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ABSTRACT

In this study an exploration was conducted of change and transformation at an institution of higher education in South Africa using Anstey’s conceptual framework. This framework incorporated the work of major change theorists as well as the balanced scorecard of Kaplan and Norton. A quantitative and exploratory approach was used. The research question for this study was formulated as follows: How successful was the organizational transformation process at the newly established university in the period 2003 – 2007? The first objective of the study was to describe the organizational transformation process as it unfolded at the newly established university. The second objective was to evaluate the success of the organizational transformation process by using Anstey’s conceptual framework. Eight factors were identified in Anstey’s framework according to which the success of the merger was analyzed. These factors were: constructive unease; harnessed urgency; clear purpose; challenging vision with clear measurable objectives; champions at all levels; culture and community; competitive competencies; coherent strategy, and communication and consultation. A computerized survey tool was utilized to design a structured questionnaire with both fixed response and open-ended questions. Some 13% of the employees responded to the questionnaire. The internal consistency of the scores derived from the instrument was confirmed using Cronbach’s alpha. Descriptive statistics revealed that 62.5% of factor scores were neutral and 37.5% negative with regard to staffs’ perceptions of the merger. Inferential statistics disclosed that academic staff viewed the merger more negatively on factor 3 challenging vision with clear measurable objectives than their administrative colleagues. The total success of the merger can be summarized by the following statement of one of the participants ‘If the NMMU merger is compared to other mergers in Higher Education in South Africa then it is clear that, from a systems and procedural perspective, it was managed satisfactory. Unfortunately the ‘people’ dimension of the merger did not feature as a priority and many staff members were alienated as a result of this.’ The limitation of the study was the small sample size. This study was also contextual in nature, meaning that it focused on the transformation process as it unfolded at a specific university in South African between the years 2003 – 2007. No results generated in this study can be generalized as they only presented a shot-in-time reflecting the transformation process at a particular organization at a particular period in time. This study also confirmed the usefulness of Anstey’s conceptual framework in assessing transformation at an institution of higher education.
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CHAPTER 1: ORGANISATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

1.1 Introduction: the problem and its setting

Since the 1980s South Africa has experienced many forces influencing the way organisations are managed, such as political change, shifting demographics, the rapid evolution of technology, changing customer and worker demands, international economic trends of increased competition and new methods of work organisation and organisational design. These forces compelled leaders to cope with, manage and lead the change processes in their organizations required if they wanted to succeed, or even survive in this new global environment. Understanding and managing this change process has become one of the most important issues of the twenty-first century (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk and Schenk 2005: 727-728). No wonder that many of the CEOs were admitting that their greatest challenge was to manage people and the problems that these transformation processes were throwing at them, as failure to do so often prevented them from building new integrated businesses (Devine & Hirsh, 1998: 7). Harvey and Brown (2001:2-3) state:

“Change is avalanching down upon our heads and most people are utterly unprepared to cope with it. Tomorrow’s world will be different from today’s, calling for new organizational approaches...Every day managers confront massive and accelerating change...In the future, the only winning companies will be those that respond quickly to change. Preparing managers to cope with today’s accelerating role of change is the central concern... The modern manager must not only be flexible and adaptive in a changing environment but also be able to diagnose problems and implement programmes...Because change is occurring so rapidly, there is a need for new ways to manage. Organizations are changing and will continue to do so in order to survive in this complex environment.”

Whilst organisations are undergoing transformation, the dilemma concerns how much turbulence can managers expose their employees to, while, at the same time, retaining some form of continuity, stability and commitment (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 735). Transformation can either be narrow in scope or impact on numerous organisational subsystems. Dunphy and Stace (1993: 905-920) describe the different scales of change as follows:
- **Fine tuning:** This is an ongoing process of refining policies and procedures in order to ensure an ongoing fit between the various organisational subsystems;

- **Incremental adjustment:** This involves changes to strategies, structures or business processes in the external environment in order to improve service delivery;

- **Modular transformation:** This involves a major realignment and/or radical change of large or significant parts/divisions/departments of an organisation. The scope of change is limited to the subsystems of the organisation such as radical downsizing or outsourcing of certain functions, but from a systems perspective the impact of even narrowly focused change intervention is likely to be felt across the whole organisation;

- **Corporate or organisational transformation:** As a revolutionary change process occurring across organisations. In this change process a total change of business direction can be observed with the formulation of a new mission statement and the adoption of a whole new set of core values. Corporate or organisational transformation was observed with the recent mergers of universities and technikons in South Africa. The legal framework for the restructuring process was described in sections 20 to 25 of the Higher Education Act (101/97) as amended, the Labour Relations Act (66/95) as amended and the Standard Institutional Statutes of the relevant universities and technikons. Mergers and acquisitions are frequently driven by changing conditions in the market such as de-regulation that leads to consolidation amongst sectors or political demands. Anstey (2006 (a): 366-367) states that the restructuring of South African tertiary educational institutions through a series of mergers between universities and technikons reflected confusion of objectives as no cost-benefit analysis or organized thinking about the preferred shape or deliverables of the newly established comprehensive universities was done, neither were any pilot projects launched to determine the feasibility of the mergers. No assurance could also be given that these massive restructuring exercises would improve student throughputs, or raise the quality of the teaching, or produce greater research outputs.

Devine and Hirsh (1998: 5-6) state that there has been a marked rise in mergers and acquisitions in the USA and Europe since the mid – 1990s and that these processes will in all probability continue into the next decade. Many employees can therefore expect to
be exposed to mergers and acquisitions at some stage during their working lives. The Roffey survey reveals the following insights when dealing with mergers and acquisitions:

- The Human Resources strategy is vitally important through all the stages of the merger and needs to be addressed as soon as possible;
- The roles and behaviour of managers have an important impact on how well employees will cope with the change-over and their adjustment to the new working environment;
- Employees often experience anxiety and need to be supported throughout the transition;
- Culture clashes between the joining organisations have often been blamed as the cause for failure in mergers (Devine & Hirsh, 1998:6-7).

Anstey (2006: 364) echoes the complexity of the transformation processes and states that the vast majority of change strategies fail to achieve their intended outcomes as concurrent attention is required for such issues as:

- Organisational direction;
- Needs and desires of current and future customers;
- Product, consumer and labour markets;
- Political, legal, economic and social opportunities and threats;
- Internal strengths and weaknesses in terms of capacity and competencies;
- Finance and technology;
- Business process efficiencies;
- Organisational issues of structure, culture and climate;
- Accessing and leveraging critical information and knowledge resources and
- Attracting, developing and retaining people with the competencies that will ensure a sustainable competitive advantage for the organisation (Anstey, 2006 (a): 364).

From the aforementioned discussion a breadth (scope) and depth (focus) in the change process are noticed, ranging from corporate transformation to fine tuning policies and procedures. The next section will discuss how this change process can be operationalised.
1.2 Approaches to managing change

Two broad approaches can be used to manage organisational change, namely an emergent/incremental approach and a planned (N-step) approach. In the emergent process emphasis is placed on the dynamic, evolving, unpredictable and complex nature of the organisational change process. The process is open-ended and continuous with no real starting point or point of completion. Burnes (1996: 193-194) describes the process as follows:

- The emergent process of change management is an ongoing process of making small-scale incremental changes by experimenting and adapting as the need arises;
- Managers play a facilitating role by creating an environment where continuous risk taking and experimentation and learning are encouraged;
- Managers create a common vision and provide direction in guiding the change process by encouraging information gathering, communication and learning.

The planned or N-step approach is pre-planned and managed through a series of steps until the change is implemented and the process is terminated. Kurt Lewin’s three step model of unfreezing the status quo, actively changing the organisation or parts of the organisation, and refreezing the new organisational state in creating a new status quo, is an example of one of the earliest models of planned change. The strength of this model implies that the people in the organisation are generally prepared to accept and take part in the change process once they understand the need for the change. Lippitt, Watson and Westley (1985) refined Lewin’s three phase model into a seven phase model as follows:

- **Phase 1:** Development of a need for change;
- **Phase 2:** Establishment of a change relationship between the relevant parties, namely the client system and the change agent;
- **Phase 3:** Diagnosis of the problem of the client system;
- **Phase 4:** Examination of goals and action plans;
- **Phase 5:** Transformation of intentions into change efforts;
- **Phase 6:** Generalisation and stabilisation of the change process;
- **Phase 7:** Termination of the relationship

(Swanepoel et al, 2005: 732-733).
This does not mean that organisational change will follow these steps in the real world but that the abovementioned theoretical framework provides some structure and understanding to the sequence of events that occur when organisations are faced with transformation. A planned process with clear time lines that were laid down in legislation was followed in the transformation of universities and technikons in South Africa.

In order for the transformation to take place a change agent, transformational leader or a team of experts/consultants usually necessary to drive the process.

1.3 The change agent and organisational transformation

As Harvey and Brown (2001: 94) rightly state:

“Change programs do not happen accidentally. Instead, they are initiated with a specific purpose and require some form of leadership to function properly”.

The change process in an organisation may be led by an individual, a team from elsewhere in the organisation or a team of specialists/consultants recruited from outside the organisation. Whether an organisation uses an internal or external change agent/s the choice is situational, as there are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches. External consultants are expensive and are usually considered when the necessary skills are unavailable in the organisation. The disadvantage is that external change agents often rely too heavily on off-the-shelf solutions rather than helping the organisation to diagnose its own situation adequately and implementing a solution tailor-made to its own circumstances. It is also not uncommon to have a team of both internal and external change agents to jointly manage the change process (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 740-742). Fubini, Price and Zollo (2007: 43) explain that stakeholders need to be able to determine whether the merger signals a momentum story, in other words a relative continuity at corporate level or whether it signals a breakaway story, in which significant transformation will be observed. In the South African context of higher education the intended mergers were quite radical.
1.4 Managing the human dimensions during the transformation process

Few management models can be applied to assist managers to develop a strategy to manage the human dimension during the transformation processes. Transformation processes are unique as they generate their own mix of human responses and issues. The timing of these responses and their intensity will depend on the nature of each individual deal. Some organisations have also experienced the cost of poor human resource management. In the merger at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University for instance staff felt that not sufficient attention was given to “the human side” of the merger – “the focus seemed to be all on policy and procedure”. Some respondents enjoyed meeting and working with new colleagues, while others were overwhelmed by the “us/them issue” and even experienced “animosity between departments which merged” (Barnard & Nel, 2007: 13). Poor human resource management can result in political in-fighting, disrupted lives, broken trust between managers and employees, loss of valued employees, slipping business performance and lost opportunities for organisational learning (Devine & Hirsh, 1998:10).

Swanepoel et al (2005: 737-738) refer to Richardson (1995) stating that the following responses can be anticipated from management and employees facing transformation, namely:

- **Failure to recognize the need for change**: Employees need to fully understand the need for change or else their own vested interests may result in resistance to change. Employees generally tend to view change through their own set of values/prejudices.

- **Fear of the unknown**: Even though people may understand the reasons for the change, they may not trust the motives of those advocating the change. People generally fear the impact of the change process on themselves, their careers, families and financial future.

- **Fear of social and work disruptions**: New organisations usually create new faces in the organisation. New personnel are frequently appointed at senior management level that may disrupt existing traditions and working relationships by implementing new policies and work procedures. Organisational change may also threaten the integrity of friendship groups that provide valuable social rewards in the working environment. Merging organisations may also have to face particularly complex power struggles.
• **New questions arise:** Surveys conducted in the organisation in order to obtain feedback on the change process may also create new questions about existing practices.

• **New structures are formed:** Changes in roles, responsibilities and lines of authority are often witnessed in transformation processes. People usually rely on old habits to perform their jobs. The change may require staff to develop new ways of performing their tasks and this will challenge them to develop new competencies. People are generally unwilling to give up existing benefits associated with their current jobs/positions. Change may mean a loss in terms of power, prestige and salary with resultant economic insecurity especially if they have to face dismissal.

• **New goals and standards are implemented:** A new organisation usually creates new mission and vision statements, standards of performance and organisational culture. This is particularly difficult for people who are resistant to the change process.

• **Selective perceptions:** As people have different perceptions and process information selectively, some may perceive the change process as a challenge while others may view the same situation as a threat to their existence.

All the abovementioned responses create uncertainty and in some individuals or organisations a resistance to change. Robbins (2005: 552) states that resistance to change can be overt, implicit, immediate or deferred. Resistance to change that is immediate and overt where employees voice their complaints, engage in a work slow-down, threaten to go on strike or engage in strike action is according to him much easier to handle than managing resistance that is implicit or deferred. Implicit resistance is more subtle and difficult to recognize as it manifests itself in actions such as loss of loyalty to the organisation, broken trust between employees and managers, loss of motivation to work, increased errors and mistakes and increased absenteeism.

Robbins (2005: 554), Devine and Hirsh (1998:10, 20, 28) and Swanepoel et al (2005: 739-740) suggest that resistance to change should be managed by:

• Developing a system to manage a coherent multi-track process and involving employees to participate in the process, thus creating champions at all levels and co-opting change agents in relevant teams/committees where applicable. This could include a new approach to internal business processes and policies.
- Facilitating support and educating personnel where applicable.
- Introducing the change process incrementally and operating within the existing culture of the organisation by a process of participation and involvement of employees.
- As a last resort, implementing explicit or implicit threats. This can include manipulation, loss or transfer of jobs, lack of promotion and the like and within the South African context, agreements have to be negotiated with representative trade unions within the ambit of section 189 of the Labour Relations Act (66/95) on issues pertaining to dismissals based on operational requirements. Robbins (2005:554) states “because change threatens the status quo, it inherently implies political activity”.

It is not only important to manage the human dimensions during the initial phases of the transformation process skillfully but careful attention must also be given to the management of the human dimensions in the latter phases of the transformation process. Devine and Hirsh (1998: 1) quote Denise Kingsmill, the deputy chairman of the Monopolies and Mergers Commission:

“Senior executives often think that the success or failure of a merger is determined by key decisions taken at the very beginning of the process. The Roffey Park research has made me more aware of the vital importance of the skilful and sensitive management of people in the months and years after the deal is made”.

This statement is supported by Ghoshal and Bartlett (1997: 8) who emphasize that the objective is not to force employees into a corporate mould by policies and constraints but to build a place where people have the freedom to be creative and to build an organisation that has the ability to exploit the knowledge and unique skills of every individual employee.

Successful transformation requires people to do things differently, to break with the past, to take risks and to become motivated about change but at the same time requiring some form of stability in the organisation to minimize demoralization of the workforce (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 739-740).
1.5 Types of organisational transformation interventions

As the nature of organisational transformation, approaches to managing change, the change agent and managing the human dimensions to change have been discussed, the following questions now arise. What is the focus of the change intervention and what methods can be used to implement transformation in the organisation? Robbins (1997: 523-526) answers by stating that the focus of the change intervention can involve the structural, technological, people, physical or cultural setting areas:

- **Structural interventions** may involve change in organisational design, decentralization, and modifying the flow of work;
- **Technological interventions** may involve interventions such as job enrichment and job enlargement;
- **People interventions** involve interventions to improve organisational performance causing the employees to become more productive. Such efforts are known as organisational development (OD) techniques, behaviour modification and management by objectives;
- **Physical setting interventions** include the layout of the workspace, interior design and equipment placement;
- **Organisational culture interventions** refer to changing shared symbols, rituals and beliefs. Change in this area is usually difficult and managers are advised to proceed with caution.

1.6 Contemporary transformation methods

Contemporary change and transformation methods such as lean production, total quality management (TQM), re-engineering and creating a learning organisation have been used to describe organisational change:

- A **lean production** system is driven by three key elements, namely zero defects (top quality), zero waste and zero inventory. The focus is on training and development complemented by a just-in-time production and a supply chain management system. The primary objective is to eliminate all waste in the system to deliver a top quality product or service to the customer at the best price and in the most customer friendly manner.
- A **total quality management** system attempts to continuously improve the quality of its products, services, people, processes and environment. It has a strong
customer focus, directing attention to both the internal and external customers with the aim of meeting or even exceeding the customer’s expectations.

- The process of re-engineering means radically redesigning or restructuring the organisation’s core processes by starting from scratch and ignoring how things were done in the past. Change agents using this approach start in the future and work backward unconstrained by existing methods or people. Central to this business process re-engineering is the focus on process thinking as Hammer and Champy (1993: 32) describe it as:

“fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvement in critical contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service and speed”.

- A learning organisation is an organisation that has developed the capacity to adapt to change. The value of change lies in the process or road that is followed in bringing about the intended transformation. The ideal is reached when change is viewed as an ongoing learning process where continuous organisational innovation and renewal are inherent in the organisational climate (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 747-748; Anstey, 2006(a): 367).

Following the discussion of contemporary transformation methods the question can now be asked, what advice do the change theorists provide for managing organisational transformation? The next section will attempt to provide direction in answering this important question.

1.7 World class models for organisational transformation

1.7.1 Ghoshal and Bartlett’s Individualized Corporation

Goshal and Bartlett (1997: 79-80) state that traditional corporate models rely heavily on the wisdom and expertise of the organisation’s top management as well as the power of its established systems and processes to transfer and exploit experience and knowledge in its day-to-day activities. As so colourfully described by General Electric’s CEO Jack Welch “an organization that has its face toward the CEO and its ass toward the customer” (Goshal and Bartlett, 1997: 37). This statement is opposed by the Individualized Corporation which has a competitive advantage over its competitors only
because of the high quality and competence of *all* its employees. They continue to argue that development of individual expertise should be a top priority and that all recruiting decisions must translate into strategic decisions. Techniques such as personnel head-hunting are advocated to attract the best personnel to the organisation, as it is only through the organisation’s superior knowledge, skills and motivation that it can remain competitive. As Ghoshal and Bartlett (1997: 83) so strategically state:

“The more a company sees itself as competing on the basis of its superior information, knowledge, and expertise, the more it will have to view itself as something other than a portfolio of financial resources to be distributed in the most efficient manner”.

In Kaplan and Norton’s terms this is an important shift away from the lag to the leading indicators.
Organisations that have managed to develop as truly Individualized Corporations have recognized that those employees closest to the customers or those who are the most knowledgeable about technology are far better placed to respond in a fast-changing competitive environment. An entirely different organisational logic is at work, it reverses the traditional perspective of allowing top managers to exercise authority and control over every aspect of the organisation by replacing it with supportive initiatives for those at the front line. From this point of view it is clear that the most important responsibility of any manager in an Individualized Corporation is to teach, create content and to learn. Thus creating a working environment that would stimulate and support each individual employee to become self-motivated, in other words “developing the people to develop the business” (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 47, 49, 62, 83). Managers in an Individualized Corporation have the challenge to create “an organizational climate that stimulates ordinary people to produce extraordinary performances” by constantly challenging each individual and the organisation as a whole to become the best it could possibly be (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 42, 109). This type of mindset moves the Individualized Corporation beyond strategic planning to organisational learning, because “the numbers and objectives don’t get you there, the people do” (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 70-71, 117). By acting in collaboration with other colleagues, thus “learning through cooperation” most individuals develop a sense of commitment, courage and supportive behaviour. This would also include providing support if any of the departments/units of the greater organisation experience problems. As individuals and the organisation as a whole are collaboratively challenged to move beyond their comfort zones to supply the
consumer with the best and surprise products, rivalry with the competitors seems to fade (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 114-118, 124). Being challenged by the consumer, does not only mean continuous refinement and improvement of products and/or services but also the ability to regenerate and to jump to new learning curves, thus creating a sense of renewal, stretch, speed and flexibility. Being challenged by themselves includes omitting to focus on past achievements or current constraints but rather seeing themselves in terms of future possibilities (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 111, 113).

To achieve the abovementioned outcomes the transformation agenda of an Individualized Corporation includes the following: revitalizing people, creating a sense of ownership, democratizing information and developing horizontal flows of information, developing new channels of communication, incorporating entrepreneurial initiatives into its organisational bloodstream, creating small performance units, building organisational flexibility, radically decentralizing resources and responsibilities, developing individual expertise, providing a supportive environment, setting clear standards and expectations, and tolerating well-intentioned failure. In this new environment the employee commits him/herself to engage in a process of continuous learning and assumes responsibility for his/her best-in-the-class performance. The organization, on the other hand, takes responsibility to ensure the freedom of each individual’s employability. This is done by continuous skill updating and creating an exciting and invigorating work climate. Under this new contract employees are seen as a resource which adds value to the organisation and management judges them as a valuable new competitive asset (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997: 285-286, 301).

Senge (1990: 7-8) is also interested in the connection between learning of the individual and learning in the organisation and their reciprocal commitment to one another. He comments how sad it is to see people’s commitment, energy and spirit deteriorate the longer they spend in an organisation. The next section explores his view on the learning organisation.

1.7.2 Senge’s Learning Organisation

Senge (1990:1-8) states that the organisations that will excel in future are those which have discovered the secret of tapping people’s commitment and which encouraged learning at all levels of the organisation. In other words “where people continually
expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together... (where) people with a high level of personal mastery are able to approach their life as an artist would approach a work of art”. Such an organisation is one where the individuals become committed to their own lifelong learning and living their lives in service of their highest aspirations.

In the context of the aforementioned information and the challenges that are inherent in mergers the format for the layout of the chapters in this study is identified in the following section.

1.8 Format for the structure of chapters in the study

The layout of chapters in the study will be as follows:
Chapter 1: Organisational transformation
Chapter 2: Measuring organisational transformation
Chapter 3: Mergers in Higher Education
Chapter 4: Research design and methodology
Chapter 5: Research results, presentation and discussion
Chapter 6: Conclusions and recommendations

1.9 Summary

South Africa has seen many forces influencing the way organisations are managed, such as political change, shifting demographics, the rapid evolution of technology, changing customer and worker demands, international economic trends of increased competition and new methods of work organisation and organisational design. These forces have compelled leaders to cope with, manage and lead the required change processes in their organisations if they wanted to succeed, or even survive in this new global environment. Understanding and managing this change process has become one of the most important and complex issues of the twenty-first century. Transformation can either be narrow in scope or impact on numerous organisational subsystems. Major theorists echo the view that organisations that want to excel in future have to tap into their people’s commitment and encourage learning at all levels of the organisation. The next chapter will elaborate on measuring organisational transformation.
CHAPTER 2: MEASURING ORGANISATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how organisational transformation is measured. One of the tools that can be used to measure organisational transformation is the balanced scorecard. The balanced scorecard developed by Kaplan and Norton (1996) and its extension the HR Scorecard developed by Becker, Huselid and Ulrich (2001) links people, strategy and performance. The balanced scorecard enables an organisation to focus not only on the financial elements of its value chain, but also on the customer, business processes, learning and growth elements (Boninelli & Meyer, 2004: 76-77). But knowing what to measure is just as important as the measuring process itself. Management must thus measure what matters as summarized in the following statement by Becker, Huselid and Ulrich (2001: 20):

“What gets measured gets managed – and what gets managed gets accomplished.”

The HR Scorecard proposes measurement of organisational performance in four areas, namely financial, customer service, internal processes and learning and growth. The measures of assessment are factors such as:

- Assets, profits, cash flow and solvency to determine the financial viability;
- Market share, student growth, customer satisfaction, brand image and benchmarking to determine customer service;
- Organisational structures, processes, policies, culture and student throughput rates to determine internal processes;
- Personnel satisfaction, hours spend in training and research, number of grievances, disciplinary hearings, work stoppages and strikes to determine learning and growth.

Where traditional organisations focus exclusively on financial measures in their organisational performance /measuring systems indicating what has happened in the past (lagging performance indicators), the balanced scorecard approach also proposes a system that recognizes performance drivers in the future (leading performance indicators). As a measuring system the HR Scorecard attempts to answer questions such as:
• What are the strategic goals of the organisation?
• How will these goals be achieved?
• How will performance be measured as the organisation progresses towards goal achievement?
• What type of employee behaviour and performance is required for successful implementation of the strategy?
• What has to be done to enable employees to behave and perform as required?
• What is currently done in this regard?
• What needs to change? (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 782-783).

Most managers understand that their organisation’s measurement system will strongly influence the behaviour of all its managers and employees. Traditional financial accounting measures have also proven to be inadequate and do not provide the necessary incentives for continuous improvement and innovation that a highly competitive environment demands (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 124). One of the tools that can be used to comprehensively evaluate an organisation’s performance is the balanced scorecard as it links people, strategy and performance while simultaneously providing managers with complex information at a glance. It provides answers to four basic questions:

• How do we look to our shareholders (financial perspective)?
• How do our customers see us (customer perspective)?
• What must we excel at (internal perspective)?
• How can we continue to improve and create value (learning and growth perspective)? (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 126).

The balanced scorecard thus proposes measurement of organisational performance in four areas, namely financial, the customer, the internal business and learning and growth. The next section will elaborate on these perspectives.

2.2 The balanced scorecard

2.2.1 Financial perspective

Financial performance measures indicate whether the organisation’s strategy, implementation and execution are contributing to profitability, growth and shareholder

- What are our financial targets?
- What drives those targets?
- What type of profit and revenue do we want to achieve?

Nair (2004: 21) further reiterates that non-profit organisations usually do not answer to financial goals but are driven by their mission and that all other objectives feed into their mission statement.

2.2.2 Customer perspective

The balanced scorecard demands that managers include statements reflecting customer service in their mission statement. Customers’ needs generally fall into four categories, namely time, quality, performance and service, and cost (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 128-129). Kaplan and Norton (2004: 89) state that the definition of quality has lately shifted from conforming to specifications, to meeting the customers’ individual expectations. Organisations are realizing that it is far less expensive to retain customers than to continually add new ones to replace those who defect. Loyal customers value the quality and service they receive and committed customers convey their satisfaction to others. The highest form of loyalty occurs when customers take on ownership behaviour for a company’s products and services. This could even include active participation in the design of new products and/or supplying recommendations on improving service delivery (Kaplan and Norton, 2004: 116-117). The questions that organisations then should ask are:

- Who are our customers?
- How do we delight them?
- Which departments do we have to address to achieve the abovementioned results?
- What goals do we want to achieve with our partners?
• What are our goals for the distribution channel? (Nair, 2004: 20).

2.2.3 Internal business perspective

Ideally the internal measures of the balanced scorecard should be wrapped around the business processes that have the greatest impact on customer satisfaction such as quality of products and services, employee skills and productivity (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 132). Nair (2004: 20) suggests that the following questions should be asked:
• In which processes must we excel to win customers?
• What internal activities should be implemented and/or retained to make it possible?

2.2.4 Learning and growth perspective

The competitive global environment demands that organisations continually improve their existing products and at the same time be creative and innovative by introducing entirely new products to the market before their competitors. An organisation’s ability to innovate, improve, grow, learn and penetrate new markets directly influences its value to its shareholders (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 134). The questions to be asked are:
• What must we be great in performing?
• What type of training must be implemented to produce the abovementioned results?
• What type of organisational climate and culture will nurture growth?
• What has to be done to develop personnel to achieve all the other identified objectives of the organisation as well? (Nair, 2004: 20).

The following figure is a simple illustration of the value creation process. It emphasizes the importance of customer loyalty, product quality and personnel development in delivering a service to delight and excel in meeting customers’ expectations.
2.3 Managing the balanced scorecard strategy

As organisations transform themselves to compete in the global environment, their ability to exploit intangible assets is becoming much more decisive than their ability to manage tangible assets. Intangible assets are described as “knowledge that exists in an organisation to create differential advantage” or “the capabilities of the company’s employees to satisfy customer needs” (Thomas, 1998: 67). The value of the intangible assets comes from how well they are aligned to the strategic priorities of the organisation and not how much it costs to create them or how much they are worth in isolation (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 211). Traditional management systems have relied too heavily on financial measures, which contribute very little to long-term strategic objectives. The balanced scorecard gives managers the ability to track financial results whilst at the same time monitoring progress in building the capabilities they need for growth. The balanced scorecard thus fills this gap by linking long-term goals with short-term actions. This is done by:

- Translating the organisation’s vision and strategic statements into action at local level;
- Communicating and linking the organisation’s strategy up and down the organisation and linking it to departmental and individual goals;
- Integrating business and financial plans;
- Providing organisations with the capacity for strategic learning, which consists of data gathering, monitoring, reviewing information, testing hypotheses, providing feedback and making the necessary adjustments (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 183-184).

The following figure highlights the importance of managing this strategy.

![Diagram](Translating the vision, Clarifying the vision, Gaining consensus, Communicating and Linking, Communicating and educating, Setting goals, Linking rewards to performance measures, Business Planning, Setting targets, Aligning strategic initiatives, Allocating resources, Establishing milestones, Feedback and Learning, Articulating the shared vision, Supplying strategic feedback, Facilitating strategy review and learning, Balanced Scorecard, Harvard Business Review, 1998: 187)

**Figure 2: Managing strategy: four processes**


But how can HR formalize its strategic role in an organisation going through a transformation process? The following figure by Becker et al (2001: 37) summarizes how HR can transform its architecture into a strategic asset.
Becker et al (2001:36-52) describe a seven-step model for implementing HR’s strategic role as follows:

**Step 1: Clearly define the business strategy**

Strategy is not a process that can be seen in isolation, it is one step in a logical continuum moving from the organisation’s *mission statement* to implementation by every member of the organisation. The overarching mission/purpose statement of the organisation provides the reason *why* the organisation exists, together with the *core values* that accompany it. The organisation’s *vision* paints a picture for the future and provides information on the direction it intends to follow. The *vision* thus sets the organisation in motion from the stability of the mission and core values to the dynamics of the strategy. Mission and vision statements set the goals and direction for the organisation and communicate to shareholders,
customers and employees what the organisation is about and what it intend to achieve. Strategy is defined as the process of selecting a set of activities in which the organisation will excel to create a sustainable difference in the marketplace (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 32-35). The challenge that organisations face is to communicate the organisation’s goals throughout the whole organisation and to implement a strategy so that employees clearly understand their role in the process as well as the accompanying measurement practices that will be used to measure their performance.

*Step 2: Build a business case for HR as a strategic asset*

Once the strategy of the organisation has been clarified, HR has to support the strategy’s implementation. As Becker et al (2001:40) echo this assertion, “*the linchpin of successful strategy implementation is a strategically focused workforce...and a balanced performance system, in tandem with an aligned HR system...is the foundation for a strategically focused organization*”.

*Step 3: Create a strategy map*

A strategy map provides the missing link between strategy formulation and strategy execution. A strategy map is a visual presentation of the cause-and-effect relationships among the components of an organisation’s strategy. It describes how an organisation creates value (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 9-10). All stakeholders in the organisation should be involved in the process as broad participation does not only improve the quality of the strategy map but will also enhance the buy-in of critical players. The following questions can guide the process:

- What are the strategic goals of the organisation?
- What are the performance drivers for each goal?
- How will performance be measured as the organisation progresses towards goal achievement?
- What are the barriers to the achievement of each goal?
- What type of employee behaviour and performance is required for successful implementation of the strategy?
• Is the HR function providing the organisation with the necessary employee competencies and behaviours to achieve the objectives?
• What needs to change to achieve these goals? (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 782-783).

Building a strategy map forces an organisation to clarify the logic of how it intends to create value for its stakeholders, customers and citizens.

**Step 4: Identify HR deliverables within the strategy map**

To integrate a business-performance measuring system, points of intersection between the human resources (HR) department and the organisation’s strategic plan must be identified. These points are identified as strategic HR deliverables. These deliverables come in two categories, namely performance drivers and enablers. **Performance drivers** are core people or related activities that will drive the process so that the goals are achieved. **Enablers** on the other hand reinforce performance drivers, for example by implementing a reward structure that will encourage ‘on-time delivery’ (Becker et al, 2001:30-33).

**Step 5: Align the HR architecture with the HR deliverables**

The question at this stage is “How to structure the HR systems (rewards, competencies, work organisation, etc.) to provide the identified deliverables?”

**Step 6: Design the strategic measurement system**

A measurement system can only create value if it is carefully matched with the organisation’s operational goals and strategy. The challenge is to develop valid measures for the HR deliverables by choosing the correct HR performance drivers, enablers and measures. The importance of identifying what has to be measured is summarized in the following statement by Becker, Huselid and Ulrich (2001: 20) “What gets measured gets managed – and what gets managed gets accomplished”.
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The following figure demonstrates the use of the balanced scorecard as a step in the continuum of linking the mission of the organisation to the strategic outcomes.

Figure 4: Linking mission and strategic outcomes

Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 33

Step 7: Implement management by measurement

This step involves implementing and managing the new management system. This will include regular testing of the measures against the strategy map. In this way the balanced scorecard can be used to:

- Clarify and update strategy;
- Align strategic initiatives;
- Communicate strategy throughout the organisation;
- Link strategic objectives to long-term targets and annual budgets; and

Anstey (2006 (c): 9) views the balanced scorecard as the most organised framework for organising and monitoring change initiatives despite its weakness in conceptualizing the role of leadership in the transformation process. In an attempt to measure the success of organisational transformation at an Institution of Higher Education Anstey’s conceptual framework will be used. His framework includes work of major change theorists as well as the balanced scorecard approach of Kaplan and Norton. The following section will elaborate on this work.

