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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Higher Education in the late 1990’s experienced significant problems with capacity due to many black students applying to enter previously white institutions (Jansen, 2002:159). The main concern of the new ANC government was the status of historically black institutions. They were unstable due to the migration away from black to white universities and technikons. This reduced their financial status and viability. In addition, the anticipated huge increase in black enrolments in higher education had not materialised (Finweek Survey, February 2009). In order to overcome both of these problems, the then Minister of Education decided to press ahead with a merger programme aimed at reducing the number of higher education institutions from 36 to 21 (Jansen, 2002:6).

The primary objective of this research is to investigate the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger Working Environment and Organisational Commitment: a case study of the administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

There seems to be a lack of efficiently and effectiveness in the operations of the Finance Department of Walter Sisulu University which this research will investigate through finding solutions to factors of improving the relationship between employee perceptions of their post-merger Working Environment and their Organisational Commitment.

This exploratory study collected primary data through the distribution of questionnaires to 59 employees from the Finance Department at the Walter Sisulu University, with a 69.12% response rate. The survey included closed questions that were analysed using statistical techniques.

The findings revealed overall low scores of 31% for employee perception of their post-merger Working Environment and 50.21% for Organisational Commitment, together with its sub-dimension Affective, Continuance and normative. These scores are disturbing and need to be urgently addressed by the management of the Institution.

The implication of the Finance staff’s low perception of their post-merger Working Environment and organisation Commitment is that the institution’s goals will be difficult to be fulfilled due to the low morale of the staff and the non-conducive working conditions.

The Institution’s Management should be more transparent, more trustworthy, and more supportive towards staff members and have a good overall communication strategy.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND FOR THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of our global economy brought about a swift move from an Industrial age to an Information Age. This ‘wave of Change’ was predicted by (Toffler, 1984:23). This movement, which started at the end of 1970’s, has had significant effects on the way in which business operates.

Technological change, especially in the field of computerisation, has had significant impact, not only on communication but also on:

- Automation – Replacing people with machines in order to improve productivity and decrease costs.
- Globalisation – An increase in trade between countries, as a consequence not only of computerisation and its effects on communication, but also other technological change, such as containerisation, jet travel (which increased the ability of producers to move more goods more cheaply), and of decreasing trade barriers (which facilitated international trade) (Hill, 2008:15). As a consequence of globalisation, firms were able to trade with the world rather than a few, selected clients/countries.

While globalisation produced benefits, the increase in international trade led to rapid increases in competition. Thus, in order to survive, firms were forced to cut their costs. Amongst the options to do so the more popular methods included the following:

- Reduce staff – given that wages and associated labour costs often represent the single largest item in the cost of production, this becomes an obvious area to examine for cost reduction purposes. This is achieved through downsizing, outsourcing, rationalising and automating (Hill, 2008:447).
Establish some form of closer association with another firm. This may take the form of joint-ventures, acquisitions or mergers. A merger is any situation in which two or more firms combine to become a single unit, thereafter operating under a different name (David, 2007:197).

Merging appears to provide many benefits, among them:

- Economies of scale (and thus lower unit costs)
- Increased capacity
- Access to the other firm’s technology
- The turning of a competitor into a collaborator, while at the same time benefiting from rationalisation. By merging, the new firm does not need two C.E.O.s, two Marketing Managers, and the like – all of which can result in considerable savings, especially in executive salary packages (Bruner, 2004:30).

While the firms struggle to become more cost effective, a change in the management-employee relationship also results. As firms are increasingly unwilling or unable to ‘carry’ excess staff should an employee’s skills become obsolete or redundant, there is little need or ability to retain them, whereas previously the individual would have been retained or transferred. ‘Job security is now a function of keeping your skills current and marketable’ (Robbins, 1997:22). It also means that in many cases, the concept of a ‘job for life’ is becoming increasingly rare.

While firms may refer to their staff as their ‘most valuable asset’, staff are increasingly regarded as just another factor of production, to be acquired or disposed of according to the needs of the firm. This means that a significant change has occurred between management and ‘the managed’. Previously, long - service staff tended to be loyal and committed to the firm. They had moved from a formal economic contract to the informal psychological contract, based on mutual trust (Stephen, 2010:4).
In many cases, the actions and motives of management are now being viewed with a pervasive distrust. They are perceived to have irrevocably broken the trust relationship – in which case, employees revert to the formal economic contract and are no longer loyal to the firm, but rather to their next pay cheque. As Robbins (1997:23) puts it, ‘the unwritten loyalty contract that previously existed between employers and employees has been irrevocably broken’.

Given that mergers almost invariably result in redundancies, it is almost inevitable that once the decision to merge with another firm is announced there is a deterioration in employee morale and an increase in stress and uncertainty. While staff may be able to understand on a rational level why the merger should occur, on an emotional level, there is always the fear of job loss, of reduced promotion potential and the like, all leading to increased cynicism and distrust (Hay & Fourie, 2002:121).

Robbins, states that ‘the landscape is littered with corporate marriages in which management failed to accurately assess the downside from culture clash’. In extreme cases, it is possible that the problems of integration are such that a mass staff exodus may occur, leaving only a shell of a company almost bereft of its intellectual capacity (1997:345.).

In modern strategic management thinking it is evident that mergers are ‘the way to go’ – a rapid way to grow the organisation, while at the same time decreasing overheads and thus increasing profits. However, this premise is often flawed.

According to systems theory, as explained by Stephen, each organisation is made up of a number of interrelated subsystems which interact synergistically to create organisational success. The total system that comprises the organisation includes, among others, management systems, technical and operational systems, financial systems and human systems. If the firm is to prosper and grow, all of these systems must interact positively. However, it appears that many senior managers concentrate on a few systems and tend to ignore or overlook others – notably the human systems. If managers choose to grow through mergers, frequently an objective is the reduction of costs through cutting staff. Thus, instead of the human subsystem
assisting in the growth, it actually hinders it by emotionally or physically withdrawing from the organisation (2010:5).

As the human system is thus, at least to a degree, disabled, it actually reduces the potential for success. Indeed, (Martin & Roodt, 2008:25) state that mergers have a negative impact leading to non-compliance in employees' commitment to the organisation, turnover intentions and job satisfaction. This can be costly to the organisation. Thus a critical but overlooked factor in any merger must be to look after and develop the human subsystem. If staff are to maintain trust and commitment to the firm, they must be treated accordingly. ‘The way that people are managed has a powerful impact both on productivity and on profitability’ (Roos & van Eeden, 2008:54).

This inconsistent analytical thinking tends to make itself visible due to it focusing on growth rather than development or ‘bigger over better’. Mergers and acquisitions often enlarge firms, but often they do not develop them in the sense of improving their capability to improve on their particular needs and those of their customers. In order to overcome this, a paradigm shift is required. Managers need to stop thinking atomistically and start systems thinking. Any system is as strong as its weakest subsystem. Thus firms should not only record mistakes of commission, but also those of omission – things not done that ought to have been done in order to create a realisation of where the firm is failing (Economist, 3.11.2009).

While in South Africa the business sector has been following the trend towards mergers, mergers have not been confined to this area. World-wide, academic institutions have been forced into mergers in order to survive. Given the financial and other problems present in higher education in the late 1990’s, it was inevitable that the concept of the mergers of academic institutions would arise. An outline of this particular problem is presented in the next section.

1.2 CHANGES IN THE ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

By ignoring many of the tenets of industrial and organisational psychology, management and government changed a committed academic cadre into a generally
alienated one. Over the last dozen years, the environment of higher education – specifically as it refers to universities and technikons (or ‘universities of technology’ as they are now known) has undergone radical change. Given the magnitude and rapidity with which these changes have taken place, it has huge implications for the reactions of staff at these institutions (Stephen, 2010:7).

With the possible exception of the ‘charmed circle’ of universities who escaped the merger process – many academics now find themselves acting as little more than supervisors in a production department being required, in terms of government exhortations for massification and throughput, to churn out ever larger numbers of students (somewhat akin to producing sausages in a sausage machine). Many of these students are at best minimally qualified and are often barely competent (Stephen, 2010:8).

The magnitude of change and the actions of management have resulted in feelings of powerlessness and concern for future careers. People who are highly committed tend to be emotionally involved and invest themselves in their institution, resulting in high levels of motivation and performance (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1999). Unfortunately, this attitude tends to generate higher stress levels.

However, if the individual’s ability to perform is reduced, for example, through management interference, performance will be affected, leading to higher levels of stress, frustration and eventually aggression, fixation or withdrawal (Mullins, 2007:5). Stress levels rise due to the lack of fit between individual needs and management demands (Blix, Cruise, Mitchell & Blix, 1994:158).

Writing in the Daily News, Naidoo identified possible causes of lowered levels of motivation and commitment. These included:

1. Change of government policies
2. Decreases in financial aid – resulting in having to do much more with much less.
3. Demands for ‘massification’ and ‘throughput’, which lead to rapidly and radically increased class sizes.
4. Lack of respect
5. Decline in student quality
6. Poor salaries
7. High job stress (Naidoo, 15.01.2008:2)

These were seen to have resulted in an alienation of personnel. The impact of these changes could well have been ameliorated had management shown a degree of support and encouragement for the staff.

All of the above were precursors to the change in top management style from collegial to managerial and the final act – the merger programme. These were the final straws in the ‘death’ of commitment for many staff. Whenever mergers occur, environmental change is usually significant. Given the changes, the psychological contract is broken and commitment levels plummet as both parties move back to the economic contract. Commitment to the ‘old’ institution is gone – in some cases, the ‘old’ institution was simply absorbed into the ‘new’ institution. Thus, it is often similar to starting in a new organisation, on probation, while both parties assess their situations and decide whether or not to commit to the new institution. Both parties renegotiate their options as to whether they stay or leave the institution.

In such periods of often intense uncertainty, industrial psychology indicates that direct interventions to reassure and calm staff emotions should be applied: in reality, it appears that this factor was significantly absent (Stephen, 2010:11).

The implications of a merger are such that, (Martin & Roodt, 2008:23) even the mentioning of it is liable to result in widespread negative reactions and a drop in performance.

What is to be learned from all of the above?

Simply, that management (be it government or institutional) cannot simply unilaterally and autocratically change the rules without expecting significant negative responses. In terms of uncertainty, as in the case of merger situations, in order to maintain continuity while the process unfolds, the need for a loyal, committed, high
performing staff cannot be underestimated (Jansen, 2002:161). Yet it appears that in all the mergers, management acted to actually alienate staff.

As any student of industrial and organisational psychology will know from their knowledge of organisational behaviour, the attainment of organisational goals is a two-way street, best attained through cooperation rather than confrontation between the parties concerned. Mullins (2007:3) stated that organisational behaviour does not only entail the study of people inside an organisational setting ‘… (but also) includes the understanding, anticipating and control of human actions’. Although much of organisational behaviour pertains to improving performance through motivation and leadership, the subordinates must accept these concepts for them to be attainable.

The job of managers is to attain goals through the best use of human performance by making the work experience both challenging and enjoyable, by creating social units designed to achieve goals and to treat staff as a primary source of productivity gains in order that work performance may be achieved through increased levels of job satisfaction, motivation and commitment (Cascio, 1998:6; Greenberg & Baron, 2000: 183).

This implies working with – rather than being confrontational in – dealings with staff. When significant change occurs, the use of organisational development techniques to smooth the transition to the new systems and to reduce resistance and conflict cannot be underestimated. By blatantly ignoring the lessons to be learned from the disciplines of industrial and organisational psychology the negative outcomes of significant environmental change and especially of the mergers, which may have been mitigated, were simply allowed to occur and inevitably contributed to what is generally regarded as a failed exercise (Reddy, 2007:486) as in all cases it appears that the critical role of people and their reactions to the merger were simply ignored by management.
1.3 ACADEMIC MERGERS

1.3.1 Europe

Finland has seen a decline in the number of Universities, dropping from 20 to 15. Denmark has experienced a reduction of 25 universities and research institutions to eight universities and three research institutions since 2007. The largest university in France, the University of Strasbourg, was formed through a merger of three universities in 2009. Wales followed suit in 2010 by merging two universities. One of these two universities had already merged from two institutions in 2009 to form a new ‘super-university’, through the government’s decision to merge institutions to reduce the numbers (Persson, E. 2011).

In these and other countries, including Sweden, Belgium and Germany, universities of various size and reputational recognition have surrendered their institutional independence in exchange for the perceived benefits that come with being merged into a larger institution. In some instances, the drive for change was largely from the bottom up. Elsewhere the mergers were initiated through changes in national policy to modernise university funding and to focus in disciplinary expertise.

1.3.2 South Africa

In the late 1990’s, it became evident that significant problems pertaining to higher education were cause for concern (Jansen, 2002:159). The main concern of the new ANC government was the status of historically black institutions. They were unstable and many black students were applying to enter previously white institutions – in other words, there was a migration away from these black to white universities and technikons. This reduced their financial status and viability. In addition, the anticipated huge increase in black enrolments in higher education had not materialised (Finweek Survey, February 2009). In order to overcome both of these problems, the then Minister of Education decided to press ahead with a merger programme aimed at decreasing the number of higher education institutions from 36 to 21 (Jansen, 2002:6).
Despite contestation from many quarters, the merger programme was forced through. The aim was to increase accessibility of entrance to black students, to stop their migration, and to provide a common level of education. The aim was also to cut the enormous costs of running thirty-six institutions. Through mergers, it was hoped to cut costs through, among other things, the rationalisation of programmes, prevention of programme duplication, and the cutting of the wage cost to obtain the benefits of economies of scale.

As indicated earlier, when mergers occur, most emphasis is given to financial factors. Little, if any, effort is given to examining the ‘people issues’ side of a merger which could result in failure in merging (Botha, 2001:276).

1.4 BACKGROUND TO WALTER SISULU UNIVERSITY (WSU)

The Walter Sisulu University path started with the intention of merging three historically disadvantaged higher education institutions, namely, University of Transkei, Eastern Cape Technikon and Border Technikon, which were spread over a radius of approximately 360 km. Situated in Eastern Cape, the second poorest province in South Africa, the one was a traditional academic university, while the other two were technically- focused ‘technikons’ established in the previous ‘homelands’ during the 1980s. Together these institution provided education for around 24 000 thousand students. They also included a loyal staff of academics and administrators each with their own institutional culture. Phobia of change; anxiety over the unknown; concern with regard to retrenchment; the loss and protection of institutional interests were issues that were discussed during the merger discussion process. What was significant about the merger was the incorporation of three historical disadvantaged institutions. The idea was also to overcome the apartheid ideology through merging. In 2002, on the 9 December the Minister of Higher Education, Professor Kader Asmal MP, declared that University of Transkei, Eastern Cape Technikon and Border Technikon, were to merge to form a new all-inclusive university in the Eastern Cape (WSU Website, n. d.)

National Government provided a route map containing merger guidelines in order for the process to start. Three phases where identified. The first dealt with compliance
by all institutions with regards to legal requirements and the establishment of an interim Council for a period of six months. The second phase dealt with the official establishment of the new institution documented in the Government Gazette, its main activity being to appoint a management team to deal with operational issues, governance and a new substantive Council. Finally, the substantive Council took up office and instituted substantive management. This phase marks the integration of all units and processes of the merger (WSU Website, n. d.). After consultation with all relevant parties from the three Institutions, the comprehensive University became known as Walter Sisulu University. A merger that was scheduled for 1 January 2005 was postponed and on 1 July 2005 the merger was established (WSU Website, n. d.).

