongo,” as approved by the Post Graduate Committee of University of Namibia, needed for fulfillment of the requirement of a degree in question.

General Sir, granting permission will facilitate the materialisation of this impotent project.

Enclosed is a “Participants Consent Form” for your information, Sir!

Lieutenant Colonel Joab Amakutuwa ‘psc-zsc’
Student Number: 200747011

Appendix D: Military Officer’s Career

* Recruited either from within or without requirement grade 12 and more.

* Cadet training for a period of nine months.

* Commissioned by the Head of State and promoted from Cadet Officer to 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieutenant.

* Enter into the probation period of 12 months
* Qualify; entered into the Platoon Commanders Course for a period of 18 months.
* Qualify; promoted to a substantial rank of Lieutenant.
* Posted as a Platoon Commander (up to 36 men).
* Recommended able to climb the ladder send in for a Company Commanders course for a period of 6 months.
* Qualify; appointed for staff duties grade three (SO3) promoted to Capt or Command Duty as Coy 2IC.
* Qualify; send for Junior and Staff Course.
* Qualify; promoted to substantive rank Major and posted as Coy Comd for a period of 05 years or Battalion 2IC.
* Recommended able to climb the ladder sent in for a Command and Staff Course for a period of 12 months.
* Qualify; appointed for staff duties grade two (SO2) for a period of three years.
* Qualify; able to climb the ladder further, recommended for promotion to substantive rank of Lieutenant Colonel:
  a. Posted as Battalion/Regiment Comd or
  b. Continue as staff officer grade one (SO1)
* When both (a) and (b) found to be eligible to go on top of the pyramid could be send in for a National Defence College (War College) for six months (orientation course).
* Qualify; promoted to substantive rank Colonel (General-in-the-making).
* Posted as:
  a. Senior Staff Officer (SSO) to Divisional HQs or
  b. 2IC Brigade for a period of three years
* Qualify; able to climb the ladder further, selected for promotion to substantive rank of Brigadier General:
  a. Posted as Brigade Comd (GOC) or
  b. General Staff Officer (GSO) at Corps level.
* From there next appointments e.g.:
  a. Maj General
b. Lt General

c. General and their equivalent in the Navy are political appointments enshrined in the constitution.

* In some countries, however, only the Chief of the Defence Force (CDF) is a political appointee.