2.4 Anstey’s conceptual framework

Anstey’s conceptual framework identifies the following core elements of organisational transformation, namely:

Constructive unease: harnessed urgency

The energy for organisational transformation is usually triggered either externally or internally. This creates an awareness that the system cannot continue in its present form. A sense of unease develops in facing the crisis. At this stage all personnel in the organisation have to realize that they must change as loyalty to the status quo will invite organisational failure. As Anstey (2006: 347) so clearly states “simply understanding the need for change at a conceptual level is insufficient – if members of an organisation are to act, the threat must have an emotional impact”. The purpose is not to create panic but to implement effective leadership and management techniques to harness the energy on the change goals and strategies the new organisation demands as old practices and traditional performance standards will not achieve the intended outcomes. To steer and to give momentum and direction to the transformation process, powerful guiding coalitions are usually formed at senior management level with the ultimate goal to achieve commitment and responsibility at all levels of the organisation. This is usually followed by the formation of senior-level steering committees followed by large-scale organisational meetings, the appointment of change agents and work teams to see the process through. The next step would be to mobilize personnel and labour organisations to buy into the process and to deal with resistance to change (Anstey, 2006(a): 346-347).
Resistance to change often emerges very early in the process. People may not agree with the reasons for the transformation and their greatest fears usually revolve around losing their jobs and job security, their status and personal identity. They may feel betrayed, angered or disillusioned. Personnel may feel pessimistic about the direction and shape of the process even if they agree to the transformation. At a time when commitment to the transformation process is required management and/or their relevant change agents are faced with personnel’s denial, complacency, immobilization, constant hesitation and passive and/or active resistance to the process. Personnel may even accept the reality of the transformation process but not commit themselves to any action. Personnel can show their resistance to the process by complaining, by being more absent from work and by losing their motivation to do their work. This behaviour can result in an increase in work related errors and loss of loyalty to the organisation and develop into work slow downs, threats of strike action and eventually strikes. These responses cannot be ignored if the organisation has to transform. Management may move around or drive through some of the resistance, by negotiating reward packages, making threats of contracts that will not be renewed or withhold promotions. People can also be manipulated by twisting or distorting facts, spreading false rumours or by withholding information. They can further be sidelined or ignored, not consulted and even blackmailed, transferred, threatened with dismissal or dismissed if they do not buy into the process. Most leaders would rather prefer their personnel to buy-in to the process as ignoring people’s feelings and concerns or trying to drive the change through by adopting a top-down manner usually creates more resistance to the transformation. Alternative methods such as growing the transformation process from the bottom up for example by providing support and/or counselling, skills training, co-option of personnel into the different task teams usually create more positive personnel responses and commitment (Anstey, 2006(a): 347-348).

Clear purpose: customer-focused mission (raison d’être)

All organisations need a purpose or a reason for their existence. This purpose should be shared amongst all stakeholders and expressed as a mission statement. Such a purpose or mission statement should clearly identify:

- The customers or clients to be served;
- The needs to be satisfied; and
- How this will be achieved (Anstey, 2006(a): 349-350)
Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives

An organisation’s vision is rooted in its mission and expressed as an ideal state of being. If the organisation’s vision is to be realized it must be translated into clear measurable goals and actions identified to measure achievement at various levels of the organisation. Effective organisations require both financial and non-financial measures by which all members in an organisation can understand their contribution to the overall performance of the organisation. The balanced scorecard offers a useful structure for evaluating performance from four perspectives, namely:

- Financial;
- Customer;
- Internal business processes; and
- Learning and growth.

To be financially successful the organisation needs growth and profitability. To achieve this end it has to ‘delight’ its customers, thus constantly exceeding customer expectations in terms of quality, cost, delivery and back-up service. To improve business process efficiencies, attention must be directed towards improving the competencies of all personnel appointed by the organisation. To further optimize human contributions, attention must be paid to the organisation’s culture, its capacity for continuous learning and adaptability and whether its employees share a sense of purpose, identity and community.

Another key concept linked to the setting of objectives is that of benchmarking. The organisation should ask itself whether the measures or standards they have selected provide them with a competitive advantage. Are their standards internally or externally determined? Is benchmarking set against competitors’ practices or against best practice standards set by similar organisations recognized in the field?

Another important decision that management has to consider is what to measure? Does the organisation aspire to continuously improve quality, to reduce cost, to have integrity in delivery, to be responsive to demand and is the organisation flexible and innovative? (Anstey, 2006(a): 350-354).
Champions: leadership at all levels

The important challenge in the transformational arena is that of leadership – follower fit. Effective leaders use a repertoire of styles to fit a particular situational demand and a range of competencies to achieve organisational goals. Different leadership styles may be required in different phases of the change process. In the change management process the leader has the responsibility to set the direction with and for teams and the organisation. This is done by setting goals and standards, defining roles and responsibilities, performing detailed planning and implementing systems to measure, monitor, evaluate and reward positive outcomes. As no leader possesses all the skills required for effective organisational performance, teams with diverse leadership competencies – a team of the right people to make it happen have to be built, thus mobilizing individual commitment and building organisational capacity (Anstey, 2006(a): 354-359).

Culture and community (organisational identity)

Organisations function optimally if their members share common values, when they interact constructively and if they have the ability to resolve tensions effectively. They also acquire and build identities not only by the products or services they deliver but also by the manner in which it is done. An organisation’s value system reflects the manner or standard against which its actions are judged by shareholders, customers, suppliers, employees and society at large. Organisational culture provides its members with a sense of identity and belonging and encourages commitment greater than that held by the individuals themselves. Notwithstanding its positive outcomes, an organisation’s culture can also prove to be a major obstacle to change, tolerance and diversity. In mergers changing the culture of the organisation is extremely difficult as it frequently demands a transformation of the soul of the organisation. Cultural change can be facilitated by:

- Modelling the new behaviour and roles by top management;
- Generating new stories, rituals and symbols to replace those currently in existence;
- Supporting and promoting employees who hold desired values;
- Selecting new employees who support the values of the organisation;
- Aligning reward systems to reinforce the desired values and behaviours;
Replacing informal norms with formal rules and procedures supporting desired behaviours; and

As a last resort to transfer, use job rotation and terminations as a means to break up existing negative subcultures (Anstey, 2006(a): 360-362).

Fubini et al (2007: 46) state that “almost every manager affirms the pivotal importance of culture in mergers, but the agreement ends there”. They state that it is better to focus on establishing a performance culture in the organisation where managers and employees collaborate effectively together in creating value for their customers.

**Competitive competencies**

Anstey (2006(a): 362) supports Fubini et al’s (2007:62) stance of building a culture of performance, in other words a culture of delivery if the organisation wants to survive in a competitive environment. Building a performance culture and ensuring a sustainable competitive advantage for the organisation means:

- Translating the organisation’s vision into measurable objectives and thus laying a platform for stretch;
- Implementing a philosophy of *kaizen* /continuous improvement / total quality management (TQM) during all stages of product development inclusive of the after sales-service supported by the necessary personnel training and reward systems;
- Encouraging entrepreneurial skills; and

**Coherent strategy (workable plan)**

The organisation’s strategy describes how it intends to create value for its shareholders, customers and citizens (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 4). Kaplan and Norton (2004:10) suggest four guiding questions to be asked to implement a workable plan, namely:

- If we succeed, how will we look to our stakeholders (financial perspective);
- To achieve our vision, how must we look to our customers (customer perspective);
• To satisfy our customers, at which processes must we excel (internal perspective); and
• To achieve our vision, how must the organisation learn and grow (learning and growth perspective)?

Process thinking is critical to effective restructuring and as Hammer and Champy (1993: 32) state, it is a “radical redesign of business processes to achieve dramatic improvement in critical contemporary measures of performance such as cost, quality, service and speed”.

Transformation of organisations is complex. Mergers for example require the continuation of existing services while developing new services and as Anstey so rightly states “people have to drive on the bridge while they are building it” (Anstey, 2006 (a): 364). The systemic nature of organisations also demands that the change process must be managed along many tracks simultaneously whilst at the same time understanding the interaction between the subsystems and the system as a whole. Too often there is failure to recognize the ripple effects that are created as a result of fiddling with one or other subsystem of the organisation. In university mergers for example, the realities of financial constraints may dictate rationalisation in staffing and increases in student fees precisely at a moment when there is a need to motivate staff and present a new brand of students to the wider public (Anstey, 2006 (a): 342).

It is vital for an organisation to operate through integrative strategies across business units and systems and across functional silos during the phase of restructuring to achieve the desired outcomes. Fundamental to the success of the whole process is a system of effective communication and consultation.

*Communication and consultation*

Anstey (2006 (a): 374-375) says that organisations experience more tensions with regard to their decision-making systems in times of change. Questions such as the following need to be answered:
• Who decides that the organisation needs to change?
• Who determines its direction?
• Who decides on its new structure?
• Who will manage the effects of the change process on the people in this new organisation?
• How will control be managed, will it be centralised or decentralised?
• What principles will guide the decision-making process?
• Who will make the decisions and drive the organisation at strategic and operational levels?
• How participative will the change management process be?
• How participative will the decision-making process of the future organisation be?
• Which communication processes will be followed?

Adding to the complexity of how inclusive the communication and consultation process should be, management is confronted with the fact that participative management is ill defined. Managers fear loss of authority and control if they implement a participative management style especially as they are faced with greater accountability in delivering organisational goals. Trade unions on the other hand fear co-option onto relevant forums and meetings and becoming rubber stamps of management decisions even though they demanded greater disclosure of information and consultation over transformational issues. Employees tend to blame superiors for not listening to them but resisting responsibility for workplace management (Anstey (2006 (a): 375, 379). Although labour legislation plays a major role with regard to rights in the workplace, the design of the decision-making systems in the organisation will ultimately determine aspects such work climate, the power to influence decision-making and the quality of an organisation’s services.

2.5 Aligning human resource systems

A major challenge of those leading the transformation process is expressed in the term alignment, thus bringing it all together in the right direction and at the right place (Anstey (2006 (a): 379). Christensen (2006: 62-63, 72) calls this the role of the organisational architect, a person who is an effective systems thinker. He states that the contribution of the organisational architect is to manage the alignment of customer needs, business strategy, organisational objectives, processes, systems and structures. This person should therefore be conversant with the workings of the entire organisation. In so doing the organisational architect sees the inter-connectiveness of the various discrete elements and should therefore be able to influence the relationship between each of the critical systems
and processes to identify what needs to be done to improve the performance of the system as a whole. The organisational architect is therefore challenged to influence management to take the same broad view and not to be constrained by inertia in avoiding implementation of the needed change in individual silos or in the system as a whole.

Anstey’s [2006(b)] strategy planning map (see Figure 5) provides an example for aligning the human resource systems of an organisation. This map emphasizes the following:

- Translation of the organisation’s vision into measurable objectives (financial, customer, internal business processes, learning and growth);
- Identification of capacity, resources, constraints and opportunities;
- Development and implementation of the appropriate strategies in human resource planning to achieve the business objectives of the organisation;
- Alignment of the organisational and human resource systems (staffing, learning and development, organisational development, performance management and rewards) with the organisational strategic plan;
- Management of structures, policies, procedures, technology, change agent and culture;
- Management of employee relations;
- Implementation of relevant legislation.
## Purpose:
**Organisational Mission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity &amp; Resources</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Constraints &amp; Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational design and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Processes and structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal business processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture, Climate &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specification of competencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>materials, information &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource Planning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce planning to numbers &amp; skills; business change drivers; future demand; gap analysis; staffing plans; development plans; change management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Learning &amp; development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>Induction &amp; orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal staffing &amp; placement</td>
<td>Employee development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleague relations</td>
<td>Career Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary &amp; flexible staffing</td>
<td>Learning networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competency networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competency models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competency assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competency development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic / change agent</td>
<td>Strategic / change agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee relations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grievance &amp; discipline handling; counselling; termination of contracts; work / life programmes; employee morale &amp; retention monitoring; health management; community relations; collective bargaining; participative systems / joint strategic planning &amp; relationship building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Laws</th>
<th>Relevant Laws</th>
<th>Relevant Laws</th>
<th>Relevant Laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity Act</td>
<td>Skills Development Act</td>
<td>Employment Equity Act</td>
<td>Labour Relations Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Conditions of Employment Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** **Strategy planning map**
2.6 **Summary**

This chapter focused on measuring the effect of organisational transformation. Frustrated by the inadequacies of traditional performance measurement systems, executives needed a balanced presentation of measures that would allow them to view their organisations from several perspectives simultaneously. An integration of the work of major change theorists as well as the balanced scorecard approach of Kaplan and Norton is found in Anstey’s conceptual framework. A balanced scorecard approach links people, strategy and performance while simultaneously providing management with a fast and comprehensive view of their whole organisation. The next chapter will focus on mergers in higher education.
CHAPTER 3: MERGERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1 Introduction

Eastman and Lang (2001: 3-4) state that major reforms and transformation took place during the 1980s and 1990s throughout Western democracies. These reforms included merging government departments, municipalities and even hospitals. In the higher education environment universities were not excluded from these transformation processes. Some smaller universities merged themselves into comprehensive institutions while others were forced to merge by government design. In a highly competitive global environment with its emphasis on new information technologies and competition for quality services and products, universities had to adapt or die. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the newly established Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in the period 2003 to 2007. Aspects that will be addressed are the following, namely the motivation to merge, the merger process and the challenges the university faced during this early developmental period.

3.2 Motivation to merge

Throughout most of history wherever possible higher education institutions have “gone it alone” they appeared to be jealous of their independence and aloof in their relationships with other institutions. Universities were however not immune to the merger virus that plagued most organisations during the late twentieth century. It is estimated that at least five hundred mergers have occurred in the public higher education sector in developed nations since the 1990s. More than ever before governments and corporations are expecting universities to respond to the needs of students and society, thus becoming more accountable for their performance. Universities thus have to compete for students, grants, contracts and donations and become more innovative in generating funds for education and research (Eastman and Lang 2001: 5-6).

The dominant theme in research literature about mergers reveals that the motives for governments merging higher education institutions include aspects such as building capacity, improving efficiency, racial desegregation and achieving economies of scale (Eastman and Lang 2001: 5). Eastman and Lang (2001: 11) further state that mergers
will probably not be undertaken if adequate financial, physical and human resources are available unless the merger is motivated by a political agenda. This was seen in South Africa when the South African government announced its final plans to restructure institutions of higher education after the publication of the Higher Education White paper 3 that outlined a framework for the transformation of higher education in July 1997; the National Plan for Higher Education in March 2001; the report on Restructuring of Higher Education by the National Working Group in January 2002 and the publication of Government Notice 855 of 21 June 2002 entitled “Transformation and Restructuring: a New Institutional Landscape for Higher Education”. This restructuring process meant a reduction in the number of institutions of higher education from 36 to 21 through a process of mergers or incorporations. (Ndung’u, 2007: 5-6). The legal framework for the restructuring process in South Africa can be found in sections 20-25 of the Higher Education Act (101/97) as amended, the Labour Relations Act (66/95) as amended and the Standard Institutional Statute. Section 23 of the Higher Education Act clearly outlines the steps to be taken by the Minister in merging two or more public higher educational institutions and section 24 deals with incorporations (Anstey, 2006(c): 4). The motivation for restructuring higher education in South Africa was threefold, namely: to meet the demands of social justice; to address the challenges of globalisation and to ensure that the country’s limited resources were effectively and efficiently utilized. The National Plan for Higher Education further translated into five strategic objectives, namely to:

- Increase access and produce graduates with skills and competencies to meet the needs of the country;
- Improve equity of access and outcomes in order to redress past inequalities thus ensuring that staff and student profiles reflect the demographics of the South African society;
- Promote diversity in the institutional landscape through programme differentiation to meet national and regional needs for knowledge and skills;
- Build high level research capacity and promote research linked to national developmental needs;
- Build new institutional identities and organisational forms by restructuring the institutional landscape of the higher education system in order to transcend the fragmentation, inequalities and inefficiencies of an apartheid past and to enable the formation of South African institutions consistent with the vision and values
of a non-racial, non-sexist democratic society (Department of Education, 2001, 2002).

The Department of Education clearly identified its intended outcome for institutional mergers in the following statement: “...it is important to emphasize that substantive integration involves much more than the formal adoption of new policies, procedures and structures. It requires ensuring that new policies, procedures and structures give rise to the creation of a new institution in the full meaning of the term, that is, real integration with a new institutional culture and ethos that is more than the sum of its parts. It cannot be based on the culture and ethos of the stronger partner in the merger process. This would be a recipe for disaster... in short, it requires a commitment from all institutions to accept that the merger process is a process between equals irrespective of the current strengths and weaknesses of the merging institutions” (Department of Education, 2002: 35).

It is also interesting to note that Fubini et al (2007: 109) define a merger of equals as a merger where the people issues of achieving a fair/equitable/merit-based balance between the two sides’ personnel, processes, systems and so forth are central to its success. They emphasize that in their experience mergers between equals were much more difficult to achieve as the managers were usually tempted to maintain the identities of their predecessor companies (Fubini et al, 2007: 24).

In a document entitled “Higher education restructuring and transformation: guidelines for mergers and incorporations” the Ministry of Education provided additional information on how the multiple aspects of these mergers should be addressed. This document discussed issues such as:

- Staff planning and restructuring;
- Conditions of service;
- Harmonization of human resource policies and procedures;
- Relations with trade unions and staff associations;
- Process, sequence and timing of the merger;
- Academic planning, quality assurance and research (Department of Education, 2003).

The Minister made the change process obligatory for institutions of higher education and according to Anstey (2006(c): 12) this created either a no-choice urgency, a constructive
unease amongst the majority of people affected or generated commitment to the transformation drive. Thus once the decision that institutions had to merge was made by Parliament, institutions were left to formulate the logistics of the merger for themselves.

3.3 Creating the NMMU

3.3.1 Establishing the Joint Management Core Group (JMCG)

Prior to the merger, the East Cape boasted five university campuses (Fort Hare, Port Elizabeth, Transkei, Rhodes and a satellite of Vista university), and three Technikons - now called universities of technology (Port Elizabeth, Boarder and Eastern Cape). A directive was issued by the Department of Education to merge the University of Port Elizabeth (UPE), the Port Elizabeth campus of Vista University (VU) and the PE Technikon (PET). This was followed by Notice number 863 in Government Gazette No 23550 of 24 June 2002 in terms of the Higher Education Act (101/97) confirming the establishment of a single comprehensive institution for the UPE, VU and PET. In a letter dated 25 June 2002 from the Minister to the Chair of the Council, the Council was invited ‘to make representations on my proposal’ by no later than 4 October 2002. After a process of internal consultation the institution agreed in principle to the merger subject to a number of pre-conditions, namely to Section 3 of the memorandum and particularly to Sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5. These conditions were:

- That the new institution displayed the curricular characteristics of what was termed an ‘engaged university’ with emphasis on professionally oriented education and not mechanically putting ‘university’ and ‘technikon’ types of curricula together into one institution.
- In order to link this ‘engaged university’ with the immediate metropolitan environment and to reflect the required level of academic integrity and international institutional currency its designation should contain the word ‘university’.
- Participating institutions should not be expected to pay for the debt (if such debt existed) from the other participating parties.
- The new institution should safeguard the immediate job prospects of staff in the participating institutions by guaranteeing that no programme of job retrenchments should be embarked upon. Staff rationalization, should be managed in terms of natural attrition, freezing and voluntary severance packages if necessary.
The need to provide maximum job security for all staff necessitated reasonable timeframes to drive the merger successfully (University of Port Elizabeth Report R/116/02).

The energy for the organisational change was thus triggered by an awareness that the system could no longer continue in its present form, a situation described in Anstey’s conceptual framework as constructive unease: harnessed urgency (Anstey, 2006(a): 346). Conscious of the larger mission of restructuring higher education nationally and regionally a Joint Management Core Group (group of five members from UPE, VU and PET) was established. Anstey (2006(c): 10) states that nobody was appointed to the leadership role and that the position could only be assumed through a negotiated process. The JMCG became the guiding coalition of leaders during the merger (Kotter (2003) in Anstey, 2006 (c): 10). In conformity with the statute this Group proposed to redress the historical inequalities of an apartheid education system including language barriers; to promote equity; to achieve more effective and efficient use of resources; to achieve greater responsiveness to developmental needs; to consolidate and articulate existing academic programmes and to develop new programmes to address regional and national needs. Aspects such as promoting student access, increasing mobility and throughput rates, building and strengthening research capacities were also included. As a Comprehensive Institution the new university would offer both university-type and technikon-type programmes thus providing articulation possibilities for its students between the different programmes (Department of Education, 2001:26; Memorandum of Agreement, 2003: 1).

Fubini et al (2007: 8) emphasize the importance of preparing well for a merger by naming the top team at the outset of the merger in order to provide leadership to the process. They warn that recovery from a poor start may be impossible to rectify at a later stage.

The new Comprehensive Institution comprising the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth campus of Vista University and the PE Technikon mapped its future as follows. In the first phase the Port Elizabeth campus of the Vista University had to be incorporated into UPE by the end of 2004 in terms of Section 20 to 24 of the Higher Education Act, transferring all its assets, liabilities and responsibilities to the University
of Port Elizabeth. In the second phase UPE merged with the PE Technikon in 2005 to establish the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (Anstey, 2006(c): 11).

The first structure that was established during the initial stages of the merger was the Joint Management Core Group. The Joint Management Core Group was established to drive the process and to give effect to the merger. The next step was to put a Memorandum of Agreement on the table to provide a road map for this process.

3.3.2 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

Anstey (2006(c): 10) states that the Joint Management Core Group spent a few months negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement. The MOA was accepted by the JMCG on 2 June 2003. The purpose of the Memorandum of Agreement was to:

- Facilitate cooperation between the parties (UPE, VU and PET) and to ensure that operational decisions did not adversely impact on the operational and organisational integrity of the Comprehensive Institution; and to
- Create a framework of understanding to guide parties’ behaviour in their efforts to create a new multi-campus Comprehensive Institution (Memorandum of Agreement, 2003: 3).

The parties to the Memorandum of Agreement committed themselves to full, transparent, proactive and timely disclosure of all material information to facilitate the merger as well as joint decision-making in all matters pertaining to the merger. It was also decided that parties to the process would contribute as equal partners to the process. The parties agreed that co-operation and joint decision-making would cover at least the following matters and where necessary to integrate and/or create new:

- Student and staff databases;
- Academic and research programmes;
- Management and organisational structures, financial administration systems including budgeting and payroll systems, bank accounts and financial controls;
- HR policies, practices and procedures including dispute resolution mechanisms, change training and the establishment of counselling centres.
They also decided to:

- Place a moratorium on staff appointments and promotions prior to the date of incorporation into the merger unless with prior arrangement by the relevant parties;
- Rationalise staff only when necessary;
- Negotiate new service contracts;
- Establish a Joint Management Core Group to oversee the merger and to give effect to the Memorandum of Agreement;
- Establish a Joint Merger Office responsible for developing and managing the detailed process necessary to give effect to the merger;
- Establish inter-institutional task teams; and
- Expect commitment by relevant parties to carry out all facets of the merger with due diligence (Memorandum of Agreement, 2003: 4-8; Ndung’u, 2007: 11).

The merging parties further committed themselves to “The creation of a new multi-campus Comprehensive Institution which will have its own identity, values and programmes based on what is best for society and the nation and through a process of joint design will offer high quality, cost effective higher education to the Nelson Mandela Metropole and beyond... and to create such a Comprehensive Institution in a manner which creates minimal disruption to students and staff involved, and attracts and retains quality staff and students” (Memorandum of Agreement, 2003: 1).

3.3.3 Joint Task Teams (JTTs)

Two categories of Joint Task Teams were established. The first category of task teams was established in terms of the Memorandum of Agreement and the other category attended to specialized focus areas. Eighteen task teams were established to address issues such as: strategic planning, governance, organisational structures, academic programmes, academic and educational development, library services, research administration, development and support, academic engagement, student services, sport, academic administration, communications and marketing, computer services, finance and financial administration, technical and operational support services, equity and transformation and human resources. The Joint Task Teams were assisted in the performance of their job by the formulation of guidelines to assist in the process as well as advising them not to declare any disputes. Their role was seen as developers for
decision-making at other levels in the system, to promote a cooperative problem-solving mindset and to avoid stalling the process of the merger (Ndung’u, 2007: 12).

### 3.3.4 Merger Office

A merger website [www.pemergera.za](http://www.pemergera.za) was launched in February 2004 to provide information on the merger to staff, students and the general public. According to the Memorandum of Agreement a merger office had to be established. This office was established in June 2004. The merger office had the responsibility to develop plans for consideration by the Joint Management Core Group and to coordinate the detailed processes to give effect to the merger. The office was staffed with a project manager, merger coordinators from each merging institution and two administrative personnel (Ndung’u, 2007:13). The merger coordinators developed guidelines to assist in the operation of the Joint Task Teams. This included defining the role of the Joint Task Teams and their contribution to the larger merging process, clarifying their reporting system and fit with the Joint Management Core Group, outlining steps for effective operations and offering a set of guiding principles (Anstey, 2006(c): 10).

### 3.3.5 Establishment of an Interim Council Elect

Anstey (2006 (c): 11-12), one of the merger coordinators, stated that the merger created its own set of legal and organisational realities leaving the actors on the ground to sort out the confusion. Legally Vista as an institution was dissolved and its campuses distributed to other universities in the country, UPE thus absorbing a part of a dissolving institution. To complicate matters even further the Vista campus was being closed but its programmes had to be continued for registered students, and staff had to continue on their existing terms and conditions of service – a staff and student pipeline reality.

The fact that only one campus of the Vista University was incorporated into the NMMU created challenges as some representatives saw this as a two party rather than a three party merger process. Some representatives for example resisted the idea of Vista being represented in the Interim Council and stated that their participation had to occur through UPE as it was a two party incorporation process (UPE and Vista) followed by a two party merger process (UPE and PET). The problem was eventually resolved by requesting
both UPE and PET to each forward a Vista nominee for the interim council to the Minister. In January 2005 an Interim Council was established.

3.3.6 **Champions at all levels**

Establishing leadership and driving the merger had its own set of challenges. Anstey (2006(c): 13) states that it would have been wiser if the Minister had appointed *leadership* early in the process as it would have reduced the politics between councils and existing leaders instead of leaving it to the different parties to negotiate. This negotiation demanded negotiation at every stage of the process, which would ultimately have an effect on the futures of the relevant executive officers as well. The negotiated process was initiated by negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement in which the team made certain guarantees to each other with regard to the manner in which they behaved during the merger. The Minister also clearly indicated that no single institution should dominate the process. This negotiated process was challenging as each organisation had its own council with different styles and policies to report to, its own tracts of education, its own culture and staff that had to be motivated and mobilized. Anstey (2006(c): 15) adds that “desirable as it may be a unified top team is unlikely in practice”.

Adding to the complexity of the matter is the fact that academics are generally a very difficult group to lead as they are trained to question, to demand rationality, to debate before acting, are resistant to concepts of commercialism of education and value the idea of their own independence very strongly (Anstey, 2006(c): 13-14).

3.3.7 **Clear purpose: customer-focused mission**

The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University primarily serves the population of the Nelson Mandela Metropole and its region. The population profile is mainly that of poverty with poorly educated parents, poor facilities and support systems at home particularly for students pursuing advanced studies. Most of the students come from a seriously under-performing secondary school system thus requiring lots of patchwork and the introduction of foundational and other support systems to bridge the gap.

Anstey (2006(c): 15-16) argues that students are the products of university systems and that universities are judged by the competence of its graduates and its ability to generate
new knowledge to society. The competence of a university’s graduates and its capacity to generate new knowledge ultimately define a university as an institution of excellence or not. It thus means that universities must look beyond their students to those who employ their graduates to determine their graduates’ marketability. In a competitive global economy employers expect their employees to be better educated, to be problem solvers, to be more productive and creative, as this will significantly improve their competitive advantage. Wolf (2005:176, 241) supports this statement by saying that competitive economies need access to good infrastructure, educated labour and an ability to obtain competitive prices to advance in a global economy. Employers thus expect educational institutions to produce the candidates they require. The challenge that the NMMU faces is to increase access of the students coming from a seriously under-performing secondary school system and to produce graduates with skills and competencies to meet national and international demands.

3.3.8 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives

Anstey (2006(c): 19) argues that higher educational institutions face a dilemma as they seek a competitive advantage in the delivery to their customers but at the same time have to conform to national standards. He adds, the more the architects of higher education seek uniformity for purposes of standardization, articulation and mobility across institutions the less important issues such as customization, innovation, and differentiation become. Customization, innovation and differentiation are those important aspects that define an institution’s identity as they also provide for that competitive advantage an institution of higher education seeks locally and internationally to attract the best students and personnel to its programmes.

Recognizing these challenges representatives of the councils, senates, student bodies, trade unions and management across the three organisations (UPE VU and PET) met in November 2003 to develop a new mission, vision and purpose statement for the new University (see Annexure B). The base work for the task of formulating a new mission, vision and purpose statement for the new university was taken on by the Strategic Planning Joint Task Team and then sent to the Joint Management Core Group where further refinement was done before rolling it out across both internal and external stakeholders for further modification. In addition to this the Communications and
Marketing Joint Task Team worked on the branding of the new institution (Anstey, 2006(c): 19-20).

Anstey (2006(c): 20), Nair (2004: 47) and Becker et al (2001:41) state that an effective vision should be capable of translation into clear objectives or goals that should be measurable. Kaplan and Norton (1996, 2000, 2002, 2004) made important contributions in this regard with their balanced scorecard approach as it links people, strategy and performance. The balanced scorecard thus enables an organisation to focus not only on the financial elements of its value chain, but also on the customer business processes, learning and growth elements (Boninelli & Meyer, 2004: 76-77). The following explanation clarifies some of these issues as they relate to the merger.

3.3.8.1 Financial objectives

Anstey (2006(c): 20-21) states that the restructuring process for higher education lacked a proper cost benefit analysis. He identified the following financial challenges of the new institution:

- Universities in South Africa receive their funding from the government and there is a clear indication that this funding will be reduced. Even though there is a push for greater access for students, indications are that the government intends to cap student enrolment at institutions in future.
- As universities are also pushed to access larger numbers of students they lack the ability to pay for their tuition. This limits a university’s ability to generate revenue from student fees and will increase the likelihood of student protest action should any such action be initiated in future.
- The shift in medical aid policies and the poor performance of pension funds have also forced employers to assume greater responsibility for the higher liability from their employees in this domain thus placing a greater demand for sound financial management practices.
- The unacceptably high proportional cost of personnel to the payroll (about 70%) in comparison with the overall operating costs of the organisation has also forced the NMMU to initiate strategies to curb costs and to implement additional/third stream income generating projects.
- The different financial management policies across the merging institutions have also forced the new institution to start with a sizable debt of almost R217m in
respect of post-retirement liabilities and over R119m in interest bearing borrowings (see Table 1). This debt would naturally impact on the financial planning and management of the newly consolidated institution as well as the immediate wage negotiations leading up into the merger. Anstey (2006(c): 22) adds that if the harmonization of conditions of service across the merging institutions is also taken into consideration then it seems as though the new institution will find it difficult to attract, retain and motivate its employees. This may even translate into downsizing with the result that employees coming from the relative financially sound organisations find themselves casualties of their merging partners.

Table 1: Summary of consolidated financial liability of NMMU (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>UPE (excluding VU)</th>
<th>PET</th>
<th>NMMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-employment medical benefit</td>
<td>R95 800 000</td>
<td>R53 879 000</td>
<td>R149 679 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension scheme</td>
<td>R20 459 000</td>
<td>R27 552 000</td>
<td>R48 011 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for leave pay</td>
<td>R5 937 000</td>
<td>R13 297 000</td>
<td>R19 234 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total post-retirement benefits</td>
<td>R122 196 000</td>
<td>R94 728 000</td>
<td>R216 924 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing borrowings</td>
<td>R29 160 000</td>
<td>R90 261 000</td>
<td>R119 421 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdraft</td>
<td>R0</td>
<td>R10 670 000</td>
<td>R10 670 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>R203 512 000</td>
<td>R143 203 000</td>
<td>R346 715 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted reserves funds</td>
<td>-R58 025 000</td>
<td>-R60 597 000</td>
<td>-R118 622 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted reserve funds</td>
<td>R114 043 000</td>
<td>R11 952 000</td>
<td>R125 995 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anstey (2006(c): 21)

3.3.8.2 Customer objectives

Customers’ needs generally fall into four categories, namely time, quality, performance and service, and cost (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 128-129). Kaplan and Norton (2004: 89) state that the definition of quality has lately shifted from conforming to specifications, to meeting the customers’ individual expectations. The question can then be asked: Who is the targeted customer of this newly established Comprehensive Institution of higher education and what are the expectations? A comprehensive institution by definition seeks to be more things to more people and as Anstey (2006(c): 22) so rightly states, a situation that many business organisations seek to avoid as it leads to confusion over core business, problems in branding and lack of focus over what really has to be done to acquire a competitive advantage in the market. He further states that there is a powerful argument that if an organisation does not develop focus around
centres of excellence in a focused way they will drift into mediocrity. Organisations are also realising that it is far less expensive to retain customers than to continually add new ones to replace those who defect. Loyal customers value the quality and service they receive and committed customers convey their satisfaction to others. The highest form of loyalty occurs when customers take on ownership behaviour for a company/organisation’s products and services. This could even include active participation in the design of new programmes and/or supplying recommendations on improving service delivery (Kaplan and Norton, 2004: 116-117). The questions that the NMMU should then ask are:

- Who are our customers, is this only students or does it also include all relevant stakeholders, actual and potential employers, donors and the government as well?
- How do we delight them?
- What are the focus/niche areas?
- Which faculties/departments/schools/units have to be improved to achieve the abovementioned results?

3.3.8.3 Internal business process objectives

Transformation in this area rotates around business processes and organisational restructuring with the primary focus to deliver better quality products (students and programmes) and services to customers (students, stakeholders, employers, donors and the government) at a reduced cost with greater efficiency and effectiveness (Anstey, 2006(c): 23). The internal process objectives relate to delivering value to students and the community by:

- Demanding instructional effectiveness and research development (personnel training and use of technology) of all academic personnel;
- Creating adequate facilities (classrooms, computer and other laboratories, sport facilities and libraries);
- Implementing support services (student accommodation, student counselling and career management services, loans and bursaries, bridging programmes, transport and safety); and
- Providing efficient and effective administrative processes to support the abovementioned services and facilities.
In order to give effect to the abovementioned processes new institutional rules were approved at a meeting of the Interim Council on 20 November 2004. Together with the Higher Education Act (101/97) and the Standard Institutional Statute, these rules would provide the main regulatory framework within which the NMMU would function. The following was also approved, namely, a standard set of accounting policies and the Committee Framework for the new academic year (Communique, 30 November 2004).

Anstey (2006(c): 24) states that the three institutions were also required to review their academic programmes to search for synergies, to eliminate overlaps, to seek routes between courses and tracks to facilitate mobility between previously distinct academic programme tracts and to search for a new programme and qualification mix. The last mentioned inevitably interfaces with the innovation drive of the university to satisfy customers at all levels, as new offerings have to be relevant, accessible, affordable, quality focused and to translate into career paths for students.