Due to this, WSU is uniquely positioned in the Eastern Cape to serve the under-developed areas of the province, with a clear rural and urban balance. WSU consists of four campuses in Mthatha, Buffalo City, Butterworth and Queenstown with several delivery sites in these areas. As such the university aims to integrate the research focus of a university with the technical career orientation of the technikons. As a comprehensive university, WSU offers students an extensive choice of education with articulation and mobility across the curriculum, from foundation programmes to post-graduate studies.

Higher Education institutions presently must confirm their viability and importance and serve the needs of their users, the government, commerce and industry and the communities in which they are positioned. The investment of taxpayers' funds into higher education demands a return in the form of graduates who are developed and equipped to pilot the economy. WSU’s core business is Teaching, Research and Community Engagement (WSU Website, n. d.).

The four faculties are:

1. Faculty of Health Sciences
2. Faculty of Science, Engineering and Technology
3. Faculty of Education
4. Faculty of Business, Management Sciences and Law
These faculties offer an extensive range of programmes and qualifications extending from certificates, diplomas and degrees to postgraduate studies. The following programme focus areas are considered as significant for development and restructuring:

- Health
- Science
- Engineering
- Business Management
- Information Technology
- Art and Fashion
- Education
- Agriculture (a future focus and currently in the process of being established)
- Hospitality Management and Tourism
- Broadcasting and Journalism (WSU website, n.d.)

1.5 SETTING

1.5.1 Finance Department

The heart of any organisation is its human resources. It needs a competent team of experts in various fields to sustain its existence and maintenance. In any organisation, the most important department is the Finance Department, as it assists in providing the financial and accounting information required to make various decisions. Walter Sisulu University is dependent on an effective Finance Department. The head office is in Mthatha at the Nelson Mandela Drive Site and another important office is based in East London at the Heritage Building, Cambridge Street (WSU Website, n. d.).

There are 68 permanent staff members in the Department. WSU Website, (n. d.) confirms that the Finance Staff perform the following functions:

- Administration and Budget preparation
Since the merger in 2005 there has appeared to be a problem in the leadership of the Department since there has been a constant change in management. These changes have brought about uncertainty among the staff. Motivation levels and job satisfaction are constantly broken down. The working environment is also constantly changing as leadership changes and the staff commitment towards the University appears in all likelihood to be highly questionable.

1.6 PROBLEM STATEMENT

People issues are a very important contributing factor to the success of any merger. The management of the merger process is crucial to its success and to the future recovery of an organisation that in almost all cases would have gone through a fairly traumatic period. In a study of Higher Education mergers in Australia, (Harman, 2002:107) argued that unless managed effectively and efficiently and with 'super-sensitivity', the effect of a merger on staff morale and loyalty can be disturbing. Against the above backdrop, the problem statement derived for this study is:

'To investigate factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment and the relationship between these two variables within the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University’
1.7 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1.7.1 Purpose of the research:

The primary objective of this research is to investigate the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment: a case study of the administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

To achieve the primary objective the following secondary objective will be investigated:

- To investigate factors that influence employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment.
- To investigate factors that influence employee perceptions of their post-merger organisational commitment.
- To investigate the relationship between employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment.

An outcome of the research will enable the writer to make recommendations towards improving the relationship between employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment and their organisational commitment.

1.7.2 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that influence Employee perception of a post-merger working environment</td>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 HYPOTHESIS

In an attempt achieve the above objectives; the following theoretical correlation hypothesis is formulated:
H1: Employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment scores together with all sub–dimensions will be low.

H2: Employees who have a negative perception towards their post-merger working environment are less committed to the merged organisation.

H3: Employees who enjoy their working environment will have a positive outlook on post-merger perceptions.

1.9 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It is anticipated that the relevant stakeholders at Walter Sisulu University will take cognisance of the research findings and if need be, take appropriate measures to overcome any shortcomings that would be revealed in this research report.

1.10 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

While the research will provide an overall historical view of the merger, the emphasis of staff reactions will be confined to employees within the Finance Department at WSU only. They were required to make the greatest degree of adjustment therefore they were selected for the study.

1.11 DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.11.1 Merge

The word ‘merge’ indicates to combine, mix, or bond steadily so as to shape the individuality or individual identity (Nichols, 2001:1203).

1.11.2 Merger

The current English pocket Oxford Dictionary defines the word ‘merger’ as the ‘joining or steadily combining of two formerly separate bodies’ (Thompson 1996:556).
1.11.3 Institutional Merger

In higher education, Harman (2002:94) states that an institutional merger is an amalgamation of two or more distinct institutions that submit their lawful and traditional independent identities in favour of a new combined identity under the administration of a single governing body. All assets, liabilities and tasks of the former institutions, including the human elements, are transferred to the single new institution.

1.11.4 Transitional Management Team (TMT)

A transitional Management Team is a team of people who assist with a transformation process. A transition is a transformation process ‘in which existing structures, institutions, culture and practices are broken down and new ones are established (Loorbach, 2007: 17).

1.12 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

The dissertation is structured as follows:

Chapter One – Introduction and Background to the Study

This chapter provides the introduction to the study. Background information referring to the rise of mergers as a strategic option, the changes occurring in academic institutions and a comment on academic mergers is presented. The study is contextualised in terms of its position with regard to industrial and organisational psychology.

Chapter Two – Literature Review

This chapter indicates the rationale for mergers. The aims and stages in the merger process are presented. The success potential and potential problem areas are discussed prior to presenting data with reference to academic mergers in South
Africa. This chapter also deals with the concepts of culture and perception and their impact on staff responses to mergers. The important aspects of cultural compatibility in mergers are presented, together with the outcomes of deculturation. Reference is also made to organisational climate. The effects of culture change in both Australia and South Africa are presented. Perceptions of mergers are then presented, both for Australia and local academic mergers.

Chapter Three – Research Methodology

This is the presentation of the research methodology. It indicates the research design and the methodology used. A quantitative approach using the questionnaire method was used for the collection of data. Post-merger perceptions of staff are presented and conclusions are drawn. Comments regarding the advantages and shortcomings of these approaches and the methods of data collection and analyses are presented.

Chapter Four – Findings / Results

This chapter presents the data collected. This will allow for conclusions to be reached on the factors that influence staff perceptions of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment.

Chapter Five – Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter the researcher will be interpreting the findings in the light of the theoretical issues that are covered in the literature review. The research problem and the hypothesis will be proved or disproved by means of the presentation and analysis of the results. The relationship between the two variables within the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University which were surveyed and analysed will be revealed.

Recommendations are made for the relevant stakeholders and for further study on this topic.
1.13 CONCLUSION

Having provided an overview of the research, including the objectives, and a brief background overview, it is now appropriate that the topic of mergers be examined in greater detail. This will be done in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Having provided a brief overview of the research topic in Chapter One, it is now appropriate to examine the topic of mergers in greater detail in order to understand the rationale behind the merger process. The aim of this section is to promote awareness of what mergers hope to achieve and potential problem areas which need to be addressed, with special reference to the staff involved (Stephen, 2010:19).

A merger is defined in higher education as a fusion of two or more different institutions under one governance where a single decision-making body manages all resources, liabilities and responsibilities from the previous institutions (Goedegebuure, 1992: 16).

Mergers amongst educational institutions are classified in terms of the academic outlook and activities that the merging institutions bring together. By drawing from private sector typologies, educational institutions have defined their own understanding of mergers and used the business terminology by replacing ‘line of business’ with ‘field of academic activity’ (teaching) and ‘type of product’ with ‘type of academic product’ (research). Four types of merger are defined by (Pritchard, 1993 as cited in Sewbaran, 2006:8-9) being:

1. A *horizontal* merger is a merger that takes place 'between institutions which function in similar academic fields and are focused towards a similar type of product' (2006:8).
2. A *vertical* merger is 'between institutions which function in similar academic fields and are focused towards a different type of product' (2006:8).
3. A *diversification* merger is 'between institutions which function in different academic fields and are focused towards a similar type of product' (2006:9).
4. A *conglomerate* merger is 'between institutions which function in different academic fields and are focused towards a different kind of product' (Pritchard, 1993 as cited in Sewbaran, 2006:8-9).

WSU falls in the category of a vertical merger.

### 2.2 POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO MERGERS

According to Sewbaran (2006:9-10), there are many uncertainties that could hinder the process of merging, namely:

- Forfeiture of assets
- Uncertainties regarding standards and professed quality
- Uncertainties regarding extra responsibilities and finances
- Positions - e.g. existing post levels and staffing position, such as position status and power
- Smaller institution loss of identity when merging with larger institutions (Sewbaran, 2006:10).

According to Strydom (1999:40), positive merging is based on:

- A shared vision validated by active governance and administration.
- Efficient communication strategies that will keep all stakeholders informed throughout and after the merger process.
- A solid commitment by all stakeholders to merge.
- A shared view of threat facing the current institutions and/or shared vision of the future potential benefits from merging.
- Guarantees regarding employment security for employees.
- Confirming continuance of courses for students.
- Instilling loyalty and a common culture for the merged institution.
- A business identity.
- Adequate time for institutional change to transpire.
• Adequate resources to stakeholders whose activities and interactions will change.
• Providing professional training and development of staff.

2.3 ACADEMIC MERGERS

Mergers represent a worldwide phenomenon, from which academic institutions have not been spared. In other countries, mergers of academic institutions have taken place with various results (Stephen, 2010:33). In Germany this was unsuccessful, while in the Netherlands they appear to have been more successful (de Paravicini, 2004:1).

In Australia, mergers were fraught with problems as attempts to cobble together disparate institutions took little note of the impact of different cultures on the merged institutions. It is suggested that, like the Australian example, cultural incompatibility was a major negative factor in the merged institutions. Experience with overseas academic mergers helps to provide insights into outcomes of mergers in this country, as parallels with their experiences can be drawn (Mahony, 1995; Johnson, 1999, cited in Stephen, 2010:33).

As a case in point, (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006:88) undertook a six year longitudinal study of six Australian institutions of higher learning which were merged into three universities. They make the point that, like SA, mergers are prompted by the rationalisation of increased growth and the reduction of costs. Their research established that ‘unless mergers are controlled effectively … the reverse is likely to occur’. They further state that mergers are highly complex events with a seemingly infinite number of factors that can lead to success or failure’ (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006:82). According to these authors, the following appear to be findings which are significant for success:

• Most managers lack merger skills, leading to negative staff perceptions regarding not only their ability, but also the success of the merger.
• Managers need to be accepted by staff – be competent and able to create an atmosphere of psychological safety for staff.

• Communication is vital and should be on-going.

• Given the degree of change, people’s reaction should be the primary focus of change – an ability to deal with ‘stressful destabilisation’ (2006:585), failing which, dysfunctional outcomes result.

• The speed of the merger depends on the ability of staff to absorb change.

• In order to push the pace of merging, top management ‘move to tighten control by imposing ... constraints ... and reducing freedom ... to make decisions’ (2006:85) resulting in a move to a power and role culture controlled by top management. This results in increased negative responses and increased resistance from staff.

Although each of the three Australian mergers, mentioned in Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, (2006:88) proceeded in a different manner, each had similar results. All respondents indicated the following:

• All mentioned negative reactions to their merger.

• All experienced a shift to higher levels of autocracy in top management.

• All experienced significant culture change.

Of the three types of merger, (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006:99) categorised the mergers as follows:

• Indifference – the merged institutions carried on much as before the merger. Only minor structural changes occurred, with both parties operating largely as separate entities.

• Immediate – the institutions were closed, staff reassigned and integrated into major campuses. The merger was cemented and the new institution moved on.

• Incremental – a phased in negotiated agreement which retained a degree of autonomy for each institution.
It was only the third option in which staff did not complain about being trivialised and where management culture shifted to a more open task- and person-support culture. Thus despite many perceived disadvantages, it may be viewed as the ‘most successful’.

2.4 OVERVIEW OF ACADEMIC Mergers IN SOUTH AFRICA (SA)

The SA merger process was proclaimed as an effort to increase efficiency, overcome the effects of apartheid, and increase throughput, for purely economic reasons (C.H.E., 2000:36). Despite this, Wyngaard & Kapp suggest that there appears little doubt that the merger programme was simply a political experiment, pushed through, despite serious reservations as to the successful outcome of the programme, mainly in order to guarantee the existence of the previously black institutions and to push through increased numbers of black graduates even if it meant combining totally disparate institutions into a ‘one size fits all’ system (2004:200).

‘There is a strong concurrence … that proposals are less consistent with the stated goals of higher education transformation and more fundamentally of political pressures’ (MacFarlane, 2002:6). Other options, including the improvement of the school system to improve the quality of university entrants or the upgrading of the black institutions’ quality of academic programmes, were ignored. Thus the merger proposals were regarded as ‘potentially counter-productive to the goals of transformation/ or as a potentially costly mistake’ (MacFarlane, 2002:6), therefore, the suggestion that the Education Department ‘take a step back from mergers as its standard tool and to rethink transformation strategies’ (MacFarlane, 2002:6) was ignored.

Nor is this all. Schultz, felt that government had underestimated the complexity of higher education institutions ‘which manifested itself in the various mergers’. ‘Predictably, the public higher education system will, over the medium term, experience notable quality depreciations in service and movement on other transformational aims’. This prediction appears to have been accurate, as will be indicated later (2003:34).
From the above, it would appear that the government ignored warnings that the merger process would potentially create more problems that it solved. Despite widespread opposition, it became obvious that the mergers would be pushed through. A couple of examples below indicate the degree of negativity by the institutions concerned:

- Rand Afrikaans University (R.A.U.): ‘deplore the decision .... Place both institutions at great risk’ (Groenewald & MacFarlane, 2004:8), RAU had ‘put forward a reasonable and well - motivated alternative proposal’ which was rejected without reasons given. There was ‘implacable opposition’, and ‘fears that the merger would wreck a very good university’ (Groenewald & MacFarlane, 2004:8).

- Pretoria/Gauteng/North West: The staff was reported to be very despondent, especially as the merger had ‘effectively been a takeover’ (MacFarlane, September, 2006:8). It was not a really merger as Pretoria had swallowed the other two merger partners ... simply absorbing the other two (MacFarlane, 2006:8). The ‘one faculty, one campus’ total integration model used here was rejected by most staff.

- University of Natal/University of Durban-Westville: Initially a federal system had been proposed but was pushed aside in favour of a totally merged unitary system. In addition to the public wrangling for the vice-chancellorship, claims of subtle racism, victimisation, distrust of management and sexual harassment (Naidoo, December 2006:6) together with fears of a drop in standards (Dismayed, 12.06.2006:16), the fact that ‘by all accounts, the University of Natal had been taken over by the University of Durban-Westville’, indicated the degree to which the merger was disliked.

Given this degree of opposition, there was little prospect of staff cooperation in the merger process. Indeed, (Jansen 2002:155) indicated that people do not always act rationally even if improved benefits are forthcoming, and that there was staff resistance even when the mergers were a *fait accompli*.
Mfusi (2004:109) indicated that no set of guidelines for merging were supplied by Government. Each institution used its own methods. Thus each merger evolved differently. Jansen, (2002:163-164) indicates four types of outcome:

1. **Institution Obliteration**

This entails the disappearance of one of the merging units. The Giyani Agricultural School, (part of the Giyani Agricultural School and the South African College for Teachers Education merger) ‘simply ceased’ to exist. Its respectable curriculum, ‘abundantly gifted with professional knowledge and broadly regarded as a centre of innovation’, was simply disregarded and its buildings were reclaimed by the Government (Jansen, 2002:163).