The restructuring process of a merger was a complicated process, as it had to integrate the structures of the NMMU, VU and the PET that originally had their own management structures. Anstey (2006(c): 24) advises organisations to fulfill the purpose for which they were established and that structure should always follow strategy. He states that the strategy should deliver to the purpose/mission statement of the university and that the organisational vision should translate into measurable objectives. At an institutional Bosberaad in February 2004 a broad initial structure was formulated and one of the Joint Task Teams was tasked to design the organisational structure for the merged university taking into account that it operated across six campuses (South, North, Second Avenue, Bird Street, Vista and George) with nine faculties at the PET and the six faculties at UPE. The Joint Task Team was guided in their organisational design by the following principles; they had to ensure that they adhere to legal requirements; avoid deep hierarchies; avoid a federal system; create a top structure that was proportionate with the core functions of the university, create coherent academic structures; use nationally and internationally coherent nomenclature; support a performance management system through manageable reporting lines; support vertical and horizontal networks to ensure integration; ensure financial stability; avoid duplication of services; maximize resources and use technology optimally; consider each institution’s unique strengths; consider the position and needs of all sites as well as that of the George satellite campus; support coordination and co-operation between all sites including the satellite campus; avoid
vested interests; consider pipeline programme realities whilst ensuring continuation of all current services, thus driving on the bridge while building it (Anstey 2006(c): 25; Anstey 2006(a): 364).

The Joint Task Team made proposals for a top management structure of an interim vice – chancellor, three deputy vice – chancellors (academic; research, technology and innovation; planning and quality); a registrar; and three executive directors (students; finance and facilities; organisational transformation and human resources). Proposals were also made for seven faculties (Business and Economic Sciences, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, Humanities, Law and Science). These proposals were supported by the Joint Management Core Group and approved by the Interim Council Elect. The next step in the process was the appointment of the Interim Vice – Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor of UPE was appointed to the position as the Vice-Chancellor of the PET decided not to participate in the process. The appointment of an Interim Vice – Chancellor had immediate benefits for the newly established university as it made a person directly accountable to operationalise the merger (Anstey 2006(c): 25). Following the appointment of the Interim Council and Vice Chancellor, the university embarked on the process to appoint and integrate personnel for the rest of the university.

The implications of a structure of seven faculties had immediate implications for the 19 deans (9 at PET; 6 at UPE and 4 incorporated from VU but no longer officially in the position of deans) (Anstey 2006(c): 26). This process also snowballed to the rest of the institution as some departments had to merge resulting in an oversupply of personnel in some areas and the necessity of creating new jobs in others. The number of permanent posts allocated to departments was determined and all personnel (academic and non-academic) had to reapply for the available posts. The appointment process started from top to bottom. Faculties were staffed one by one by first appointing all permanent personnel for each department. It was also clearly emphasized that this appointment process would not be an opportunity for any promotion except where new posts were created.

Concerning the contracts of employment and the rights and obligations of employers and employees, section 21(5) and section 23 and of the Higher Education Act (101/97) state that contracts of employment and the rights of employers and employees are automatically transferred to the new employer. These sections also dovetail with the
Labour Relations Act (66/95) concerning employment issues. As a surplus of employees was created in some areas a reduction in the workforce became necessary. In South Africa an employer who contemplates dismissing employees for operational reasons has to follow section 189 of the Labour Relations Act (66/95). Section 189 of the Labour Relation Act (66/99) states that:

- Both procedural and substantive obligations are placed on the employer to consult and to seek joint consensus on, amongst other things, appropriate measures to avoid dismissals;
- The employer has to disclose information relevant to the consultation;
- If one or more employees are selected for dismissal, criteria for their selection must be agreed upon with the consultative parties;
- Selected criteria for dismissal must be neutral and exclude any form of unfair discrimination;
- Consensus is reached on severance pay;
- If employees are dismissed for operational requirements preference should be given to these employees if the employer contemplates hiring employees in future on condition that they possess comparable qualifications;
- The employer informs the employee and relevant trade union / s of the decision.

Jansen (2002:172) states that the impact of mergers is usually “devastating for the emotional and professional lives of staff” especially if their careers are ended or redirected and if their views and interests are simply overrun by government policy.

Another challenge that faced the new institution was the harmonization of conditions of service. During the writing up of this study much still needed to be harmonized. See Table 2 below.
Table 2: Challenges with regard to the harmonization of the conditions of service between UPE, VU and PET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions of service</th>
<th>UPE</th>
<th>Vista</th>
<th>PE Technikon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Salary scales attached to Peromnes job grades</td>
<td>• Salary scales attached to Levels Job Grades</td>
<td>• Salary scales attached to Peromnes job grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Salary ranges different to Vista’s</td>
<td>• Do not receive annual personal increments</td>
<td>• Salary ranges different to Vista’s and UPE’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual personal increments either April or October until max of scale is reached (under revision – to be replaced by performance management linked increases)</td>
<td>• Salary scales adjusted annually with agreed percentage as negotiated between unions and management</td>
<td>• Annual personal increments in the actual incremental month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Salary scales adjusted annually with agreed percentage as negotiated between unions and management</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Salary scales adjusted annually with agreed percentage as negotiated between unions and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-pensionable</td>
<td>• Non-pensionable</td>
<td>Non-pensionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R11 604 pa for permanent full-time employees and R7 176 pa for permanent part-time employees</td>
<td>• R16 950 pa for permanent and Contract staff earning R69 213 and above. 75% of salary for staff earning below R69 213 pa</td>
<td>Home Owners Allowance: Lecturer – HOD and Peromnes 9 - 4 = R805.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Lecturer and Peromnes 13 - 10 = R665.00 pm Peromnes 18 – 14 = R415.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rental Allowance (i.e. all non-home owners): Peromnes 18 – 14 = R205.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All the rest = R270.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bonus</td>
<td>• 13th cheque</td>
<td>• 13th cheque</td>
<td>13th cheque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Payable in birthday month</td>
<td>• For staff Jan - Mar payable in April and staff having birthdays in April - Dec payable in their birthday month</td>
<td>• Payable in birthday month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tax deducted annually</td>
<td>• Tax deducted monthly</td>
<td>• Tax deducted annually (in bonus month)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprises 1 - 3 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Academic Manager allowances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travelling Allowances: Deans, Directors and Sport Department Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-pensionable and taxable</td>
<td>• Research travel = R87 per month for academic staff</td>
<td>Computer Services Staff (non-academic) 20% non – pensionable allowance pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Managers payable on annual appointment</td>
<td>• H.O.Ds R45 000 p.a. (R15 000 as research grant)</td>
<td>Computer Studies Staff = 10% non-pensionable allowance per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amounts range between R9 245 pa to R20 800 pa</td>
<td>• Campus Principal + Higher according to individual packages.</td>
<td>Acting Allowances: Staff up to Peromnes level 9 = In accordance with BEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amount payable determined on Peromnes points attached to post</td>
<td>• Computer Science Professional Allowance: R23 136 per annum differ in ranks (not allowed to claim overtime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Computer Centre consultants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-pensionable and taxable</td>
<td>• IT Professional Allowance: R29 202 per annum differ in ranks (not allowed to claim overtime 24 hour standby 7 days per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Either 10% allowances with 40 days annual leave (no long leave) or</td>
<td>Deans: Difference between R555 103 and staff members’ package p.a. Dean then gets paid the difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15% allowances with 27 days annual leave (no long leave) or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15% allowances with 30 days annual leave (no long leave) or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15% allowances with 36 days annual leave (no long leave) or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20% allowances with 21 days annual leave (no long leave)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.3 Acting allowance
- Acting for 4 consecutive weeks or longer
- 15% of own salary when acting on a higher grade
- 10% of own salary when acting on same grade
- 5% of own salary when acting on a lower grade
- Sub-Heads of an Academic Dept R217 per month for duration of acting (could act on a month to month basis or for a full 12 months)
- Acting for at least 3 months consecutively
- Maximum 6 months
- 1 Notch if the position is up to 2 post levels higher than person acting
- 2 Notches if the position is more than 2 post levels higher than person acting

### BENEFITS
#### 5. Pension
- Only permanent staff
- Employee contribution 7.5%
- Employer contribution 13.7%
- Retirement age 65 years
- Permanent and contract staff
- Employee contribution 7.5%
- Employer contribution 16%, made up as follows: Prov fund = 11%, Pension = 3%, 3 x Annual – funeral plan + admin cost
- Retirement age 60 years or early retirement 55 years. Should pensioners wish to work till the age of 65 years they have to write a letter of motivation to University Management, it will either be approved or not approved.
- Only permanent staff. Optional for staff on at least a 2 year contract
- Employer contribution = 16%
- Employee contribution = 8%
- Normal retirement age: 60 years; Early retirement from 55 years; Guarantee option (for those who qualify, from 60 years)
- Permanent medical disability: 60% of final salary
- Death benefit: 3 X annual salary – Monthly pension of 40% of final salary.

#### 6. Medical
- Two schemes available i.e. Lifemed (3 options) and Sizwe (2 options)
- Only permanent employees subsidised with 60%
- Subsidy continues on retirement for staff employed before 1 April 2001
- No retirement benefit for staff employed after 1 April 2001
- Bestmed (3 options)
- Permanent and temporary/full-time staff subsidised with 70%
- Retirement benefit for all staff – stay on subsidised medical aid after retirement
- Two schemes available i.e. Lifemed (3 options) and Bonitas (2 options)
- Staff subsidized either 60% or 50% (employment date 01/01/2002 and later).
- Subsidy continues after retirement/disability for all who were employed before 01/04/2002. No subsidy for the rest after retirement/disability
- Bestmed (3 options)
- Permanent and temporary/full-time staff subsidised with 70%
- Retirement benefit for all staff – stay on subsidised medical aid after retirement
- Two schemes available i.e. Lifemed (3 options) and Bonitas (2 options)
- Staff subsidized either 60% or 50% (employment date 01/01/2002 and later).
- Subsidy continues after retirement/disability for all who were employed before 01/04/2002. No subsidy for the rest after retirement/disability

#### 7. GLA
- Optional benefit
- 3x life cover (50% subsidised)
- Additional spouse cover (not subsidised)
- Additional disability cover (no subsidy)
- Condition of service benefit
- 4 x Annual Salary (full payment subsidised by Vista) - benefit taxable
- Spouse not covered
- Condition of service benefit
- 4 X annual salary for death or permanent disability (premium subsidized at 50%)
- 1 X annual salary for “dread disease cover” (diseases are specified)
- 1 X annual salary for spouse cover (life)

#### 8. Funeral
- None
- 1 month’s salary
- Provided on Lifemed and Bonitas for all members.

### LEAVE BENEFITS
#### Conditions of service UPE Vista PE Technikon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAVE PER ANNUM</th>
<th>Academic staff:</th>
<th>Administration / Academic &amp; contract staff: all levels</th>
<th>Administration / Academic &amp; contract staff: all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual leave</strong> (working days)</td>
<td>all levels</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>10 days accumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post levels 1 - 5</td>
<td>36 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post levels 6 - 8</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post levels 9 - 17</td>
<td>27 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accumulative Leave
10 days per annum (can be carried over and can be commuted for cash)
2. **Long leave**
   - Post levels 1 - 5: 11 days
   - Post levels 6 - 8: 10 days
   - Post levels 9 - 11: 5 days
   - Post levels 12 - 14: 3 days
   - Post levels 15 - 17: 2 days

3. **Compulsory accumulative leave**
   - Post levels 1 - 5: 3 days
   - Post levels 6 - 14: 2 days
   - Post levels 15 - 17: 1 day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Staff incl. Contract staff:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On termination of employment, annual leave not taken should be paid out (accumulative and non-accumulative leave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Research leave**
   - Academic staff only
     - Granted on a one-to-one basis when own leave is used for approved research purposes
     - To a maximum of 96 days
     - Contractual pay-back obligation
     - 16 days
   - No research leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave for study, sabbatical and research purposes. M and D studies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- granted on a one-to-one basis when own leave is used for approved purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undertaking re work back (period determined by Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum period of leave for study or research is one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate/Post – graduate (non-academics):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 22 days per leave cycle inclusive of exams (1:1 and agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M and D studies (non-academics):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 90 Working days (1:1 and agreement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Special Research leave**
   - Academic staff only
     - Granted on ad hoc basis if leave credits are inadequate
     - To a maximum of 192 days
     - Contractual pay-back obligation
     - Ad hoc
   - No special research leave, but special study leave is granted to an employee following a period of service as head of a department, clean or campus principal, but is not available during the last year of service.
     - For a lead of a department up to six months after serving a full term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Sick leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Cycle of</th>
<th>Leave Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>54 days (103 days) half pay and 54 days full pay for staff on post levels 1 – 14 appointed prior to 1 September 1995 receive 103 days full pay and 103 days half pay. Special dispensation for staff on post levels 1 – 14 appointed prior to 1 September 1995 receive 103 days full pay and 103 days half pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>120 days over a 3 year period (full pay) 120 days over a 3 year period (half pay) 120 days over a 3 year period (unpaid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Maternity leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Cycle of</th>
<th>Leave Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Staff</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 months paid and 1 month unpaid Subject to 12 months’ pensionable service 3 months paid; 1 month unpaid or accumulative leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Special leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Leave Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference/ papers/ seminars</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>Union activities: 20 days per annum collectively if it has less than 3 office bearers and 7 additional days for each additional office bearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport leave</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>Participation, representative, competitor, coach or manager, referee, official or judge. Represents PE – Technikon as coach/manager/participant of <em>bona fide</em> PE Technikon official sports meetings: 5 days Represents SA in any sport/cultural activity (coach/manager/participant) = 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study leave</td>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>3 days i.e. 2 days before the examination and the day of the examination. Examination purposes (any Technikon, university, technical college) Attending own graduation ceremony: 3 day if outside Metropole; 1 day if in PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibility leave</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>A maximum of 5 days will be granted for funerals (i.e. spouse, life-partner, adoptive parent, child, grandchild or sibling, parent or parent-in-law). A maximum of 10 days leave per annum may be given to an employee to take care of his / her sick child. Subject to 4 months’ service 3 Day’s paid leave: When the employee’s child is born or ill In the event of death of the employee’s spouse/life partner, parent, adoptive parent, dependants, child, adoptive child, grandchild or sibling legal spouse’s parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>5 working days and further period of absence on a day – to day basis for every days leave taken a debit of one working day is required. Overseas travel grant 15 working days in total and the further period of absence on a day – to day basis for every 2 days leave taken a debit of day is required. 10 days Shop Steward leave Subpoenaed as witness in court case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Unpaid leave
- On application, approved at discretion of management
- Continuation of benefits at full cost to employee

Ad hoc

On application

- On application, approved at discretion of management
- Continuation of benefits at full cost to employee

10. National safety
- For compulsory rendering of service for national security

Ad hoc

Not specified

Not specified

11. Project Specific
Fixed Term contract leave
- Annual leave only
  - Post levels 6 - 8: 30 days
  - Post levels 9 - 14: 27 days
  - Sick leave: 10 days

Not specified

Not specified

1.25 days per calendar month; paid out on termination only after 4 months’ service.

12. Recess leave
- Academic staff
  - As indicated in calendar of the University
  - Recess period extended over at least 44 working days per annum

At least 44 days per annum

30 days for academic staff only

- Academic staff
  - As indicated in Calendar of the Technikon
  - 50 working days per leave cycle: i.e. 40 days as vacation; 10 days academic development (scheduled during December)

OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions of service</th>
<th>UPE</th>
<th>Vista</th>
<th>PE Technikon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hours of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As determined by HOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administrative staff and laboratory technicians 08:00 – 12:45 &amp; 13:30 – 16:30 Mondays to Fridays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical and Service staff 07:30 – 12:45 &amp; 13:30 – 16:30 Mondays to Fridays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Library staff 08:00 – 12:30 and 13:30 – 16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Library after hours on rotation basis: 12:30 – 13:00, 13:00 – 13:30, 16:30 – 18:00 during recess and one Saturday every 6 weeks from 09:00 – 12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Afternoons off: every alternate week (on full salary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Core time of at least 5 hours per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration staff and Library: (choice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 07h30 - 16h00 with half hour lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 08h00 - 16h30 with half hour lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff Saturday working hours: 08h00 - 13h00 (shifts worked) and also during the week they have staff on shifts (as arranged by the Campus Librarian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Study benefits</td>
<td>Only at UPE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% for employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% for spouse of employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 0, 12.5, 25, 50, 75 or 100% for employee’s children depending on child’s income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 0, 50, 75 or 100% for retired employee’s children depending on years of service from 0 – 10, 10 – 15, 15 – 20, 20+ years respectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At PET:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100% for employee’s children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% of tuition fees for courses offered at UPE but enrolled elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 75% for courses not offered at UPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 75% of tuition fees for research orientated degrees at other universities if promoter or supervisor is attached to that institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If studying at foreign universities, equivalent of UPE fees paid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employee binds contractually to University for the same number of years as financial assistance granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If breach of contract or failure to complete course, money must be paid back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Studying at Vista: |
| • 100% of tuition fees for a full-time employee and his/her dependant/s. The employee is required to pay the registration fee. |

| Any other University or Technikon: |
| • 75% of the tuition fees and boarding fees at any University or Technikon in South Africa for employees’ dependants if employment date was before 1 October 1990. |
| • Employment after 1990 receives 75% tuition fees taxable for dependants/spouses. |

| Only at PE Technikon: |
| • 100% for staff, spouse and own dependent children |

| At UPE: |
| • 100% for employee’s children |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Long Service Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 10 years certificate only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21 years &amp; 30 years R2000 taxable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Financial recognition for higher qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Policy under revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No payments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Not stated |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Job evaluation &amp; grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Peromnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grade linked to approved compensation and leave benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Not stated |

| Only at PE Technikon: |
| • 100% for staff, spouse and own dependent children |

| At UPE: |
| • 100% for employee’s children |

Anstey (2006(c): 31)
The challenges with regard to the harmonization of conditions of service between UPE, VU and PET can be summarized as follows:

All three institutions attach their basic salary scales to Peromnes job grades and adjust their salary scales annually. Salary scales differ across the institutions but the details of these differences are not included in the information provided. A non-pensionable housing allowance is paid to employees of all three institutions but it differs across all three institutions on aspects such as the amount being paid out and whether the person is a permanent full-time, permanent part-time or contract employee. Job position according to Peromnes grade is also taken into consideration at the PET. Employees of all three institutions receive a 13th cheque either in their birthday month or in the payout quarter nearest to their birthday. Tax payable on this amount is deducted annually by UPE and PET and monthly at VU.

Great differences are present in the allocation of allowances. All three institutions pay allowances to academic managers and IT professional staff according to rank. Academic heads/managers are paid between R9245.00 and R45000.00. Provision is also made at all three institutions for acting allowances. These vary between a fixed monthly allowance of R217.00 at VU and the payment of a percentage of the person’s own salary depending on the notch/grade of the work performed. IT professional staff’s allowances vary between R23123.00 and R29202.00 (as a professional allowance with no overtime claims allowed). Or it may vary between 10-20% of an employee’s non-pensionable income with additional annual leave benefits. Deans and campus principles at the VU receive additional allowances. Travelling allowances are included at VU and PET.

Pension benefits are only payable to permanent staff at UPE and PET, VU include contract staff as well. Employee contributions to the fund differ between 7.5 and 8% and employer contributions between 13.7 and 16%. The retirement age for both VU and PET is 60 years of age and that of UPE 65 years.

Medical schemes options are available at all three institutions. At UPE only permanent staff are subsidized, VU subsidizes full time staff as well. At UPE the contribution to the subsidy is 60%, at PET between 50 – 60% depending on employment date and at VU the contribution is 70%. For both UPE and PET the employer’s subsidy only continues after
retirement if an employee was employed before 1 April 2001 and 1 April 2002 respectively.

Leave benefits differ across the different institutions. At the time of going to press UPE had an elaborate system according to which leave was calculated. This leave was subdivided into annual leave, long leave, compulsory accumulative leave, recess and research leave. This leave is allocated according to job grade and whether the person is an academic. PET allocates 30 days’ non-accumulative and 10 days’ accumulative leave per annum. Provision is also made for study, sabbatical and research leave. Little information is available on the leave options at VU and no provision is made for research leave.

Sick leave at all three institutions run in three year cycles except for academic staff at UPE whose sick leave runs in cycles of 4 years. Differences in the number of days according to which full pay, half pay and unpaid leave are given exist across all three institutions. All three institutions provide for 3 months of maternity leave. UPE provides for an additional 3 months of unpaid leave and VU and PET for one extra month. All three institutions make provision for special leave. This leave can be used for presenting papers at seminars, participating in and/or managing sport related activities. UV and PET make additional provision for labour representatives to attend meetings and workshops. UPE provides for 10 days of study leave per annum and VU for 3 days per examination. PET does not specify the amount of study leave to be taken for examination purposes but they limit the amount to be taken for graduation purposes to a maximum of 3 days if the employee has to attend his/her own graduation ceremony out of town. A 3 day family responsibility leave is available at UPE and PET, VU will extend this period to 5 days in the event of funerals. This privilege is limited to the staff member’s spouse/partner, children and parents. Unpaid leave is managed by all three institutions on application.

The hours of work for academic staff for UPE and PET is determined by the Head of the Department. VU expects their staff to be on duty for at least 5 hours per day. Administrative staff generally work from 08:00 to 16:30 with an afternoon off every alternate week at UPE and once a month at PET. Additional schedules are provided for library staff.
The study benefits for an employee at UPE are 100% and 50% for his/her spouse. Study benefits for children are dependent on the child’s income and on a retired member of staff’s years of service. VU and PET provide 100% benefit for staff, their spouses and own dependent children. In a staff satisfaction survey conducted in 2007 staff listed the excellent leave and study benefits as one of the most positive things of working at the NMMU (Barnard & Nel, 2007: 12).

Long Service Awards are presented to employees of all three institutions. UPE provides three certificates, namely at 10, 21 and 30 years of service with monetary compensation at 21 and 30 years of service. VU recognizes long service awards for every five years completed and PET recognizes its first award at 10 years of service there after every five years and a monetary compensation is attached to every award.

PET recognizes higher qualifications with monetary compensation and UPE’s policy is currently under revision.

Job grading and evaluation practices are linked to Peromnes grading at both UPE and PET. These grades are linked to approved compensation and leave benefits.

The abovementioned information reveals discrepancies exist in all areas of the conditions of service between UPE, VU and PET. Galpin and Herndon (1999:177) advise employers to plan effectively and to communicate staffing issues adequately during mergers so that unrealistic expectations are avoided as these issues can create major dissatisfaction and conflict.

Another challenge that faced the new institution was the harmonization of the different sites where programmes were presented. At an NMMU Council meeting in July 2005 final decisions were made concerning the location of various faculties and campuses in Port Elizabeth and George. The sites were the following:

- *Vista campus.* This campus would focus on the following: teacher upgrading programmes, particularly in science, mathematics and technology, professional development particularly for the legal profession, service to the surrounding communities through appropriate engagement actions such as entrepreneurial development. This campus would form the hub of NMMU’s system-wide access initiatives. It would include initiatives to facilitate programme articulation and
development of learners to access higher education as well as non-formal programmes that would focus on developing disadvantaged learners and teachers.

- **Algoa campus.** This campus site was to be closed, as the property did not belong to the university.
- **Bird street campus.** The business school would locate to this site as it was in close proximity to the central business district.
- **Second Avenue campus.** This campus would house the social sciences and humanities, public administration, communication and languages, initial teacher education, as well as high-level professional education for adult learners and the coursework Master’s programmes in the Faculty of Arts.
- **South Campus.** At this campus the following faculties would be situated, namely Law, Science, Health Sciences, Business and Economic Sciences. Consolidation of all academic science programmes and research would also be affected on this campus.
- **North campus** would accommodate high-quality technologically orientated education such as architecture, civil engineering, building sciences, quantity surveying and construction management, as well as creative arts.
- **George campus.** This campus has two sites. The York Street site would house social and business studies and the Saasveld site natural resource management (Communique to staff and students, 29 July 2005).

In a survey conducted on campus at the beginning of 2005 it was found that 83% of both staff and students strongly objected to being relocated. Their reasons were the following namely, distance (staff 33%; students 35%); safety (staff 21%; students 17%); academic quality (staff 5%; students 12%); quality of facilities (staff 16%; students 6%); transport (staff 5%; students 19%); accommodation (staff n/a; students 8%) (Talk@NMMU, 2005).

For the allocation of sites for the administrative and other support systems of the university a hybrid/mixed model was suggested. It was decided that senior management and key specialists would be centralized and where possible located close to Executive Management in order to enhance management support and decision-making. Support services would be decentralised to the points where they were required, but control and accountability would be centrally located as staff may be spread geographically in terms of function and services (Communique to staff and students, 29 July 2005).
3.3.8.4 Learning and growth objectives

The objectives in this perspective identify which jobs (employee skills, talent and knowledge defined as human capital), which systems (information systems, databases, networks and technology defined as information capital) and what kind of climate (culture, leadership, alignment and teamwork defined as organisation capital) were required to support the value-creating internal processes (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 32). Further discussion attempts to clarify these issues.

3.3.8.4.1 Human capital

A competitive global environment demands that organisations continually improve their existing products (student performance, programmes, research output) and at the same time create and introduce entirely new products to the market before their competitors. Ghoshal and Bartlett (1997: 119) challenge organisations to be willing to allow “individuals to question existing company strategy and practice and push the organization beyond its comfortable linear development path”.

An organisation’s ability to innovate, improve, grow, learn and penetrate new markets directly influences its value to its shareholders (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 134). The university should ask itself:

- What must we be great in performing?
- What type of training, education, salary and benefits must be implemented to produce the abovementioned results?
- What type of organisational climate and culture will nurture growth?
- What has to be done to develop personnel to achieve all the other identified objectives of the organisation as well? (Nair, 2004: 20).

Anstey (2006(c): 27) states that there is evidence that competitive organisations manage their human assets more effectively. Competitive organisations attract, retain and motivate talented people better and they acknowledge and treat their personnel as their most valuable asset. Competitive organisations have the added advantage that they have the ability to leverage the collective knowledge of their personnel more skilfully. Gouillart and Kelly (1995: 241) deduce that from their
experience people only change their behaviour patterns as a result of the benefits or rewards they reap, or hope to reap, as a consequence of what they do.

Anstey (2006(c): 27) further challenges HR management to identify its contribution to the university by being instrumental in creating a competitive advantage for the university. He suggests that this can be done by reducing cost, increasing revenue growth, stimulating innovation and by creating a quality work life and services in measurable terms. It has already been stated that the university spends 70% of its overall operating costs on salaries and the question then turns to the effectiveness and efficiency of this spending in terms of delivery to the core business of the university. Competitive organisations actively buy and borrow top performers and aggressively bounce poor performers and to do this they offer great jobs with great rewards. Anstey (2006(c): 28) reports that university systems are generally resistant to performance management and their reward systems are depressingly standardized, in other words it will be very difficult for universities to obtain a competitive advantage under these conditions.

In terms of student enrolments the university experienced a worrying decline for the year-on-year figures for 2004 and 2005. The total enrolments for PET programmes were down by approximately 5% while the enrolments at the Vista campus declined by about 17.5%. A very drastic decline in enrolments in the off-campus university programmes amounted to nearly 80%. The reasons for the decline in this area were due to the fact that the:

- Number of lowly qualified teachers who made up the majority of these students declined (most of them have upgraded their qualifications over the past few years);
- Programme presentation via satellite transmission was phased out; and
- Outstanding student debt forced the university not to re-register some of these off-campus students again.

On-campus enrolments at the UPE campus increased by 4% but the overall enrolments for the NMMU reflected to a decrease of nearly 2% due to the significant decline in the Vista campus enrolments for the period under discussion (Communique to staff and students, 4 April 2005).
3.3.8.4.2 Information capital

One of the most challenging aspects of the merger was the alignment of information systems and networks across the six campuses and three institutions. The following had to be integrated and/or created:

- Student and staff databases;
- Academic and research programmes;
- Management and organisational structures, financial administration systems including budgeting and payroll systems, bank accounts and financial controls;
- HR policies, practices and procedures including dispute resolution mechanisms, change training and the establishment of counselling centres.

3.3.8.4.3 Organisation capital

In his inaugural address the first Vice-Chancellor and CEO stated that the NMMU had set itself firmly on being an engaged institution according to its vision, mission and values statement (see Annexure B). According to him, an engaged institution is vibrant and in continual interaction with its various constituent communities such as the local and international academic community, various levels of government, business and industry and civil society in all its forms and expressions. These partnerships would also extend to sectors of communities that had no particular relationship with the previous merging institutions. He also emphasized the importance of transformation that requires a diversified student and staff corps and the challenge of developing a new academic model that will ensure relevance and responsiveness to regional and national needs. From a cultural perspective the new university would be a values driven university. The values that would drive the university are: equity and fairness, respect for diversity, people-centeredness, student access, engagement, excellence, innovation and integrity. He concluded by saying that as a fully-fledged university the NMMU had to improve its output in the creation of new knowledge and technology as it could not call itself one of South Africa’s premier universities if it did not increase its contributions in the fields of research, technology and innovation:

(http://www.petech.ac.za/staffnewsletter/2006/03%20May06/Inauguration.htm).
3.4 Summary

This chapter described the reasons for the merger, the creation of the new university and the challenges it faced. Fubini et al (2007:3-4; 68, 2, 26) state that the best integration in a merger is achieved when there is a desire to go beyond conventional performance, in other words to achieve a merger that is truly healthy. They define a healthy merger as a merger where the senior corporate leadership matches the excellence achieved by the many integration managers and teams and where rapid learning of new customers and external stakeholders are achieved. Fubini et al (2007:3-4; 68, 2, 26) continue by saying that the most important signs of trouble during the integration phase are customer attrition and loss of talented personnel. A healthy merger according to them makes a major contribution towards the corporate health of the surviving company in aspects such as operating and financial performance, business and technical capabilities, strength of stakeholder relationships, corporate culture, pace and focus of learning and its ultimate ability for renewal. They conclude by saying that top management alignment is achieved when attention is drawn away from itself and the integration process is finally focused on the outside world and its competitors.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research design and methodology of the study. Aspects such as the research question and objectives of the study, data collection methods, sampling procedure, reliability and validity, data analysis and research ethics are discussed.

4.2 Choice of the research area

The researcher decided to investigate the organisational transformation process of a newly established comprehensive institution of Higher Education, namely the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. The NMMU was established following the recent merger of the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth branch of the Vista University and the PE Technikon. In this revolutionary transformation process a total change of business direction was observed with the formulation of a new vision and mission statement and the refinement of new institution’s core values.

The researcher was an employee of the NMMU during the merger but was not a member of any task team dealing with the merger. The researcher was also fortunate that the department in which she was employed did not have to merge with another department and she did not feel that her post was threatened in any way.

4.3 Research question

The research question was formulated as follows: How successful was the organisational transformation process at the newly established NMMU in the period 2003-2007?

4.4 Research objectives

The first objective of this study was to describe the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the newly established NMMU in the period 2003 –2007 (Chapter 3).

The second objective was to evaluate the success of the organisational transformation process at the NMMU by using Anstey’s conceptual framework. This framework
integrates the work of major change theorists as well as the balanced scorecard of Kaplan and Norton.

4.5 Research design and methodology

4.5.1 Research design

A quantitative and exploratory approach was used. The study was conducted by means of a survey whereby employees were asked to share their perceptions of the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the NMMU between the years 2003-2007.

The study's exploratory nature meant that the study was done to satisfy the researcher’s curiosity and desire for a better understanding of the transformation process as it unfolded at the NMMU. It was hoped that the insights achieved would contribute to a wider understanding of such processes and the theory in the field of mergers in higher education. Babbie and Mouton (2003: 80) refer to Selltiz et al (1965) who advised the researcher to:

- Review related social science and other pertinent literature and to
- Perform a survey of people who have had practical experience of the problem to be studied.

In this study the researcher used a questionnaire to gain insight into the perceptions of personnel of the transformation process as it unfolded at the NMMU and thereafter evaluated its outcome within Anstey’s conceptual framework.

This study was also contextual in nature, meaning that this study only focused on the change and transformation process as it unfolded at a specific university in South Africa between the years 2003 – 2007. No data generated from this study can be generalised as they only present a shot-in-time reflecting the transformation process at a particular organisation at a particular period in time.

4.5.2 Research methodology

This research was conducted in two phases.
In phase 1, the researcher:

- Presented a research proposal to the relevant committees of the university to obtain permission to conduct the study;
- Performed a literature study on organisational transformation (Chapter 1-2);
- Described the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the NMMU between the years 2003 – 2007 (Chapter 3).

In phase 2, the researcher:

- Determined the criteria for evaluating organisational transformation by using Anstey’s conceptual framework which incorporates the work of major theorists as well as Kaplan and Norton’s balanced scorecard approach;
- Constructed a questionnaire incorporating the criteria specified in Anstey’s conceptual framework (see Annexure D);
- Conducted a survey by dispatching the questionnaires via e-mail to all personnel of the university who were appointed before January 2005;
- Analysed the data obtained from the questionnaires on the perceptions of staff concerning the merger (Chapter 5);
- Evaluated the success of the transformation process at the NMMU by using the data to draw insights and conclusions about the success of the merger. For this exercise the analysis was organised using Anstey’s conceptual framework (Chapter 6).

4.6 Data collection

A computerized survey creation tool was utilized to design a structured questionnaire with both open and close ended questions. This questionnaire was utilized to collect data on employees’ perceptions of the merger. The questionnaire was dispatched via e-mail to all personnel of the university but only personnel who were appointed before January 2005 were asked to respond as they were more likely to know the answers to the questions. These participants would also have been exposed to the merger process from the beginning. Participants were asked to tick their selected response options on the provided questionnaire and to supply additional information to clarify options where necessary. English was used for communication purposes. The questionnaire was open for response for three weeks and three reminders were dispatched to encourage
employees to participate in the study. Feedback from the questionnaires was automatically collated and displayed in group/cluster format by the programme utilized. This programme also prohibited a participant from entering their responses twice on the system.

Additional information on the merger was obtained from the relevant reports, the HEQC Audit and financial statements.

4.7 Sampling procedure

The target population for this study was all personnel of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University who were appointed before January 2005. Some 1490 permanent and contract personnel fitted this category. They were selected because they would have been exposed to the merger from the beginning and were likely to know the answers to the questions. Only 199 employees responded to the questionnaire.

4.8 Reliability and validity

Reliability means that a particular technique would provide the same results if applied repeatedly under the same conditions to the same participants. The internal consistency of the scores derived from the questionnaire was determined by using Cronbach’s alpha. Total reliability does however not ensure that the applied measures measure what they are supposed to measure. One could in fact get the same wrong answer consistently. The measure in such a case would be reliable but not valid. Validity refers to the extent to which the measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. Validity in this research was ensured by:

- Including only personnel who have been exposed to the merger as they were likely to understand the questions;
- Formulating unambiguous test items;
- Formulating test items according to Anstey’s conceptual framework and
- Ensuring clear understanding of all information. (Babbie & Mouton, 2003:119-123).
Data analysis

Numerical and graphical descriptive statistics were generated by using MS-Excel and Statistica packages. For inferential statistics the level of statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$. For practical significance the thresholds values for Cohen’s $d$ were according to those recommended by Cohen (1988: 24-28), i.e. if the absolute value $d$ is between 0.00 and 0.19 – not significant; 0.20 to 0.49 – small; 0.50 to 0.79 – moderate and 0.80 and greater – large. When it is reported that the result of an inferential test is significant, it is implied that the criteria for both statistical and practical significance were met. Chapter 5 will elaborate on these findings.

Ethical considerations

Informed consent to conduct the study was obtained from the following:

- The RTI (NMMU Research, Technology and Innovation) Committees of the Faculties of Arts and Business and Economic Sciences;
- The Research Ethics Committee (Human) at the NMMU;
- The Registrar of the NMMU (see Annexure C).

Participation in this research was voluntary. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study and it was assumed that participants who completed the questionnaire gave their informed consent. All information was strictly confidential and anonymous. No identifying information was collected by the researcher that could link any questionnaire back to any specific staff member (for example by an e-mail address or the IP address of the computer from which the questionnaire was sent). Feedback from the questionnaire was automatically entered by the computer programme utilized and all data were directly produced in group/cluster format further eliminating any chance of participants being identified. The computer programme utilized for this questionnaire has been programmed to shut down after six months of capturing the first data. Data generated from this research would be unavailable for re-use (see Annexure D: Personnel Questionnaire).

The likelihood of being exposed to any risk by participating in this study was minimal.
4.11 Summary

This chapter elaborated on the issues surrounding the research process. A detailed description was given on the research objectives, research design and methodology, data collection techniques, informed consent, confidentiality and protection of participants during the execution of the research. The next chapter will elaborate on the research results.
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH RESULTS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research results obtained from the questionnaire. Numerical and graphical descriptive statistics were generated by using the MS-Excel and Statistica packages.

5.2 Framework for data analysis

The data was analysed by performing an analysis of test items, factor scores and inferential statistics. The framework for the data analysis was done according to Anstey’s conceptual framework (see chapter 2.4 for more details). Anstey’s conceptual framework was divided into the following factors, namely:

- Factor 1: Constructive unease: harnessed urgency
- Factor 2: Clear purpose
- Factor 3: Challenging vision and clear measurable objectives
- Factor 4: Champions at all levels
- Factor 5: Culture and community
- Factor 6: Competitive competencies
- Factor 7: Coherent strategy
- Factor 8: Communication and consultation.

5.3 Biographical details of participants

Feedback from participants with regard to their biographical details revealed the following information.

Question 1.1: Please indicate your employment type

Of the population of 1490 permanent and contract personnel that fitted this category, 199 or 13% of employees responded to this questionnaire. Of the sample of 199 employees, 100 participants (50.3%) were administrative and 99 (49.7%) academic. The percentage of administrative and academic members who responded to the questionnaire compares well with the employment statistics for the year 2005-2007. The NMMU employed 1425 permanent staff members in 2005 compared to 1303 in 2006 and 1490 in 2007. In 2007
permanent staff members comprised of 527 (35%) instruction/research staff and 963 (65%) administrative and professional support staff (HEQC Audit, 2008: 15).

Question 1.2: If you are an academic, please indicate your faculty

![Faculty Distribution]

Administrative staff was not asked to respond to this question. The Faculty of Arts provided the most respondents namely 20%, followed by the Faculty of Science 19%, Faculty of Engineering, the Built Environment and Information Technology 18%, Faculty of Business and Economic Science 13%, Faculty of Health Science 13%, Faculty of Law 8%, Faculty of Education 5%, HEADS 3% and George Campus 1%. Staff from all faculties responded with low response rates from the faculties of Law and Education, the Higher Education Access and Development Services (HEADS) and George campus.

Question 1.3: What is your Peromnes grade?

![Peromnes Grade Distribution]
The highest percentage of employees who participated in the study found themselves in Peromnes grades 6 - 8 (35% administrative and 84% academic staff) and 9 – 11 (48% administrative staff and 12% academic staff). When this information is collated then 58% of participants were categorised at level 6 - 8 (usually the level of middle management) and 31% of participants at level 9 - 11 of the Peromnes grade. Less than 10% of participants fell in the top and lower ends of the Peromnes scale.

Question 1.4: Employment status?

![Employment Status Chart]

The employment status of 90% of administrative staff and 88% of academic staff was permanent. Altogether 89% of participants were permanent and 11% contract employees of the university.

Question 1.5: In which year were you appointed at the pre–merging institution?
Most participants were appointed in 2000 - 2004 (35% administrative, 27% academic and 31% all) followed by appointments in:

- 1995 - 1999 (29% administrative, 22% academic and 25% all)
- 1990 - 1994 (19% administrative, 21% academic and 20% all)
- 1980 - 1984 (7% administrative, 14% academic and 11% all)
- 1985 - 1989 (4% administrative, 8% academic, 6% all)
- 1975 - 1979 (2% administrative, 35% academic, 3% all)
- 1970 - 1974 (2% administrative, 4% academic, 3% all) and lastly
- 1965 - 1969 (2% administrative, 2% academic and 2% all).

Question 1.6: At which pre-merger institution were you appointed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Elizabeth branch of Vista University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Elizabeth Technikon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When participants were asked at which pre-merger institution they were appointed the results were the following:

- 48% of administrative and 40% of academic staff members came from the University of Port Elizabeth;
- 41% of administrative and 42% of academic staff members came from the Port Elizabeth Technikon;
- 10% of administrative and 18% of academic staff members came from the Port Elizabeth branch of the Vista University.

When this information was collated then 44% of participants came from the University of Port Elizabeth, 42% came from the Technikon and 14% from the Port Elizabeth branch of the Vista University.
Participants were mainly between the ages of 30 - 59. For administrative staff the order was as follows: 33% of participants were categorised between the ages of 40 - 49, followed by 29% of participants falling in the age group 30 - 39 and 50 - 59 respectively. The academic staff had 38% of respondents in the 50 - 59 category, 30% of participants in the 40 - 49 year category and 16% between the ages of 30 - 39. When this information was collated 34% of participants were 50 - 59 years old, followed by 32% of participants who were 40 - 49 years old and 23% between the ages of 30 - 39. Some 66% of participants in this study were over the age of 40.

More female administrative staff members (68%) than males (32%) responded to the questionnaire and for academic staff slightly more males (51%) than females (49%) responded. When this information was collated 59% were males and 41% were females. These figures corresponded well with those of the HEQC Audit (2008: 19) with a gender profile in 2007 of 57.3% male and 42.7% females.
The majority of participants were White, namely 59% of administrative staff and 79% of academic staff. When this information was collated then 69% of participants were White, followed by Black (11%), Other (9%), Coloured (8%) and Indian (4%). The HEQC Audit (2008: 18) reflected a staff profile for 2007 of White (80.8%), African (10.1%), Coloured (5.7%) and Indian (3.4%) staff members. It seemed that less white persons responded to the questionnaire compared to the information supplied by the HEQC Audit. The 9% who indicated ‘other’ could also have come from this category or other members of personnel who were infuriated by this question.

In response to question 1.10, certain respondents answered as follows:
- European-African,
- We are supposed to be a non-racial country,
- African,
- If you provide an acceptable definition for this NONSENSE I’ll consider answering,
- European (White is not a race).

To summarize, from the abovementioned information 13% of employees responded to this questionnaire. Of the sample of 199 employees, 49.7% of participants were academic and 50.3% administrative. A total of 58% of participants were categorised at Peromnes level 6 - 8. This is usually the level of middle management. Some 76% of respondents were appointed between 1990 to 2004. Altogether 89% of participants were permanent and 11% contract employees of the university. A total of 44% of participants came from the University of Port Elizabeth, 42% came from the Port Elizabeth
Technikon and 14% from the Port Elizabeth branch of the Vista University. The predominant age of participants was between the ages of 50 - 59 followed by the 40 - 49 year olds. A total of 66% of participants in this study were over the age of 40. The study included 59% of males and 41% females. Participants was predominantly White (69%), followed by Black (11%), Other (9%), Coloured (8%) and Indian (4%).

The next section will focus on an item analysis of participants’ perception of the merger according to Anstey’s conceptual framework.

5.4 Anstey’s conceptual framework: item analysis

5.4.1 Factor 1: Constructive unease: harnessed urgency

This section consists of the following subscales and questions, namely:

- **Factor 1.1 Establishment of steering committees (Questions 4.2 - 4.4)**
- **Factor 1.2 Performance of steering committees (Questions 5.1 - 5.6)**
- **Factor 1.3 Mobilization of personnel and labour organisations (Questions 2.1 - 2.5 and 4.1)**

**Factor 1.1: Establishment of steering committees**

**Question 4.2:** The task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger

In response to the question whether the task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger, 44% of administrative staff and 28% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the
statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 30% and 33% respectively. More academics (39%) than administrative (26%) participants were undecided on the matter. When this information was collated then 32% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger and 36% agreed and strongly agreed with the statement whilst 32% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.

A merger office was in fact established in June 2004 who inter alia had the function to compile agendas for the Joint Management Core Group and identified cross-functional work required amongst Joint Task Teams. This office was thus established before UPE incorporated Vista (PE campus) by the end of 2004 or merged with the PET by the end of 2005 (Anstey, 2006(c): 11).

Question 4.3: The task teams / committees had the necessary leadership skills to drive the process
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In response to the question whether the task teams / committees had the necessary leadership skills to drive the process then 42% of administrative staff and 33% of academic staff members neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. It was further noted that 24% of administrative staff and 23% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 34% and 44% respectively. When this information was collated then 39% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the task teams / committees had the necessary leadership skills to drive the process, 24% agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 37% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.
In response to the question whether all stakeholders were adequately represented in the task teams / committees, 38% of administrative and 35% of academic staff members were undecided on the matter. Administrative participants (35%) and academic (45%) staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement in comparison with those participants who agreed and strongly agreed with the statement, namely 27% for administrative staff and 20% for academic staff. When this information was collated then 40% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that all stakeholders were adequately represented in the task teams / committees, 24% agreed and strongly agreed and 36% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement.

Question 4.5: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions regarding the assessment of task teams in the merger process as follows:

- “Staff were informed but not consulted.
- Much of what transpired was not transparent until it was too late to provide any feedback on.
- In the end, decisions were made by top management, irrespective of committees.
• The serious decline in staff morale can be attributed to the inexperienced managerial team.
• Our faculty led by our dean approached the then UPE university Arts Faculty on own initiative to start the process of negotiation with the neighbouring campus. It was a very open and vague field, when and how contact with other campuses was supposed to take place was never fully explained.
• The feeling about the JTTs was that we were made to talk but made no impact on any of the decisions that were eventually made.
• As a staff member on the ground, I was not privy to this kind of information so I cannot comment on it.
• The people ‘driving’ the merger had no prior experience of all the intricacies of mergers. Post merger integration problems were not anticipated. My Doctoral Research was on Mergers & Acquisitions. My opinion was never canvassed.
• The merger was made out to be painless and just a paper exercise - which it DEFINITELY was not. We lost leave, security of positions, and a sense of loyalty towards our institution. The smooth talkers were chosen for the JTTs – but they proved to be ‘mantel-swaaiers’.
• The fact that we formed JTTs very early in the process was very good as it mobilised us and ensured that we worked towards a common goal. I wish to congratulate the Director: M&CR for getting this done very early in the process. Now, 3 years later, it feels that we've always been colleagues.
• For a staff member that takes a seat on the TASK TEAM, surely don’t have to look at Human Resources needs in terms of remuneration – It is human behaviour – If my salary is R20.000 and over would I seriously look at the remuneration needs of the staff?
• Although the reasons were explained, these reasons were not particularly cogent, and the process was accepted as a fait accompli, determined for primarily political reasons.
• The institutions did commit to committees. And certainly the old UPE was besotted with committees. However, as per the comments below an internally managed process becomes a territory contestant in many instances there neither was not full disclosure to committees’ nor full disclosure from committees to employees.
• Stakeholders were not adequately represented - and in many cases, stakeholders were asked for opinions and in 100% of the cases where we (as staff members) were asked for input, such input was simply ignored.

• There is widespread agreement that texts like a MOA are often just seen as symbolic and that there is often a disjuncture between what is written down on paper and what happens in practice. Whatever dissenting voices said and urged in the JTTs was ignored and previous structures in the then PE Technikon (in the case of the structure within which I now work) were largely replicated. The entire merger process was about who had access to dominant structures and powerful people and whose voices prevailed. White men dominated the chairing and skilfully steered processes to serve their own interests. It did not matter how early the JTTs etc were introduced, the issues of unequal power relations was never looked at and addressed. Some of us say that there is now a new broederbond (propped up by a moederbond) in power in the structure within which we work. Representation was not adequate during merger processes. The professor that I fell under manipulated things to his own advantage. I call what happened a 'settlement' (Sedunary's word). In the same way that there was settlement in the country in 1994 between competing class and race interests, there was a settlement about who would be in power in the structure within which I work. However, race did not even feature.

• Ex UPE academic staff was underrepresented.

• Stakeholders were represented, but their contributions were ignored as management had their own agenda. The old UPE structure was super-imposed on what was to become a comprehensive institution. As a result, the same inefficiencies still exist in the structure.

• I repeat: a task team to which I was assigned never met, despite numerous enquiries to my superiors as to when it would meet.

• They changed rules as they went along! Even the rules that they came with don’t apply to everyone.

• Task teams could not really influence pre-decided outcomes. Leadership of task teams were all biased towards one of the 3 institutions - stakeholders were not really represented.

• The process was as inclusive as possible and widely publicized.

• Employees were often asked for their opinion, but it was mostly ignored. Sort of an afterthought to try and pacify people into thinking that their opinion mattered.
• Task teams operated in response to their mandates.
• Not all teams/committees were equally driven by adequate leadership. OWN agenda's played a too important part, sometimes.
• Unions were misled about how the merger would be implemented. The consequences only became clear as the merger progressed.
• The focus was on the task to be completed with no regard to the people.
• I cannot comment on what the task teams/committees did or did not do.
• No one on the lower levels was invited or was given the chance with possible suggestions.
• We were not told about our task team.
• I feel UPE staff dominated the merger process.
• The minimum disruption of services during our merger is indicative of good planning and placement of appropriate systems in good time”.

To summarize, assessment of the task team(s) in the merger was a question to be answered by all staff who participated in the study, whether they were members of the task teams or not. This might have been a reason for the low response to the different sections of this question. When collating the ‘disagree and strongly disagree’ as well as the ‘neither agree nor disagree’ options then the response to this section of the questionnaire were significantly negative, namely:

• Almost two-thirds of the participants were not of the opinion that the task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger and
• Three-quarters of participants did not agree / or were neutral on the leadership and representation of the relevant stakeholders in the different task teams / committees.

The main themes from the open-ended question revealed the following:

• Not all teams / committees were equally driven by adequate leadership but task teams functioned according to their mandate to get the job done.
• Leadership of task teams was at times biased towards one of the three institutions and participants felt that all stakeholders were not really represented.
• Own agendas and power struggles played an important role in these task teams.
Participants were of the opinion that these deliberations were not always transparent and that decisions were already made by top management. Task teams could in this case not really influence pre-decided outcomes. Communication between these task teams and employees was also lacking.

Staff complained about low morale and a sense of loss of loyalty towards the institution.

It must however be noted that a minimum disruption of services occurred during the merger being an indication of management’s planning and placement of appropriate systems in time and professionalism of staff in keeping focus despite unhappiness in some situations.

Factor 1.2 Performance of steering committees

Question 5.1: Setting goals

When participants were asked to comment on the task teams’ performance with regard to the setting of goals, 65% of administrative and 57% of academic staff reported that satisfactory performance was demonstrated. Goal setting was further rated as very good (10%) and excellent (5%) by administrative and very good (18%) and excellent (4%) by academic staff. A total of 20% of administrative staff and 22% of academic staff rated goal setting as poor. When the information was collated then 61% of participants were satisfied with the goal setting, 14% thought it was very good and 4% gave it an excellent rating, while only 21% of participants perceived the goal setting to be poor.
Question 5.2: Planning the work to be done

When participants were asked to comment on planning for the work to be done, 52% of administrative and 56% of academic staff reported that satisfactory performance was demonstrated. Planning was further rated as very good (13%) and excellent (5%) by administrative and very good (13%) and excellent (4%) by academic staff. Altogether 29% of administrative staff and 27% of academic staff rated the planning phase as poor. When the information was collated then 54% of participants were satisfied with the planning, 13% thought it was very good and 4% gave it an excellent rating, while only 28% of participants perceived the planning to be poor.

Question 5.3: Delegating responsibility

When participants were asked to comment on delegating responsibility in the task teams, 58% of administrative and 55% of academic staff reported that satisfactory performance was demonstrated. Delegating responsibility was further rated as very good (7%) and excellent (4%) by administrative and very good (11%) and excellent (4%) by academic staff. A total of 31% of administrative staff and 30% of academic staff rated delegation as poor. When the information was collated 57% of participants were satisfied with the
delegation, 9% thought it was very good and 4% gave it an excellent rating, but 30% of participants perceived the planning to be poor.

Question 5.4: Solving problems

When participants were asked to comment on task teams’ ability to solve problems, 48% of administrative and 61% of academic staff perceived it to be poor. It was also noted that 40% of administrative and 33% of academic staff reported that problems were satisfactorily resolved. Problem solving was further rated as very good (9%) and excellent (3%) by administrative and very good (5%) and excellent (1%) by academic staff. When the information was collated, then 55% of participants perceived problem solving to be poor, 36% of participants were satisfied with the problem solving, 7% thought it was very good and 2% gave it an excellent rating.

Question 5.5: Monitoring progress

When participants were asked to comment on monitoring the progress of the work to be done, 58% of administrative and 50% of academic staff reported that satisfactory performance was demonstrated. Monitoring progress was further rated as very good
(8%) and excellent (4%) by administrative and very good (14%) and excellent (1%) by academic staff. Some 31% of administrative staff and 35% of academic staff rated monitoring progress as poor. When the information was collated 54% of participants were satisfied with the progress monitoring, 11% thought it was very good and 3% gave it an excellent rating, but 33% of participants perceived the monitoring to be poor.

Question 5.6: Achieving set goals

When participants were asked to comment on the achievement of set goals, 47% of administrative and 53% of academic staff reported that satisfactory performance was demonstrated. Achieving set goals was further rated as very good (9%) and excellent (1%) by administrative and very good (7%) and excellent (4%) by academic staff. Altogether 42% of administrative staff and 36% of academic staff rated goal achievement as poor. When the information was collated 50% of participants were satisfied with the goal achievement, 8% thought it was very good and 3% gave it an excellent rating, but 39% of participants perceived the goal achievement to be poor.

Question 5.7: Any comments, especially if poor option was selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors were corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions regarding the task teams’ performance as follows:
“Decisions were taken by top management that often did either not filter down to the relevant parties, or the people actually having to do the extra work were not consulted or their workload taken into consideration.

Again, lack of transparency to mere staff members’ means that I have absolutely no idea. Often we were at the receiving end of decisions that took place ‘somewhere up there’.

Personally I thought that the process was too rushed and the correct sequence of action was not thought out properly.

The JTTs could not achieve goals if the final decision was not always the one chosen by the JTTs.

JTTs recommendations were mostly ignored by Management.

The implementation of the merger hinged to a large extent on erstwhile PET staff who had no idea of university degree programmes. Sit-sito all PET rules, procedures and policies found their way to the newly branded NMMU.

The delegation of responsibilities mostly resulted in a reduction of capacity to maintain academic standards, and the solving of problems, as well as monitoring of progress, should be seen against the overall effect of the acceptance of mediocrity brought about by the increased level of bureaucracy.

Am not qualified to assess these items accurately. My overall impression was that a good deal of planning went on but the communication aspect failed. It failed on two counts - the failure to fully and speedily communicate and the credibility of the communicators.

My perception was that goals were set the wrong way around - the merging of the academic side was left for last (in terms of programmes, staff, departments etc) - leading to chaos which could have been prevented if top management had their priorities in the right order.

What does excellent mean? It is a contested term (see Skelton 2005). All the criteria can be nullified because the whole process was about who was in control.

Goalposts shifted to accommodate internal politics.

Shall I say it again? Okay. The team never met.

Very little feedback seemed to reach the affected employees and often any minutes of meetings where major decisions had been taken were ‘sanitised’ for public consumption. Important decisions affecting employees seemed to be taken unilaterally.
• Not enough communication to staff.
• Many problems of other branches of merger not sorted out, like leave lost during two years (2005 and 2006) no one is accountable. Unfinished business of financial transfers not done to date. Assistance asked from management with regard to these is in vain.
• They were undecided about everything, because clueless people were put in the section 189 office.
• Deviations from the mandate occurred frequently without consultation.
• Results for interviews took a long time to be announced and for applicants to be informed. When one questioned the results and wanted to know the criteria used for selection, one would be tossed around from office to office as if no one (from the committee members) wanted to take responsibility.
• Problems were never solved just ignored. Some people used the merger for personal gain and others were sidelined.
• A seeming order informed the surface but chaos reigned underneath especially in the re-applying for jobs situation which has left sections in the administration dysfunctional and the academic in many areas short staffed.
• Too many problems at ground level are ignored. Too many inconsistencies in decision making and too little consideration for the real impact of decisions. Many decisions were made by people who had no clue what was really going on in the lecture halls etc.
• To be honest I did not serve on all the committees to be able to judge. No one can actually judge this and this is not a useful question...it is purely opinion or speculation with no link to what really happened...obviously some committees were better than others.
• The ‘goals’ may have been achieved, but this does not mean the goals themselves were of merit or in the institution's ultimate best interests.
• One has to beg for anything to be fixed.
• Great at just bulldozing the thing ahead, but no cognisance of problems coming to light.
• This information was never relayed adequately to contract staff - who were largely left to their own devices.
• I do not know what the task teams’ performance was.
• About setting of goals I am not sure.
• Not all stakeholders at the time were performing their duties efficiently – a ‘them us’ mentality was still very evident, especially from the university colleagues.
• Goals achieved after due dates.
• Planning should have commenced earlier, wider stakeholder meetings should have been held and more regularly.
• People still hadn’t been appointed long after the cut-off date”.

To summarise, the statistical analyses revealed that the assessment of the task team’s performance was judged largely positive for the setting of goals, planning the work to be done, delegating responsibility, monitoring progress and achieving set goals, but half of the participants judged the problem solving to be poor.

The main themes with regard to the open-ended questions dealing with the task teams’ performance were as follows:
• Participants expressed the view that decisions were made by top management.
• They felt that the process was rushed, that transparency could have been improved and that goal posts were shifted to accommodate internal politics.
• Some participants were satisfied with the planning and goal setting while others would have preferred these processes to have started earlier or from another angle.
• Decisions had to be made about whose administrative process would be followed.
• Communication was once again highlighted as an issue. Mistrust and ignorance with regard to programme delivery between the staff of the University and the Technikon were evident— an ‘us them’ approach surfaced.
• Staff complained that problems that were identified were not addressed and the impact of decisions on their lives not considered.
• Staff also voiced their complaints and concerns with regard to increased work loads and loss of academic standards.
Factor 1.3: Mobilization of personnel and labour organisations

Question 4.1: The NMMU developed a clear memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved.

In response to the question whether the NMMU developed a clear memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved, 45% of administrative staff and 38% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 19% and 32% respectively. Participants of both categories were also undecided on the matter, namely 35% (administrative) and 30% (academic). When this information was collated then 26% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the NMMU developed a clear memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved, 42% agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 32% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.

Question 2.1: Reasons for the merger were clearly explained

The majority of administrative staff, namely 56% and 48% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed that the reasons for the merger were clearly explained to them. When
this information was collated then 53% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the reasons for the merger were clearly explained to them, 36% disagreed and strongly disagreed and 12% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

Question 2.2: The merger was conducted for sound reasons

In response to the question whether the merger was conducted for sound reasons 45% of administrative staff and 58% of academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement in comparison with the agree and strongly agree rating options of 36% and 27% respectively. When this information was collated then 52% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the merger was conducted for sound reasons, 32% agreed and strongly agreed that the merger was conducted for sound reasons and 17% of participants were undecided on the matter.

Question 2.3: The urgency of the merger was clear
In response to the question whether the urgency of the merger was clear, 44% of administrative staff and 65% of academic staff disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement in comparison with the agree and strongly agree rating options of 34% and 23% respectively. When this information was collated then 55% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the urgency of the merger was clear, 29% agreed and strongly agreed that the merger was conducted for sound reasons and 16% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

**Question 2.4:** Management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger

In response to the question whether management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger, 43% of administrative staff and 62% of academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement in comparison with the agree and strongly agree rating options of 29% and 19% respectively. When this information was collated then 52% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger, 24% agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 24% of participants were undecided on the matter. With this feedback from respondents it would have been difficult for management to mobilize them around a process that were externally imposed which made no sense to them.
In response to the question whether the labour organisations successfully mobilized their members to participate in the merger, 36% of administrative staff and 42% of academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement in comparison with the agree and strongly agree rating options of 27% and 22% respectively. More participants of both categories were undecided on the matter, namely 37% and 35%. When this information was collated then 40% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the labour organisations successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger, 25% agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 36% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter. Data revealed that the majority of participants also stated that labour organisations failed to mobilize staff into the merger.

Question 2.6: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions regarding the NMMU merging process as follows:

- “The merger was a politically motivated process.
- The reasons for the merger and rush to do so were not explained at all. I think the whole thing was totally unnecessary. Things were quite OK as they were before. The merger resulted in lower standards, loss of jobs and opportunities, lower salaries, more work, etc. The whole 189A process was also totally ridiculous and
unacceptable. I have been working for 5 years on NCWA contracts with a peanut salary and no benefits and I never get the opportunity of anything better in spite of my astronomical workload I perform.

- Employees went into the merger reluctantly and were given no option but to cooperate.
- What has the merger achieved?
- Reasons given were not always the truth. The fact that all Vista campuses were in huge financial trouble was never disclosed.
- Those leading the merger were not well informed and caused much frustration through their lack of commitment to the staff above all else.
- The merger exercise was a costly waste of time and money and to date no real benefit has been derived. It was a politically motivated sanction that has nothing to do with teaching. From the promised merging of admin overheads (supposedly leading to cost savings) nothing has come. In fact the opposite has happened - we now have more admin staff than in the pre-merged institutions.
- It was forced upon members by management who, from my perspective, mostly acted in a dictatorial manner.
- Employees really had no choice in the matter. The merger was decided upon by the powers that be.
- A very 'pressurised' approach was followed.
- There was no choice at all, and most went along reluctantly, trying to ensure that their own merging institution did not get ‘taken over’ by the other.
- Why do you want to merge institutions that were excellent individually? The institutions are not even on the same level....
- Nothing was explained to make the merger's need clear. I always felt that at some point the urgency of making one institution in PE that provided higher education will be explained and until today that is still not clear.
- There were so many unclear issues, not specific.
- This was a political merger, driven by the ruling political party and other useful idiots.
- Other than it being a vision of the then minister of education no good reason existed in this case (some others were more appropriate like two Technikons sharing a border).
• The reasons as set out by the minister in his first announcement of the merger were invalid, particularly with regard to UPE but they were never challenged.

• Task teams were set up and in your JTT we worked very closely with colleagues from the other institutions which ensured joint ownership.

• To date I still do not know why the institutions merged.

• The merger was useless and has resulted in more unhappiness than necessary.

• As much as the merger was a necessity and looked impressive on paper - the institution forgot the most important factor the Human Resources. Without the staff the institution cannot regulate. The stress of the merger impacted negatively on the staff, some resigned, left work without any job, fell ill and even opted for death. Remuneration is one of the main issues that are not rightfully addressed. The imbalances caused more friction between staff (Missionvale versus UPE versus PET). Speaking with emotion it is an insult that staff through our able bodied Unions has to 'Fight' for a fair increases- and yes, the humiliation carries on…

• We just had to do what we were told to do by Government. The reasons were flawed in many respects.

• We were not mobilized to participate in the merger, as the result I don't like the merger.

• The DOE had a politically correct case for merging the apartheid institutions. There were real opportunities for rationalisation of services and improvement of services to students. The DOE however, did not sufficiently think through the issues and the implications leaving the detail to the institutions. The then minister of education had a typical shoot from the hip style and this was evident in the approach (note outcomes based education). In transformation processes of this type transformation driven by the employees demands an altruistic framework and commitment to overarching institutional and national objectives. Ninety-nine percent of humankind is not capable of this mind set and sadly the leadership and workers of the three institutions showed themselves firmly placed within the 99%. This is why such transformations should be driven by truly neutral 3rd parties who can manage the conflicting interests in such a manner as to achieve the clearly articulated institutional and national outcomes. So the DOE failed the process by not having thought through the outcomes and not having allocated the necessary resources both human, financial and time to achieve these outcomes. The leadership and the workers failed in their inability to rise above their own
interests either personal or institutional in order to create an institution that could serve the best interests of education. A transformation that has at its head an institutional hit-man being paid large bonuses to achieve outcomes also runs the risk of finding agendas driven through for the sake of personal gain.

- The institutions were bulldozed into the merger, staff was not taken into account and in general the merger was a disastrous effort.
- Decisions made were fait accompli and the discussions were a complete waste of time.
- The merger was politically motivated with no academic merit.
- As I understand things, the Department of Education (DoE) explained the merger in terms of moving away from historically black higher education institutions and in terms of equity. However, I agree with Pithouse (2006), who says that mandatory institutional mergers were a typical cost-cutting neo-liberal exercise. Many black employees on the then Vista PE campus immediately left and got positions in other institutions like parliament and in my view equity for white, middle-aged women like myself who were critical of merger practices did not feature. Concerning participation during merger processes, white males dominated in the structures within which we now work. I was supposed to represent the structure in question on the then Vista campus, but the white men marginalised me and I was not included in their meetings. The white men in question now hold the most powerful positions in the merged structure supported by white women. And women like myself, who refused to compete against colleagues and backstab work at the bottom of the merged hierarchy. I have talked to many people about this. The DoE should have known that there would be terrible destructive power struggles in which the dominant would ensure their dominance. During the processes, I phoned a person at the DoE and was told to talk to the Merger Office and CEO of the institution. But at the time, I learned not to trust anyone. Everyone seemed to be out for themselves. Self-interest prevailed over the public good. It is still like that in the post-merger context and all I want to do is get out of the NMMU, even though I know I am one of a few critical voices in the institution.

- I feel the management of the merger process was chaotic. Most of the employees however knew that they had to participate and did so as their focus was on keeping the institution functioning. Management abused this commitment from staff blatantly to cover their lack of organisational skills and project management.
• You cannot mix oil and water and end with oil.
• There was no sound reason for the merger. It was a political decision made by minister of education to punish ‘non-struggle’ HE institutions.
• Reasons for the merger were non-existent. Prof …article (in response to Prof …’s one) made it clear that there was simply no choice - government had decided we would merge, and we must just make the best of it however unreasonable the decision may be. We still don't know what a ‘comprehensive institution’ is. Did the minister of education know? Did he tell anyone? Government's decision to phase out the BTech further clouds this issue. Is any part of the ‘Technikon’ legacy to be retained? If not, why did we merge, why not just close down the Technikon? It was urgent, certainly. The edict was that the merge would take effect on 1 Jan 2005, whether or not anyone was ready, and whether or not anyone had a clue as to why. A task team to which I was assigned never met, despite numerous enquiries to my superiors as to when it would meet.
• Government never really had a clear idea that was conveyed as to the necessity for the merger. At Vista we were subjected to changes in our position from a merger to incorporation with no explanation for the change in wording.
• I still believe that there is a market for the two institutions to operate separately.
• Management steamrolled the merger without much input from other stakeholders.
• The reason for the merger was never clear to anyone including management. All they were interested in is keeping their positions.
• Senior staff members (admin and academic) went into ‘save my job at all cost’ mode and such morale, work ethic and team spirit have deteriorated significantly in certain departments.
• But what was disappointing was when the unions agreed with the employer that only gender would be considered when applying the equity principle.
• The politics driving the merger was not beneficial to academic standards - employees did participate but opinions were not taken into account as well as those of labour.
• Consultation was widespread within the institution and all concerned were given an opportunity to have an input and voice their concerns.
• The merger seemed to be based on political reasons rather than economic or efficiency reasons.
• Confusion abounded and real participation in the acceptance of the chosen model of the merger which was not staff centred, was not sought or gained.

• The merger management was largely inhumane and used to settle old scores mostly by the ex-UPE staff who gained the most. There was little or no transparency and a great deal of behind the scenes plotting.

• The merger would have taken place no matter what the comments were.

• Staff had no choice and top management in general made promises that never materialized!

• We were not told about the reasons for the merger or the advantages and disadvantages of the merger.

• We were just told and sometimes when we asked a question, the answer was that it still had to be investigated.