2. **Protected Enclosure**

A unit was allowed to continue a separate existence within the newly merged institution. This is the case of the Johannesburg College of Education, which enjoyed a separate dispensation regarding finance, promotions and campus statutes. It continued as an autonomous entity (Jansen, 2002:164).

3. **Subsumed Integration**

This involves the takeover of a smaller viable unit. In this case the University of Pretoria took over the MEDUNSA Veterinary Science Facility. The larger institution made only marginal changes to its structures and procedures. This resulted in a specialised small unit becoming part of a bigger institution (Jansen, 2002:164).

4. **Equal Partnership**

In the case of Eastern Cape Technikon, Border Technikon and University of Transkei, it seemed to combine three established units, their physical assets, students and staff. It was unlikely to lead to dissatisfaction from one of the three partners. (Jansen, 2002:164).
At a workshop, regarding mergers, which was organised by the Centre for Higher and Adult Education in November 2002 and which was attended by academic staff members from a wide range of further and higher education institutions in South Africa, thirty five respondents were requested to participate in a survey regarding mergers. One respondent summed it all up as follows: ‘I am not in favour of mergers of the kind I have experienced. There must be ways of effecting mergers that can be more user friendly’ (Wyngaard & Kaap, 2004:198-199). Despite all the negative responses, Wyngaard & Kapp, (2004:198) suggest that ‘the merger will be described as a success no matter what happens on the coal face of the staff and student realities’.

2.5 **REASONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION MERGERS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Some of the most common reasons are (Jansen, 2002:135-136):

- Cost savings from the reduction of duplication and more effective operations
- An increased level of skills and competencies of lecturers
- Greater height and breath of educational offering
- Maintenance of a higher overall quality of education
- More opportunity to attract and retain students
- Improved utilisation of resources
- Greater opportunity to progress, develop new skills and achieve excellence
- Increased opportunity and enhanced research output
- A more powerful SRC body to attend to student needs

2.6 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC MERGERS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Wyngaard & Kapp, (2004:200) indicated that most academic mergers in SA were hostile, financial and political. Botha (2001:276) suggests that before the mergers actually took place the following should be considered:
• Choice of a merger partner – must be culturally compatible and able to develop a joint culture. Although not stated as such, a due diligence would be required.

• Enabling legislation to facilitate the merger - establishing internal policy, mechanisms and procedures.

• Timing the merger: noting that many institutions were not ‘historically and politically ready for merging.

• A merger plan to transform for both merger and post - merger integration is drawn up. Care should be taken to avoid an ‘inappropriate pace of integration’.

• Peoples’ issues are probably the most important aspect of the process. He warned against over-reliance on financial information and ignoring people and cultures ‘at their peril’ (Botha, 2001:276).

‘Mergers occur fairly regularly in higher education abroad, but are not a common phenomenon in South Africa ... (thus) very little documented research and academic discourse exists on the topic in our country’(Botha, 2001:274). Botha also stressed that in SA, all the academic mergers were forced. In all cases the merger partners were allocated.

At the workshop organised by the Centre for Higher and Adult Education, referred to above and attended by academic staff members from a wide range of further and higher education institutions in South Africa, the following emerged:

• News of the merger was met with mixed feelings. Intellectually a positive reaction, but misgivings as to the outcomes. One respondent welcomed the merger, stating it was ‘preferable to the present losing organisation’ (Wyngaardt & Kapp, 2004:192).

• Levels of communication differed. Most felt poorly informed. ‘Left in the dark – and a lack of connection’ (Wyngaardt & Kapp, 2004:191).
Facilitation varied between institutions, but generally there appears to have been a lack of prior planning (Wyngaard & Kapp, 2004:199).

An on-going theme was the perceived lack of involvement of staff, which led to negative outcomes such as:

- low morale – ‘devastating’ (Wyngaard & Kaap, 2004:194). The majority were ‘demotivated, cynical, clinically depressed and could barely operate’ (Wyngaard & Kaap, 2004:198).
- Increased conflict between staff, lack of loyalty, feelings of betrayal, of disappointment and despair are quoted.

The majority of staff were severely affected by the merger. Many reacted negatively to the magnitude of change, with some having to ‘work with traumatised staff’ (Wyngaard & Kapp, 2004:198).

Hay & Fourie (2002:125 - 129) proposed a seven point framework for a merger. The components of this framework are as follows:

- Conduct feasibility study.
- Develop an initial proposal of intent.
- Set up a consultative stakeholder process. This should include a shared vision not imposed by one institution and a mechanism for dealing with sensitive issues.
- Set up team-building initiatives to forge a new institutional culture, share experiences and identify challenges.
- Establish time frames in order to monitor progress.
- Resolve technical issues, by establishing steering committees and subcommittees including a strategic plan, plans for finance, and plans for human resources.
- Formulate ‘a merger proposal’ including a rationalisation plan; a strategic plan for the new institution including finance, organisational structures and time
scales. This stage should include due diligence and financial reports from the parties concerned.

Botha (2001:277) also suggested three options for merged structures:

1. **The Confederal Structure:**

A confederation is formalised and fairly permanent union in which the constituent elements retain full autonomy. Mutual consent to collaborate and cooperate on issues of mutual interest and a contract between the parties that describes the obligations and rights of each party regarding the collaboration, are characteristic of a confederal structure. No one party will be able to dictate to the other regarding matters outside the cooperation agreement.

2. **The Federal Structure:**

The federal structure can take a variety of forms, the two main variants being:

- Centralised powers and functions are specified while the decentralised powers and functions (in other words, ‘the rest’) remain with the individual members of the federation.
- Devolved powers and functions are specified while everything else is centralised.

3. **The Unitary Structure:**

The existing parties merge into a single body with one central administration. Certain functions and powers could be decentralised if necessary, but a single identity would be essential.

Each option has advantages and disadvantages while the confederal and federal structures are simpler, given that each entity retains a fair degree of cultural and administrative systems intact. It is significant that in almost all circumstances, it was the unitary model of complete integration that was chosen. This despite the fact that
it was the most difficult model to implement and in the case of WSU, because of the
degree of cultural and administrative and academic change involved, the one most
likely to be unsuccessful.

Botha (2001:280) concludes that although merging is a complex endeavour with
much opportunity for failure, if properly planned and managed, it is possible to make
a resounding success of the process. However, he adds the comment that
‘additional resources, guidance and assistance would be required, as the merging
activity uses so much of the time and energy of those involved, that the quality of the
core business would otherwise undoubtedly suffer’ (Botha, 2001:280). Thus it is
essential that adequate resources, both human and financial, are mobilised to affect
a positive outcome.

2.7 FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL MERGING

An important fact was established in Chapter One that people issues are the most
significant factor in the success or failure of a merged institution. Price (1999:39)
states that leaders involved in mergers ‘disregard the people issues at their peril’
and that issues of culture, effective communication and proper change management
strategies need to be put in place and these must be well managed before, during
and after a merger. Effective leadership and management are also critical to the
success or failure of a merger.

Before discussing any of these factors for successful merging, it is important to make
a distinction between leading and managing. Leadership and managing are not
commonly exclusive but rather complementary (Napolitano & Henderson 1998:3).
Today’s realities require that the manager’s ability to implement plans and
accomplish results be integrated with the leader’s ability to set direction and inspire
and engage others. The primary role of the leader - manager is to influence others’
performances by helping to shape an organisation in which people can realise and
express their capabilities and in so doing contribute more fully.
2.8 MANAGING CHANGE

2.8.1 What is Managing Change?

‘Change can be described as the individual ability to have the freedom to think, feel, do something different without feeling threatened in an organisation’ (Sewbaran, 2006:17). To manage change can be challenging. Most organisations appear to use a mechanistic model, first applied to managing physical work and superimposing it onto the new mental model of today’s knowledge organisation. Change management can be broken up into small units and then managed. This is the bequest of Frederick Winslow Taylor to scientific management. The idea is to think innovatively and not increasingly reproduce physical labour. Strategic thinking involves the recognition of patterns and the foreseeing of problems and opportunities before they occur, that is the ultimately the goal (Sewbaran, 2006:17-18).

Change management should not be perceived as the correction of one problem at a time. Instead it should be seen as involving a balance between a number of activities in order to effect change. This is generally what happens in most organisations. An organisation may simultaneously be working on two completely different outcomes like Operational issues and Quality Assurance as part of their change mandate. The key to the activity is not perceiving these entities as separate but connecting and balancing them. Change management involves the management of communication between those who lead the change and the implementers of that change as well as managing the environment in which it will occur together with the emotions that involves an organisations makeover (Sewbaran, 2006:18).

2.8.2 Factors significant in Managing Change

Research indicates a need to fit management strategies into particular characteristics of the organisation and to holistically address all aspects when it is operational. Christensen & Overdorf, (2000:65) pinpoint the challenge presented in meeting the needs of the current organisation and the emerging organisation.
A significant point of emphasis is that the organisation’s Management is also the messenger in that everything they state, as well as their silences, transcends a message. Too often managers presume that the communication is the responsibility of staff, Human Resources or the Public Relations Department. However, communication must be everyone’s main concern irrespective of at which level of an organisation they are positioned. This is vital when looking at change where rumours are rife. A need for information to be conveyed repetitively and accurately is important to the organisation’s well-being as it takes time for understanding and for the belief of a message. It becomes cumbersome when the message is not an expected or popular one (Sewbaran, 2006:19)

Sewbaran suggests that an important dimension of change involves changing employee attitudes and allowing them to participate in the change process so that they can understand and contribute to the organisational vision. In doing this, workers would voluntarily change their behaviour and this would improve production. If success with regards to their improved commitment to the organisation is achieved, workers will feel validated and continue with this behaviour. This would cause a domino effect leading to successful organisational change. Therefore managers, when introducing a programme, must have a win-win situation mapped out. They appeal to workers vanities in order to get them to believe in their vision instead of forcing them to comply. However, often workers had been through so many change programmes in organisations that they are not easily persuaded to believe in anything new (2006:20).

If change is to be initiated, top management should be in the front line. When that proves successful everyone else will follow. The first to change ought be the top executives who will have to adapt to a process of working side-by-side with their employees to develop the organisation for the future. A common management technique is to initiate decision-making down to the lowest level of employees. The authority given should not be dumped on the ordinary employee and left for them to figure it out for themselves. Instead, they should be led, prepared and made to understand what exactly the expectations of the organisation are. Regular feedback and dialogue is essential to their participation. The belief that workers’ feelings are
not part of who they are and should be kept separate from their work is inaccurate. Change is essentially about feelings (Sewbaran, 2006:20-21).

Trust is an essential part of an organisation. A lack of trust in an organisation that is experiencing difficulty or change can be problematic. Trust during change has two aspects, predictability and capability. The first refers to a person’s nature of wanting to know what to expect, especially in times of change, as trust has become worn. Workers would want to know that their employment is secured after having invested years in an organisation and would want to know how this career path can be traced. Predictability during times of change takes on a new format, that of intention and ground rules. Therefore the organisation must be clear about its intentions and goals because the clearer these are the more predictable the future of the workers within an organisation will be (Gregson, 1992:85). Secondly, organisational trust can only occur when both managers and their reports define the capability that each is providing and each side must perceive the other as competent. Previously, capability was seen in terms of delivery. The belief now is that if processes are correctly steered and controlled the correct outcome will follow. For this to be successful capable people must be identified and put in place before those involved will accept the situation needed for success. If both sides understand the needs, capabilities and objectives of the other, trust can be encouraged (Gregson, 1992:86).

Mbinda (2005:36-37) states that processes and values are not flexible or adaptable, unlike resources. An organisation would need to create spaces for new capabilities to exist as it needs these processes and values instilled in order to change. Various ways can be developed to unlock such capabilities:

- The creation of new organisational structures to enable the development of new processes along corporate boundaries.
- Turning out an independent organisation from existing organisations.
- Obtaining an altered organisation whose processes and values closely match the requirements of the new mission. These changes clearly have implications for the existing organisation together with the demands placed on the organisation’s leadership (Mbinda (2005:37)).
Sewebaran, (2006:23) emphasises that change management involves balancing the fixed processes with the value system. This requires the communication of a shared awareness of how the various parts intertwine so that everyone can trust the idea which will draw the organisation together. A Transition Management Team (TMT) is needed to oversee change in an organisation in order to effectively champion transformation. The Chief Executive Officer’s (CEO) main function is to be a visible champion in the transformation process and to ensure that change initiatives fit together. The CEO should also set the change trend and give direction.

The Transition Management Team should take into consideration the experiences of John P. Kotter, who has observed more than 100 companies who tried to re-create themselves into meaningfully, healthier competitors. He confirms that a few of these companies’ change efforts have been very successful. Some have been absolute failures. Most fall somewhere in between with a distinct slope towards the lower end of the balance. The most universal lesson to be learned from the successful cases is that the change process goes through a series of stages that usually require a considerable period of time. Avoiding stages creates only the impression of speed and never yields a satisfying result (1995:59 – 61. These stages include:

- Creating a sense of urgency.
- Forming a powerful leading coalition.
- Crafting a vision.
- Communicating the vision.
- Allowing others to act on the vision.
- Planning and creating short-term achievements.
- Combining improvements and escalating more change.

2.9 APPROACHES TO MANAGING CHANGE

The social psychology of the workplace is crucial to organisational change in the work environment. Cardinal to this is how managers and workers react to change and how to advocate this change to the workers, especially pertaining to stress,
conflict and emotional issues. They need to acquire support for, and involvement in, change in order to secure the success of the organisation’s change’ (Kotter, 1998:2).

When instituting change the pitfalls with regard to concerns and possible challenges, as well the period needed for change to be implemented, must be taken into consideration as new values are being created within the organisation. Various methods and models of change management exist, each with its advantages and disadvantages. We need to realise that there is no perfect model for initiating change. A common approach is that of Lewin’s Three – Step Model, which will be outlined in the next sub-section (Mbinda 2005:39).

2.9.1 Lewin’s three step model

According to Lewin (cited by Balogun, Hailey, Johnson & Scholes, 1999:145) effective change in organisations ought to follow three steps, namely:

1. **Unfreezing:** This is about making all the employees in the organisation ready for change. To accept this change, the people need to feel that the doubt and the discomfort that the change will cause are overshadowed by the need for the change process to take place. Individuals will have to let go of the past in this step.

2. **Moving into a new state:** This refers to the implementation of the required changes throughout the organisation. Individuals will start to accept and acclimatise to the new environment in this step.

3. **Refreezing:** This includes entrenching the changes throughout the organisation to confirm that employees do not revert into their previous patterns of behaviour. This step directs the way for continued incremental change. Individuals start to move forward during this step (Balogun et al, 1999:145).
Figure 2.1 illustrates the dual paths that both the individual and the organisation move through during the change process.

**Figure 2.1**

**THE DUAL CHANGE PATHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL PATH</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFREEZE</td>
<td>LETTING GO OF THE PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVE</td>
<td>ADAPTING TO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFREEZE</td>
<td>MOVING FORWARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Balogun et al, 1999:153

### 2.10 HUMAN CAPITAL

#### 2.10.1 What is Human Capital?

People are the greatest asset of an organisation. However, are organisations being genuine when they say that human resources are their 'greatest assets' or are they merely indulging in some aspiring thinking - emphasising an ideal that could become a reality if given the correct tools? (Sewbaran, 2006:24).

According to (Drucker, 1992 cited in Sewbaran, 2006:24), the problem with most organisations globally is not that companies don't value their people. It is that they do not know how to. They have not established a dependable way to appraise the worth of what they have or to increase its value through better management. This lack of know-how is not merely a difficulty for the Human Resources Department to handle. Nor can it be blamed on human resources. Human factors in the work place cannot, and should not, be departmentalised and thus marginalised. Because of its high
impact on both organisational operations and on organisational value, this issue matters greatly to all managers and leaders. In order to value people, organisations must move beyond the belief of human resources and toward the belief of human capital.

2.10.2 Importance of Human Capital to an Organisation

Over the past few decades, managerial movements across the world mainly practised Total Quality Management (TQM) and strategic planning. Each of these activities made significant positive contributions to organisational performance. However, these activities could have had even better outcomes if they had taken the value of human capital into full consideration. In each of these activities, organisations saw human resources as an interchangeable or even a disposable means to some greater end: market dominance, higher product and service quality, or more efficient procedures. The great reality that all these activities lost was the fact that organisations cannot achieve positive and lasting outcomes unless they also learn to manage and improve the value of their employees as a workforce (Sewbaran, 2006:25).

In the 21st century, (Drucker, 1992 cited in Sewbaran, 2006:25) maintains, ‘managers still believe that employees need us more than we need them’. Managers who still believe in this are missing a key part in the concept of human capital: organisations need people. To say that there is human capital within an organisation implies many things, namely:

- Human beings employed in their work are not purely people moving resources around. They themselves are resources that can be valued, measured and developed like any other resource held by the organisation.

- Human beings are dynamic resources that can increase in value over time, not inert resources that depreciate in value.
• Human beings are prime among all resources. Capital is synonymous with net worth - the remaining assets of an organisation after all liabilities have been deducted.

• As such, human beings and the systems created to recruit, reward, and develop them form a major part of any organisation’s value as much, or perhaps even more, than other assets such as cash, land, plant and equipment and intellectual property.

• Organisation value can suffer when human capital is mismanaged (Drucker, 1992 cited in Sewbaran, 2006:25).

2.11 LESSONS LEARNT AND FACTORS TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION FROM MERGERS

Wyngaard & Kapp, (2004: 199) mention a few lessons or factors learnt from mergers through literature on mergers in further and higher education institutions, feedback from surveys on the impact of mergers and workshops attended.

• Proper pre-merging planning was lacking. No past outcomes were considered regarding experiences of similar mergers in other countries.

• A well-organised and well-planned merger implementation plan that takes into account the `cultures' of the different institutions and develops according to reasonable and genuine phases or stages and take into account the life cycle of all the merging institutions.

• A reliable and strong institutional leadership is required and whose authority and credentials are respected by the entire stakeholder’s of the institution.

• There must be solid and strategic leadership that has acknowledged the political arrangements for the mergers and then positions its goals and
resources for optimal placing of its staff, students and the programme offerings.

- A solid and reliable staff complement, whose contribution and commitment is guaranteed and sustained by institutional leadership throughout the merger process in a consistent and transparent manner (Jansen, 2002:176).

- There should be continuing monitoring and auditing to confirm that the processes are performed as planned.

- A merger will be less complex for a party which has a durable and provable financial position, has professional and performing employees and a strong and reliable student membership.

- Well-organised post-merger management and contingency planning are important to guarantee that the merger is correctly implemented.

Fielden, & Markham, (1997) suggest some lessons learned from mergers which include:

- Do not make promises that may be difficult to maintain. It is risky to make any promises too early in the merger process because unexpected situations will unsurprisingly arise and require unexpected actions that could harm the credibility and integrity of senior management.

- Attention must be given to the staffing process. It is critical for the morale of the employees and the credibility of senior management that the staffing process be envisage as sensible.

- A centralised arrangement is essential. It would be difficult to control the change process in a decentralised organisation. A centralised structure helps ensure that decisions are made quickly and that objectives and actions are aligned.
Develop employee policies carefully. Merging organisations must take the time to blend their policies and think of what is best for the new organisation.

Employees expect change as they go through the merger process and are therefore more open to new ways of doing things.

2.12 ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

2.12.1 What is Organisational Culture?

‘Organisation culture is taken to be the ‘shared values and beliefs that underlie a company’s identity’ (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2002:58). Selecting individuals on the basis of their skills alone is no guarantee that they will subsequently become effective and committed employees. The individual worker has to fit in with other employees and with the organisational climate and style of work which are manifestations of the underlying culture of the organisation. The incongruity of poor person – work environment fit has been shown to result in low job satisfaction and stress, which affects individual outcomes (i.e. physical, psychological and mental well-being) as well as organisational outcomes. If two or more organisations come together and their cultures are incompatible to the extent that many employees no longer ‘fit’ into the environment, the resulting effects are likely to have a substantial and large-scale impact. In the normal, everyday functioning of the organisation, culture operates in a ‘taken for granted’ fashion and only assumes salience in people’s minds when it is disturbed or threatened. Mergers are the greatest disturbers of cultural peace and regularly result in ‘culture collisions’. Trivial issues and differences may assume major proportions. It will create ambiguous working environments, conflict, employee incongruity and stress, affect organisational performance adversely and also the quality of work life. Therefore, the effects of merging different cultural types as it influences managerial styles and behaviours, both prior to and during the merger period and the extent to which a single coherent culture emerges, has important consequences for both organisational and human merger outcomes (Sewbaran, 2006:31).
2.12.2 Types of Organisational Culture

Harrison & Stokes (1992:13) advocate the belief that organisations have a combination of four cultural types each eliciting different behaviours and human values. These are now discussed below.

1. The Power Orientation

A cultural type found in small organisations where the person in charge controls everything (Martin, 2005: 493). Harrison & Stokes (1992: 14) focus on organisations being power-orientated. This concept is more geared to inequality of access to resources and, for example, anything that one person does not share with another when the other needs or wants it. Power culture leads to people controlling others because they have the resources that others need and are not willing to share (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 14). Brown (1995: 68) sees it as culture that has one source with a spread of influence that is interconnected through functional and specialist ties that co-ordinate and move throughout an organisation. Martin reiterates, stating that crucial decision are made by the person who wields the power making the person autonomous and authoritative in all decision-making matters. This approach has the feature of being single-minded and authoritative as one person’s idea and personality dominates the whole organisation. The greatest strength of this type of culture is that the organisation is able to react quickly in its decision-making (Brown, 1995: 68; Martin, 2001:590).

2. The Role Orientation

Role culture can be described as culture founded on the existence of rules, procedures and job descriptions, as opposed to the solitary power found in leadership as in power orientations (Brown, 1995: 68; Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 15; Martin, 2001: 590). With role culture the struggle for power is confined to obeying the rules and these rules lead to the belief that role culture is bureaucratic and the organisation’s principles are rational, orderly and dependable (Brown, 1995:68; Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 15; Van der Post, De Coning, & Smit, 1997: 150). Within an environment of this nature, authority and responsibility are delegated from the top
to the bottom and each level in the organisation has a specific area of authority where work takes place continuously without direct involvement of top management (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 15). Its advantage is that employees within an organisation are able to apply more energy to their work (Harmse, 2001: 12). A disadvantage is that trust cannot be established as lower-level employees are not given independence nor are they trusted with good judgement (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 15). In addition, traditional role-orientation organisations may have difficulty keeping up with fast changing environments due to it being difficult to change set rules and regulations (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 15).

3. The Achievement Orientation

Achievement organisational culture allows employees to have a shared vision or purpose (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 17). It relies on the organisation’s shared vision through the use of its mission to attract and release employees’ individual energy in search of shared goals. The organisation uses its mission to focus the individual energy of its employees (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 17).

There is a need for systems and structures to be in place as the system is achievement orientated in its mission. It is only changed when a change occurs in the mission statement making is more open to changing rules and regulations (Harmse, 2001 12; Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 17).

A positive feature of this type of culture is that employees contribute more freely because they experience a sense of ownership so there is a shared purpose. As a result, the whole organisation prospers (Harrison & Stokes, 1992:17). It also inculcates enthusiasm, high energy and ownership through involvement of all parties in an organisation. However, involvement of all can be cumbersome when it comes to decision-making. The amount of energy involved can cause people to burn out faster, especially when results are not achieved (Harrison & Stokes, 1992:18). What may also occur is that under-organised employees may lack the necessary time for planning and so rely on the common mission to organise work. Thus leads to a loss of unity of effort (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 18)
4. The Support Orientation

The support organisational culture’s foundation is established on shared trust of employee and organisation thereby believing that they are valued as human beings (Harrison & Stokes, 1992:20). With a support culture a sense of warmth and caring exists as it is assumed that belonging goes hand-in-hand with commitment to the organisation (Harmse, 2001:13; Harrison & Stokes, 1992:21).

The positive side of this type of organisation is that employees make sacrifices for each other and this forges team loyalties which in turn add to high performance and a good morale. Employees are motivated and enthusiastic. However, this type of organisation is more conflict-avoidance orientated as it tends to ignore difficult situations. Differences in employees skills are often ignored as it treats all its employees equally. Decisions are often made out of kindness and reality is distorted (Harrison & Stokes, 1992: 22).

All the above variables will be considered when looking at Walter Sisulu University.

2.13 POST MERGER PERCEPTIONS OF WORKING ENVIRONMENT

2.13.1 What is Perception?

Dalton, Hoyle & Watts, refer to perception as a process by which one acquires mental images of one’s environment. Through it, one organises, interprets and gives meaning to sensations or messages that one receives from the senses of sight, smell, touch, taste and hearing. Many factors influence perception of culture; heredity, needs, peer pressures, interests, values, snap judgements and expectations. These factors contribute, in varying degrees, to the way one thinks and feels about people, situations, events and objects (2006:31).

2.13.2 What is Working Environment?

Morris & Kuratko state that working environment is the setting or environments in which an employee finds himself or herself when he or she comes to the workplace
each day. It is explained by the set of conditions in which the employee must operate as he or she attempts to accomplish organisational tasks and personal goals. The employee develops perceptions about the environment based on experiences and interactions over time. Included among these perceptions can be the extent to which the environment expects or permits employees to demonstrate individual creativity, experimentation, citation innovation, and endurance in the face of rejection and to use resources and related organisational behaviours. The work environment is influenced by a host of factors, ranging from current business conditions and the management style, the appropriate use of rewards, resources and the availability thereof, management support, organisational support, and risk-taking (2002:299).

2.14 CONCEPT OF ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

2.14.1 What is Organisational Commitment?

Organisational commitment is a psychological state that characterises the employee’s relationship with the organisation. This has implications in terms of continuing his or her membership in the organisation. A committed employee is one who stays in the organisation under any favourable or unfavourable circumstances affecting the organisation. This research seeks to find out if there is a relationship between perceptions of working environment and organisational commitment. A great deal of attention has been given recently to the study of commitment to the organisation. Like many constructs in organisational psychology, commitment has been conceptualised and measured in various ways. Common to all the conceptualisations of commitment found in the literature, past research on organisational commitment has shown that it has an impact on job performance, turnover (Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W., 1982: 35); Gregson,1992: 80-95 and absenteeism (Angle & Perry,1981:113).

In trying to resolve the different ways of measuring organisational commitment, Allen & Meyer (1990:1) proposed a three-component model of organisational commitment. This model has been extensively and successfully used in many research studies measuring organisational commitment. This research also uses the model to
determine the levels of organisational commitment amongst the Walter Sisulu University full-time finance administration staff.


Allen & Meyer advised that there are three types of commitment; affective, continuance and normative.

1. Affective Commitment

Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional link to, identification with and involvement in the organisation. This attachment relates to the role one plays in relation to the goals and values or to the organisation for its own good.

Determinants of Affective Commitment: It is largely due to rewards or punishment. Rewards or punishment are given by an organisation in answer to the contributions it employees make or to those that they do not achieve success in. Employees commit themselves to these incentives or punishments. These incentives or punishment include: routinisation, resource shortage, role conflict, supervisory support, workload, co-worker support, job autonomy, promotional opportunities, job security, pay and promotion. These can positively or negatively affect the employee’s affective commitment.

2. Continuance Commitment

The continuance commitment is defined as the loss of benefits that would be incurred if the employee departs or resigns from the organisation. The fewer alternatives open to the employees the more they would want to continue with their continuance commitment to their current employer.

Determinants of Continuance Commitment: A few potential determinants of continuance commitment include general empowerment, self-investment, social support (supervisory, co-worker, spouse, parent and friend) and opportunities. Self-investment is regarded as time, effort and energy the employee has invested in the
organisation. The more they have invested in the organisation the more they will want to continue because leaving would cause them to lose much. If their benefits cannot be transferred they will be less likely to leave. The lack of external job opportunities increases the costs linked with leaving the organisation. Therefore, the fewer the available alternative jobs in the environment, the greater will be the employee’s continuance commitment to their current employer.

3. Normative Commitment

The normative commitment refers to an employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organisation. These feeling are influenced by people’s experience culturally and within the organisation.

**Determinants of Normative Commitment**: Socialisation and interaction is important to the development of normative commitment. Normative commitment is dependent on normative beliefs that are inculcated in an employee through pre-entry (family and cultural) and post-entry (organisational) socialisation processes. If employees have this type of commitment it is perceived as normative commitment. The other method that is regarded as developing normative commitment is the principle of ‘exchange’. This is achieved through the receiving of rewards from an organisation that appeals to an employee’s sense of moral obligation.

2.15 CONCLUSION

In this chapter literature pertaining to mergers has been highlighted. This literature has revealed the meaning of merging, the types of mergers, reasons for merging, and barriers to mergers as well as variables for successful merging. Proper change management, recognition of human capital, the presence of an on-going communication strategy and the establishment of a unitary culture for the merged institution are seen as critical variables for the successful functioning of any merger. These variables impact on the working environment which employees perceive as either negative or positive and they will ultimately determine levels of employee commitment to the organisation. Finally, local and international experiences of mergers amongst higher education institutions have shown some similar trends -
cost-savings are not always achieved out of merging. 'Soft' issues such as communication, staff morale and organisational culture are as equally important as are some of the 'hard' issues such as finance, in the successful functioning of any merger.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the empirical study is intended to address the research problem (formulated in Chapter One). It aims to investigate the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and the organisational commitment of the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University, as well as provide possible solutions.

Hussey & Hussey (1997:1) state that research is regarded as a process of enquiry and investigation. It is a methodological, orderly process where correct methods are used to collect and analyse data. Research is regarded as an instrument that escalates knowledge. They debate that research should address a specific problem or issue, in order to set a definable objective for research activities. Riley, Wood, Clark Wilkie & Szivas (2000:7) agree by referring to the Oxford Mini-dictionary (1991 edition), which defines research as 'study and investigation, particularly to find new facts'. They further elaborate that research may be directed towards the confirmation of current facts or the increase of knowledge. They further claim that it concerns the development of new perspectives on current knowledge and need not presuppose the discovery of new facts.