• The work and activities organised along merger task teams were intended for all to participate”.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that half of the participants agreed that the reasons for the merger were clearly explained to them. More than half of the participants were negative on the statements that the NMMU developed a clear memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved and more than half of the participants disagreed that:

• The merger was conducted for sound reasons ;

• The urgency of the merger was clear and that

• Management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger.

The main themes of the open-ended question revolved around the following issues:

• The merger was a politically motivated process. Institutions had no choice in the matter. The Department of Education failed the process by not having thought through the outcomes and not having allocated the necessary resources human, financial and time to achieve these outcomes. They also did not sufficiently think through the issues and the implications, thus leaving the details to the institutions to solve themselves. This left employees upset and resistance increased as they felt that institutions were bulldozed into the merger. Respondents expressed feelings of mistrust and being pressurised into the merger.
• Self-interest prevailed over the public good and the impression was created that the leadership and the workers failed in their inability to rise above their own interests either personal or institutional in order to create an institution that could serve the best interests of education.

5.4.2 Factor 2: Clear purpose

This section consists of questions 10.1 – 10.4

Question 10.1: NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement

In response to the question whether the NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement, 61% of administrative staff and 63% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 14% of administrative and 13% of academic staff respectively. Participants of both categories were also undecided on the matter, namely 25% administrative and 23% academic staff members. When this information was collated then 62% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement, 14% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement and 24% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.
Question 10.2: Customers or clients to be served are identified

In response to the question whether customers or clients to be served are identified, then 59% of administrative staff and 67% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 14% and 17% respectively. Participants of both categories were also undecided on the matter, namely 27% of administrative and 15% academic staff members. When this information was collated then 63% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that customers or clients to be served are identified, 16% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement and 21% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.

Question 10.3: Needs that the NMMU has to satisfy are stated

In response to the question whether the needs that the NMMU has to satisfy are stated, 50% of administrative staff and 59% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the disagree and strongly disagree rating options of 19% and 13% respectively. Participants of both categories were also undecided on the matter, namely 31% of administrative and 28% academic staff members. When this information was collated then 54% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the
needs that the NMMU has to satisfy were stated, 16% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement and 29% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter.

Question 10.4: How the mission / purpose has to be achieved is clear

In response to the question whether it was clear how the mission / purpose has to be achieved, participants of both categories were undecided on the matter, namely 39% of administrative and 34% academic staff members. Some 33% of administrative staff and 28% of academic staff agreed and strongly agreed with the statement in comparison with the strongly disagree and disagree rating options of 31% and 38% respectively. When this information is collated then 35% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter. Some 30% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that how the mission / purpose had to be achieved is clear and 33% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 10.5: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with the mission/purpose statement of the NMMU as follows:

- “The mission/ purpose seemed clear, but the problem is that they don't stick to it and live it out. There is still far too much discrimination, inconsistency and unfair treatment.
- What the mission states is clear, but it is not put into practice.
• Lack of consistency and congruence between expressed mission and implementation of action.

• The vision and mission statements are just that. Political statements far removed from the real world.

• I have responded to this already. Nelson Mandela is a top statesperson to be admired. How can a University strive to achieve his values? How will you measure this? Read any book on the strategic intent of businesses and you will realise how naive the strategic intent of the NMMU is worded.

• The vision and mission are fuzzy with politically correct terminology that hasn't been fleshed out.

• The values listed are in need of serious revision. Academic excellence stands about second last. It needs to rank in place number one and nowhere else.

• The mission & vision is 'politically correct' and does not really stand out from any other HE institutions. It is far too long. One gets the impression that it tried to keep everyone happy, without being bold and really visionary. It should now be re-evaluated 3 years down the line when the dust has settled.

• The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University is an engaged and people-centred university that serves the needs of its diverse communities by contributing to sustainable development through excellent academic programmes, research and service delivery.' This Institution does not serve the needs of its diverse communities. Charity begins at home before we embrace others.

• Its nice words on paper but that is all.

• NMMU is committed to customer service, as the result front line staff attend courses / workshops that teach them about service rendering to clients.

• NMMU needs to grow research, needs to get more students to graduate - but management wants to cut on budgetary spending by reducing permanent staff members!

• Stating the mission is very different from carrying it out.

• Still some work to be done to refine and sharpen the vision, mission and values. Clarity with respect to the academic mission of a comprehensive university still needs to be sharpened and widely communicated.

• My objection is that this is all just verbiage. Vision / Mission / Values are on display wherever you look, but they are not true. ‘People-centred? Caring? Upholding the Bill of Rights? Respecting diversity? Promoting reconciliation?’
It's all just propaganda. The truth: one works absurd amounts of overtime without pay and without leave. The hypocrisy, the pretence, is probably the worst. They proclaim loudly and often that they care. But actually they are bullying and exploiting the staff. One has to be a monotheist and nothing else. There is no respect for religious freedom, equality and dignity. Not even common courtesy is extended to persons other than monotheists who want collective prayer to be conducted in the workplace. Council ignored the advice of the (unanimous) Institutional Forum in this regard, and in the same breath said it was being ‘democratic’. The gall! In the entire institution, there is woeful prejudice and ignorance about cultural and religious differences. From Council down, we are governed by cultural, moral and spiritual illiterates - they simply don't know any better. By a resolution of Council I have the ‘right’ to ask permission to leave a religious gathering. In the propaganda they invoke the Bill of Rights, yet they subvert it. Even in this survey you expected me to declare my ‘race’ - I don't accept that concept, it is not defined in law or in science. It's a disgraceful that a ‘university’ should have any truck with it. The ‘equity’ policy makes it very clear to me that I am not welcome here and should leave.

- Our Mission is too long winded and unclear, should be a lot shorter to start with.
- I am still not sure if the current leadership know where they are going or not.
- The mission needs to be revised as it does not represent a ‘new generation university’.
- The mission is too vague and longwinded as well as very academic and inclusive.
- It is one thing to have a mission and quite another to implement it, if even one factor is out of alignment for example understaffing and too much pressure on academics over and above their core function. No one is really doing missions. What is critical (academic need / what is really needed for excellence) audits.
- What is in writing and what really happened - and still happens - often differ.
- The customers and clients are identified however whether their needs are always met to the best of the institution's ability is doubtful.
- Community service requires much but is not funded by either the Government or the University. It is however in the mission.
- How can the organisation achieve purpose with unhappy staff?"

To summarize, the statistical analysis verified that more than half of the participants agreed that the NMMU had a clear mission / purpose statement, that customers or clients
to be served were identified and that the needs that the NMMU had to satisfy were stated. More than half of the participants have also stated that how the mission / purpose had to be achieved was unclear.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the mission/purpose statement of the NMMU were the following:

- Participants stated that the mission / purpose statement was clear but complained about the lack of congruence between the expressed mission and implementation of action.
- It was also suggested that the mission / purpose statement needed to be revised as it did not represent a ‘new generation university’.
- It was also suggested that clarity with respect to the academic mission of a comprehensive university needed to be sharpened and widely communicated.
- Customers and clients were identified but whether their needs were always met to the best of the institution's ability was doubtful especially if an organisation had to deal with so many unhappy employees.

5.4.3  Factor 3: Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives

This section consists of the following subscales and questions, namely:

Factor 3.1  Formulation of vision and objectives (Questions 11.1 - 11.4))
Factor 3.2  Financial perspective (Questions 11.5 - 11.7))
Factor 3.3  Customer perspective (Questions 11.8 - 11.10)
Factor 3.4  Internal business perspective (Questions 11.11 - 11.14)
Factor 3.5  Learning and growth (Questions 11.15 - 11.19)
Factor 3.1: Formulation of vision and objectives

Question 11.1: NMMU has a clear vision

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU has a clearer vision? The response to this question was: 43% of administrative and 28% of academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement, 36% administrative and 37% academic participants were undecided on the matter and 20% administrative and 34% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 37% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 36% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU has a clearer vision and 27% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.2: NMMU’s vision is translated into clearer measurable performance objectives

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU’s vision is translated into clearer measurable performance objectives?’ The response to this question was: 41% of administrative and 40% of academic participants
were undecided on the matter, 31% of administrative and 19% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 28% administrative and 41% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 41% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 25% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU’s vision is translated into clearer performance objectives and 35% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.3: People are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of NMMU’s performance objectives

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 11.3]

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that people are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of NMMU’s performance objectives?’ The response to this question was: 41% of administrative and 30% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 22% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 37% administrative and 50% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 36% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 21% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of NMMU’s performance objectives and 44% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.4: Our department’s objectives are better linked to those of the overall organisation

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that your department’s objectives are better linked to those of the overall organisation?’ The response was: of 56% administrative and 34% of academic participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter, 32% of administrative and 31% academic participants were undecided on the statement and 11% administrative and 34% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 45% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that their department’s objectives are better linked to those of the overall organisation, 32% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter and 23% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

To summarize the statistical analysis revealed that 45% of participants agreed that their department’s objectives were better linked to those of the overall organisation. When the neither agreed nor disagreed options were combined with the disagreed and strongly disagreed options then the response of participants was significantly negative. Some 80% of participants were uncertain of how they can personally contribute to the attainment of the NMMU’s performance objectives. A total of 75% were negative about the statement that the NMMU’s vision was translated into clearer measurable performance objectives and more than 60% of participants were negative about the clearer vision statement of the university.
Factor 3.2: Financial perspective

Question 11.5: NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives

In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives? The response was: 44% of administrative and 45% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 33% of administrative and 19% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 23% administrative and 36% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 45% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives and 30% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.6: More funds are allocated to departments

In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that more funds are allocated to departments? The response to this question was: 37% of administrative and 29% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 6% of
administrative and 12% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 57% administrative and 59% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 33% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 9% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that more funds are allocated to departments and 58% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.7: People feel more uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future

![Bar graph showing responses to Question 11.7]

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do people feel more uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future?’ The response to this question was: 27% of administrative and 23% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 55% of administrative and 58% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 18% administrative and 19% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 25% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 57% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people feel more uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future and 19% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 23) stated that mergers had a negative impact on institutional finances and the NMMU was not immune to it. After three years the situation has improved due to careful financial management. At the time of the merger the University possessed a small investment base of R25 million, with R109 million in the trust, and a cash equivalent of approximately R100 million. With about 2 500 staff on the payroll and an infrastructure spread across six campuses careful planning was demanded. Fortunately the DOE had a special fund to assist merging higher-education institutions and allocations of R37 million (for the recapitalisation of long term loans) and R52 million
(for merger-related projects in respect of infrastructure and operating systems) were received by the University.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that more than half of the participants felt uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future and they also disagreed that more funds were allocated to departments.

**Factor 3.3: Customer perspective**

**Question 11.8:** Our department’s performance compares more favourably with that of other tertiary institutions

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 11.8](chart.png)

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that your department’s performance compares more favourably with that of other tertiary institutions?’ The response to this question was: 38% of administrative and 28% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 43% of administrative and 42% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 18% administrative and 29% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 33% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 43% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that their department’s performance compares more favourably with that of other tertiary institutions and 24% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.9: Our department delivers a better service to the university after the merger

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that your department delivers a better service to the university after the merger?’ The response to this question was: 41% of administrative and 45% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 40% of administrative and 13% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 18% administrative and 42% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 43% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that their department delivers a better service to the university after the merger and 30% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.10: NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities?’ The response to this question was: 56% of administrative and 40% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 17% of administrative and 21% academic participants
agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 28% administrative and 39% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 48% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 19% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities and 33% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed a significantly negative response to this section when the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options were collated. Some 80% of participants were negative about the quality of the NMMU’s graduates. More than 70% were negative about their own department’s service delivery after the merger and more than half of the participants were also negative about their own department’s performance in comparison with that of other tertiary institutions.

**Factor 3.4: Internal business perspective**

**Question 11.11:** NMMU has better facilities to deliver a quality service to students
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‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU has better facilities to deliver a quality service to students?’ The response to this question was: 32% of administrative and 24% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 31% of administrative and 19% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 67% administrative and 59% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 28% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 25% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU had better facilities to deliver a quality service to students and 47% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.12: NMMU has better support services to deliver a quality service to its students

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU has better support services to deliver a quality service to its students?’ The response to this question was: 30% of administrative and 31% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 31% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 39% administrative and 50% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU had better support services to deliver a quality service to its students and 45% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.13: NMMU has more efficient administrative processes to support all its services

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU has more efficient administrative processes to support its services?’ The response to this question was: 26% of administrative and 17% of academic participants
were undecided on the matter, 25% of administrative and 7% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 49% administrative and 76% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 21% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 16% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU had more efficient administrative processes to support all its services and 62% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.14: Site allocation has not affected our department’s performance negatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that site allocation has not affected your department’s performance negatively?’ The response to this question was: 22% of administrative and 17% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 34% of administrative and 29% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 34% administrative and 53% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 19% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 37% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that site allocation had not affected their department’s performance negatively and 43% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that about 60% of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed that the NMMU had more efficient administrative processes to support all its services. When collating the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options the response of participants was significantly negative. Some 75% of participants were negative about the facilities and support services to students and a total of 60% of participants were negative about the site allocation.
Factor 3.5: Learning and growth

Question 11.15: People in our department have more skills to achieve the objectives of the university

The response to this question was: 35% of administrative and 38% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 37% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 28% administrative and 42% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 37% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 29% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department had more skills to achieve the objectives of the university and 35% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.16: People in our department have clearer performance targets according to which they are assessed

The response to this question was: 19% of administrative and 33% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 35% of administrative and 26% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 21% administrative and 19% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 19% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department had clearer performance targets according to which they are assessed and 21% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
assessed?’ The response to this question was: 33% of administrative and 26% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 36% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 30% administrative and 54% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, only 28% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department had clearer performance targets according to which they were assessed and 42% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.17: People in our department get more regular feedback from their supervisor / s on their work performance

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that people in your department get more regular feedback from your supervisor / s on your work performance?’ The response to this question was: 26% of administrative and 29% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 40% of administrative and 9% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 31% administrative and 62% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 28% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department got more regular feedback from their supervisor / s on their work performance and 46% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.18: People in our department are learning and updating their skills more frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that people in your department are learning and updating their skills more frequently?’ The response to this question was: 32% of administrative and 29% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 29% of administrative and 18% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 38% administrative and 53% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information is collated then 31% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 24% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department were learning and updating their skills more frequently and 46% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.19: People in our department are more creative than before the merger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that people in your department are more creative than before the merger?’ The response to this question was: 38% of administrative and 33% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 23% of administrative and 9% academic participants agreed and
strongly agreed with the statement and 40% administrative and 59% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 35% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 16% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that people in their department were more creative than before the merger and 49% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that the response to this section was significantly negative when the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options were collated. More than 80% of participants were not of the opinion that people were more creative after the merger. Some 75% of participants could not agree that people in their departments were updating their skills more frequently or that they received more regular feedback from their supervisors. A total of 70% of participants were also negative about the performance targets and skills in their departments.

5.4.4  Factor 4: Champions at all levels

This section consists of questions 15.1 - 15.14

Question 15.1:  Top management led the NMMU merger process effectively

‘To what extent do you agree that top management led the NMMU merger process effectively?’ A total of 32% of administrative and 28% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 37% of administrative and 22% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 32% administrative and 50% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that top management led the
NMMU merger process effectively, 29% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 41% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.2: Middle management (departmental level) led the NMMU merger process effectively

‘To what extent do you agree that middle management led the NMMU merger process effectively?’ A total of 31% of administrative and 42% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 39% of administrative and 23% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 30% administrative and 34% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 36% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that middle management led the merger process effectively, 31% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 33% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.3: Student admissions to the university have increased

‘To what extent do you agree that student admissions to the university have increased?’ A total of 43% of administrative and 53% of academic participants were undecided on
the matter, 25% of administrative and 17% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 31% administrative and 29% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 48% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that student admissions to the university had increased, 21% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 31% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit report stated that the combined headcount enrolment of the institutions that were to form the NMMU peaked in 2001 at 32 343 and by 2007 fallen to 23 688, thus a loss of 8 100 or 25%. The decline was due to an institutional decision to enhance the quality of provision to distance students by decreasing the number of enrolments in this mode of delivery. Full time equivalent (FTE) student enrolments increased by 1 400 over the period 2000 to 2007 as full time students began replacing part-time distance students by 2003. Since the merger the NMMU headcount enrolments have dropped from a total of 26 301 in 2004 to 23 688 in 2007 in which period the headcount enrolments in distance programmes declined from 5 700 to 3 934. The percentage of under-and postgraduate enrolments had been fairly stable across the years (HEQC Audit, 2008: 19-20).

Question 15.4: Graduates with skills necessary to meet the needs of the country have increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘To what extent do you agree that graduates with skills necessary to meet the needs of the country have increased?’ A total of 48% of administrative and 55% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 13% of administrative and 4% academic participants agreed with the statement and 40% administrative and 41% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated
then 52% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that graduates with skills necessary to meet the needs of the country had increased, 8% of participants agreed on the matter and 40% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

According to the HEQC Audit report the major fields of study in 2007 according to student headcounts were 31% science, engineering and technology (SET), 25% business and management, 22% education and 22% in other humanities. The NMMU experienced a substantial decrease in the enrolment figures in the faculty of education due to the aforementioned strategy of the NMMU to deliberately decrease its distance education enrolments. The increase in enrolments in SET and business and management as well the decrease in the enrolments in humanities was in line with national development priorities and the selected academic growth areas of the NMMU (HEQC Audit, 2008: 20).

The NMMU student success rates for 2007 were: 71.4% for contact students, 85.2% for distance education students with an overall figure of 73.1%. Little fluctuation occurred for the contact and overall figures between the years 2005 and 2007. The NMMU’s overall success rate, which is based on the ratio of successful FTE students to enrolled FTE students, was below the national average although it has risen marginally from 72.7% in 2004 to 73.1% in 2007 (HEQC Audit, 2008: 22).

**Question 15.5:** Student profiles are a better reflection of the demographics of South African society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘To what extent do you agree that student profiles are a better reflection of the demographics of South African society?’ A total of 39% of administrative and 38% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 50% of administrative and 52% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 10%
administrative and 9% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 39% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that student profiles were a better reflection of the demographics of South African society, 51% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 10% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit’s analysis of the distribution of NMMU student enrolments by race revealed a fairly constant distribution over the years 2003 to 2007. The figures for 2007 were 60.7% African, 12.1% Coloured, 2.5% Indian and 24.7% White (HEQC Audit, 2008: 21). It can be deduced from the aforementioned information that progress has been made in diversifying the student profile in respect of race.

**Question 15.6:** Staff profiles reflect the demographics of South African society much better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘To what extent do you agree that staff profiles reflect the demographics of South African society?’ A total of 47% of administrative and 41% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 24% of administrative and 17% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 29% administrative and 41% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 44% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that staff profiles reflected the demographics of South African society, 21% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 35% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit reflected the following staff profiles according to race for the university in 2007: 80.8% White, 10.1% African, 5.7% Coloured and 3.4% Indian. The figure for White, Coloured and Indian staff remained constant for the period 2004 to
2007 whilst the figure for African staff members increased by 2% (HEQC Audit, 2008: 18). It is clear that considerable progress still has to be made in diversifying the equity profile of the staff in respect of race.

Question 15.7: Academic programmes are better designed to meet regional needs

‘To what extent do you agree that academic programmes are better designed to meet regional needs?’ A total of 60% of administrative and 48% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 18% of administrative and 18% academic participants agreed and strongly agree with the statement and 22% administrative and 34% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 54% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that academic programmes were better designed to meet regional needs, 18% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 28% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.8: Academic programmes are better designed to meet national needs
‘To what extent do you agree that academic programmes are better designed to meet national needs?’ A total of 62% of administrative and 51% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 22% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 16% administrative and 30% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 56% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that academic programmes were better designed to meet national needs, 21% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 23% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

According to the HEQC Audit report the major fields of study in 2007 according to student headcounts were 31% science, engineering and technology (SET), 25% business and management, 22% education and 22% in other humanities. The NMMU experienced a substantial decrease in the enrolment figures in the faculty of education due to the aforementioned strategy of the NMMU to deliberately decrease its distance education enrolments. The increase in enrolments in SET and business and management as well the decrease in the enrolments in humanities was in line with national development priorities and the selected academic growth areas of the University (HEQC Audit, 2008: 20).

**Question 15.9:** Research is more linked to national developmental needs
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‘To what extent do you agree that research is more linked to national developmental needs?’ A total of 62% of administrative and 57% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 24% of administrative and 22% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 14% administrative and 21% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 59% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that research was more linked to

123
national developmental needs, 23% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 18% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.10: Research capacity of the NMMU has increased

‘To what extent do you agree that the research capacity of the NMMU has increased?’ A total of 59% of administrative and 40% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 21% of administrative and 19% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 20% administrative and 42% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 49% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the research capacity of the NMMU had increased, 20% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 31% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 118, 124) reported that the research capacity of academics at all levels needed to be raised and the number of rated researchers remained virtually static since 2004.

Question 15.11: Fragmentation of the apartheid past has been reduced
‘To what extent do you agree that fragmentation of the apartheid past has been reduced?’
A total of 32% of administrative and 37% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 36% of administrative and 31% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 33% administrative and 32% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 34% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that fragmentation of the apartheid past had been reduced, 34% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 33% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.12: Inequalities of the apartheid past have been eliminated
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‘To what extent do you agree that the inequalities of the apartheid past have been eliminated?’ A total of 38% of administrative and 39% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 19% of administrative and 18% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 42% administrative and 43% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 39% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the inequalities of the apartheid past have been eliminated, 19% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 42% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 15.13: For all its problems the NMMU merger has been a success

‘To what extent do you agree that for all its problems the NMMU merger has been a success?’ A total of 33% of administrative and 28% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 43% of administrative and 33% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 24% administrative and 39% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 31% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU merger had been a success, 38% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 31% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 15.14: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions regarding the success of the NMMU merger as follows:

- “Although admissions have increased, good graduates have decreased (inverse proportion). People are just admitted due to their skin colour and past, but they are not up to standard and so never reach graduation. Standards have dropped to try accommodating these people. Apartheid is present all over again but this time to the detriment of the white students and staff who have no opportunity to develop their skills and talents as all efforts are wasted on the blacks. The merger
was a big mistake which will have long-lasting negative effects on the country for generations to come (for those who are listening to me, mark my words).

- Success means better, effective service and outcomes - that is not currently the case - especially with reference to administrative functions, i.e. admissions, registration, public image in general, etc.
- Apartheid past? Give me a break. If anything this question proves an obsession with race where the objective is the political, social and employment marginalisation of white staff and students at the NMMU.
- The process was painful, but where there is no pain there is no gain. All in all a success, our strengths have been combined. The problems that still persist could be dealt with now. No institution is perfect and problem free.
- Hard to respond...Be careful...some of the statements are politically speaking expedient.
- The merger sucked…
- Demographics cannot be the only criteria singled out for staff profiles; a University's staff profile must be measured by far more important criteria; demographics are only politically correct criteria.
- It could be regarded as a qualified success, in the sense that what had to be done (as ordained) was done to the best of the (limited) ability of those involved, who were often not qualified to handle the traumatic changes that were required.
- The NMMU as institution is not necessarily a better one than the separate institutions were before the merger. Reverse apartheid is now taking place in appointment processes - this has happened in several places. So how can it be said that the merger process was a success? I don't know. Given another 5 - 10 years, maybe the NMMU can rise above the mess that had been made in the last couple of years.
- Most black students still register courses in which employability is not that much. Most of our courses are not responsive to regional needs because we are still importing certain skills.
- If the NMMU merger is compared to other mergers in Higher Education in South Africa then it is clear that, from a systems and procedural perspective, it was managed extremely well. Unfortunately the “people” dimension of the merger did not feature as a priority and many staff members were alienated as a result of this.
• All in all, I am positive about this merger and took a decision in 2004 that I would go with it and not against it. A positive outlook will in most cases prove beneficial to all.

• Top and middle management? From what I have seen they were just looking after themselves. In any case they could not possibly have done a competent job - there was never remotely enough time to plan. I won't comment on measurable performance of the University (research etc). Let the figures speak for themselves. When I hear talk of ‘demographics’, I realize that people are still as racially obsessed and hateful as ever they were. There has been absolutely NO progress towards non-racialism. The boot is just on the other foot now.

• There are still entrenched divides between employees of the various institutions and this becomes apparent whenever promotions or awards are considered. This is because all ex-UPE staff have ended up in management positions in our faculty. They tend to look after their own, which happen to be the staff pre-merger.

• Racism will never end in this institution!

• NMMU is functioning, stabilizing and moving forward so based on that, one should say the merger was indeed a success; it is after all our first merger!!!!

• More paperwork = less research!!!!!!!

• Inequalities of the past have not been eliminated if in classes there are still lecturers who allow Afrikaans speakers to write an assignment in Afrikaans (their mother tongue), when Xhosa speaking students have to write in English, a second language. It means there is still an inequality in the way students are expressing their knowledge which is very disturbing at this stage of transformation.

• Academics standards are dropping in some departments because good academics are leaving.

• Woman and other races are still not moving up the ranks. Barriers held up by White men are still very much alive at some campuses.

• At face value we can say that the merger is a success. The scars that people endure from the merger process should not be underestimated. Merged institutions elsewhere failed after a while because of unresolved issues of salary harmonisation, lack of clear job description, the ignorance of the human factor, etc.

• Certainly not on all levels.

• There are WAY too much TOKEN efforts towards equity. Black people who are useless should not be promoted simply to get the ratios looking right. It is an
insult to the many who are really good at what they do!! Rather cultivate new staff members through mentorship programs than promote people who have over and over proven they are not good academic material! We have enough VERY promising students who could fill the equity gaps.

- Too many international students who are not proficient in English are admitted to the university. The problem seems to have been addressed to some extent during the past year, but it is still a problem.
- Too early by far, to tell. Wait and see...
- I don't view the merger as an immediate success, although ultimately it was the only feasible option for the region - it has decimated intellectual growth of PE and surrounds.
- Everything is on the ‘surface,’ as soon as a problem arises the mass retaliate with violence. Racism is more rampant than ever in reverse.
- Pay the employees according to what they do”.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that the only statement that obtained a positive rating was the question on whether student profiles were a better reflection of the demographics of South African society after the merger, the rest of this section was very negatively interpreted especially if the neutral and disagree options were combined. The outcome presented itself as follows: some 90% of participants were negative with regard to graduates having the necessary skills to meet the needs of the country. A total of 80% of participants were also not of the opinion that academic programmes were better designed to meet regional or national needs; that the inequalities of the apartheid past had been eliminated; that the research capacity of the NMMU had increased or that it was linked to national developmental needs; that student admissions to the NMMU had increased or that staff profiles reflect the demographics of South African society. Altogether 70% of participants were not of the opinion that either top or middle management led the merger process effectively.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with participants’ perceptions of the success of the merger were as follows:

- Participants stated that divides still existed between employees of the different institutions.
- It was apparent that racial and equity issues had not yet been resolved.
• Participants have also expressed their concern regarding academic standards due to the poor preparation of students and the loss of excellent academics. One participant observed ‘although admissions have increased, good graduates have decreased’ and that students still registered for courses with low employability.

• The total success of the merger could be summarized by the following statement of one of the participants ‘If the NMMU merger is compared to other mergers in Higher Education in South Africa then it is clear that, from a systems and procedural perspective, it was managed extremely well. Unfortunately the ‘people’ dimension of the merger did not feature as a priority and many staff members were alienated as a result of this’.

5.4.5 Factor 5: Culture and community

This section consists of questions 11.20, 11.21 and 12.1 – 12.6.

Question 11.20: Compared to the situation prior to the merger all stakeholders identify more strongly with the NMMU

In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that all stakeholders identify more strongly with the NMMU?’ The response to this question was: 30% of administrative and 30% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 25% of administrative and 10% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 45% administrative and 60% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 18% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that all stakeholders identified more strongly with the NMMU and 52% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.21: NMMU is putting more effort into the development of its own culture
(shared values / beliefs / purposes in work)
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‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU is putting more effort into the development of its own culture?’ The response to this question was: 32% of administrative and 30% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 44% of administrative and 34% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 24% administrative and 36% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 31% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 39% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU was putting more effort into the development of its own culture and 29% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 12.1: Appointment procedures of the university
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In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the appointment procedures reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 41% of administrative and 42% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 17% of administrative and 13%
academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 42% administrative and 45% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 41% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the appointment procedures reflect the value system of the university, 15% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 44% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 12.2: Reward systems of the university

In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the reward systems reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 28% of administrative and 25% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 7% of administrative and 3% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 65% administrative and 72% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 26% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the reward systems reflected the value system of the university, 5% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 68% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 12.3: Relevant policies of the university

In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the relevant policies reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 45% of administrative and 46% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 29% of administrative and 28% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 26% administrative and 26% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 45% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the relevant policies reflected the value system of the university, 28% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 26% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Questions 12.4: Behaviour of top management

In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the behaviour of top management reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 43% of administrative and 32% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 13% of administrative and 17% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 45% administrative and 51% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 37% of participants neither agreed
nor disagreed that the behaviour of top management reflect the value system of the university, 15% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 47% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 12.5: Behaviour of middle management (departmental level)

In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the behaviour of middle management reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 44% of administrative and 39% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 28% of administrative and 25% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 28% administrative and 36% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 42% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the behaviour of middle management reflected the value system of the university, 27% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 32% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 12.6: Behaviour of fellow employees

In response to the question ‘To what extent do you agree that the behaviour of fellow employees reflect the value system of the university?’ a total of 47% of administrative
and 43% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 32% of administrative and 29% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 20% administrative and 27% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 45% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the behaviour of fellow employees reflect the value system of the university, 31% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 24% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 12.7: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with the value system of the university as follows:

• “There is no reward system.
• There is no reward system, and also no accountability for poor performance. Where in any working environment is it left to the employee to motivate good performance - surely the employer should have policies in place to recognise this?
• Who cares?? It's not going to make any difference...
• The HOD is not very organised and has a grudge shared with most of the other people and against another department which is actually trying to help us.
• Call me in to motivate...each of them is a little Kingdom.
• Individuals within the department position themselves without thinking about the impact of their behaviour on others. (Thank goodness these are the exception than the rule). A case in point - information is shared before presentation to a task team, this individual copies & pastes shared information as part of his / her plan, but to soften the ‘blow’ my name is added below his / her name. Other staff members have complained that it is about self-gain for the said individual and he / she doesn't realise what damage he / she is doing to the team. I don't trust and share as frequently as in the past - which is in fact, detrimental to the larger team.
• If the value system of the NMMU was regulated correctly - we would not have staff looking for alternative employment.
• Academic criteria for the appointment of staff are often subservient to goals of achievement with regard to equity, instead of linked to such goals, resulting in a loss to the institution as a whole.

• In our department we have much support - but the same cannot be said of management at higher levels.

• The value regarding fairness and equity needs attention because many of the systems and processes relating to the merger were unfair to many categories of staff. It seemed as if management manipulated processes to suit affordability aims rather than to apply rules consistently and fairly. Progress on harmonising salaries has been far too slow and poorly communicated to staff in terms of how it will be done and what the timelines will be. Many policies have been designed to control rather than enable the core business of the university.

• I think I've covered this in previous comments. Appointment procedures are racially biased and discriminatory. What reward systems? There is still no policy on respect for cultural and religious diversity. And it certainly is not practised by top or middle management. (I personally have been bullied and threatened with disciplinary action by a VERY senior person because of my religious beliefs). Fellow employees do not display team spirit, solidarity or loyalty. You have to watch your back.

• Some HODs are still a law unto themselves and don’t follow rules. Black staff at low levels is still being mistreated and are too afraid to speak because of fear of further discrimination and losing their jobs! By the time a post is advertised in a particular Department, they already know who they are going to employ!

• Any organization of this size will have good and bad employees. NMMU however do not reward excellent employees very simply causing excellent employees to deteriorate to the level of bad employees. There are no systems in place to convince / motivate / force / enable bad employees to change.

• Favouritism still exists as well as an extraordinary lenience towards equity candidates.

• White lecturers are racist towards black students.

• The last eight years I have improved my qualifications, won two awards, published articles, ventured in collaboration projects and I am currently doing the work of a senior lecturer yet I am not even on the bottom notch of a lecturer. Financially I have fallen by the wayside. The goalposts are moved just as I think I have made it!! Frustrating and demotivating!!! HR management is pathetic!!
• Top management of the NMMU behaves as if they were never at the bottom and that they do not understand what people are going through. Sometimes their judgment is clouded by having too much information on policies and procedures and forgetting to use their common sense and show a human side.

• Middle management is often in the unenviable position of having to protect its own job rather than develop core values and encourage high levels of quality development.

• Generally the staff is ‘glum’.

• During the placement procedure merit did not play a role and favourites got placed higher while more experienced and competent individuals were placed lower.

• Some staff is employed because they know Mr or Ms XYZ. No consistency in applying the procedures.

• Insufficient transparency relating to these issues, poor performance is still maintained and not dealt with and thus sending message of demotivation and distrust”.

To summarize, the statistical analyses revealed a very negative response when the neutral and disagree options were combined with regard to the implementation of the value system of the university. Some 90% of participants were dissatisfied with the reward systems. More than 80% were not impressed with the appointment procedures of the university or the behaviour of top management in reflecting the value system of the university. Some 70% of employees were also not impressed with the behaviour of middle management, the relevant policies of the university or with the behaviour of fellow employees.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the value system of the university created the following response from participants:

• Participants felt that the value system of the university was not supported by the reward systems.

• They complained that poor performance was tolerated and that there were no systems in place to convince / motivate / force / enable bad employees to change. This resulted in poor motivation and distrust amongst the other employees.

• Unhappiness was also expressed with the appointment procedures as participants felt that appointment procedures were racially biased and discriminatory.
• In the management of staff, heads of departments were not excluded from negative feedback. They were accused of favouritism and protecting their own jobs instead of encouraging higher levels of quality performance from their employees.
• Top management was accused of not understanding the complexities of their employees’ challenges.