This chapter offers an overview of the research process that is addressed and the philosophy to be adopted. It also provides a synopsis of the research design that was used for the empirical study. The pilot study, data collection, development of the questionnaire, questionnaire cover letter, sampling methods, data analysis, trustworthiness and ethical consideration are also discussed.

3.2 THE RESEARCH PROCESS

The research process followed in this research study is multi-tiered and follows the following stages (Hussey & Hussey, 1997:15; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2000:4):
Both Hussey and Hussey (1997:15) and Saunders et al (2000:4) maintain that there are many overlaps of the different stages of this process and that these different stages may have to be continuously revisited. The multi-tiers of the research process are represented in Figure 3.1 (Saunders et al, 2000:85).

**Figure 3.1**  A graphic presentation of the multiple tiers of the research process
3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.3.1 Research Paradigm

A framework that directs how scientific research should be conducted is called a research paradigm. The use of reason and argument in searching for the truth and knowledge concerning the reality of general causes and principles is described as Philosophy (Oxford Compact Dictionary and Thesaurus, 1997:557). Paradigms are philosophical frameworks that guide how scientific research should be shown (Collis & Hussey, 2009: 55). The researcher will be employing the positivistic paradigm.

3.3.2 Positivistic Paradigm

Paradigms provide frameworks for conducting research. The positivistic paradigm focuses on providing a framework for natural and scientific methods that are used in social science. Positivism is reinforced by the belief that reality is independent of people and the goal is the discovery of theories based on empirical research (observation and experiment) (Walliman, 2005:16). Knowledge is derived from positive information because every rationally justifiable assertion can be scientifically confirmed or is capable of logical or mathematical proof (Walliman, 2005:16). Maree, (2007:53), states that the positivist paradigm is led by five principles:

1. Agreement of scientific method.
2. The eventual goal of inquiry is to improve laws (in numbers) of overall understanding. If the law is known, the researcher can influence the environment to produce the expected result because scientific knowledge is testable.
3. Science does not equate to common sense.
4. Common sense must not bias a researcher’s research.
5. Science should be as value-free as possible and the eventual goal of science is to produce knowledge, regardless of politics, morals, value, etc. involved in the research.
Eventually science ought to be judged by logic, general conditions and all announcements must be true for all times and places. Research results can be proved only by empirical means, not argumentation. It has a deductive approach, using quantitative data (Maree, 2007:49).

3.3.3 Quantitative Paradigm

The purpose of this study is to determine the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment: a case study of the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

This research is situated in the positivistic paradigm and will be quantitative. According to Maree (2007:48-51), quantitative research is a process that is systematic and objective in its ways of using numerical data from only a selected subgroup of a universe (or population) to simplify the results to the universe that has been studied. The three most important components in this definition are:

2. Generalisability, (2007:49)

The result of a quantitative study is usually the confirmation or disproving of the hypotheses which were tested (Mbinda, 2005: 48).

3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN

To determine the most appropriate research design, the research investigation and nature of the information to be collected should be clearly explained. The main question researched in this study was to investigate the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment of the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University. Literature regarding this study was obtained through details
of books and journal articles from electronic databases. Results were drawn from the literature and discussed in Chapter Two (Mbinda, 2005: 49).

3.5 PILOT STUDY

De Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. & Delport, C., (2002:210) perceive a pilot study as a dress rehearsal of the main study. The purpose of a pilot study is to administer the questionnaire to a small number of people who possess similar characteristics to the target group in order to ensure that the respondents will not encounter problems with completing the questionnaire and that the researcher will not have problems with the analysis of the responses. A pilot study also allows a valuation of the validity and reliability of the questionnaire (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2000: 304). A pilot study can elicit information about the time it took to complete the questionnaire, the clarity of instructions and questions, whether respondents felt uneasy about answering certain questions, whether major topics were omitted and whether the layout was clear and attractive. In addition, respondents must be encouraged to suggest any other improvements to the questionnaire (Lekelandi, 2009:96-97).

The approach used for the pilot study in this research project was as follows. The questionnaire was given to three permanent members of the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University to respond on the content, wording and layout of the questionnaire. The respondents indicated that the questionnaire was user friendly. They were also requested to complete the final questionnaire.

The comments received from the pilot study were used to improve the questionnaire so that it could be circulated to the target population as defined in Chapter One. The participants in the pilot study indicated that the number of questions were too many therefore the researcher reduced the questions. Secondly, they indicated that the cover page needed to be more informative and clear regarding the study and its intent. This was complied with. Confidentiality was paramount in this research. The cover page was amended to assure the participants that their contribution would remain anonymous as they questioned being exposed if they participated in the study.
3.6 DATA COLLECTION

The technique of data collection was in the form of the individual administration of questionnaires where the researcher would distribute the questionnaires to the relevant staff for completion and return at a later date to collect them. In possible instances, the researcher would wait while the respondent(s) complete the questionnaire(s).

Questionnaires and rating scales checklists as data gathering techniques were selected for this study and Leedy (1999:191) identifies this as a reliable method. According to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (1997:244) questionnaires are some of the most widely used data collection methods. They are seen as giving the most effective collection responses from a large number of participants. Rating scales are mere checklists of items with varying degrees of intensity or ranges of frequencies on how events occur (Leedy, 1999:201).

3.6.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a list of carefully designed questions, selected after considerable testing with a view to producing reliable answers from a selected sample. The aim is to discovery what a particular group of participants do, feel and think (Hussey & Hussey, 1997:161). Questionnaires are commendable at gathering information on facts and opinions from large numbers of people (Riley et al, 2000:90). The population of the Finance Department of Walter Sisulu University comprises of 68 permanent staff members.

The questionnaire was tested for accuracy in expression, relevance objectivity, and appropriateness to the problem situation. The questionnaire used in this research was shortened into a nine page document.

The design of the questionnaire comprised of 3 sections which included 5 questions in Section A, 28 questions in Section B and 24 questions in Section C, where the participants were asked closed questions. They were required to select one
appropriate answer from a list of prearranged answers. The choice of individual questions was determined by the data required and was developed by the researcher, or adopted or adapted from other questionnaires.

All items on the questionnaire were drawn from the variables from which the researcher could address the research question. The following was taken into consideration when designing the questionnaire:

The instructions should be:

- Simple, clear and concise
- The appearance must be user friendly.
- The completion time of the questionnaire must be considered.
- The questions sequence must be done in such a way so as not to confuse the respondent.
- The questionnaire must provide for closed questions where the respondent has to choose one response from a set of five categories, on a scale.

In designing the questionnaire for this study (Appendix C), some new questions were formulated, while others were adopted and/or adapted from the questionnaires used by Sewbaran, (2006:102). Section A is dedicated to the demographic characteristics, while personal views regarding employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment are targeted in Sections B & C.

Personnel normally have limited time. It was therefore decided to use closed questions for all of the questions, as this type of question is quicker and easier to complete. They are also easier to process in the data analysis stage of the research study. The closed questions were a combination of what are referred to as ‘list and scale’ questions (Saunders et al, 1997:259). List questions include a list of answers from which the respondent can choose the relevant answer.

Saunders et al (1997:265) advise that the length of a survey will affect the response rate. They propose that the best length for a self–managed questionnaire is six to eight A4 pages. The actual questionnaire used in this study was nine pages long.
One page contained the covering letter, one page covered demographic characteristics, and four pages covered employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment while three pages focused on organisational commitment.

3.6.2 Cover Letter

Leedy (1999:194) stresses the importance of a well-structured and courteous cover letter. The letter should persuade the respondent to complete the questionnaire, but should remain tactful and respectful to build and maintain good interpersonal relations. Saunders et al (1997:267) quote (Dillman, 1978) who has shown that the message contained in the covering letter will affect the response rate. Apart from the salutation, details of the researcher and the process to be followed, they recommend that the cover letter should include the following four messages:

- The content, purpose and importance of the research
- The respondent’s importance to the study and the time it will take to complete the questionnaire
- Promises of confidentiality and anonymity
- Information about how the results will be used.

A covering letter was formulated on the basis of this structure (Appendix C) and accompanied each questionnaire.

3.7 SAMPLING

3.7.1 Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the process of choosing observations. According to (Maree, 2007:172) there are two types of sampling methods, probability and non-probability sampling techniques. Probability sampling is often the primary method for selecting large representative samples, if all members of a population are identical, although, social research is often prepared in conditions where one cannot select the styles of probability samples used in large-scales social surveys.
3.7.2 Sample Selection

The sampling method used in this study was the non-probability sampling method where each respondent in the population had a known, non-zero probability of being selected. In this study, the population used was the 68 Permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

It involved the selection of convenient sampling techniques using respondents who were prepared to fill in the questionnaire. The non-probability technique of convenience sampling was used as participants were selected on their accessibility and immediacy to the researcher. Subjects were selected on availability. The testing of an entire population is normally preferred but in most cases the population is usually too large. In this study while the population was not large, it was widely spread and accessibility to all participants proved difficult.

Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher. The subjects are selected just because they are easiest to recruit for the study and the researcher did not contemplate selecting subjects that were representative of the entire population. In all forms of research, it would be ideal to test the entire population, but in most cases, the population is just too large and this makes it impossible to include every individual. This sampling technique was used because it is fast, inexpensive, easy and the subjects were readily available (Castillo, 2009).

The researcher would have liked to have used a more scientific approach, namely a probability sampling technique free from bias. Due to the nature of this research thesis the researcher was limited by both time and budget.

3.8 SCALE

According to Stead & Struwig (2003:95) scaled-response questions such as Likert-type scales are preferable to other methods of questions as they provide ordinal data. For the purpose of this study, a Likert scale with five type categories was used in the development of the questionnaire (See example below, Table 3.1).
Table 3.1 Likert Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 STATISTICAL DATA ANALYSIS AND TECHNIQUES

The data obtained from the survey were analysed according to Section A, B and C of the questionnaire with the assistance of a statistician from the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

The statistical analysis used in this study comprised of numerous descriptive statistics such as frequency tables and the suitable graphical designs such as bar and pie charts. Measures of central tendency such as arithmetic means and various measures of dispersion such as range, minimum and maximum values and standard deviations were also calculated and applied where appropriate.

The statistical analysis technique that was used to analyse the data further was that of regression analysis. Such analysis associates relationships between one dependable variable and one or more independent variables. Hypothesis tests were prepared, including analysis of variance (ANOVA), Independent T-Tests and Pearson’s Correlation Analysis. All of these tests used a 5% significance level. From the analysis of these tests, recommendations were made to Walter Sisulu University.

3.9.1 ANOVA Test

The researcher used the ANOVA Test to test if all three populations’ means per dimension were significantly different. The general methodology for this technique is:

H0: All three population means are equal
H1: At least one of the population means is unequal

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \]

\[ \alpha = \text{probability of rejecting H0 when it is true. The test is two tailed.} \]
The formulated values are achieved through F Tables
Note: The p value = The probability of HO being true. If the p-value is < α = 0.05, we reject HO.

3.9.2 Independent T-Test

The researcher used the independent T-Test to test if two population means are significantly different. The general methodology for this technique is:
HO: µk = µ1
H1: µk = µ1
α = 0.05
α = probability of rejecting H0 when it is true. The test is two tailed.
The formulated values are achieved through T Tables.
Note: The p value = The probability of HO being true. If the p-value is < α = 0.05, we reject HO

3.9.3 Correlation Test

This test calculates the relationship between two sets of variables. It calculates the correlation coefficient (r) and performs a hypothesis test to see if the correlation coefficient is significantly different from zero (i.e. where there is no relationship).

For this test the population correlation coefficient is identified by ‘r’. The sample correlation coefficient is identified by ‘r’.
The hypothesis test takes the following structure:
HO: r = 1
H1: r = 0 to -1
α = 0.05

3.10 TRUSTWORTHINESS

Trustworthiness refers to the credibility and validity of quantitative research (Johnson, 1997:282). To ensure trustworthiness there is a need for factual accuracy of the account. Several options to increase ‘trustworthiness’, such as reliability and
validity, are essential criterion for quality in quantitative studies as they endorse the concept of consistency of data that is achieved and verified through examination of raw data, data reduction and notes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985:300). Respondents were informed that at any given stage they were allowed to withdraw from the study.

3.11 RESEARCH ETHICS

Business research ethics refers to a code of conduct which requires the pursuit of organisational interests rather than self-interests. Ethical consideration applies to the subject organisation, the researcher, the respondents and the analysts (Sekaran, 2000:17).

Some ethical issues that affect the research process are the following (Saunders et al, 2000:132):

- Maintaining the privacy and anonymity of individuals.
- Ensuring that participation is voluntary and also the right of the sample to withdraw from the research process.
- Maintaining openness with respect to the consent and the possibility of misleading the participants.
- Protection of the confidentiality of the data provided.
- Participants’ reaction to the data collection methodology.
- Participants’ reactions to the use, analysis and presentation of data provided.
- Maintenance of objectivity of the researcher.

Leedy and Ormrod (2001:107) classify these issues into four categories:

1. Protection from Harm

Respondents should not be subjected to any form of physical or mental harm. This includes the stress or embarrassment that could arise from reporting data that can be linked to an individual respondent (Saunders et al, 2000:140).
2. Informed Consent

Informed consent relates to the participation of the respondent in the research being undertaken, where the respondent’s consent is freely given and this consent is based on full disclosure about participation rights and the use of the research data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:107). Participation rights should be clarified to the extent that respondents are made aware that they are able to withdraw from the research at any point.

The key elements as advocated by Saunders et al (2000:36) that were addressed were:

- The nature of the research where the study was briefly described, including the nature of the sample.
- The requirements of taking part where the participation activities and duration of these activities were explained.
- The implications of taking part and the participants’ rights where the voluntary nature of participation and the right of the participant to withdraw from partaking in this study at any point, was clearly explained. Additionally, the anonymity and the right of the participants to anonymity was also explained and highlighted.
- The use of data and the data collection methods with regard to who will have access to the data collected, what will happen to the data after the completion of the research study and where the data will be preserved.

3. The Right to Privacy

The right of the individual to expect privacy in a research report is of paramount importance when considering ethics, unless expressly granted in writing by the incumbent (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:108). Leedy & Ormrod advocate the use of assigned codes with any written paperwork, rather than the use of any participants’ names.
4. Honesty with Professional Colleagues

Honesty not only extends to that of reporting the information in a complete, contextualised and unbiased way. Appropriate accreditation of the use of another’s ideas or writings is mandatory (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001:108).

This research study has covered the ethics of informed consent. This was displayed and attached to the first page of the research instrument.

3.12 CONCLUSION

In this chapter the researcher has provided an assessment of the methodology of the research completed. The methodology selected for this project was believed to be best appropriate to the circumstances. The methods which were used in the collection of data are considered suitable to the needs of the study (Stephen, 2010: 87).

Chapter Four presents the data collected. The data collected was analysed and is discussed in relation to the questions and the study topic formulated in Chapter One.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

An overview of the research design used in this research was presented in Chapter Three. The focus of Chapter Four will be on the presentation of the data collected and the analysis, and interpretation of this data using data tables and graphs. The research findings are then established and discussed in relation to the hypotheses formulated in Chapter One. This study is based on a scientific process and various research designs are discussed. A field survey was conducted with a questionnaire as the data collection instrument. Its purpose was to collect information about factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment.

4.2 RESPONSE RATE

Table 4.1 below illustrates the response rate achieved for this research. The total population for this research was 68 permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University. There were 59 questionnaires distributed. The total number of respondents that participated in this research was 47. In nine cases responses were received indicating that the participants were not available at the time of distribution of the questionnaire. Twelve questionnaires were not received due the fact that the respondents were not available on the days of collection of the questionnaires and others were on leave which included study, sick and annual leave.
Table 4.1  Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Response numbers and Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Responses</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Usable responses</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No and non-available responses</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Usable Response Rate</td>
<td>79.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A response rate of 79.66% (N =59) is large enough for meaningful statistical analysis and acceptable interpretation (Bryman & Bell, 2007: 244; Welman, Kruger & Mitchell, 2005:154).

A response rate that is lower than 50% represents a minority, which indicates that a completely incorrect generalisation of the population may be achieved. The response rate of 69.12% is therefore considered as more than satisfactory for the purpose of this research.

4.3  THE CODING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Each question from all three sections in the questionnaire was firstly coded with a number. This helped to identify each question in the questionnaire and helped when analysing and interpreting data. This pre-coding methodology implemented for the questionnaire is one that has been supported by Hussey & Hussey (1997:175). The prospective answer to each question had an adjacent number, indicating the potential response code to that question (refer Table 1 in Chapter 3, page 55).

The data is presented and analysed in the same order as it appears in the questionnaire:

- Section A: Demographic information
- Section B: Perception of post-merger working environment
- Section C: Organisational commitment
4.4 SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSES

Section A of the questionnaire required the respondents to provide demographic information related to age in years, gender, ethnic group, educational qualification and working experience in years.

This data is shown in the graphic figures below and summarised at the end.

As indicated in Figure 4.1 above, 21.3% of the respondents are between the ages of 21 to 30 years and 36.2% are between the ages of 31 to 40 years. 14.9% of the respondents are between 41 to 50 years old, while 25.5% are between the ages of 51 to 60 years old. Only 2.1% of the respondents are more than sixty years old.

Statistics for the Pie Chart above: Male = 17 and Female = 30.

Figure 4.2 indicates that 63.8% of the respondents are female and 36.2% are male.
Figure 4.3 Sample of Segmentation by Ethnic Group

Statistics for the Pie Chart above: Black= 45, Coloured=1 and Indian=1. As indicated in Figure 4.3 there are an even number of Coloured and Indian employees representing 2.1% of the sample and the majority of the sample is Black representing 95.7%.

Figure 4.4 Sample of Segmentation by Educational Qualification

Statistics for the Pie Chart above: Matric only=4, Diploma=15, Degree=17 and Post Degree/Diploma=11. According to Figure 4.4 above, 8.5% of the respondents have passed matric only, while 31.9% have a Diploma, 36.2% of the respondents have obtained a Degree and 23.4% have obtained a post Degree qualification.
Figure 4.5 illustrates that 14.9% of the respondents have less than five years and 25.5% between six years and ten years working experience. There are 21.3% of the respondents who have between 11 years and 15 years' experience. This percentage applies also to the 16 years to 20 years working experience. There are 8.5% who have between 21 years and 25 years working experience and there are 8.5% who have a working experience of between 26 years and 30 years.

4.5 SUMMARY OF DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

According to the above information and graphs, age is fairly spread, although 72.4% of the respondents are less than 50 years old. Gender is dominated by female being close to double the number of males in this sample. In terms of the ethnic group the majority of the sample are Blacks representing 95.7%. The majority of the respondents are fairly well educated with 23.4% having a post graduate qualification. 59.6% of the respondents have more than 10 years working experience while 40.4% have less than 10 years working experience.

4.6 SECTION B: EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF THEIR POST-MERGER WORKING ENVIRONMENT ANALYSES

This section analyses and interprets the descriptive statistics for the individual questions and then the overall aggregated scores regarding employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment.
4.6.1 Descriptive Statistics within individual questions of employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment

Q1: 4.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 42.6% disagree, 34.0% are neutral, while 17.0% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that they are provided with adequate resources to perform their daily tasks.

Q2: 4.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 38.3% disagree, and 34.0% are neutral, while 23.4% agree that Computer and photocopy equipment are in good working order.

Q3: 10.6% of the respondents strongly disagree, 46.8% disagree, and 27.7% are neutral, while 14.9% agree that they are provided with all the necessary resources to work efficiently and effectively.

Q4: 14.9% of the respondents strongly disagree, 27.7% disagree, and 29.8% are neutral, while 27.7% agree that the network in the institution is in place to ensure effective communication between one delivery site and the other.

Q5: 27.6% of the respondents strongly disagree, 51.1% disagree, and 17.0% are neutral, while 4.3% agree that the merger has resulted in a positive change in job characteristics (the duties and responsibilities of your job have changed for the better).

Q6: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 55.3% disagree, and 31.9% are neutral, while 4.3% agree that the working hours are better after the merger.

Q7: 27.7% of the respondents strongly disagree, 51.1% disagree, 19.1% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that they have greater job security after the merger.

Q8: 23.4% of the respondents strongly disagree, 61.7% disagree and 14.9% are neutral, that they have greater job satisfaction after the merger.
Q9: 31.9% of the respondents strongly disagree, 53.2% disagree, and 12.8% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that the merger has saved them a great deal of time and energy (e.g. decisions taken at meetings are implemented accordingly).

Q10: 6.4% of the respondents strongly disagree, 17.0% disagree, 51.1% are neutral, while 19.1% agree and 6.4% strongly agree that their supervisors were more supportive and helpful towards them after the merger.

Q11: 4.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 14.9% disagree, 40.4% are neutral, while 29.8% agree and 10.6% strongly agree that their supervisors always respect and recognise the work that they perform.

Q12: 38.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 48.9% disagree, and 12.8% are neutral, that the merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by staff towards top management.

Q13: 31.8% of the respondents strongly disagree, 55.3% disagree, 8.5% are neutral, while 2.1% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that feedback is always timeous and reliable from the merged top management team to staff.

Q14: 34.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 44.7% disagree, and 21.3% are neutral, that the merged top management team places great emphasis on relevant staff development.

Q15: 27.7% of the respondents strongly disagree, 57.4% disagree, and 12.8% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that the merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by top management towards staff.

Q16: 34.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 46.8% disagree, 17.0% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that staff ideas relating to the merger are encouraged and used constructively by top management.
Q17: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 44.7% disagree, 27.7% are neutral, while 17.0% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that they feel that their supervisors and top management are sensitive to their personal needs.

Q18: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 23.4% disagree, 38.3% are neutral, while 21.3% agree and 8.5% strongly agree that the merger has brought about discriminatory practices by top management towards staff.

Q19: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 48.9% disagree, 36.3% are neutral, while 10.6% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that in general, the Institution’s goals and objectives are established by participation between all management and staff.

Q20: 23.9% of the respondents strongly disagree, 43.5% disagree, 28.3% are neutral, while 4.3% agree that budget setting, performance appraisal and other methods of control are generally used for guidance and reward rather than policing and punishment at the University by the merged top management team.

Q21: 34.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 34.0% disagree and 32.0% are neutral, that top management is competent and equipped to handle the merger efficiently.

Q22: 38.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 42.6% disagree, 17.0% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that staff in the new merged environment see themselves as a big family unit.

Q23: 19.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 36.2% disagree, 29.8% are neutral, while 14.9% agree that the merged staffs has great respect and tolerance for each other's cultural diversities.

Q24: 25.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 55.3% disagree, 17.0% are neutral, and while 2.1% agree that they get rewarded for all the extra work they do at the University with very little problems.
Q25: 27.7% of the respondents strongly disagree, 55.3% disagree and 17.1% are neutral, that there are better opportunities for advancement since the merger.

Q26: 17.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 38.3% disagree, and 40.4% are neutral, while 4.3% agree that the strategic management policy in the merged institution is being effectively implemented.

Q27: 27.7% of the respondents strongly disagree, 44.7% disagree, and 25.5% are neutral, while 2.1% agree that decisions taken by top management (campus managers) regarding the same issues from all campuses are consistent.

Q28: 34.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 42.6% disagree and 23.4% are neutral, that they have a clear view for the need to have merged.

As can be seen from Appendix A, Table A, regarding employee perception of their post-merger working environment a number of results stand out in this Section. Items that stand out more negatively include: (Note: Means scores from the range 1-5)

Q8: I have greater job satisfaction after the merger Mean = 1.91

Q9: The merger has saved me a great deal of time and energy (e.g. decisions taken at meetings are implemented accordingly). Mean = 1.85

Q12: The merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by staff towards top management. Mean = 1.74

Q13: Feedback is always timeous and reliable from the merged top management team to staff. Mean = 1.87

Q14: The merged top management team places great emphasis on relevant staff development. Mean = 1.87
Q15: The merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by top management towards staff. Mean = 1.89

Q16: Staff ideas relating to the merger are encouraged and used constructively by top management. Mean = 1.87

Q18: The merger has brought about discriminatory practices by top management towards staff, mean = 2.98

Q22: Staff in the new merged environment see themselves as a big family unit. Mean = 1.83

Q25: There are better opportunities for advancement since the merger. Mean = 1.89

Q28: I have a clear view for the need to have merged. Mean = 1.89

**Items which stand out to be more positive are indicated below:**

Q2: Computer and photocopy equipment are in good working order. Mean = 2.77

Q10: My supervisor is more supportive and helpful towards me after the merger. Mean = 3.02

Q11: My supervisor always respects and recognises the work that I perform. Mean = 3.28

From the above results the following can be noted:

- Q1 - Q4 results indicate that staff disagree that the resources available after the merger are adequate to perform their work efficiently and effectively. Resources seem to be a major negative factor after the merger.
• According to Q5-Q9 responses above, staff disagree that the merger was a good idea and that it brought better working conditions and job satisfaction.

• According to Q10 – Q21 results prove that staff are quite neutral regarding how their supervisor’s support and recognise them, while the majority of the staff disagree that top management is doing a good job. Top management’s actions and leadership ability seem to have given staff members a negative attitude towards the merger.

• According to Q22-Q23 staff seem to disagree in finding harmony working together in the merged Institution.

• Q24 -Q25 There are significant disagreement percentages of 80.8% and 83.0% respectively here that staff disagree that the merged institution recognises and rewards them for work done and that it promotes growth opportunities.

• 26-Q27 Staff disagree that top management’s strategy and decision-making are fit to lead the merged institution to success.

• In Q28, 76.6% of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree that they knew why the institutions had to merge.

4.6.2 Descriptive Statistics within the overall questions of employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment

The study will now investigate the descriptive statistics for the overall aggregate scores for employee perception of their post-merger working environment as indicated in Table 4.2 below:
Table 4.2 Overall scores of the total mean and standard deviation for perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Working Environment</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 above shows an overall mean score of 2.24 for employee perception of their post-merger working environment as permanent staff of the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University. As a percentage, the mean score equals \((2.24-1)/4 *100 = 31.0\%\) which is not a good overall employee perception of their post – merger working environment. The minimum and maximum scores above reveal a wide range of scores from a minimum of 1.3 to a maximum of 3.3, indicating that there is a fluctuating degree of opinion on this issue. The mean percentage figure of 31% reflects that the staff are generally not happy to work with each other, although they feel that they do have the support of their supervisors. Regarding top management the staff feel that they are not adequately supported and that top management’s leadership abilities are highly debatable.

4.7 SECTION C: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITHIN EACH COMPONENT OF ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

This section analyses and interprets the descriptive statistics for the individual questions in each component and then the overall aggregated scores regarding Allen & Meyer’s Organisational Commitment.

4.7.1 C 1 Affective Commitment Scale

Q1: 21.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 36.2% disagree, and 27.6% are neutral, while 14.9% agree that they would be very happy to spend the rest of their careers with this institution.

Q2: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 53.2% disagree, and 21.3% are neutral, while 17.0% agree that they enjoy discussing this organisation with people outside it.
Q3: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 23.4% disagree, 44.7% are neutral, while 25.5% agree and 4.3% strongly agree that they really feel as if this organisation's problems are their own.

Q4: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 34.0% disagree, and 38.4% are neutral, while 25.5% agree that they do not feel like part of the family at this organisation.

Q5: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 27.7% disagree, and 38.3% are neutral, while 31.9% agree that they do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organisation.

Q6: 27.7% of the respondents disagree, 51.1% are neutral, while 19.1% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that this organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for them.

Q7: 4.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 34.0% disagree, and 40.4% are neutral, while 21.3% agree that they do not feel emotionally attached to this organisation.

Q8: 51.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 29.8% disagree and 19.1% agree that they think that they could easily become as attached to another organisation as they are to this one.

Table 4.3  Individual question analysis of the component Affective Commitment in Allen & Meyer's Model of Organisational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7.2 C2 Continuance Commitment Scale

Q1: 17.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 34.1% disagree, 12.8% are neutral, while 34.0% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that it would be very hard for them to leave this organisation right now even if they wanted to.

Q2: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 36.2% disagree, 19.1% are neutral, while 34.1% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that too much in their life would be disrupted if they decided they wanted to leave this organisation now.

Q3: 4.2% of the respondents strongly disagree, 38.3% disagree, 31.9% are neutral, while 21.3% agree and 4.3% strongly agree that one of the major reasons why they continue to work for this organisation is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organisation may not match the overall benefits they have here.

Q4: 6.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 30.4% disagree, 30.4% are neutral, while 30.4% agree and 2.3% strongly agree that one of the few serious consequences of leaving this organisation would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

Q5: 19.1% of the respondents disagree, 36.2% are neutral, while 44.7% agree that right now, staying with this organisation is a matter of necessity, as much as desire.

Q6: 4.3% of the respondents strongly disagree, 36.2% disagree, 34.0 % are neutral, while 25.5% agree that they feel that they have too few options to consider leaving this organisation.

Q7: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 23.4% disagree, 29.8% are neutral, while 42.6% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that it wouldn't be too costly for them to leave this organisation now.
Q8: 17.0% of the respondents strongly disagree, 25.5% disagree, 27.7% are neutral, while 25.5% agree and 4.3% strongly agree that they are not afraid what might happen if they quit their job without having another one lined up.

Table 4.4 Individual question analysis of the component Continuance Commitment in Allen & Meyer's Model of Organisational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2 1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.3 C3 Normative Commitment Scale

Q1: 14.9% of the respondents disagree, 12.8% are neutral, while 68.1% agree and 4.2% strongly agree that they think that people these days move from company to company too often.

Q2: 2.1% of the respondents strongly disagree, 29.8% disagree, 17.0% are neutral, while 46.8% agree and 4.3% strongly agree that things were better in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers.

Q3: 21.3% of the respondents disagree, 42.6% are neutral, while 34.0% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that they do not think that wanting to be a company man is bad.

Q4: 29.8% of the respondents disagree, 44.7% are neutral, while 23.4% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that one of the major reasons why they continue to work for this organisation is that they believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
Q5: 8.5% of the respondents strongly disagree, 42.6% disagree, 25.5% are neutral, while 21.3% agree and 2.1% strongly agree that if they got another offer for a better job elsewhere they would not feel it was right to leave this organisation.

Q6: 34.0% of the respondents disagree, 46.8% are neutral, while 14.9% agree and 4.3% strongly agree that they were taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation.

Q7: 55.3% of the respondents disagree, 23.4% are neutral, and while 21.3% agree that they do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organisation.