5.4.6 Factor 6: Competitive competencies

This section consists of questions 11.22 – 11.32

Question 11.22: We have more top performers / academics in our department

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that you have more top performers / academics in your department?’ The response to this question was: 20% of administrative and 24% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 11% of administrative and 15% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 35% administrative and 53% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 43% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 11% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that they had more top performers in their department and 45% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.23: We have more top performers / academics in our department relative to other similar departments in the country

In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that you have more top performers / academics in your department relative to other similar departments in the country? The response to this question was: 60% of administrative and 34% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 10% of administrative and 14% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 31% administrative and 52% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 47% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 12% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that they had more top performers / academics in their department relative to other similar departments in the country and 41% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.24: NMMU attracts more top performers as employees than other universities in the country

In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU attracts more top performers as employees than other universities in the country? The response to this question was: 29% of administrative and 17% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 5% of administrative and 5%
academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 66% administrative and 77% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 23% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 6% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU attracted more top performers as employees than other universities in the country and 72% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.25: NMMU loses more top performers than other universities in the country

![Bar chart showing responses to question 11.25](chart.png)

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU loses more top performers than other universities in the country?’ The response to this question was: 28% of administrative and 32% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 64% of administrative and 63% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 8% administrative and 5% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 73% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU lost more top performers than other universities in the country and 7% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 61) reported that the University lost a number of senior and highly experienced staff immediately after the merger. Concerned about the loss of excellent staff the University developed a Retention of Scarce / Critical Skills Policy which was implemented since June 2007. This policy aimed to improve the retention of staff by permitting the payment of a scarce-and-critical-skills allowance to certain categories of employees.
Question 11.26: NMMU develops and trains more employees to be top performers

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU develops and trains more employees to be top performers?’ The response to this question was: 39% of administrative and 38% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 11% of administrative and 9% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 50% administrative and 53% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 39% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 10% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU developed and trained more employees to be top performers and 52% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.27: NMMU pays better salaries to attract top performers

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU pays better salaries to attract top performers?’ The response to this question was: 12% of administrative and 12% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 5% of administrative and 1% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 83% administrative and 84% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 12% of
participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 4% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU paid better salaries to attract top performers and 85% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.28: NMMU pays better salaries to retain top performers

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU pays better salaries to retain top performers?’ The response to this question was: 12% of administrative and 11% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 2% of administrative and 1% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 86% administrative and 89% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 11% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 2% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU paid better salaries to retain top performers and 87% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.29: NMMU’s pay systems have improved

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU’s pay systems have improved?’ The response to this question was: 16% of
administrative and 25% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 26% of
administrative and 16% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the
statement and 58% administrative and 59% academic staff disagreed and strongly
disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 21% of
participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 21% of participants agreed and
strongly agreed that the NMMU’s pay systems had improved and 58% disagreed and
strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question11.30: NMMU acknowledges exceptional performance much more

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the
NMMU acknowledges exceptional performance much more?’ The response to this
question was: 24% of administrative and 23% of academic participants were undecided
on the matter, 10% of administrative and 10% academic participants agreed and strongly
agreed with the statement and 67% administrative and 67% academic staff disagreed and
strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 24% of
participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 10% of participants agreed and
strongly agreed that the NMMU acknowledged exceptional performance much more and
67% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 11.31: NMMU investigates more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU investigates more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees?’ The response to this question was: 26% of administrative and 29% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 12% of administrative and 4% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 62% administrative and 67% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 27% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 8% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU investigated more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees and 65% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.32: NMMU encourages entrepreneurship much more

‘In comparison with the situation prior to the merger to what extent do you agree that the NMMU encourages entrepreneurship much more?’ The response to this question was: 33% of administrative and 39% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 16% of administrative and 17% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 52% administrative and 44% academic staff disagreed and strongly
disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 36% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed on the matter, 17% of participants agreed and strongly agreed that the NMMU encouraged entrepreneurship much more and 48% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 11.33: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions with regard to the situation prior to the merger as follows:

- “I have tried my best at NMMU over the last 5 years under very difficult situations, but get no decent salary even, never mind still rewards. I try to study part time as well but there is no time to enjoy it. I am more overworked and underpaid than other people in my department. I enjoy the work and subject material, but I am really not treated as I should. The university does not appreciate my loyalty and dedication.

- Pay packages are still an unresolved issue.

- As far as remuneration is concerned the NMMU is busy impoverishing its staff. Top management are on very high salaries but the rest of us get shafted with salaries that are not even remotely related to industry or other universities. The restrictive policies on salaries (including the moratorium on notch increases) make the NMMU a very poor employer regarding its salaries. On entrepreneurship, the new NMMU is so hell bent on grabbing levies and taxing entrepreneurial activities to fatten their coffers that it is stifling all new enterprises.

- I don't think staff have been looked after or nurtured at all in the new institution. We have taken a back seat to the merger and financial requirements!!

- The payment system has caused major frustration. The structure / procedures for payment for NCW staff are not made clear, no document from the NMMU to state what forms to be filled in, to whom they must be processed and who is responsible for what type of payments. We have staff that was very angry about delayed payments, and it was not due to late or lack of payment requests.
• We have more ‘policies, objectives, rules and procedures’ wonderful manuals and slogans for the ‘world outside’ but what does it help?? The quality of work is scary, the quality of students is a disgrace and the work does not get done. Really in theory it sounds wonderful and I suppose for the powers to be that live in the ‘gekke paradys’ and ‘stone castle without windows’ it is all hunky-dory and wonderful. But in reality, I want to burst into tears. We really went downhill with the merger and it will take a MIRACLE to correct everything in my lifetime still.

• With ALL the policies the NMMU which ought to be a WISDOM / KNOWLEDGE institution, kills all entrepreneurial spirit. As wisdom workers, we are managed just like factory workers from the industrial era (=90 years ago). I can motivate this in detail...with evidence.

• The only observable strategy to gain control over finances is by cutting budgets and paying substandard salaries.

• Three years down the line we have come a long way but I can't but help to ask: ‘Was the merger REALLY necessary?’ (And I supported the process from the start) Those who fought for it are all on retirement (soon to join them is the minister of education who started this process) - we are overworked as we now need to serve 7 campuses with the same number of staff, whilst they can play golf, drink G & T and have fat pensions ... It really doesn’t seem fair. We were once again puppets in the hand of politicians.

• Top academics who retired have not been replaced by successors at the same (or higher) levels of achievement or qualification. (Numerous cases can be mentioned.)

• NMMU does not pay employees competitive salaries as the result we are losing skilled employees.

• From my perception, it seems as if staff is expected to do much more with much less - and if you don't perform as expected, regardless of the operational environment, you will be penalised in the long run.

• The general perception is that NMMU does not have any loyalty to staff that have been loyal to this institution. The staff morale is the least of NMMU’s worries, where it should be high on the list. Staff is regularly reminded of how little money the faculty has and that we should be thankful that we have a job. There is no reward for hard work, and no appreciation shown for added effort.
• The salaries at NMMU are not good enough to attract top academics and cannot compare with the private sector.

• NMMU should do more to identify top performers both in academia and administrative sections of the university with a view to recognising and rewarding these employees. Very little is done to recognise and reward excellence and this could encourage mediocrity because top performers are treated the same as ‘loafers’ - with the only exception being the research domain. There should be incentives for excellence in research, teaching, engagement, innovation and service delivery/contribution to vision attainment (the latter to be utilized to also include and encourage admin / academic support staff who do not qualify for academic awards).

• Entrepreneurship is encouraged because we have to deliver the same quality with far less support and resources.

• Before the merger there was at least some (meagre) opportunity for training / skills development. Since the merger there has been none in my department. No time. No guidance. No initiative from above... There was some waffle at a ‘strategic planning workshop’ about ‘excellence’ and ‘professionalism’ - just verbiage. I myself offered to give a 10-minute presentation to share some insights with colleagues about some techniques which I had found hugely time-saving. I put several days' ‘leave’ into preparing a PowerPoint and demo. In almost three days of the workshop, 10 minutes could not be found for such a purpose. Next time I won't offer. The University as a whole faces huge problems, most of which can be attributed to lack of planning and lack of opportunity (time) to plan. Overcrowding, monstrous shortage of lecture venues. Measures guaranteed to demotivate staff and to encourage skilled staff to leave: yes. But measures to retain or replace skills? Measures to reward ‘excellence’? Certainly not in this department, and not visible elsewhere either.

• The new university has been plundered from its symbols of stature and tradition. Some examples to illustrate the point, the VC has become the CEO of the institution and the title of deans’ has been changed to that of Executive Deans. Are we not also executive lecturers and professors? Senate, the forum for intellectual stimulating and challenging debates has become the rubber stamp of decisions taken elsewhere. Recommendations are that degree names in future should not be written in Latin. Students at graduation ceremonies go through ‘roll calls’ by only reading initials and surnames instead of making it more personal by
using their names as well. A plea is made to keep some traditions in the new institution.

• The systems put in place after the merger appeared to merely secure the management positions and established ex-UPE academics.

• We have moved backwards regarding our pay systems. The PE Technikon paid electronically not with cheques and companies out there always complimented the Technikon with the way they processed payment.

• There is so much difference in people in the same scale yet the harmonisation process is not doing what it is suppose to be doing. How do you explain a salary difference of over R50 000.00 per annum for people in the same grade and doing the same job?

• NMMU is not even aware of some of the amazing effort being spent on various projects, but since these projects are not that visible to everyone, the hardworking employees dedicated to these projects never receive the accolades they deserve or even encouragement. As for entrepreneurship, I see this as falling under the banner of third stream income which in many instances has failed dramatically due to red tape, and seeing all third stream income entities as all being exactly similar and as such have to operate under the same set of rules.

• There is too much red tape involved in many processes; a corporate culture with mechanisms to improve efficiency needs to be developed.

• The comprehensive institution is not an attractive option compared to a traditional university.

• The reallocation of the foundation /extended programme to the Missionvale campus has a negative effect in the willingness and readiness of students to be part of the programme. This also enforces stereotypes and perceptions that anything that is not good belongs to the township. The structure at the university supports academics to perform, but when it comes to our faculty academics are not given opportunities to be developed. When academics make their own means to be developed they are regarded to be developing for their own good and not for the faculty. There is no vision and strategy for the development and retention of individual academics. Academics are just seen to be people who should be doing teaching and research which is regarded as something separate from teaching. People who already have an advantage in research are given more opportunity to develop themselves and no strategy is put in place to develop the upcoming academics who need more time off from lectures so that they can develop their
research skills. The NMMU salary scale cannot compare to other institutions. One feels that they are giving their all and not getting anything in return in terms of remuneration. This results in academics leaving for better salaries to other universities and the private sector.

- I think we are being taken for granted. I have been stuck on the same notch for 5 years now DESPITE being a TOP performer in BOTH teaching AND research. SPECIFICALLY due to this, I am planning to leave the NMMU as soon as I finish my doctoral studies (within the next 12-18 months).

- Poor management of the harmonisation and grading processes leaving personnel upset and disillusioned.

- It's difficult to spend more time improving yourself and your work when most of your time is spent trying to cope with merger related issues such as the inheritance of sub-standard courses and the endless meetings that we are forced to attend. You end up spending so much time trying to sort out rubbish problems that shouldn't exist in the first place that you don't have time for anything else.

- The University has become more bureaucratic than the previous Institution - it even displays a character of a government culture.

- NMMU, in my personal experience, does not value excellence or top performance, but rather values obedience to the status quo.

- NMMU salaries are lagging behind other institutions for similar positions.

- From what I have heard from students, they are not satisfied with the quality of many lecturers.

- Poor performance by some Faculties and shortage of lecturers made it impossible from students to do well, current lecturers are never available, they all have private jobs on the side line, use temps just to fill the gap.

- Our Department is unable to keep stability in terms of staffing. People come and leave due to uncertainty. No clear commitment to retain staff. Contracts without benefits are threatening the department.

- NMMU will still lose more top performers if it keeps paying staff peanuts.

- I don't think NMMU has proved itself as yet to staff in terms of pay, training or academic excellence.

- Poor performers are maintained and perhaps even rewarded and lack of retention plan and strategy that is owned by all departments and managers exists. Managers who perform poorly are not performance managed sending messages of demotivation to the rest of the staff. The team of high performers are not
adequately looked after and fast-tracked and this practice is not owned by Line Managers but deferred as someone else's responsibility. Teaching and learning are not yet inclusive thus excluding adequate participation by marginalized students and staff. The Hearing community excludes the DEAF on professional and student life / teaching and learning level”.

The abovementioned questions dealing with the current situation in comparison to the situation prior to the merger elicited intense reactions from participants. More than 85% of participants disagreed that the NMMU paid better salaries to attract or to retain top performers. Some 70% of participants also disagreed that the NMMU attracted more top performers than other universities in the country. More than 70% of participants agreed that the NMMU lost more top performers to other universities in the country. More than half of the employees disagreed that the NMMU developed and trained more employees as top performers, acknowledged exceptional performance or investigated more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees. More than half of the participants also disagreed that the pay systems of the university had improved and more than half of them also disagreed that all stakeholders identified more strongly with the new university.

The main themes of the open-ended question in this section revolved around the following issues:

- Participants expressed their frustration with the remuneration and pay systems as well as a lack of appreciation for loyalty, dedication and hard work.
- The perception also existed that the university was losing excellent staff due to poor remuneration packages. It had been suggested that more should be done to identify and recognise high performers and that incentives are implemented for excellence in research, teaching, engagement, innovation and service delivery or contribution to vision attainment. The latter to also include and encourage administrative and academic support staff who did not qualify for academic awards.
- On the entrepreneurial front it was suggested that policies must be simplified to make it possible for employees to engage in this new adventure.
- Participants also suggested that red tape involved in so many administrative processes should be eliminated and a corporate culture established that would improve efficiency.
Participants complained and questioned the quality of service delivery. Overcrowded lecture halls and a shortage of excellent lecturers were other complaints. It was interesting to note that a plea was made for the introduction of a performance management system. The quality of work performance was specifically highlighted as well as the quality of the students.

- A need was expressed for the creation of more developmental and promotion opportunities for lecturers and specifically for the development of research skills.
- It appeared from the feedback that marginalized students and personnel were still excluded.
- A plea was also made for retaining those qualities and traditions that made a university a true university.

5.4.7 Factor 7: Coherent strategy

This section consists of questions 13.1 – 13.9

Question 13.1: The quality of the academic programmes has improved

‘To create value for its stakeholders, to what extent do you agree that the quality of the programmes has improved since the merger?’ A total of 49% of administrative and 48% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 18% of administrative and 15% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 32% administrative and 37% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 49% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the quality of the programmes had improved since the merger, 17% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 35% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 13.2: The organisational structure of the NMMU has become a barrier in getting the work done

‘To what extent do you agree that the organisational structure of the NMMU has become a barrier in getting the work done?’ A total of 34% of administrative and 22% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 53% of administrative and 69% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 14% administrative and 9% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 28% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the organisational structure had become a barrier in getting the work done, 61% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 12% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 13.3: The decentralised decision making systems have made it easier to get the work done

‘To what extent do you agree that the decentralised decision making systems have made it easier to get the work done?’ A total of 51% of administrative and 38% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 25% of administrative and 23% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 24% administrative and 39% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this
information was collated then 44% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the decentralised decision making systems had made it easier to get the work done, 24% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 31% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 13.4: NMMU staff has become less responsive to student needs

‘To what extent do you agree that NMMU staff have become less responsive to student needs?’ A total of 32% of administrative and 34% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 39% of administrative and 34% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 28% administrative and 34% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 33% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU had become less responsive to student needs, 36% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 31% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 13.5: NMMU staff has become more responsive to community needs

‘To what extent do you agree that the NMMU staff have become more responsive to community needs in creating more value to its stakeholders?’ A total of 45% of administrative and 53% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 32% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the
statement and 23% administrative and 27% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 49% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU staff had become more responsive to community needs, 26% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 26% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 13.6: NMMU staff has decreased their research outputs

‘To what extent do you agree that the NMMU staff have decreased their research outputs?’ A total of 67% of administrative and 40% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 22% of administrative and 38% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 10% administrative and 21% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 54% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU staff had decreased their research outputs, 30% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 16% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 118) reported that the 2006 research publication output at the NMMU were produced by less than 30% of academic staff members. The broad trends from 2004 to 2007 indicated that the Faculty of Science was responsible for approximately a third of the subsidised research publications, followed by the Faculties of Arts and Law. These outputs were substantially below both the big five research institutions as well as the second tier of institutions such as North West University and the University of Johannesburg.
Question 13.7: NMMU staff has increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs

‘To what extent do you agree that the NMMU staff have increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs to create value for its stakeholders?’ A total of 64% of administrative and 56% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 15% of administrative and 14% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 21% administrative and 29% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 60% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU staff had increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs, 15% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 26% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 119) reported that the NMMU had five patents (two South African and three international patents) by the end of 2007.

Question 13.8: Staff’s work performance has become more linked to reward systems

‘To what extent do you agree that staff’s work performance has become more linked to reward systems in creating value to its stakeholders?’ A total of 20% of administrative and 40% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 13% of administrative
and 8% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 66% administrative and 51% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 30% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that staff’s work performance had become more linked to reward systems, 11% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 59% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

The HEQC Audit (2008: 62, 64) reported that the University Council approved a performance management system, known as the Excellence Development System (EDS) in October 2007 with the intention of phasing it in during 2008. A workload policy for academic staff was also developed during 2008 with the overarching purpose to ensure both an equitable distribution of work within teaching units, and an appropriate balance between teaching and learning, research and community engagement responsibilities amongst academic staff members.

Question 13.9: NMMU’s relationships with relevant stakeholders have increased

‘To what extent do you agree that the NMMU’s relationships with the relevant stakeholders have increased its value to its stakeholders?’ A total of 62% of administrative and 60% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 29% of administrative and 19% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 10% administrative and 21% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 61% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the NMMU’s relationships with the relevant stakeholders had increased, 24% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 16% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 13.10: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with perceptions regarding NMMU staff's ability to create value as follows:

- “Hardly any time to do anything else but work.
- We are just too busy with all the extra red tape to really have time to see what is going on, never mind respond to the needs!!! Brownie points seem to count a lot, enforcing academics to be selective in how they approach tasks. A case of - what can I get out of this.
- What reward systems?
- All initiatives from staff are micro-managed.
- People are bombarded by red tape (forms, policies, procedures etc. etc.) and are becoming more office bound. Time to think innovatively on a regular basis simply doesn't exist as work loads have more than doubled for the same number of staff. Sometimes one actually feels that you don't even want to take leave, because on your return, you'll come back to a backlog and avalanche of paper work, requests etc. etc.
- A question; Are some of the NMMU staff truly committed to this Institution through their service delivery and assistance to students and staff after the merger; OR is their attitude - waiting for their kids to finish school so that tertiary tuition becomes freely available? What is our staff's coping mechanism - I mentioned earlier the merger failed to look at the needs of our staff.
- Staff often feel (I am one of them!!) that they should simply be allowed to do their jobs as well as they can - because they actually enjoy what they are doing! Having all the merger-related issues dumped on staff - without decent explanations / rationale as to why and how, simply demotivates staff.
- There are no rewards for hard work.
- What decentralised decision making systems? This is too depressing to continue writing.
- No work performance systems are in place.
• The staff is very demotivated, how can you have a boss with no qualification or experience in a particular admin department? The person has less qualifications than his subordinates and knows nothing about ITS, yet they still get appointed the HOD. Is it because of colour or what?

• Several academics with good research outputs have left due to the merger and the comprehensive nature of the institution.

• Do reward systems exist? If they do, no one explained them to me and I have not been notified on their existence.

• I think our financial and ordering processes are PATHETIC.

• Working with the systems is the most frustrating and time consuming experience.

• Too much time spent on senseless meetings which make it difficult to up your work. Too little staff results in huge classes which put strain on the amount of time you have to complete your work.

• More and more admin for HODs and directors as dean's delegate downwards, ever downwards. Research outputs have increased, and everyone is trying to publish / learning how to, due to the enormous incentive now offered (post new Research policy).

• Staff worked for financial rewards rather than simply for the joy of teaching and learning. Students learned this same mentality and become largely functionalist in their approach, rather than desiring to learn for the sake of learning.

• No reward system in place for suggestions that lead to improvement in faculties, departments, higher management takes the credit”.

To summarize, the statistical analysis on the NMMU staff’s ability to create value for its stakeholders elicited the following response from employees. More than half of the participants were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) on the following questions, namely the:

• NMMU staff have decreased their research outputs;
• NMMU staff have increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs and
• NMMU’s relationships with relevant stakeholders have increased.

Some 60% of participants agreed that the organisational structure of the NMMU had become a barrier in getting the work done and they disagreed that staff’s work performance had become more linked to reward systems.
The following responses were significantly negative when combining the neutral and disagree options. More than 80% of participants questioned that the quality of the academic programmes had improved after the merger. A total of 75% of participants were also not satisfied with the decentralised decision making systems and response to community needs. Some 60% of participants disagreed that staff had become less responsive to student needs.

The main themes of the open-ended section dealing with staff’s ability to create value generated the following response from participants:

- Staff members complained that they were too busy to have time to think innovatively.
- Added to this were the complaints about being micro-managed, too much time spent on senseless meetings, being bombarded by red tape and working within the systems as frustrating and time consuming.
- Heads of departments and directors were not excluded from increasing administrative responsibilities.
- Participants voiced their frustration about the lack of incentives and a performance management system.

5.4.8 Factor 8: Communication and consultation

This section consists of questions 14.1 – 14.6

Question 14.1: Information was supplied at regular intervals as the merger progressed

‘To what extent do you agree that information was supplied at regular intervals as the merger progressed?’ A total of 15% of administrative and 11% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 67% of administrative and 74% academic participants
agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 19% administrative and 14% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 13% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that information was supplied at regular intervals, 71% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 16% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 14.2: Sufficient information was supplied

‘To what extent do you agree that sufficient information was supplied?’ A total of 25% of administrative and 31% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 36% of administrative and 27% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 38% administrative and 42% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 28% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that sufficient information was supplied, 32% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 40% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 14.3: The right kind of information was provided
‘To what extent do you agree that the right kind of information was provided?’ A total of 26% of administrative and 31% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 26% of administrative and 20% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 48% administrative and 49% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 28% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the right kind of information was supplied, 23% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 48% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 14.4: The information was trustworthy
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‘To what extent do you agree that information was trustworthy?’ A total of 39% of administrative and 23% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 17% of administrative and 22% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 45% administrative and 56% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 31% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that information was trustworthy, 19% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 50% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.
Question 14.5: Although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger people felt they were not heard

‘To what extent do you agree that although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger people felt they were not heard?’ A total of 15% of administrative and 1% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 78% of administrative and 83% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 7% administrative and 3% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this information was collated then 14% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that people felt that they were not heard, 81% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 6% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 14.6: People were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made

‘To what extent do you agree that people were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made?’ A total of 19% of administrative and 13% of academic participants were undecided on the matter, 76% of administrative and 81% academic participants agreed and strongly agreed with the statement and 37% administrative and 5% academic staff disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement. When this
information was collated then 16% of participants neither agreed nor disagreed that people were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made, 79% of participants agreed and strongly agreed on the matter and 5% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

Question 14.7: Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with staff perceptions with regard to the information / communication received from top management during the merger as follows:

• “Nobody ever listens to what I say or recommend.

• I think that certain decisions were made and steamrolled by management, this could be due to the fact that certain decisions / actions had to be made by deadlines.

• Too many...I am running out of time.

• As said before, we were the puppets in the hands of politicians and soon to be retired top management. I still can't see the value. Why fix something that wasn't broken?

• Often information was supplied that simply was not a true reflection of the facts; decisions were taken without really taking into consideration the input from relevant stakeholders - and it seemed as if many decisions were taken literally BEFORE consultation took place.

• The process as described in copious documents seemed fair. But some of us got rail-roaded. Promises made and expectations created by previous managers just evaporated as the new managers took over. Yes, in my department it was a take-over, not a merge.

• My statements earlier about decisions being made unilaterally are applicable here as well. It often appeared that while there was a consultation process no attention was given to what was stated at these consultations and management simply was going through the required procedures to implement their decisions.
• Information was supplied yes, but it was never certain as they cut and chopped at every turn.

• Always felt as if management is only taking care of themselves. Human capital is not valued at the NMMU.

• People's views were just listened to but not heard. Decisions were made and people were informed about them. People had to move about 5 times from office to office and to different campuses. People were told that they will have to move to a certain campus and then informed again that they do not have to move - what happened in between??

• The way management lied to staff about our financial position has left me personally with no trust whatsoever in the management and the processes here. If I am expected to give my best, I expect the university in turn to do ITS best to take care of me!! I've been here for 12 years and now all of a sudden I'm treated like a disposable item. If you want loyalty PAY PEOPLE REASONABLE SALARIES!

• Very important decisions about policies were not highlighted and staff was very unhappy about what seemed to be railroading particularly in Senate. The fact that everybody was swamped and under terrible pressure was not factored into the situation. There has been no real talk about a complete review of critical policies and decisions taken in this overheated time.

• The merger happened in the offices of a few select (and very biased) managers. Most of the people on the ground (not to mention in the classroom) had very little to do with its final outcome. There was the APPEARANCE of participation, but in reality this was mostly a mask for decisions taken in secret at the top, and underpinned by old school UPE (National Party) thinking.

• If there were no answers to other questions, would you say information was adequately provided? Would you trust the answer with 'maybe' when it comes to your future?

• Lack of wide enough participation in decisions. Insufficient and inconsistent information received”.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that some 70% of participants agreed that management supplied information at regular intervals. A total of 80% of participants stated that although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger,
people felt they were not heard and that they were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made.

A total of 50% of participants disagreed that the information was trustworthy. The following responses were also negative when the neutral and disagree options were combined, namely two thirds of participants complained that insufficient information was supplied and 75% of participants complained about the kind of information that was supplied.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with staff members’ perceptions with regard to the information / communication received from top management during the merger were as follows:

- Participants complained that they received insufficient and inconsistent information and that the information supplied was not always a true reflection of the facts.
- People felt that their views were listened to but that they were not heard.
- Certain decisions were made and steamrolled by management, this could be due to the fact that certain decisions / actions had to be made by deadlines.
- An impression was further created that the merger happened in the offices of a few select managers.

The next section investigated participants’ reasons for resisting the merger, how they demonstrated their resistance and how management responded to employees’ resistance to the merger.

5.5 Resistance to the merger

Question 6 asked participants whether resistance to the merger occurred in their department, question 7 investigated the reasons for the resistance to the merger, question 8 provided information on how staff showed their resistance to the merger and question 9 asked how management responded to employees’ resistance.
Question 6.1: Was there any resistance to the merger in your department? If your answer to this question is no or don’t know, please go to question 10

When participants were asked to comment on whether there was any resistance to the merger in their department, 72% of administrative and 75% of academic staff responded positively to the question. It was noted that 18% of administrative staff and 22% of academic staff responded negatively to the question and 11% of administrative and 3% of academic staff did not know whether there was resistance to the merger in their department. When this information was collated then 73% of participants answered positively to the question, 20% negatively and 7% of participants were not sure whether there was any resistance to the merger in their department.

Question 6.2: If your answer to question 6.1 is yes, what percentage of your department’s staff resisted the merger? Rough estimate.

Participants did not respond to this question.

Question 7: Reasons for resistance to the merger

In the following section of the questionnaire radio buttons were used and participants were unfortunately unable to tick both options if both options were applicable. Participants were then advised to select the most applicable option for each question. If a participant failed to select an option from the list provided then the omission was recorded in the relevant tables as ‘no reasons’.
Question 7.1: Reason / s for the merger

The reasons for the merger were stated by 47% of administrative and 52% of academic staff as their own reason for resisting the merger. Some 44% of administrative and 36% of academic staff perceived this to be other members’ reasons for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that the reason / s for the merger is their own reason for resisting the merger and 40% of them perceived these reason/s to coincide with that / those of other staff members.

Question 7.2: Timing of the merger

The timing of the merger was perceived by 51% of administrative and 38% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. Altogether 40% of administrative and 38% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 45% of participants stated that the timing of the merger was other members’ reason for resisting the merger and 39% stated that it was their own reason as well.
Question 7.3: Mission / purpose statement of the NMMU

The mission / purpose statement of the NMMU was perceived by 54% of administrative and 36% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. A total of 28% of administrative and 30% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 45% of participants stated that the mission / purpose statement was other members’ reason for resistance and 29% stated that it was also their own reason for resisting the merger.

Question 7.4: Vision statement of the NMMU

The vision statement of the NMMU was perceived by 56% of administrative and 37% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. Some 25% of administrative and academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 46% of participants stated that the vision statement was other members’ reason for resistance and 25% stated that it was also their own reason for resisting the merger.
Question 7.5: Values of the NMMU

The values of the NMMU were perceived by 56% of administrative and 30% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. A total of 28% of administrative and 34% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 43% of participants stated that the values of the NMMU were other members’ reason for resistance and 31% stated that this was also their own reason for resisting the merger.

Question 7.6: The way / manner in which the merger was managed

The way / manner in which the merger was managed were stated by 54% of administrative and 63% of academic staff as their own reason for resisting the merger. Some 38% of administrative and 23% of academic staff perceived this to be other members’ reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 59% of participants stated that the way the merger was managed was their own reason for resisting the merger and 30% of them perceived this reason to coincide with that of other staff members.
Question 7.7: Educational reason / s

Educational reason / s for the merger were stated by 59% of academic and 40% of administrative participants as their own reason for resisting the merger. Some 54% of administrative and 26% of academic staff perceived this to be other members’ reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that educational reason / s were their own reason for resisting the merger and 40% of them perceived these reason / s to coincide with that / those of other staff members.

Question 7.8: Fear of the unknown

Fear of the unknown was perceived by 51% academic and 46% of administrative participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. A total of 49% of administrative and 33% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that the fear of the unknown was other members’ reason for resistance and 40% stated that it was also their own reason for resisting the merger.
Fear of job insecurity was stated by 53% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as their own reason for resisting the merger. Some 43% of administrative and 47% of academic staff perceived this to be other members’ reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that fear of job insecurity was their own reason for resisting the merger and 45% of them perceived this reason to coincide with that of other staff members.

Loss of expertise was stated by 51% of administrative and 48% of academic participants’ as their own reason for resisting the merger. A total of 43% of administrative and 36% of academic staff perceived this to be other members’ reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that loss of expertise was their own reason for resisting the merger and 39% of them perceived this reason to coincide with that of other staff members.
Question 7.11: Reduced resource allocation to our department

Reduced resource allocation to our department was perceived by 47% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. A total of 43% of administrative and 34% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 45% of participants stated that the reduction of resource allocation to their department was other members’ reason for resistance to the merger and 38% stated that it was also their own reason for resisting the merger.

Question 7.12: Resisted the leadership

Resistance to the leadership was perceived by 63% of administrative and 48% of academic participants as other members’ reason for resisting the merger. Some 26% of administrative and 29% of academic staff stated that this was their own reason for the resistance as well. When this information was collated then 55% of participants stated that resistance to the leadership was other members’ reason for resistance to the merger and 28% stated that it was also their own reason for resisting the merger.
Question 7.13: Any other comments regarding reasons for the resistance to the merger

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with their perceptions regarding the reasons for the resistance to the merger as follows:

- “The university is going to become a Technikon and it did.
- Most felt that we were left in limbo, not given enough of a sense of ‘we put staff 1st and look after your needs because we value what you have to offer’. It was more ‘if you don't like it leave, we don't care about you as we can find others to replace you’. The fear was palpable throughout all campuses for at least 1 year prior.
- Unilateral and unequal allocation of research leave, reduction of previous educational benefits and retirement age.
- Lack of transparency.
- Management was not familiar with our programmes and needs.
- Fear of programmes changing to meet new standards which were not compatible with applied courses.
- The quality of service reduced. The workload increased and the working conditions deteriorated.
- The manner in which people were leaving the institution without management trying to make it different for them. It was as if it was good when people left as they were making it less necessary to retrench - this caused one to wonder about your role within the institution, is it necessary for you to be here?
- I have already stated that the merger was politically driven. The compatibility of ex UPE degree programmes and PET diplomas is questionable. Also the dedication and knowledge levels of our merger partners, some Vista staff still think we owe them ‘something’. Look at the Vision and Mission statements of the NMMU. I am ashamed to be associated with people who wrote such a lot of trash. Compare the strategic intent of the NMMU with that of Pick’n Pay, Anglovaal...Our mission statement is naive if you compare it to others on ‘HOW’ it should be done.
• The UPE Senate was emasculated in the merger process. The Senate was never given a formal opportunity to debate the government's reasons for the merger and to have its views recorded. Once the merger process got underway various reports of sub-committees served before Senate but Senate never felt consulted in the form of passing a formal resolution; Senate was merely asked to note such reports.

• Those that resisted the merger were obviously those who had the most to lose - and lose they did - for no valid reason other than change for the sake of change!

• The reasons for the merger provided were not seen to be valid, and the loss of expertise was regarded by practically everyone as a big negative. Fear of job insecurity was definitely seen by some members as a reason for resistance.

• I think if the Vision statement and the values of the NMMU were clearly stated to the level of understanding of all employees we wouldn't have lost people with expertise or people who were loyal to their former institutions.

• The initial resistance to the merger related to the lack of thought on the part of the DOE and the possible loss of standards. It later emerged that insufficient resources had been allocated to the merger, plus as the jockeying for position and hurried promotions began in institutions a perception of bad faith emerged. Further the development of a mission, vision and values began in a climate of uncertainty. There is also a deep suspicion in my soul of mission, visions and values that are developed by marketing and appear as screensavers and on t-shirts and do not seem to be lived. I also suspect that the real vision for the institution is to be a really good teaching university focusing on volumes of undergraduate students with very small pockets of research as individuals climb to the top of the milk bottle. If that is so then do not talk of a university of excellence leave that to the grand research institutions - be proud to be who you really are. Our screensavers are yet another educational deception. Apartheid lied about separate but equal-let us make truth our touch-stone.

• The merger per se could have been a positive process - the way in which it was handled and managed was not done efficiently and effectively, ignoring one of the most important resources of the institutions - its staff members!