Q8: 2.2% of the respondents strongly disagree, 34.0% disagree, 38.3% are neutral, while 25.5% agree that jumping from organisation to organisation does not seem at all unethical to them.

Table 4.5  Individual question analysis of the component Normative Commitment in Allen & Meyer's Organisational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3 1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study now investigates the descriptive statistics that make up each component of organisational commitment. The aggregated scores within each component of organisational commitment namely affective, continuance and normative is analysed and represented in Table 4.6 below.
Table 4.6  Overall total mean and standard deviation scores for the three dimensions of Organisational Commitment

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean %</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>47.66</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>54.12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisation Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall mean score of 50.2% in Table 4.6 above indicates that the respondents are generally committed to their organisation. However, the respondents seem to be more committed to the organisation in terms of the normative commitment (54.1%). This indicates that there is a link between the employee’s emotional perceptions of the institution and their commitment to the institution. The continuance commitment with a mean score of 47.7% shows that employees are prepared to forfeit their benefits and depart or resign from the institution. A mere 12.8% of the employees are neutral as to whether they will leave the institution immediately.

Affective commitment’s mean score of 48.9% indicates that the employee’s feelings do not really remain with the institution.

These results substantiate the fact that the scores on the organisational commitment dimensions are relatively equally distributed. Although these scores are low, with an average of 50.2% there is substantial potential for improvement within all three dimensions of organisational commitment, especially in Continuance and Affective Commitment.
Regarding the neutral responses from participants on Organisational Commitment, there are items which stand out as indicated below:

**Affective Commitment**

Q 3 I really feel as if this organisation’s problems are my own, scoring 44.7%.

Q 6 This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me, scoring 51.1%.

Q 7 I do not feel emotionally attached to this organisation, scoring 40.4%.

These Affective Commitment results indicate that the respondents are uncertain where their emotional link and involvement with the institution are.

**Continuance Commitment**

In the overall results of Continuance Commitment there are low scores of neutrality among the participants with Q 5 scoring the highest with 36.2%.

Q 5 Right now, staying with my organisation is a matter of necessity, as much as desire.

These Continuance Commitment results indicate that few respondents are uncertain how they feel regarding losing their benefits if they leave the institution.

**Normative Commitment**

Q 3 I do not think that wanting to be a company man is bad, scoring 42.6%.

Q 4 One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organisation is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain, scoring 44.7%.
Q 6 I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation, scoring 46.8%.

These Normative Commitment results indicate that the respondents are uncertain where their feelings of obligation with the institution are.

If the working environment can improve at the institution, these improvements may influence the participants to be more committed to the institution. On the other hand if the working environment deteriorates or continues as it is, it may influence the participants to be less committed to the institution, resulting in negative reactions. These scores should be a worrying factor to management as they may be influencing the employee’s performance.

4.8 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITHIN EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR POST-MERGER WORKING ENVIRONMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT.

The study now investigates the correlations across all the constructs reflected in Table 4.7 below and also in the form of Scatter plots (Appendix B, Table A)

Table 4.7 Correlation matrix between the perceptions of their Post-Merger Working Environment and Organisational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Aff Commit</th>
<th>Cont Commit</th>
<th>Norm Commit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 above shows the linear relationship between the perceptions of their post-merger working environment scale and each component of organisational commitment scales. It can be seen that the linear relationship between perceptions of their post-merger working environment scale and Normative Commitment (-0.14) scale is negative resulting into a negative correlation or no correlation at all. The linear relationship between perceptions of their post-merger working environment...
scale and Continuance Commitment (0.18) and Affective Commitment (0.09) scale is positive although both positive correlations with Affective Commitment show a very weak relationship, in the case of both one would be justified in concluding that there is no noticeable relationship. There is a noticeable significant correlation between Affirmative Commitment and Continuance Commitment of 0.43 and a slightly less noticeable significant correlation of 0.35 between Normative Commitment and Continuance Commitment. This would suggest that among employee perception there is a relationship between their Continuance Commitment and their Affective and Normative Commitments.

4.9 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS WITHIN EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF THEIR POST-MERGER WORKING ENVIRONMENT, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The study will now investigate to see if there are any significant findings within employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment, organisational commitment and each of the demographic variables.

Table 4.8 Overall Total means and standard deviation scores for Working Environment and Organisational Commitment with all its sub-dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study will use the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Independent T-Test and Pearson’s Correlation Analysis to see if there are any significant findings within employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment, organisational commitment and each of the demographic variables (age, gender, qualification and work experience).
4.9.1 By Age

The study will now investigate the significance between the age demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance and normative commitment using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. The results are revealed in Table 4.9 below:

Table 4.9  Employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment, Organisational Commitment and the Age component of the demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance (p&lt;0.05)</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>eta-squared</th>
<th>Levels of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>10.097</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>13.759</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>17.381</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>5.223</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>16.533</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question is thus asked: Is there a significant difference between age of respondents and the perceptions of the post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance and normative commitment? To answer this question the study needed to conduct an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. According to the above information in Table 4.9 the p-values are above 0.05, meaning there is no significant difference between the age demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment (p=0.561), affirmative commitment (p=0.540) and normative commitment (p=0.998). Regarding continuance commitment and the age demographic, the p value = 0.009 which is below 0.05 shows that there is difference.
4.9.2 By Gender

The study will now investigate the significance between the gender demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance and normative commitment using the independent t-test. The results are revealed in Table 4.10 below:

Table 4.10 Overall t-test comparing the two genders with employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment and the Organisational Commitment components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-tests; Grouping: Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
<th>Levels of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4984</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.6647</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.9219</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above information in Table 4.10 the p-values are above 0.05, meaning there is no significant difference between the gender demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment (p=0.4984), continuance commitment (p=0.6647) and normative commitment (p=0.9219). Regarding affirmative commitment and the gender demographic, the p value = 0.0509 which is below 0.05 indicates there is a significant difference.
4.9.3 By Qualification

The study will now investigate the significance between the qualification demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance and normative commitment using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. The results are revealed in Table 4.11 below:

Table 4.11 Employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment, Organisational Commitment and the Qualification component of the demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance (p&lt;0.05)</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>eta-squared</th>
<th>Levels of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>9.823</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>12.480</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>21.072</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>13.929</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above information in Table 4.11 the p-values are all above the significant level 0.05, meaning there is no significant difference between the qualification demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment (p=0.514), affirmative commitment (p=0.141), continuance commitment (p=0.828) and normative commitment (p=0.059). The normative commitment component is on the border of having a significant difference. With the trend from other demographics, age and gender, this demographic could change as it may be influenced by the other two if any changes do occur in the future.
4.9.4 By Work Experience

The study investigated the significance between the work experience demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance and normative commitment using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. The results are revealed in Table 4.12 below:

**Table 4.12 Employee perception of their Post-Merger Working Environment, Organisational Commitment and the Work Experience component of the demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Variance (p&lt;0.05)</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>eta-square d</th>
<th>Levels of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of post-merger working environment</td>
<td>0.0880</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
<td>10606</td>
<td>10.266</td>
<td>8625</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.2444</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.5800</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>13.570</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.3230</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>5.4937</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3734</td>
<td>4985</td>
<td>16.014</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.3812</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>0.7569</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1892</td>
<td>42575</td>
<td>15.777</td>
<td>6042</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.3756</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above information in Table 12 the p-values that are all above the significant level 0.05, would indicate that there is no significant difference. These include the relationship between the work experience demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment (p=0.985), affirmative commitment (p=0.772) and normative commitment (p=0.733). However, the continuance commitment component (p = 0.012) shows that there is a significant difference.

The age demographic (Table 4.9) where the results indicate, through the use of an ANOVA test, that there is no significant difference between the age demographic and the perception of post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment and normative commitment, but there is a difference with regard to continuance commitment. This indicates that the majority of the participants in the study did not fear losing their benefits and would resignation from the institution.

The T-Test performed on the gender demographic (Table 4.10), indicated that there are no significant differences with regard to perception of post-merger working...
environment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. But effective commitment had a score of 0.0509 and these, compared to the others, are significant. This indicates that the participants, both male and female, did not feel emotionally linked to the institution.

There is no significant difference in the qualifications demographic (Table 4.11) from a statistical point of view through the ANOVA test. Although there are no statistically significant differences, the practical significance of the differences on Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment is important. This indicates that there may be real differences on these two factors.

Regarding work experience (Table 4.12) it indicates that continuance commitment was significant as its, p-value= 0.0129, differed significantly when compared to the other variables. Therefore, we can deduce that participants in the study did not fear resigning and losing their benefits.

4.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter served to document the results of the research study conducted on the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University at Walter Sisulu University. The documentation of the results included the interpretation of the results using statistical calculations and the presentation of the results using both graphs and tables.

Firstly, the response rate was identified and plotted in the form of a table. Secondly, the demographical variables were examined and illustrated with the use of pie graphs.

Thirdly, Section B was analysed and the individual questions in each component were interpreted and then the overall aggregated scores regarding post-merger working environment were examined.
Fourthly, Section C, was analysed by focusing on the individual questions in each component and then on the overall aggregated scores regarding Allen & Meyer’s Organisational Commitment.

Lastly in this chapter descriptive statistics regarding employee perception of their post-merger working environment, organisational commitment and the demographic variables were analysed and interpreted.

The next and final chapter will focus on the conclusions and recommendations arising from the results of the empirical survey, with respect to the literature review, the survey and the identified sub-problems.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the conclusions of the research are established and discussed in relation to the hypotheses formulated in Chapter One. Then, as a result of the findings there are recommendations that are made. This will allow for a conclusion to be reached on the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment of the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

5.2 FINDINGS

In an attempt achieve the objectives of this research as stated in Chapter One, the following theoretical correlation hypothesis is formulated:

**HYPOTHEIS 1:** Employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment scores together with all sub-dimensions will be low.

According to the results found in Table 4.2, regarding perceptions of their post-merger working environment, the mean score of 31.0%, represents a low score which supports the hypothesis. This suggests that the staff perceive their post-merger working environment as more negative than positive.

Table 4.6 portrayed the overall total mean and standard deviation scores for the three dimensions of organisational commitment addressed in Section C. The mean score 50.21% represents a low score which supports the hypothesis. This suggests that the staff perceive the organisational commitment as more negative than positive at Walter Sisulu University.
HYPOTHESIS 2: Employees who have a negative perception towards their post-merger working environment are less committed to the merged organisation.

The correlation coefficient between perception of post-merger working environments and organisational commitment through its sub-dimension show through Table 4.7 that Affective Commitment with an assigned \( r \) value of 0.09 and Continuance Commitment with an assigned \( r \) value of 0.18, which is between 0 and 1, have only slight positive correlations regarding perceptions towards their post-merger working environment. This concludes that the staff members with a positive Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment are slightly committed to Walter Sisulu University and therefore Hypothesis 2 is not supported.

Normative Commitment, with an assigned \( r \) value of -0.14, has no correlation regarding perceptions towards their post-merger working environment. This concludes that the staff members with negative Normative Commitment are not committed to Walter Sisulu University and it therefore does not support Hypothesis 2.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Employees who enjoy their working environment will have a positive outlook on post-merger perceptions

The correlation coefficient between perception of post-merger working environments and organisational commitment through its sub-dimension show through Table 4.7 that Affective Commitment with an assigned \( r \) value of 0.09 and Continuance Commitment with an assigned \( r \) value of 0.18, which is between 0 and 1, have a slight noticeable positive correlation regarding perceptions towards their post-merger working environment. This concludes that the staff members with a positive Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment do slightly enjoy their working environment and have a positive outlook on post-merger perception at Walter Sisulu University and therefore supports the hypothesis 3.

Normative Commitment with an assigned \( r \) value of -0.14 has no correlation regarding perceptions towards their post-merger working environment. This
concludes that the staff members with negative Normative Commitment do not enjoy their working environment at Walter Sisulu University and therefore hypothesis 3 is supported.

Hypotheses 1 and 3 is statistically proven to be true and hypotheses 2 is statistically proven to be incorrect regarding the sub dimension of organisation commitment.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Staff perception of their post – merger working environment and organisational commitment are significantly interrelated in certain respects. The study will now look in more detail into the statistical findings of these factors; perception of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment, through its three sub-dimensions, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

The significant scores that have emerged from the research findings reveal that only 31.0% of the staff has a positive perception of their post-merger working environment and only 50.2% of them are effectively committed to Walter Sisulu University.

**Perception of their post – merger working environment:**

From the study results the following can be noted:

- In terms of the Q1 – Q4 results, more than 50% of the staff disagreed that the resources available after the merger are adequate to perform their work efficiently and effectively. Resources seem to be a major factor after the merger from these results.

- According to Q5 - Q9, staff disagreed that the merger was a good idea and that it brought better working conditions and job satisfaction.
According to Q10 - Q21, results prove that staff are quite neutral regarding how their supervisor’s support and recognise them, while the majority of the staff disagreed that top management is doing a good job. Top management’s actions and leadership ability seem to have given staff members a negative attitude towards the merger.

According to Q22 - Q23, the staff seem to disagree in finding harmony working together in the merged Institution.

According to Q24-Q25, staff disagreed that the merged Institution recognises and rewards them for work done and promotes growth opportunities.

According to Q26-Q27, staff disagreed that top management’s strategy and decision-making are fit to lead the merged institution to success.

In Q28, 76.6% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed that they knew why the institutions had to merge.

Dalton et al, (2006:31) refer to perception as a process by which one acquires mental images of one’s environment that contributes to the way one thinks and feels about people, situation, events and objects. Morris & Kuratko, (2002:299) state that the working environment deals with the setting in which the employee finds himself or herself when he or she comes to the workplace each day. It is influenced by a number of factors ranging from current business conditions and the management style.

A significant score has emerged from the study findings in that only 31.0% (Table 4.2) of the staff have a positive perception of their post-merger working environment at Walter Sisulu University. In the light of these findings it can be deduced that due to the following factors after the merger; lack of resources, unsuitable working condition, low job satisfaction, no organisational and management support, and no recognition and reward for work done, the perception of the employees working environment and employees’ not achieving the organisational goals have been
influenced. This analysis reflects that the staff are not happy working at Walter Sisulu University, although they do have the support of their supervisors. Questions answered by staff revealed that concerns connecting to the management of the Institution are a major contributing factor as to why staff perceive their post-merger working experience to be negative. Regarding top management, they feel that they are not adequately supported by such management and that the management’s leadership abilities are highly debatable.

Regarding organisational commitment, a significant score has emerged from the study findings, which reveals an overall score of 50.21% which reflects that only approximately half of the Finance staff members seem to be generally committed to the Institution. The results also show that the scores on the organisational commitment dimensions are relatively normally distributed. Although these scores are on the border line of 50%, there is substantial room for improvement within all three dimensions of organisational commitment, especially in respect of Continuance and Affective Commitment.

With reference to Table 4.3, Table 4.4 and Table 4.5 a closer examination of the questions answered by staff regarding Organisation Commitment through its three sub-dimensions will be attempted.

**Affective Commitment:** A closer examination of the questions that staff answered regarding affective commitment and which stood out in this sub dimension reveals the following:

- How staff felt regarding making the Institution problem’s their own.
- How staff felt regarding belonging to the Institution.
- How staff felt that the Institution means a great deal to them.