• The department split and had different faculties from before.

• In January 2005 my department was utterly unprepared, yet suddenly we had to perform way beyond peak. It's criminal. Mission, vision, values etc, and descriptions of the process which would be followed were just words on paper. e.g.: I was shoved into a different job with far less responsibility than I had had
before, and none of the prospects for advancement/ career development. A notice with my new (very different) job title was prominently displayed - two years before we applied for positions in the new structure. I was never consulted about core competencies or KPAs. And it's obvious that people were appointed without any regard for said competencies or KPAs. A lot of people were effectively demoted (and demotivated) - take it or leave...

- Could not see any advantage. Still can't see any. Additional administrative workload, meetings, etc.
- Job security was the most important one.
- With duplicate sections for most admin sections on old PETECH and UPE, it is natural to fear rationalization leading to resistance to the merger.
- Caused by the reduction in number of lecturers to teach the same number of students or contract staff doing more work than those announced permanent after the placement.
- The model of a comprehensive institution is not acceptable to me and a few colleagues.
- Anti-transformation tendencies.
- It feels as though UPE became an extended PET.
- Most, it became clear that there were agendas that were running parallel to the general information not the least the impact on the academic of the RAM model and the lack of pursued consultation with senior academics.
- It harmed individuals and families due to insecurity of jobs - unnecessarily.
- Enormous psychological trauma staff underwent, and has not healed from (with no psychological support in place before this traumatic event).
- No cognisance was taken of the completely different attitudes, methods of teaching, types of students, academic demands belonging to the different institutions - all just lumped together.
- The merger did not value intellectual expertise or excellence or dedication. It mostly valued those who agreed with management and obeyed the rules dictated by management. The institution remains in this frame of thinking even now.
- Since the merger the NMMU’s morals and standards have deteriorated.
- Some staff are not qualified to pursue the duties they do.
- Lack of adequate skills. Inadequate resources to manage the administrative and personal fall-out related to the merger activities lack of management support.
• As was feared, the so-called merger was not that, but rather a take-over by UPE”.

To summarize, the statistical analysis revealed that more than half of the participants stated that their own reasons for resisting the merger were: the way / manner in which the merger was managed, reason / s for the merger, educational reason / s and loss of expertise. Half of the participants viewed other members’ reasons for resisting the merger as resistance to the leadership. It was also interesting to note that the four top reasons for administrative participants’ own reasons for resisting the merger in order of importance were: the way / manner in which the merger was managed, fear of job insecurity, loss of expertise and fear of the unknown. Academic participants were concerned about the way / manner in which the merger was managed, educational and other reasons for the merger and loss of expertise.

The main themes for the open-ended question for the resistance to the merger focused on the following issues:

• Employees were very upset about the fact that they were forced into the merger by the Department of Education. The university feared a take-over by the technikon and the technikon feared a take-over by the university. These concerns were voiced in expressions such as ‘the university is going to become a technikon and it did and the so-called merger was rather a take-over by UPE’.

• The focus then moved to employees’ perception of management’s lack of concern for the distress they were facing. Issues such as changes in conditions of service resulting in job insecurity were at the top of their agendas. The feeling expressed was that ‘the merger did not value intellectual expertise or excellence or dedication’.

• Employees further voiced their concern about the impact of the merger on their daily work performance such as increased workloads, fellow employees jockeying for positions, experts leaving / retiring and changes in the management of familiar structures and processes.
Question 8: How staff showed their resistance to the merger

Question 8.1: Complaints were voiced

Voicing their complaints was perceived by 54% of administrative and 58% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Some 38% of administrative and 37% of academic staff stated that voicing their complaints was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 56% of participants stated that voicing their complaints was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 38% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.2: Motivation to work was lost

Loss of motivation was perceived by 56% of academic and 50% of administrative participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Some 50% of administrative and 33% of academic staff stated that loss of motivation was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 52% of participants stated that loss of motivation was other members’
method of showing their resistance to the merger and 41% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.3: Work-related errors and mistakes increased

![Chart showing percentage of participants who perceived increased work-related errors and mistakes as other members' or their own method of resistance]

Increased work-related errors and mistakes were perceived by 50% of administrative and 47% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. A total of 32% of administrative and 25% of academic staff stated that increase in work-related errors and mistakes were also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that increase in work-related errors and mistakes was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 28% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.4: Absenteeism increased

![Chart showing percentage of participants who perceived increased absenteeism as other members' or their own reason]

When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that increase in absenteeism was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 28% stated that it was also their own method of choice.
Increased absenteeism was perceived by 71% of administrative and 51% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Some 15% of administrative and 8% of academic staff stated that increase in absence from work was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 60% of participants stated that increase in absenteeism was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 11% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.5: Loss of loyalty to the organisation

Loss of loyalty to the organisation was perceived by 54% of administrative and 51% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Altogether 41% of administrative and 40% of academic staff stated that loss of loyalty to the organisation was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 52% of participants stated that loss of loyalty to the organisation was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 40% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.6: Work slowdown occurred
Work slowdown was perceived by 66% of administrative and 48% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Some 19% of administrative and 12% of academic staff stated that work slowdown was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 58% of participants stated that work slowdown was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 11% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

**Question 8.7:** Threats to go on strike were voiced

**Question 8.8:** Strike action occurred

Threats to go on strike were perceived by 68% of administrative and 49% of academic participants as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Altogether 12% of administrative and 10% of academic staff stated that threats to go on strike were also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 58% of participants stated that threats to go on strike were other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 11% stated that it was also their own method of choice.
Employees did not strike because of the merger. Participants might have interpreted this question as a method that could also have been used to force management to accede to their demands. Strike action was perceived by 59% of administrative and 37% of academic participants’ as other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger. Some 4% of administrative and 3% of academic staff stated that strike action was also their own method of showing their resistance to the merger. When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that strike action was other members’ method of showing their resistance to the merger and 4% stated that it was also their own method of choice.

Question 8.9: Any other comments regarding reasons for the resistance to the merger?

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with how staff showed their resistance to the merger as follows:

- “More and more was taken away from staff financially. Not good for staff morale, which is now pretty obvious at this stage. No sense of trust left. Very little loyalty.
- No negative responses. Our department carried on with the good work.
- Regardless of whether feedback was provided, certain management parties showed resistance to hear them.
- Some found other employment.
- The staff morale was and still is extremely low.
- There was no strike or slowdown that I am aware of.
- Poor execution leads to many other negative things. People (staff) feel alienated. They do not see themselves as true leaders any longer. Question: Why did staff (white) suddenly join the Unions???, The answer is obvious.
- Very de-motivating indeed. The technicalities were expertly dealt with but people were left to suffer. This is NOT ‘people-centred’ in the least.
- These symptoms did not really apply to the department. The effect was psychological more than anything else, and staff members voted with their feet by resigning or taking early retirement.
• The real issue becomes for me the conversations that begin and go on endlessly. The constant debate and discussion leads to things like loss of productivity, absenteeism, working to rule and looking for other jobs.

• The way in which it was handled.

• Workload, which had always been heavy, increased insanely. When I complained, the response from above was: ‘Stop feeling sorry for yourself’. As a white male, ‘be thankful that you have a job’. Working in the Admin here has always been like the army or correctional services, but it's become worse since the merger. One is a machine. The place is inhuman. Motivated by my own values, I routinely went the extra marathon. It was noticed, even by the VC who singled me out publicly on several occasions. Reward? Overtime pay? Time off? Nothing. It's criminal. It leaves me resentful and demotivated.

• Job security and people getting demoted.

• When people felt the criteria used for selection was not clear, they wrote letters, they met with the committee members.

• Unhappiness was suppressed due to fear of loss of jobs.

• University of Johannesburg did not retrench, they appointed more staff. Why did we undergo this gruelling process?

• Mainly a feeling of frustration at the increased pressures (larger departments, more meetings and admin., more conflict, less personal contact with colleagues, a breakdown of camaraderie).

• A serious loss of morale resulted from the bad management of the merger. While few doubted the importance and value of the merger, instead of joining academic expertise and developing the mentality of a family the institution tried to act like an anonymous corporate enterprise whose concern was for statistics and monetary profit rather than human and intellectual profit.

• There is a marked lack of respect between the students and staff.

• Fear of benefits to be taken away and that happened. Salary issues.

• Wellness issues increased, ill-health increased, in-fighting increased and distrust increased”.

To summarize, participants demonstrated their own resistance to the merger (in order of importance) by:

• Losing their motivation to work
• Losing loyalty to the organisation
• Voicing their complaints
• Increasing work-related errors and mistakes
• Increasing absenteeism
• Demonstrating work slowdowns
• Threatening to go on strike.

More than half of the participants viewed other members’ reaction to the merger (in order of importance) as:
• Increased absenteeism
• Work slowdowns
• Threats to go on strike
• Voicing of complaints
• Loss of motivation to work
• Loss of loyalty to the organisation
• Increase in work-related errors and mistakes and
• Strike action.

The top three methods for administrative staff showing their resistance to the merger were: loss of motivation to work, loss of loyalty to the organisation and voicing their complaints. Academic participants also showed their resistance to the merger by losing their loyalty to the organisation, by voicing their complaints and by losing their motivation to work.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the manner in which staff showed their resistance to the merger were the following:
• They wrote letters and met with relevant committee members.
• Participants stated that their loyalty, motivation and productivity decreased, absenteeism occurred and they worked according to rule.
• Participants stated that demotions and retrenchments took place and new job options were considered.
• During these times staff morale was generally very low.
• Staff witnessed an increase in ill-health, distrust, conflict, less personal contact with colleagues and a breakdown in camaraderie.
• Notwithstanding the terrific stress staff encountered during the merger no strike actions occurred.

The HEQC Audit reported that it was remarkable that the NMMU was able to deal with the merger in a manner that led to uninterrupted service delivery and no incidents of staff or student unrest (HEQC Audit, 2008: 6-7).

Question 9: Management’s response to resistance

Question 9.1: Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment

![Bar chart showing responses to question 9.1]

Management did everything possible to obtain members’ commitment, was perceived by 60% of administrative and 52% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. A total of 19% of administrative and 11% of academic staff stated that management did everything possible to obtain their commitment. When this information was collated then 56% of participants stated that management did everything possible to obtain other members’ commitment to the merger and 15% stated that this treatment was directed at them as well.

Question 9.2: Support and/or counselling were offered

![Bar chart showing responses to question 9.2]
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Management offered support and counselling, was perceived by 71% of administrative and 41% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 10% of administrative and 7% of academic staff stated that management offered support and counselling to them as well. When this information was collated then 55% of participants stated that management offered support and counselling to other members during the merger and 9% stated that this treatment was directed at them as well.

Question 9.3: New skills training was offered

Management offered new skills training, was perceived by 60% of administrative and 40% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 10% of administrative and 11% of academic staff stated that management offered new skills training to them as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that management offered new skills training to other members during the merger and 11% stated that this treatment was directed at them as well.

Question 9.4: Members were co–opted into the different task teams
Management co-opted members into the different task teams, was perceived by 60% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. A total of 15% administrative and 7% academic staff stated that management co-opted them into the different task teams as well. When this information was collated then 51% of participants stated that management co-opted other members of the staff into the different task teams to overcome resistance to the merger and 11% stated that they were also co-opted into the different task teams.

Question 9.5: Reward packages were negotiated

![Chart showing the distribution of participants' perceptions of reward packages being negotiated.]

Management negotiated reward packages, was perceived by 59% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 7% of administrative and 3% of academic staff stated that reward packages were offered to them as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that management negotiated reward packages to other members of staff during the merger and 5% stated that this treatment was directed at them as well.

Question 9.6: Threats were made that contracts would not be renewed

![Chart showing the distribution of participants' perceptions of threats to contracts.]

Management negotiated reward packages, was perceived by 59% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 7% of administrative and 3% of academic staff stated that reward packages were offered to them as well. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that management negotiated reward packages to other members of staff during the merger and 5% stated that this treatment was directed at them as well.
Management made threats that contracts would not be renewed, was perceived by 53% of administrative and 38% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. A total of 16% of administrative and 14% of academic staff stated that threats were made to them as well. When this information was collated then 45% of participants stated that management made threats that contracts would not be renewed to other members of staff during the merger and 15% stated that these threats were directed at them as well.

**Question 9.7: Threats were made that promotion / s would be withheld**

Management made threats that promotion(s) would be withheld, was perceived by 53% of administrative and 34% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 13% of administrative and 23% of academic staff stated that threats were made to them as well. When this information was collated then 43% of participants stated that management made threats that promotion / s would be withheld to other members’ of staff during the merger and 18% stated that these threats were directed at them as well.

**Question 9.8: People were manipulated for example by twisting or distorting facts / spreading false rumours / withholding information**
Management manipulated employees, was perceived by 49% of administrative and 41% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 31% of administrative and 16% of academic staff stated that they were also manipulated. When this information was collated then 45% of participants stated that management manipulated other members of staff during the merger and 23% stated that they were also manipulated.

Question 9.9: People were sidelined / ignored / not consulted

Management sidelined / ignored / not consulted employees, was perceived by 41% of administrative and 42% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 43% of administrative and 36% of academic staff stated that they were also sidelined / ignored / not consulted. When this information was collated then 42% of participants stated that management sidelined / ignored / not consulted other members of staff during the merger and 39% stated that they were also sidelined / ignored / not consulted.

Question 9.10: People were blackmailed

Management blackmailing employees was perceived by 53% of administrative and 33% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to
employees’ resistance to the merger. A total of 3% of administrative and 5% of academic staff stated that they were also blackmailed. When this information was collated then 43% of participants stated that management blackmailed other members of staff during the merger and 4% stated that they were also blackmailed.

Question 9.11: People were transferred

Management transferring employees was perceived by 56% of administrative and 45% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Altogether 13% of administrative and 7% of academic staff stated that they were also transferred. When this information was collated then 50% of participants stated that management transferred other members of staff during the merger and 10% stated that they were also transferred.

Question 9.12: People were threatened with dismissal

Management threatened employees with dismissal, was perceived by 57% of administrative and 38% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. Some 4% of administrative and 5% of academic staff stated that they were also threatened with dismissal. When this information was collated then 48% of participants stated that
management threatened to dismiss other members of staff during the merger and 5% stated that they were also threatened with dismissal.

Question 9.13: People were dismissed

Management dismissed employees, was perceived by 53% of administrative and 40% of academic participants as other members’ perception of management’s response to employees’ resistance to the merger. A total of 1% of both administrative and academic staff stated that they were also dismissed. When this information was collated then 46% of participants stated that management dismissed other members of staff during the merger and 1% stated that they were also dismissed.

Question 9.14: Other, specify:
The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author when stating his/her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended question dealing with management’s response to the resistance by adding any other information that was not covered by the closed-ended questions above. The feedback of participants was as follows:

- “The people who have suffered the most are those that are not previously from UPE.
- Appointments to the (new) department were made without due recognition of the needs best known by the incumbents at the time.
- As a contract employee I was not allowed to apply for a senior position - which was filled by inexperienced outsider. Salary pegged at lowest of the lowest scale.
- None of the above. Management couldn't give a continental hoot.
• Management did very little but invoke Section 189A to steamroller the process. A lot more could have been done except that. But given the visionaries that they are / were, one could not expect anything else.

• Training? What's that? The managers just ignore us.

• They didn't care. Did not listen to the realities of the implications.

• Lots of racism when it came to appointments. Whites and coloured were appointed in the first round, while blacks had to wait in the pool not certain about their future. With whites and coloureds their qualifications were never considered and most of them have none anyway but still posts that were advertised wanting people with at least M+3.

• Staff members who manipulated the system got away with it.

• Disciplinary and counselling action was undertaken.

• An incident occurred where a colleague was charged and found guilty without the opportunity of defending himself. Facts were distorted to drive somebody else’s agenda.

• Many situations occurred in the business of staffing and RAM that were completely demotivating for staff in that in the process the new financial structure meant some staff went down levels. It also became clear that the number of posts was less than staff and that situation was handled very poorly. It seemed that management, by bussing in some arbitrary motivational speaker, thought that it was dealing with stress ...this was not true and a survey of the NMMU staff's stress profile medically and psychologically would reveal that many staff were treated for depression and stress related conditions.

• People who left were not replaced at all - or it took ages to replace them (no consultation took place with the individuals/departments affected). The result: substantially increased workloads - with no compensation - and burnout - and disillusionment.

• Some people’s responses were subtly, covertly and / or overtly ignored.

• On the whole it was pacifying, reassuring meetings with the principal, imbibing endless muffins and juice (no one wants to see a muffin anymore!), but for the rest the top management was faceless, seeming going through the motions without questioning the need for it.

• Basically the feeling was that we were ignored and had no say.
• I'm afraid it was a case of academic qualifications having preference in what is a 
skills-based qualification, so former PE Technikon staff in our department lost 
out. Also the ‘boss’ was a UPE man and understandably looked after his own 
staff first.

• People were frustrated with them getting changed to another place without their 
knowledge”.

Question 9.15: Any other comments regarding aspects covered by previous statements

The information that follows is a direct copy of participants’ responses. Spelling errors 
and language errors have been corrected without compromising the intent of the author 
when stating his / her case. Where respondents identified individuals and departments by 
name these names and departments were omitted in order to protect the relevant 
individuals and departments involved. Participants responded to this open-ended 
question dealing with management’s response to staff resistance by adding the following 
additional comments:

• “Reward packages? What is this a joke? Top level management got fat rewards. 
The rest of us? Hahaha good one.

• Threats were not made directly. It was the impression one got; the insinuation 
was that you could be replaced and would be replaced if needs be. People left 
because of this no-certainty policy that was being disseminated by different 
happenings in the placement process.

• I can write a book on the distortions, quid pro quo dished out...

• The factors mentioned under 8 also apply to this section, by and large. What 
assistance was given, was utilised, and staff turnover occurred in spite of the 
relevant treatment.

• I think from my perspective the major problem was that nobody really seemed to 
care. One's own department could emphasize but were essentially in the same 
boat and pretty powerless. The HR department decided to take a legalistic rather 
than a motivational perspective. I also believe that there was a deliberate strategy 
to draw out the process to increase the stress levels and thereby dislodge as many 
people as possible and to make the rest so insecure that they would accept 
anything. A company in the private sector that drew out a merger as long as this 
institution did would have gone bankrupt. The number of psychologists who have 
built retirement homes funded by counselling stressed employees is legend in the 
city.
• When people had to leave to other departments, their Directors refused allowing them to go before they get replacements when they move from contracts to permanent positions.

• Most staff in my area has found that systems have become tyrannically complex and time consuming and yet at the same time 100% less efficient - examples of this are available. It is clear that systems are forcing changes in the academic sphere which are not congruent with the aims of education. The new design leave of the leave system does not support a long term career as a teacher / lecturer as it does not recognise the nature of the job and seems to be based on a notion of fraud.

• There was very little transparency. Top management simply went ahead, doing what they wanted to do (despite all the so-called structures that were put into place).

• Having been a ‘victim’ of the 189 process I can only express deep sadness that the institution should have been so destructive of human capital in its processes.

• There were a lot of threats that people are going to be fired.

• People acted in higher grades but did not get allowance, no notch increases for more than two years”.

To summarize, participant’s perception of management’s response of their own resistance to the merger (in order of importance) was:

• People were sidelined / ignored / not consulted;
• People were manipulated;
• Threats were made that promotion /s would be withheld;
• Threats were made that contracts would not be renewed;
• Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment;
• Members were co-opted into the different task teams;
• New skills training was offered;
• People were transferred;
• Support and/or counselling were offered;
• Reward packages were negotiated;
• People were threatened with dismissal;
• People were blackmailed and
• People were dismissed.
More than half of the participants viewed management’s response to other employees’ resistance to the merger as:

- Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment;
- Support and/or counselling were offered;
- Members were co-opted into the different task teams;
- New skills training was offered;
- Reward packages were negotiated and
- People were transferred.

It appeared from the abovementioned information that participants viewed management’s response to other members’ resistance to the merger as much more accommodating than their own resistance to the merger. It was also interesting to note that the top three reasons for administrative participants’ response to management’s handling of their own resistance were: people were sidelined/ignored/not consulted, people were manipulated and everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment. Academic participants stated that their resistance was managed by being sidelined/ignored/not consulted, threats were made that promotion/s would be withheld and people were manipulated.

The main themes of the open-ended questions were the following:

- Participants were upset about the way that Section 189A was managed as well as the manner in which appointments, demotions and disciplinary matters were handled.
- Staff once again complained about their increased workloads and emphasized how demotivating and stressful the merger was. This resulted in stress-related conditions such as disillusionment, depression and burnout.
- According to participants’ feedback, management distorted facts, they made threats indirectly, little transparency occurred, staff turnover was witnessed and systems became tyrannically more complex.
- Participants felt that nobody seemed to care and that HR decided to take a legalistic rather than a motivational stance.
5.6  Factor Scores

5.6.1  Reliability of factor scores

Item analysis to determine the reliability of factor scores was conducted and consisted of factor analysis to establish the significance of the factor loadings of the relevant items and the calculation of Cronbach’s alpha coefficients as an indication of the scores’ internal consistency. Factor loadings are the correlations between the items and the factors. Hair, Black Babin, Anderson and Tatham (2006: 128) state that the minimum factor loading regarded to be significant for a sample size of 200 is 0.40. For the purpose of a basic exploratory study Cronbach’s alpha values greater than 0.50 indicate adequate reliability (Nunally, 1978: 226).

For the total score (ACF) calculated as the mean of the scores measuring each of the eight dimensions of Anstey’s model, statistical analyses revealed that all factor loadings were significant with a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.90 confirming the internal consistency of the observed ACF scores. The percentage variance explained was 59.7%. See Table 3 for the relevant details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive unease: harnessed urgency</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear purpose</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Champions at all levels</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture and community</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive competencies</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coherent strategy</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and consultation</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item analysis revealed that all factor loadings and Cronbach’s alpha values for the various factor scores were above the threshold values of 0.40 and 0.70 respectively, thus confirming the reliability of the derived scores. See Table 4 for the relevant details.
Table 4: Factor 1 - Constructive unease: Harnessed urgency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ansley’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of steering committees</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2 Task teams / committees were introduced early enough</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Task teams / committees had necessary leadership skills</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 All stakeholders were adequately represented</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of steering committees</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.1 Setting goals</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Planning the work to be done</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Delegating responsibility</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Solving problems</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 Monitoring progress</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 Achieving set goals</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of personnel and labour organisations</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1 NMMU developed a clear MOA to guide the merger</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Reasons for the merger were clearly explained</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Merger was conducted for sound reason</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Urgency of the merger was clear</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Management successfully mobilized employees</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Labour organisations successfully mobilized</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive unease: harnessed urgency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACF1.1 Establishment of steering committees</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACF1.2 Performance of steering committees</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACF1.3 Mobilization of personnel and labour organizations</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings above 0.4 for all questions and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 were significant for this factor. The percentage variance was 70.8%. See table 5 for the relevant details.
### Table 5: Factor 2 - Clear purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear purpose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.1 NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement</td>
<td>NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2 Customers and clients to be served are identified</td>
<td>Customers and clients to be served are identified</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 Needs that the NMMU has to satisfy are stated</td>
<td>Needs that the NMMU has to satisfy are stated</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 How the mission / purpose has to be achieved is clear</td>
<td>How the mission / purpose has to be achieved is clear</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings of above 0.4 and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84 were significant for this factor. The percentage variance was 61.7%. See table 6 for the relevant details.

### Table 6: Factor 3 - Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives in comparison with the situation prior to the merger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of vision and objectives</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.1 NMMU has a clearer vision</td>
<td>NMMU has a clearer vision</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2 NMMU’s vision is translated into clear performance objectives</td>
<td>NMMU’s vision is translated into clear performance objectives</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3 People are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of the objectives</td>
<td>People are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of the objectives</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4 Our department’s objectives are better linked to those of the overall organisation</td>
<td>Our department’s objectives are better linked to those of the overall organisation</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial perspective</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.5 NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives</td>
<td>NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.6 More funds are allocated to departments</td>
<td>More funds are allocated to departments</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7 People feel more uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future</td>
<td>People feel more uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers perspective</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.8 Our department’s performance compares favourably with other tertiary institutions</td>
<td>Our department’s performance compares favourably with other tertiary institutions</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9 Our department delivers a better service to the merger</td>
<td>Our department delivers a better service to the merger</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.10 NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities</td>
<td>NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor loadings above 0.4 were significant for all questions except for the questions dealing with student and staff profiles. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.82 was significant for this factor. The percentage variance was 33.7%. See table 7 for the relevant details.

**Table 7: Factor 4 - Champions at all levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champions at all levels</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Top management led the NMMU merger process effectively</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Middle management led the merger process effectively</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Student admissions to the university have increased</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Graduates with skills necessary to meet the needs of the country have increased</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.5 Student profiles are a better reflection of the
demographics of South African society  .313
15.6 Staff profiles reflect the demographics of South
African society  .279
15.7 Academic programmes are better designed to
meet regional needs  .716
15.8 Academic programmes are better designed to
meet national needs  .733
15.9 Research are more linked to national
developmental needs  .721
15.10 Research capacity of the NMMU has increased  .661
15.11 Fragmentation of the apartheid past has been
reduced  .468
15.12 Inequalities of the apartheid past have been
eliminated  .320
15.13 For all its problems the NMMU merger has
been a success  .675

Factor loadings above 0.4 were significant for all questions and the percentage variance
was 44.2%. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.81 was significant for this factor. See table 8 for the
relevant details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey's conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champions at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to situation prior to the merger all stakeholders identify more strongly with the NMMU</td>
<td></td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>NMMU is putting more effort into the development of its own culture (shared values / beliefs / purpose in work)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by appointment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by the reward systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by relevant policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of top management</td>
<td></td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of fellow employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to situation prior to the merger all stakeholders identify more strongly with the NMMU</td>
<td></td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>NMMU is putting more effort into the development of its own culture (shared values / beliefs / purpose in work)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by appointment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by the reward systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by relevant policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of top management</td>
<td></td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value system of university is supported by behaviour of fellow employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Factor 5 - Culture and community
Factor loadings above 0.4 were significant for all questions and the percentage variance was 39.8%. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.77 was significant for this factor. See table 9 for the relevant details.

Table 9:  
Competitive competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive competencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.22 We have more top performers / academics in our department</td>
<td></td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>We have more top performers / academics in our department relative to other similar departments in the country</td>
<td></td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>NMMU attracts more top performers as employees than other universities in the country</td>
<td></td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>NMMU loses more top performers than other universities in the country</td>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>NMMU develops and trains more employees as top performers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>NMMU pays better salaries to attract top performers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>NMMU pays better salaries to retain top performers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>NMMU’s pay systems have improved</td>
<td></td>
<td>.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>NMMU acknowledges exceptional performance much more</td>
<td></td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>NMMU investigates more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>NMMU encourages entrepreneurship much more</td>
<td></td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings above 0.4 were significant for all questions and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.72 was significant for this factor. The percentage variance was 32.8%. See table 10 for the relevant details.
### Table 10: Factor 7 - Coherent strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherent strategy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Quality of the academic programmes has improved</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Organisational structure has become a barrier in getting the work done</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Decentralised decision making systems have made it easier to get the work done</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>NMMU staff have become less responsive to student needs</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>NMMU staff have become more responsive to community needs</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>NMMU staff have decreased their research outputs</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>NMMU staff have increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Staff’s work performance has become more linked to reward systems</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>NMMU’s relationships with relevant stakeholders have increased</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>32.8 .72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings above 0.4 were significant for all questions and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.50 was significant for this factor. The percentage variance was 54.3%. See table 11 for the relevant details.

### Table 11: Factor 8 - Communication and consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anstey’s conceptual framework</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication and consultation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Information was supplied at regular intervals</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Sufficient information was supplied</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Right kind of information was provided</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Information was trustworthy</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger people felt they were not heard</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>54.3 .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>People were merely asked to rubber – stamp decisions that had already been made</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive statistics for factor scores are reported in Table 12. Mean scores less than 2.60 on the 5-point Likert scale were negative, scores between 2.60 and 3.40 were neutral and scores greater than 3.40 were positive. In the frequency distribution the modal groups are shaded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF1.1</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF1.2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF1.3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3.1</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3.2</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3.3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3.4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF3.5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics for factor scores revealed a negative to neutral response on average from participants of the merger according to the eight factors identified in Anstey’s conceptual framework.

Three of the eight factors had negative modal groups:

- **Factor 1 Constructive unease: harnessed urgency** (ACF1: 41% negative responses) obtained a neutral mean score of 2.75 This section dealt with the reasons for the merger and all the related sub-factors had negative modal groups: establishment (ACF1.1: 37%) and performance (ACF1.2: 85%) of steering committees and the mobilization of personnel and labour organisations (ACF1.3: 40%).
• **Factor 2 Clear purpose** (ACF2: 40% negative responses) also received a neutral mean score of 2.78. This factor addressed the mission of the university and identification of its customers.

• **Factor 6 Competitive competencies** (ACF6: 70% negative responses) received a negative mean score of 2.30. This factor addressed the opinion of participants on the ability of the university to attract, retain or motivate top performers.

The factors with neutral modal groups were:

• **Factor 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives** (ACF3: 44% negative responses) received a neutral mean score of 2.75. This section dealt with the formulation of the vision and objectives of the university and issues related to the balanced scorecard. The related sub-factors obtained a mixture of negative and neutral modal groups: balanced scorecard **Factor 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives** (ACF3.1: 34% negative, 34% neutral), perceptions regarding the financial perspective (ACF3.2: 46% neutral), customer perspective (ACF3.3: 45% neutral), internal business perspective (ACF3.4: 53% negative) and learning and growth (ACF3.5: 48% negative).

• **Factor 4 Champions at all levels** (ACF4: 63% neutral responses) received a neutral mean score of 2.88. Items included in this factor related to management’s handling of the merger, whether inequalities of the past have been eliminated and whether the NMMU merger was a success.

• **Factor 5 Culture and community** (ACF5: 50% neutral responses) received a neutral mean score of 2.68. Items in this factor revolved around stakeholders’ identification with the university and the culture and value system of the new merged university.

• **Factor 7 Coherent strategy** (ACF7: 56% neutral responses) received a neutral mean score of 2.77. Items included in this factor were quality of work performance, decentralised decision-making systems, response to student and community needs, staff performance, research and entrepreneurial outputs and reward systems.

• **Factor 8 Communication and consultation** (ACF8: 51% neutral responses) received a neutral mean score of 3.28. These items depicted the quality of information received from management on the merger and participants’ perception of their feedback to management.
5.6.3 Inferential statistics for factor scores

To determine whether the observed negative mean factor scores could be generalised to the sampled population, one-sample t-tests were conducted for the factors and sub-factors with negative mean scores (M < 2.60), i.e. ACF1.2, ACF3.2, ACF3.4 and ACF6, to test the hypotheses:

\[ H_0: \bar{x} = 2.60 \]
\[ H_1: \bar{x} < 2.60 \]

The results of tests were significant for factor ACF1.2 (\( t = -8.13, df = 166, p < .0005, d = -0.63, \text{moderate} \)) and ACF6 (\( t = -7.75, df = 189, p < .0005, d = -0.56, \text{moderate} \)), but not significant for factor ACF3.2 (\( t = -0.94, df = 191, p = .175 \)) and ACF3.4 (\( t = -0.32, df = 192, p = .373 \)).

Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether the factors were related to post type (academic and administration) and institution (UPE, VU and PET), i.e. whether there were significant differences between the post types and institutions with regard to factors that were measured. The results are summarised in Table 13.

### Table 13: MANOVA results for factors and sub-factors

For the profile ACF1, ACF2, …, ACF8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Type</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the profile ACF1.1, ACF1.2, ACF1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Type</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the profile ACF3.1, ACF3.2, …, ACF3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Type</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only significant MANOVA result obtained was with regard to post type (administrative and academic) for the sub-factors ACF 3.1 to ACF 3.5, of Factor 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine the significance of the differences between administrative personnel and their academic counterparts for each of the sub-factors of ACF 3. The results summarised in Table 14 revealed significant post type differences for Factor 3 and all its sub-factors except ACF3.2 pertaining to perceptions regarding the financial perspective. Descriptive statistics for the significant ANOVA results are reported in Table 15.

Table 14: ANOVA results for factor ACF3 and its sub-factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACF3</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Type</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACF3.1

| Post Type | 5.82 | 1  | 181 | .017 | .047 |
| Institution | 0.13 | 2  | 181 | .876 | n.a. |
| Interaction | 0.00 | 2  | 181 | .997 | n.a. |

ACF3.2

| Post Type | 1.40 | 1  | 181 | 2.38 | n.a. |
| Institution | 1.33 | 2  | 181 | .267 | n.a. |
| Interaction | 0.56 | 2  | 181 | .571 | n.a. |

ACF3.3

| Post Type | 6.06 | 1  | 181 | 0.15 | 0.40 |
| Institution | 2.22 | 2  | 181 | .111 | n.a. |
| Interaction | 0.02 | 2  | 181 | .976 | n.a. |

ACF3.4

| Post Type | 13.39 | 1  | 181 | .000 | .065 |
| Institution | 1.50 | 2  | 181 | .226 | n.a. |
| Interaction | 0.42 | 2  | 181 | .655 | n.a. |
The results reported in Tables 13 to 15 reveal that administrative staff were significantly more positive than their academic colleagues with regard to:

- **ACF3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives**
- **ACF3.1 Formulation of vision and objectives** - small difference;
- **ACF3.3 Customer perspective** - small difference;
- **ACF3.4 Internal business perspective** - moderate difference;
- **ACF3.5 Learning and growth** - moderate difference.
5.7 Summary

In this chapter the research results were presented. Analysis was performed using the MS-Excel and Statistica packages. Discussions were conducted according to Anstey’s conceptual framework with the following eight factors:

- Factor 1: Constructive unease harnessed urgency
- Factor 2: Clear purpose
- Factor 3: Challenging vision and clear measurable objectives
- Factor 4: Champions at all levels
- Factor 5: Culture and community
- Factor 6: Competitive competencies
- Factor 7: Coherent strategy
- Factor 8: Communication and consultation.