With an overall mean score 48.85 % (Table 4.6) in this dimension it proves that the staff does have a low degree of affective commitment to the Institution. Allen and Meyer (1990) refer to affective commitment as an employee’s emotional link to, identification with and involvement in the organisation. This attachment could be due
to one's role in relation to the organisational goals and values or to the organisation for its own sake. Therefore we can see from the above results and the literature found in Chapter Two that 51.15% of the employees are negatively affected in their working environment since there are no positive incentives that will increase their affective commitment to the institution.

**Continuance Commitment**: Questions that staff answered regarding continuance commitment and that stood out in this sub dimension included:

- Staying with the institution is more a necessity than a desire.
- It would be costly for staff members to leave the Institution

With an overall mean score 47.66% (Table 4.6) in this dimension it proves that the staff who want to move away from the Institution will probably have to think seriously of the consequences that they may face. Allen & Meyer (1990) define continuance commitment as the loss of benefits that will be incurred if the employee departs from the organisation. If their benefits cannot be transferred they will be less likely to leave. This indicates that 52.34% are willing to forfeit their benefits and depart from the institution.

**Normative Commitment**: Questions that staff answered positively in this sub dimension included:

- How staff felt regarding people moving from one institution to another.
- How staff felt there was more commitment in the pass in belonging to one organisation.
- How staff felt that being a company man is bad.
- That loyalty is essential and therefore a sense of moral obligation towards the organisation remains.

Allen and Meyer (1990) describe normative commitment as an employee’s feelings of obligation to remain at the organisation. These feeling are influenced by people’s experience culturally and within the organisation. ‘Organisation culture is taken to be
the ‘shared values and beliefs that underlie a company’s identity’ (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2002:58). According to the results 45.88% do not feel obliged to remain at the institution and can change jobs without feeling indebted to the institution. With an overall mean score of 54.12% (Table 4.6) in this dimension it suggests that just one half of the staff are generally happy with the cultural and social environment and show a positive normative commitment towards the Institution.

The study continued to statistically compare the different demographics to see how they influenced the four factors: perception of their post-merger working environment, affirmative commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

With reference to table 4.9, and the significant level of 0.05, there is no noticeable influence that age has on staff perceptions of the post-merger working environment (p value = 0.575), affective commitment (p value = 0.540), and normative commitment (p value = 0.998) since all these scores are above the 0.05% significant level. However age does influence the continuance commitment factor with a p-value score of 0.009.

According to Table 4.10, there is also no noticeable influence that gender has on staff perceptions of the post-merger working environment (p value = 0.4984), continuance commitment (p value = 0.6647), and normative commitment (p value = 0.9219) since all these scores are above the 0.05% significant level. However gender does influence the affective commitment factor with a p-value score of 0.0509.

Regarding qualification, Table 4.11 illustrates that there is no influence on staff perceptions of the post-merger working environment (p value = 0.514), affective commitment (p-value = 0.141), continuance commitment (p value = 0.828), and normative commitment (p value = 0.059) on qualification, since all these scores are above the 0.05% significant level.

Table 4.12 shows that there is no influence that work experience has on staff perceptions of the post-merger working environment (p value = 0.985), affective
commitment (p-value = 0.772) and normative commitment (p value = 0.733) since all these scores are above the 0.05% significant level. Work experience has an influence on Continuance commitment with a p value = 0.122.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Research is something that people start in order to find results in a systematic way, thereby increasing their knowledge. However, research must take cognisance of the challenges and limitations mentioned in the research design and during the data collection stage of the research process in this study, for example, resistance was met from some satellite campus staff to complete the questionnaire. For future research it is suggested that:

- Future research focus on all departments within the University concerned rather than the Finance Department only.

- While the study only focused on factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment, future research can look at other factors, such as diversity, business processes, organisational structure, team building, stakeholder participation, intellectual capital and communication.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The researcher can conclude that the employees felt negatively impacted by the merger in their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment.

With regard to the professional elements it seems that the merger did not have a positive impact on participants. These points listed below influenced the perception of the employees working environment and employees not achieving the organisational goals.
• The merger had a negative impact on relationships with top management. Employees experienced high levels of frustration, irritation and aggression towards the top management of WSU.

• The change process was not implemented correctly. The merger created a severe breakdown in communication.

• Performance standards of employees were affected at WSU as a result of the merger.

• The relationships between colleagues after the merger were accepted.

• This weak mean score (Table 4.2) shows that the employees are unhappy with their post-merger working environment, which then impacts on job performance, turnover and absenteeism as described by (Mowday et al, 1982: 35; Gregson, 1992: 80-95; Angle & Perry, 1981:113). Therefore we can deduce that they are not performing and would absent themselves at times without a valid reason.

• Within the working environment, a host of factors ranging from current business conditions and the management style influence employees (Morris & Kuratko, 2002:299).

• It is also revealed that staff members are not job satisfied after the merger and that they are not being recognised and rewarded for extra work done for the Institution.

Organisational commitment reflects that the Finance staff members seem to be generally committed to the Institution. Regarding the sub-dimension of Organisational Commitment, Affective Commitment refers to an employee’s emotional link in this dimension; it proves that the staff has a low degree of affective commitment to the Institution (48.85%, Table 4.6). Therefore we can see from the results (Table 4.6) that 51.15% of the employees are negatively affected in their
working environment since there are no positive incentives that will increase their affective commitment to the institution. Continuance Commitment, in this dimension it proves (Table 4.6) that the staff who want to move away from the Institution will probably have to think seriously of the consequences that they may face. Allen & Meyer (1990) defines continuance commit as the loss of benefits that will be incurred if the employee departs from the organisation. If their benefits cannot be transferred they will be less likely to leave. Allen and Meyer (1990) describe normative commitment as an employee's feelings and obligation to remain at the organisation. These feeling are influenced by people’s experience culturally and within the organisation. ‘Organisation culture is taken to be the ‘shared values and beliefs that underlie a company’s identity’ (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2002:58). 54.21% of the employees feel they are not obliged to remain with the Institution. They feel cultural influenced will not affect their decision to leave.

There is substantial room for improvement within all three dimensions of organisational commitment, especially in respect of Continuance and Affective Commitment.

There were mixed differences through various statistical tests such as the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Independent T-Test and Pearson’s Correlation Analysis tests to see if there are any significant findings within employee perceptions of their post-merger working environment, organisational commitment and each of the demographic variables (age, gender qualification and work experience).

There was no significant difference between the age demographic, but there is a difference with regard to continuance commitment. This indicates that the majority of the participants in the study did not fear losing their benefits and would resign from the institution.

Regarding the gender demographics, there were also no significant difference, but effective commitment was on the border of having a difference which indicates that the participants did not feel emotionally linked to the institution, both male and female participants.
There is no significant difference in the qualifications demographic from a statistical point of view, through the ANOVA test, as the sample used was too small. Although there are no statistical significant differences, the practical significance of the difference on Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment is large. This indicates that there may be real difference on these two factors, but that the sample is too small for statistical significance to be achieved.

Regarding work experience it indicated that continuance commitment was significant as it differed significantly when compared to the other variables. Therefore, we can deduce that participants in the study did not fear resigning and losing their benefits.

The empirical study showed that the merger did indeed have a definite impact on the employees, although the impact carried over from category to category.

Through the findings from the study the researcher can state that the merger impacted the employee’s perceptions of their post-merger working environment and organisational commitment of the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WALTER SISULU UNIVERSITY

In interpretation of the findings, the following recommendations are made possible for Walter Sisulu University regarding employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment.

In general, there needs to be a more transparent and friendly working relationship between the management of the University and its staff. This can be addressed through:

- Any decision decided on by management that will affect employees should be taken in discussion with that employee involved so as to confirm transparency and implementation (Gregson, 1992:86).
• All Campus managers should be consistent and flexible in their decisions. This which will increase employee support and appreciation (Gregson, 1992:86).

• There is much uncertainty and lack of confidence by employees towards management. There is complacency amongst the different managers since they have been in their positions for extensive periods of time at their particular campuses (Wyngaard & Kapp, 2004: 199).

• Management and supervisors should demonstrate trust, integrity and dedication towards employees. This brings about confidence in the employees while performing their duties (Gregson, 1992:86).

• WSU must establish a comprehensive communications strategy that will serve all stakeholders. The strategy should include the following features:
  - It should be honest and not afraid to be repeated even if it is rather petty.
  - Information should be accessible consistently and timeously to all stakeholders concerned.
  - Communication must be convincing (Strydom, 1999: 40).

• Comments on the performance and decisions regarding employees must be communicated timeously and understood by the employees to guarantee that operations are not delayed (Strydom, 1999: 40).

• Walter Sisulu University must value its employees in moving away from the notion of employee being treated as human resources and toward the concept of human capital, a concept that perceives people as valuable commodities and not as perishable resources (Sewbaran, 2006: 24).

• Attainable and actual goals are to be established to promote a good ‘people person’ atmosphere that is established on trust, relationships and support amongst employees within the University in order to endure a support culture (Kotter, 1998:2).
• Induction awareness programmes should be conducted to support all employees and particularly new employees through the socialisation process so that employees in the merged institution learn to understand the expected behaviour within a short time (Hay & Fourie, 2002:125-129).

• Management must align employee roles in accordance to the organisation’s vision, goals and values (Wyngaard & Kapp, 2004: 199).

• The University should evaluate its organisational culture and leadership methods annually to investigate any gaps found between the existing culture and the anticipated culture (Strydom, 1999:40).

• Finally, suitable systems and procedures based on scientific methods need to be implemented by Walter Sisulu University in completing tasks (Mbinda, 2005:36-37).

5.7 BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE RESEARCH

Institutions have experienced transformation since 2004. This led to the merging of smaller institutions into larger institutions. This process combines a range of people, and therefore many organisational cultures are joined. The organisational culture of an organisation contributes and influences the organisational commitment of the employees’, therefore the suitable fit between the organisational culture and employee will clearly affect the organisational commitment of employees.

The main objective of this research was to establish the factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment within the permanent administration staff in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University. The first step in achieving this objective was an in-depth theoretical study. The second step was an empirical survey that was conducted to gather the opinions of employees. The third step was to analyse the data received from the employees. The fourth and final step was to analyse the data, state the finding and make recommendations to Walter Sisulu University.
A concise chapter by chapter overview of a manner in which the purpose and objective of this research was met is presented below.

Chapter One served as an introduction and orientation to the research in terms of the purpose, objectives and hypotheses. It also contained a summary of the primary and secondary sources related to the research, which were obtained from both national and international sources.

Factors such as Managing change, human capital, organisational culture working environment and organisational commitment literature were reviewed in Chapter Two. Chapter Two concluded with a discussion of Allen and Meyer’s three-component model of organisational commitment (1990).

Chapter Three focused on research design and methodology applied in this research. The research paradigm, research population and sample, as well as the research method were explained. The measuring instrument applied in this research was also discussed. The chapter concluded with an explanation of trustworthiness and the ethical considerations.

Chapter Four dealt with the statistical results of this research. The response rate was identified. Analysis of individual questions, responses from perception of employees, post-merger working environment and Allen & Meyer’s organisational commitment with its three sub-dimensions, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment were statistically scrutinised. Hypothesis tests were prepared, including analysis of variance (ANOVA), Independent T-Test and Pearson’s Correlations Analysis. The chapter was concluded with descriptive statistics using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and T-Tests, to show the relationship between employee perception of their post-merger working environment, organisational commitment and the demographics age, gender, qualification and working experience.

The final chapter, Chapter Five presented the results of the hypothesis formulated in Chapter One. The research findings were discussed in detail with reference to literature found in Chapter Two. The chapter concluded with recommendations made by the researcher, supported by literature found in Chapter Two, to Walter Sisulu University.
In conclusion, working environment is a powerful tool which management can use to enhance performance and influence the extent of organisational commitment towards the Institution.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table A
Section B: Individual question totals for perception of post-merger working environment in questionnaire order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Table A
Correlations across all the constructs reflected in Table 4.4. below in the form of Scatter plots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scatter plots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff_Commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont_Commit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm_Commit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear participant

You are invited to participate in a survey questionnaire to give your responses on factors that influence employee perceptions of a post-merger working environment and organisational commitment in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu University.

This survey will contribute towards research carried out by Mr Selwyn Hilary Morrison for a dissertation in the Master of Business Administration Degree offered by the Faculty of Business Studies at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. The outcome of this research would be made available to you, with the aim of seeking improvements in the Finance Department at Walter Sisulu Universities.

All information that you provide will in no way be connected with your name. I estimate that it will take you about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire.
**SECTION A:**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**PLEASE PUT A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK:**

1. **AGE IN YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **ETHNIC GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matric only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Degree / Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **WORKING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B:

RATE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ON A FIVE POINT SCALE BY PLACING A TICK (X) IN THE BOX YOU THINK BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE STATEMENT:

PERCEPTIONS OF POST- MERGER WORKING ENVIRONMENT

1. I am provided with adequate resources to perform my daily tasks.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

2. Computer and photocopy equipment are in good working order.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

3. Finance staff members are provided with all the necessary resources to work efficiently and effectively.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

4. The network is in place to ensure effective communication between one delivery site and the other.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

5. The merger has resulted in a positive change in job characteristics (the duties and responsibilities of your job have changed for the better).
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

6. My working hours are better after the merger.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5

7. I have greater job security after the merger.
   - Strongly Disagree 1
   - Disagree 2
   - Neutral 3
   - Agree 4
   - Strongly Agree 5
8. I have greater job satisfaction after the merger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. The merger has saved me a great deal of time and energy (e.g. decisions taken at meetings are implemented accordingly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. My supervisor is more supportive and helpful towards me after the merger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. My supervisor always respects and recognises the work that I perform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. The merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by staff towards top management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Feedback is always timeous and reliable from the merged top management team to staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. The merged top management team places great emphasis on relevant staff development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. The merger has created an atmosphere of trust and confidence by top management towards staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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16. Staff ideas relating to the merger are encouraged and used constructively by top management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I feel my supervisor and top management is sensitive to my personal needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The merger has brought about discriminatory practices by top management towards staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. In general, the University goals and objectives are established by participation between all management and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Budget setting, performance appraisal and other methods of control are generally used for guidance and reward rather than policing and punishment at the University by the merged top management team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Top management is competent and equipped to handle the merger efficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Staff in the new merged environment; see themselves as a big family unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. The merged staff has great respect and tolerance for each other's cultural diversities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. I get rewarded for all the extra work I do at the University with very little problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. There are better opportunities for advancement since the merger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The strategic management policy in the merged institution is effectively implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Decisions taken by top management (campus managers) regarding the same issues from all campuses are consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I have a clear view for the need to have merged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C:

ALLEN & MEYER'S ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT SCALE (OCS)

C 1 AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT SCALE:

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I enjoy discussing my organisation with people outside it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I really feel as if this organisation's problems are my own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I do not feel like part of the family at my organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I do not feel emotionally attached to this organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organisation as I am to this one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2 CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT SCALE

1. It would be very hard for me to leave my organisation right now even if I wanted to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organisation now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organisation is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organisation may not match the overall benefits I have here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organisation would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Right now, staying with my organisation is a matter of necessity, as much as desire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organisation now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I am not afraid what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C3 NORMATIVE COMMITMENT SCALE

1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organisation for most of their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I do not think that wanting to be a company man is bad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organisation is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Jumping from organisation to organisation does not seem at all unethical to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!