Statistical analysis confirmed the reliability of the summated scores with significant factor loadings and Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for all factors.
6.1 Introduction

Major reforms and transformation took place during the 1980s and 1990s throughout Western democracies. Reforms included merging government departments, municipalities, hospitals and major business enterprises. In the higher education environment universities were not excluded from these transformation processes. More than ever before governments and society are expecting universities to respond to the needs of students and society, thus becoming more accountable for their performance. Eastman and Lang (2001:5) report that the dominant theme in literature about mergers reveals that the motives for governments merging higher education institutions include aspects such as building capacity, improving efficiency, racial desegregation and achieving economies of scale.

The motivation for restructuring higher education in South Africa was threefold, namely: to meet the demands of social justice; to address the challenges of globalisation and to ensure that the county’s limited resources were effectively and efficiently utilized. The National Plan for Higher Education further translated into five strategic objectives, namely to:

- Increase access and produce graduates with skills and competencies to meet the needs of the country.
- Improve equity of access and outcomes in order to redress past inequalities thus ensuring that staff and student profiles reflect the demographics of South African society.
- Promote diversity in the institutional landscape through programme differentiation to meet national and regional needs for knowledge and skills.
- Build high level research capacity and promote research linked to national developmental needs.
- Build new institutional identities and organisational forms by restructuring the institutional landscape of the higher education system in order to transcend the fragmentation, inequalities and inefficiencies of an apartheid past to enable the formation of South African institutions consistent with the vision and values of a non-racial, non-sexist demographic society (Department of Education, 2001, 2002).
The Department of Education clearly identified its intended outcome for institutional mergers in the following statement: “it is important to emphasize that substantive integration involves much more than the formal adoption of new policies, procedures and structures. It requires ensuring that new policies, procedures and structures give rise to the creation of a new institution in the full meaning of the term, that is, real integration with a new institutional culture and ethos that is more that the sum of its parts. It cannot be based on the culture and ethos of the stronger partner in the merger process. This would be a recipe for disaster...in short, it requires a commitment from all institutions to accept that the merger process is a process between equals irrespective of the current strengths and weaknesses of the merging institutions” (Department of Education, 2002:35).

Prior to the merger, the East Cape boasted five university campuses (Fort Hare, Port Elizabeth, Transkei, Rhodes and satellite of Vista university), and three Technikons - now called universities of technology (Port Elizabeth, Boarder and Eastern Cape). A directive was issued by the Department of Education to merge the University of Port Elizabeth (UPE), the Port Elizabeth campus of Vista University (VU) and the PE Technikon (PET). This was followed by Notice Number 863 in Government Gazette No 23550 of 24 June 2002 in terms of the Higher Education Act (101 / 97) confirming the establishment of a single comprehensive institution for UPE, the Port Elizabeth campus of VU and PET. The energy for the organisational change was thus triggered by an awareness that the system could no longer continue in its present form, a situation described in Anstey’s conceptual framework as constructive unease: harnessed urgency (Anstey, 2006 (a): 346). In this revolutionary transformation process a total change of business direction was observed with the formulation of a new vision and mission statement and the refinement of the new institution’s core values.

Understanding and managing this change process was not only a challenge for the newly established university but it has also become one of the most important management issues of the twenty-first century (Swanepoel et al, 2005: 727 - 728). Various models on the management of transformation have been discussed in the context of this study (see Chapter 1) but to measure the organisational transformation at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Anstey’s conceptual framework was chosen. Anstey’s conceptual framework was selected because it incorporated the work of major theorists as well as Kaplan and Norton’s balanced scorecard approach.
6.2 Research design and methodology

A quantitative and exploratory approach was used. This study was contextual in nature, meaning that it focused on the transformation process as it unfolded at a specific university in South Africa between the years 2003 - 2007. No data generated from this study could be generalised as they only presented a shot – in - time reflecting the transformation process at a particular organisation at a particular period in time.

6.2.1 Research Question

The research question for this study was formulated as follows: How successful was the organisational transformation process at the newly established NMMU in the period 2003 - 2007?

6.2.2 Objectives of the study

The first objective of this study was to describe the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the newly established NMMU in the period 2003 – 2007.

The second objective was to evaluate the success of the organisational transformation process at the NMMU by using Anstey’s conceptual framework.

6.2.3 Data collection

A computerized survey tool was utilized to design a structured questionnaire with both open and closed ended questions. This questionnaire was utilized to collect data on employees’ perceptions of the merger. The questionnaire was despatched via e-mail to all personnel of the university but only personnel who were appointed before January 2005 were asked to respond.

6.2.4 Sampling procedure

The research population was 1490 permanent and contract employees. A total of 199 employees or 13% of the population responded to the questionnaire.
6.2.5 **Reliability**

The internal consistency of the entire instrument and for each of its subscales was assessed by using Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach’s alpha was significant for the entire questionnaire as well as for all of its subscales.

6.2.6 **Ethical considerations**

The research proposal for this study met the ethical standards of all the relevant committees of the university.

6.3 **Research results**

6.3.1 **Biographical details**

A total of 13% of employees responded to this questionnaire. Of the sample of 199 employees, 50.3% of participants were administrative and 49.7% academic. A total of 58% of participants were categorised at Peromnes level 6 - 8. This is usually at the level of middle management. Some 76% of respondents were appointed between the years 1990 - 2004. Altogether 89% of participants were permanent and 11% contract employees of the university. A total of 44% of participants came from the University of Port Elizabeth, 42% came from the Port Elizabeth Technikon and 14% from the Port Elizabeth branch of the Vista University. The predominant age of participants was between the ages of 50 - 59 followed by the 40 - 49 year olds. Two thirds of the participants in this study were over the age of 40. The study included 59% of males and 41% females. Some 69% of participants were racially categorized as White, followed by 11% Black, 9% Other, 8% Coloured and 4% Indian. Referral to race in this study elicited some intense response reaction from participants. The biographical details of the questionnaire responded well with the information provided by the HEQC Audit of the University.

The next section will focus on participants’ perception of the merger.
6.3.2 Participants’ perception of the merger

6.3.2.1 Anstey’s conceptual framework item analysis

Factor 1: Constructive unease: harnessed urgency

Factor 1.1: Establishment of steering committees

Assessment of the task teams in the merger was a question to be answered by all staff who participated in the study, whether they were members of the task teams or not. This might have been a reason for the low response to the different sections of this question. When collating the ‘disagree and strongly disagree’ as well as the ‘neither agree nor disagree’ options then the response for this section of the questionnaire was significantly negative, namely:

- Almost two-thirds of the participants were not of the opinion that the task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger and
- Three-quarters of participants were negative / or were neutral on the view of the leadership and representation of the relevant stakeholders in the different task teams / committees. These task teams were conceived very early in the merger and were meant to be the main vehicle through which to coordinate the merger process.

The main themes from the open-ended question revealed the following:

- Not all teams / committees were equally driven by adequate leadership but task teams functioned according to their mandate. Leadership of task teams was at times biased towards one of the three institutions and participants felt that all stakeholders were not really represented. Own agendas and power struggles played an important role in these task teams.
- Participants were of the opinion that these deliberations were not always transparent and that decisions were already made by top management and task teams could in this case not really influence pre-decided outcomes. Communication between these task teams and employees was also lacking.
- Staff complained about low morale and a sense of loss of loyalty towards the institution.
• It must however be noted that a minimum disruption of services occurred during the merger.

Factor 1.2: Performance of steering committees

The statistical analysis revealed that the assessment of the task teams’ performance was judged very positively for the setting of goals, planning the work to be done, delegating responsibility, monitoring progress and achieving set goals, but half of the participants judged the problem solving to be poor.

The main themes with regard to the open-ended question dealing with the task teams’ performance were as follows:
• Participants expressed the view that decisions were made by top management. They felt that the process was rushed, that transparency could have been improved and that goal posts were shifted to accommodate internal politics. Some participants were satisfied with the planning and goal setting while others would have preferred these processes to have started earlier or from another angle.
• Decisions were made about whose administrative process would be followed that of UPE, VU or PET.
• Communication was highlighted as a problem. Mistrust and ignorance with regard to programme delivery between the staff of the University and the Technikon were evident and an ‘us them’ approach surfaced.
• Staff complained that problems that were identified were not addressed and the impact of decisions on their lives not considered.
• Staff also voiced their complaints and concerns with regard to increased work loads and loss of academic standards.

Factor 1.3: Mobilization of personnel and labour organisations

Some 50% of the participants agreed that the reasons for the merger were clearly explained to them. More than half of the participants were negative on the statements that the NMMU developed a clear memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved. More than half of the participants disagreed that:
• The merger was conducted for sound reasons;
• The urgency of the merger was clear and that
• Management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger.

The main themes of the open-ended question revolved around the following issues:
• The merger was a politically motivated process. Institutions had no choice in the matter. The Department of Education failed the process by not having thought through the outcomes and not having allocated the necessary resources human, financial and time to achieve these outcomes. They also did not sufficiently think through the issues and the implications of their decisions thus leaving the details to the institutions to solve themselves. This left employees upset and resistance increased as they felt that institutions were bulldozed into the merger. Respondents expressed feelings of mistrust and being pressurised into the merger.
• Self-interest prevailed over the public good and the impression was created that the leadership and the workers failed in their inability to rise above their own interests either personal or institutional in order to create an institution that could serve the best interests of education.

Factor 2: Clear purpose

The statistical analysis verified that more than half of the participants agreed that the NMMU had a clear mission / purpose statement, that customers or clients to be served were identified, that the needs that the NMMU had to satisfy were stated. More than half of the participants however also stated that how the mission / purpose had to be achieved was unclear.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the mission / purpose statement of the NMMU were the following:
• Participants stated that the mission / purpose statement was clear but complained about the lack of congruence between the expressed mission and implementation of action.
• It was also suggested that the mission / purpose statement needed to be revised as it did not represent a new generation university. It was also suggested that clarity with respect to the academic mission of a comprehensive university needed to be sharpened and widely communicated.
• Customers and clients were identified but whether their needs were always met to the best of the institution's ability was doubtful especially if an organisation had to deal with so many unhappy employees.

Factor 3: Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives

Factor 3.1: Formulation of vision and objectives

The statistical analysis revealed that 45% of participants agreed that their department’s objectives were better linked to those of the overall organisation after the merger. When the neither agreed nor disagreed options were combined with the disagreed and strongly disagreed options then the response of participants was significantly negative. Some 80% of participants were uncertain of how they could personally contribute to the attainment of the NMMU’s performance objectives. A total of 75% were negative on the statement that the NMMU’s vision was translated into clearer measurable performance objectives and more than 60% of participants were negative about the vision statement of the university.

Factor 3.2: Financial perspective

The statistical analysis revealed that more than half of the participants felt uncertain about the NMMU’s financial future and they also disagreed that more funds were allocated to departments.

Factor 3.3: Customer perspective

The statistical analysis revealed a significantly negative response to this section when the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options were collated. Some 80% of participants were negative about the quality of the NMMU’s graduates. More than 70% were negative about their own department’s service delivery after the merger and more than half of the participants were also negative about their own department’s performance in comparison with that of other tertiary institutions.
Factor 3.4: Internal business perspective

The statistical analysis revealed that about 60% of participants disagreed and strongly disagree that the NMMU had more efficient administrative processes to support all its services. When collating the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options the response of participants was significantly negative. Some 75% of participants were negative about the facilities and support services to students and a total of 60% of participants were negative about the site allocation.

Factor 3.5: Learning and growth

The statistical analysis revealed that the response to this section was significantly negative when the neither agreed nor disagreed and disagreed and strongly disagreed options were collated. More than 80% of participants were not of the opinion that people were more creative after the merger. Some 75% of participants could not agree that people in their departments were updating their skills more frequently or that they received more regular feedback from their supervisors. A total of 70% of participants were also negative about the performance targets and skills in their departments.

Factor 4: Champions at all levels

The statistical analysis revealed that the only statement that obtained a positive rating was the question on whether student profiles were a better reflection of the demographics of South African society after the merger. The rest of this section was very negatively interpreted especially if the neutral and disagree options were combined. The outcome presented itself as follows: some 90% of participants were negative with regard to graduates having the necessary skills to meet the needs of the country. A total of 80% of participants were also not of the opinion that academic programmes were better designed to meet regional or national needs; that the inequalities of the apartheid past have been eliminated; that the research capacity of the NMMU had increased or that it is linked to national developmental needs; that student admissions to the NMMU had increased or that staff profiles reflected the demographics of South African society. Altogether 70% of participants were not of the opinion that either top or middle management led the merger process effectively.
The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with participants’ perceptions of the success of the merger were as follows:

- Participants stated that divides still existed between employees of the different institutions.
- It was apparent that racial and equity issues had not yet been resolved.
- Participants also expressed their concern regarding academic standards due to the poor preparation of students and the loss of excellent academics. One participant observed that ‘although admissions have increased, good graduates have decreased’ and that students still register for courses with low employability.
- The total success of the merger can be summarized by the following statement of one of the participants ‘If the NMMU merger is compared to other mergers in Higher Education in South Africa then it is clear that, from a systems and procedural perspective, it was managed extremely well. Unfortunately the ‘people’ dimension of the merger did not feature as a priority and many staff members were alienated as a result of this’.

**Factor 5: Culture and community**

The statistical analysis revealed a very negative response when the neutral and disagree options were combined with regard to the implementation of the value system. Some 90% of participants were dissatisfied with the reward systems. More than 80% were not impressed with the appointment procedures of the university or the behaviour of top management in reflecting the value system of the university. Some 70% of employees were also not impressed with the behaviour of middle management, the relevant policies of the university or with the behaviour of fellow employees.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the value system of the university created the following response from participants:

- Participants felt that the value system of the university was not supported by the reward system.
- They complained that poor performance was tolerated and that there were no systems in place to convince / motivate / force / enable bad employees to change. This resulted in poor motivation and distrust amongst the other employees.
- Unhappiness was also expressed in the appointment procedures as participants felt that appointment procedures were racially biased and discriminatory. One
participant observed ‘by the time a post is advertised in a particular Department, they already know who they are going to employ!’ Another participant added ‘the value regarding fairness and equity needs more attention as many of the systems and processes relating to the merger were unfair to many categories of staff’.

- Heads of departments were accused of favouritism and protecting their own jobs instead of encouraging higher levels of quality performance from their employees and top management was accused of not understanding the complexities of their employees’ challenges.

Factor 6: Competitive competencies

These questions dealing with the current situation in comparison to the situation prior to the merger elicited intense reactions from participants. More than 85% of participants disagreed that the NMMU paid better salaries to attract or to retain top performers. Some 70% of participants also disagreed that the NMMU attracted more top performers than other universities in the country. More than 70% of participants agreed that the NMMU lost more top performers to other universities in the country. More than half of the employees disagreed that the NMMU developed and trained more employees as top performers, acknowledged exceptional performance or investigated more ways of motivating higher levels of performance in their employees. More than half of the participants also disagreed that the pay systems of the university had improved or that more efficient administrative processes were in place to support all its services. A total of more than half of the participants also disagreed that all stakeholders identified more strongly with the new university.

The main themes of the open-ended question in this section revolved around the following issues:

- Participants expressed their frustration with the remuneration and pay systems as well as a lack of appreciation for loyalty, dedication and hard work.
- The perception also existed that the university was losing excellent staff due to poor remuneration packages. It was suggested that more should be done to identify and recognise high performers and that incentives should be implemented for excellence in research, teaching, engagement, innovation and service delivery or contribution to vision attainment. The latter should also include and encourage
administrative and academic support staff who did not qualify for academic awards.

- On the entrepreneurial front it was suggested that policies must be simplified to make it possible for employees to engage in this new adventure.
- Participants suggested that red tape involved in so many administrative processes should be eliminated and a corporate culture established that would improve efficiency.
- Participants also complained about and questioned the quality of service delivery. It is interesting to note that a plea was made for the introduction of a performance management system. The quality of work performance was specifically highlighted as well as the quality of the students. Overcrowded lecture halls and a shortage of excellent lecturers were other complaints.
- A need was expressed for the creation of more developmental and promotion opportunities for lecturers and specifically for the development of research skills. It appeared from the feedback that marginalized students and personnel were still excluded.
- A plea was made for retaining those qualities and traditions that make a university a true university.

Factor 7: Coherent strategy

This factor assessed the implementation of coherent strategies to create value for its stakeholders. The statistical analysis on the NMMU staff’s ability to create value for its stakeholders elicited the following response from employees. More than half of the participants were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) on the following questions:

- NMMU staff have decreased their research outputs;
- NMMU staff have increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs;
- NMMU’s relationships with relevant stakeholders have increased.

Some 60% of participants agreed that the organisational structure of the NMMU had become a barrier in getting the work done and they disagreed that staff’s work performance was more linked to reward systems.

The following responses were significantly negative when combining the ‘neutral and disagree’ options. More than 80% of participants questioned that the quality of the
academic programmes had improved after the merger. A total of 75% of participants were not satisfied with the decentralised decision making systems and response to community needs. Some 60% of participants disagreed that staff had become less responsive to student needs.

The main themes of the open-ended section dealing with staff’s ability to create value generated the following response from participants:

- Participants complained that they were too busy to have time to think innovatively. Added to this were the complaints about being micro-managed, too much time spent on senseless meetings, being bombarded by red tape and working within the systems as frustrating and time consuming. Heads of departments and directors were not excluded from increasing administrative responsibilities.
- Participants voiced their frustration about the lack of incentives and a performance management system.
- One of the respondents questioned fellow employees’ commitment to the institution as the impression was created that staff only work for financial rewards instead of for the joy of teaching and learning. This response was echoed by another that said that ‘staff often feel that they should simply be allowed to do their jobs as well as they can, because they actually enjoy what they are doing!’

Factor 8: Communication and consultation

The statistical analysis revealed that some 70% of participants agreed that management supplied information at regular intervals. A total of 80% of participants stated that although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger people felt they were not heard and that they were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made.

A total of 50% of participants disagreed that the information conveyed was trustworthy. The following responses were also negative when the neutral and disagree options were combined, namely two thirds of participants complained that insufficient information was supplied and 75% of participants complained about the kind of information that was supplied.
The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with employees’ perceptions with regard to the information / communication received from top management during the merger were as follows:

- Participants complained that they received insufficient and inconsistent information and that the information supplied was not always a true reflection of the facts. People felt that their views were listened to but that they were not heard.
- One of the respondents gave an explanation of the decision making process as follows: ‘I think that certain decisions were made and steamrolled by management, this could be due to the fact that certain decisions / actions had to be made by deadlines’.
- An impression was further created that the merger happened in the offices of a few select managers. Another participant complained that very important decisions about policies were not highlighted and certain employees were very unhappy about what seemed to be railroading particularly in Senate.

From the abovementioned information it was evident that employees were unhappy about the merger and resistance to the merger needed investigation.

6.3.2.2 Factor scores

6.3.2.2.1 Reliability of factor scores

Statistical analyses revealed that factor loadings were significant for the total scores (ACF) of all individual factors and Cronbach’s alpha was 0.90. For the purpose of a basic exploratory study a cut-off value of 0.50 indicated adequate reliability. The observed Cronbach’s alpha coefficients exceeded this cut-off point.

6.3.2.2.2 Descriptive statistics for factor scores

The descriptive statistics for factor scores revealed a neutral to negative response from participants’ of the merger according to the eight factors identified in Anstey’s conceptual framework.
• A total of 62.5\% of factor scores were neutral for Factor 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives, Factor 4 Champions at all levels, Factor 5 Culture and community, Factor 7 Coherent strategy and Factor 8 Communication and consultation.

• Some 37.5\% of factor scores were negative for Factor 1 Constructive unease: harnessed urgency, Factor 2 Clear purpose and Factor 6 Competitive competencies.

6.3.2.2.3 Inferential statistics for factor scores

The MANOVA results revealed no significant statistical difference between the employment type (administrative and academic) and merger institution (UPE, VU and PET) for the eight factors of Anstey’s model (ACF 1 to ACF 8). Administrative personnel were generally more positive than their academic counterparts on ACF 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives.

The ANOVA results revealed a statistical significance between employment type and the following sub-scales, namely:

• ACF 3.1 Formulation of vision and objectives small significance;
• ACF 3.3 Customer perspective small significance;
• ACF 3.4 Internal business perspective moderate significance;
• ACF 3.5 Learning and growth moderate significance.

It appeared that academic staff perceived the abovementioned factors more negatively than the administrative staff of the institution.

6.4 Resistance to the merger

6.4.1 Reasons for the resistance to the merger

The statistical analysis revealed that more than 70\% of participants said that there was resistance to the merger in their department. More than half of the participants stated that their own reasons for resisting the merger were: the way / manner in which the merger was managed, reason / s for the merger, educational reason / s and loss of expertise. Half of the participants viewed other members’ reasons for resisting the merger as resistance to the leadership. It was also interesting to note that the top four
reasons for administrative participants’ own reasons for resisting the merger in order of importance were: the way / manner in which the merger was managed, fear of job insecurity, loss of expertise and fear of the unknown. Academic participants were concerned about the way / manner in which the merger was managed, educational and other reasons for the merger and loss of expertise.

The main themes for the open-ended question for the resistance to the merger focused on the following issues:

- Employees were very upset about the fact that they were forced into the merger by the Department of Education.
- The university feared a take-over by the technikon and the technikon feared a take-over by the university. These concerns were voiced in expressions such as ‘the university is going to become a technikon and it did and the so-called merger was rather a take-over by UPE’.
- The focus then moved to employees’ perception of management’s lack of concern for the distress they were facing. Issues such as changes in conditions of service resulting in job insecurity were at the top of their agendas. The feeling expressed was that ‘the merger did not value intellectual expertise or excellence or dedication’.
- Employees further voiced their concern about the impact of the merger on their daily work performance such as increased workloads, fellow employees jockeying for positions, experts leaving / retiring and changes in the management of familiar structures and processes.
- Another very important challenge facing the merger was expressed by one of the participants of how the NMMU would position itself with regard to other universities in the country and at the same time fulfil the needs of its own diverse communities: ‘I also suspect that the real vision for the institution is to be a really good teaching university focusing on volumes of undergraduate students with very small pockets of research... if that is so, then do not talk of a university of excellence or do we leave that to the grand research institutions?’.

6.4.2 How staff showed their resistance

Participants demonstrated their own resistance to the merger (in order of importance) by:

- Losing their motivation to work
• Losing loyalty to the organisation
• Voicing their complaints
• Increasing work-related errors and mistakes
• Increasing absenteeism
• Demonstrating work slowdowns
• Threatening to go on strike.

More than half of the participants viewed other members’ reaction to the merger (in order of importance) as:
• Increased absenteeism
• Work slowdowns
• Threats to go on strike
• Voicing of complaints
• Loss of motivation to work
• Loss of loyalty to the organisation
• Increase in work-related errors and mistakes.

The top three methods for administrative staff showing their resistance to the merger were: loss of motivation to work, loss of loyalty to the organisation and voicing their complaints. Academic participants also showed their resistance to the merger by losing their loyalty to the organisation, by voicing their complaints and by losing their motivation to work.

The main themes of the open-ended question dealing with the manner in which staff showed their resistance to the merger were the following:
• Participants said they wrote letters and met with relevant committee members.
• Participants also stated that their loyalty, motivation and productivity decreased, absenteeism occurred and they worked according to rule.
• Participants further stated that demotions and retrenchments took place and new job options were considered. During these times staff morale was generally very low.
• As a result of increased work pressures staff witnessed an increase in conflict, less personal contact with colleagues and a breakdown in camaraderie. One of the participants remarked ‘Wellness issues increased, ill-health increased, in-fighting
increased and distrust increased’. Notwithstanding the terrific stress staff encountered during the merger no strike actions occurred.

6.4.3 Management’s response to the resistance

Participants’ perception of management’s response of their own resistance to the merger (in order of importance) was:

- People were sidelined / ignored / not consulted;
- People were manipulated;
- Threats were made that promotion /s would be withheld;
- Threats were made that contracts would not be renewed;
- Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment;
- Members were co-opted into the different task teams;
- New skills training was offered;
- People were transferred;
- Support and /or counselling were offered;
- Reward packages were negotiated;
- People were threatened with dismissal;
- People were blackmailed and
- People were dismissed.

More than half of the participants viewed management’s response to other employees’ resistance to the merger as:

- Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment;
- Support and / or counselling was offered;
- Members were co-opted into the different task teams;
- New skills training was offered;
- Reward packages were negotiated and
- People were transferred.

It appeared from the abovementioned information that participants viewed management’s response to other members’ resistance to the merger as much more accommodating than their own resistance to the merger. It was also interesting to note that the top three reasons for administrative participants’ response to management’s handling of their own
resistance were: people were sidelined / ignored / not consulted, people were manipulated and everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment. Academic participants stated that their resistance was managed by being sidelined / ignored / not consulted, threats were made that promotion / s would be withheld and people were manipulated.  

The main themes of the open-ended question were the following:

- Participants were upset about the way Section 189A was managed as well as the manner in which appointments, demotions and disciplinary matters were handled.
- Staff once again complained about their increased workloads and emphasized how demotivating and stressful the merger was. This resulted in stress related conditions such as disillusionment, depression and burnout.
- According to participants’ feedback, management distorted facts, they made threats indirectly, little transparency occurred, staff turnover was witnessed and systems became tyrannically more complex. One employee remarked that the new leave system did not support long term career prospects and participants felt that nobody seemed to care. This was supported by their perception that HR took a legalistic rather than a motivational stance.

6.5 Achievement of research objectives

The first objective of this study was to describe the organisational transformation process as it unfolded at the newly established NMMU in the period 2003 - 2007. This objective was achieved in Chapter 3. In that chapter the merger process at the NMMU was described.

The second objective was to evaluate the success of the organisational transformation process at the NMMU by using Anstey’s conceptual framework. This objective was also achieved.

Descriptive statistics revealed that 62.5% of factor scores were neutral and 37.5% negative with regard to staffs’ perceptions of the merger. Inferential statistics revealed that academic staff viewed the merger more negatively on Factor 3 Challenging vision with clear measurable objectives than their administrative colleagues. The total success of the merger can be summarized by the following statement of one of the participants ‘If
the NMMU merger is compared to other mergers in Higher Education in South Africa then it is clear that, from a systems and procedural perspective, it was managed satisfactorily. Unfortunately the ‘people’ dimension of the merger did not feature as a priority and many staff members were alienated as a result of this’. This information confirmed the feedback obtained from the staff satisfaction survey conducted in 2007, namely staff stated that insufficient attention was given to the ‘human side’ of the merger and that ‘the focus seemed to be all on policy and procedure’ (Barnard & Nel, 2007: 13).

The research findings substantiate the usefulness of Anstey’s conceptual framework in the assessment of transformation at an institution of higher education.

6.6 Limitations of the study

The following limitations were identified:

- The most important limitation of the study was the low response rate. The low response rate could have been due to the fact that a staff satisfaction survey was conducted about two months prior to this survey and personnel were not motivated of completing another questionnaire within such a short time span.

- This study was also contextual in nature, meaning that it focused on the transformation process as it unfolded at a specific university in South African between the years 2003 - 2007. No data generated from this study could be generalised as they only presented a shot – in - time reflecting the transformation process at a particular organisation at a particular period in time.

- Mergers in general elicit negative responses from those who are affected by its outcome. The researcher was of the opinion that completing the questionnaire could have been one of the avenues for participants’ to ventilate their anger and frustration at the process over which they had no control. This could have played a role in the negative outcome of the research findings.

- The questionnaire also had its limitations. Questions relating to the resistance to the merger (questions 7-9) only allowed for one option to be chosen by the participant although the participant was asked to indicate both their own and others’ responses to each question. It was thus not possible to tick both options if your own and other members’ perceptions were the same. Participants were then advised to differentiate between those options that were applicable to themselves and to others.
6.7 Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- More attention is given to the skilful and sensitive management of people during a merger to minimize demoralization of the workforce. Successful transformation requires people to do things differently to break with the past, to take risks and to become more motivated about their new work environment.

- Another survey is conducted in a few years time when the turmoil of the merger has subsided with the purpose of assessing whether the University has developed the ability to look outside itself and started to focus on the broader world and its many competitors.

6.8 Summary

Employees experienced the merger as a traumatic event and their main concerns were the poor management of people and the quality of the service delivery. The ultimate success of the merger will be determined by the skilful and sensitive management of people in the months and years to come. In his inaugural address earlier this year the second vice-chancellor stated that he would soon launch NMMU 2020, a project to sharpen the long-term vision of the future NMMU. This plan would focus on people and aim (amongst other objectives) to:

- Define the NMMU’s academic purpose
- Improve research
- Elevate the status of teaching
- Expand community engagement
- Act in a socially responsive manner
- Focus on sustainability and
- Meet transformational objectives.

He further emphasized that the NMMU had reached a new phase and now has to grow a humanising pedagogy in which the university will embrace both rights and obligations with equal fervour and where all people will be served to the best of the university’s abilities, so that people can see their hopes, their dreams and finest aspirations realized (In Touch, 2008: 1). In conclusion, we believe that the NMMU has the ability to develop into a highly competitive university by creating excellence in aspects such as operating
and financial performance, business and technical capabilities, strength of stakeholder relationships, corporate culture, teaching, research and community partnerships.
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Conceptualisation means to define the key concepts (Mouton, 1998: 114). In this study the following concepts need clarification:

**Acquisition**

An *acquisition* is any transaction in which something is acquired. The terms acquisition, merger and takeover are often used interchangeably (Slorach & Rylance, 2005:161).

**Balanced scorecard**

One of the tools/methods that can be used to comprehensively evaluate an organisation’s performance, is the *balanced scorecard* as it links people, strategy and performance whilst simultaneously providing managers with complex information at a glance. Four perspectives are used to show how results are achieved, namely financial, customer, internal business processes and learning and growth (Harvard Business Review, 1998: 126).

**Benchmarking**

*Benchmarking* is a process of comparing metrics between organisations (Nair, 2004: 233) or as defined by Spendolini (1992: 9) “a continuous systematic process for evaluating the products, services and work processes of organisations that are recognized as representing best practices for the purpose of organisational improvement”. The balanced scorecard offers a strategic template for organising enterprise thinking, planning and evaluation. Specific targets and measures are formulated by the planners themselves.

**Change**

According to the Oxford dictionary *change* means to give up, get rid of, go from one place to another, become different or to become new.
Change agent / s

A change agent is a person who acts as a catalyst and who assumes responsibility for managing the change activities (Robbins, 2005:551).

Comprehensive Institution

A Comprehensive Institution means a single higher education institution that provides both university and technikon type programmes (Notice number 863 in Government Gazette No 23550 of 24 June 2002).

Initiatives

Initiatives are key programmes an organisation must undertake to enable it to achieve identified objectives (Nair, 2004: 234).

Intangible assets

Intangible assets are described as “knowledge that exists in an organisation to create differential advantage” or “the capabilities of the company’s employees to satisfy customer needs” (Thomas, 1998: 67).

Joint Management Core Group (JMCG)

The Joint Management Core Group was established at the onset of the merger and consists of a group of five members from each merging institution. Its purpose is to provide leadership to the process and to give effect to the Memorandum of Agreement (Memorandum of Agreement, 2003:6; Ndung’u, 2007: 12).

Key performance indicators

Key performance indicators are essential measures that are critical for strategic realisation (Nair, 2004: 234).
Lagging indicator

A lagging indicator is a measure that is identified only after the event occurs (Nair, 2004: 234).

Leading indicator

A leading indicator is a measure that can indicate the result of an event prior to it occurring (Nair, 2004: 234).

Measure

A measure is a quantifiable formula whose variables define what needs to be measured and monitored in order for a target to be achieved (Nair, 2004: 234).

Merger

A merger is a major change project and usually involves the joining or amalgamation of two or more organisations to form a new organisation (Devine & Hirsh, 1998: 21). A healthy merger as a merger where the senior corporate leadership matches the excellence achieved by the many integration managers and teams and where rapid learning of new customers and external stakeholders are achieved (Fubini et al, 2007: 4; 68).

Mission

The overarching mission statement of the organisation provides the reason why the organisation exists. Mission and vision statements set the goals and direction for the organisation and communicate to shareholders, customers and employees what the organisation is about and what it intends to achieve (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 34-35).

Objective

An objective is a goal to be achieved. In order to be achieved it has to be specific, measurable and attainable (Nair, 2004: 234).
**Perspective**

The balanced scorecard describes four main perspectives to consider in formulating strategic directions, namely:

- **A financial perspective**, involving key financial objectives that define the overall strategic themes of achievement;
- **customer perspective**, revolving around issues of value, competency and customer related objectives;
- **internal business perspective**, focusing on operational objectives that lead and support the financial and customer goals;
- **learning and growth perspective**, covering the objectives that feed all other perspectives as the foundation for mobilizing and sustaining the organisation in realizing its strategy (Nair, 2004:235).

**Target**

A target is a numeric value representing a desired result (Nair, 2004: 235).

**Transformation**

Corporate or organisational transformation is described as a revolutionary change process. In this change process a total change of business direction can be observed with the formulation of a new mission statement and the adoption of a whole new set of “core values” (Dunphy and Stace, 1993: 905-920).

**Top management/team (executive management)**

*Top management/team (executive management)* refers to the group of senior managers at the relevant apex of the whole organisation that shares the general responsibility for the future of the organisation. The top team/top managers are the people that will regularly interact with the CEO of the organisation (Fubini et al, 2007: 29). Where reference is only made to management in the documentation line managers are included.
Stakeholder

*Stakeholders* can be internal and/or external to the organisation. These are a person and/or group who are directly involved and/or affected by the change and transformation process (Devine & Hirsh, 1998: 21).

Strategy

*Strategy* is defined as the process of selecting a set of activities in which the organisation will excel to create a sustainable difference in the marketplace (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 35).

Value

A *value* is an affective disposition towards a person, an object or an idea and represents a way of life. Values create identity and refer to what is “right and wrong”. In this context, the concept refers to what is acceptable behaviour in the organisation and how an organisation wishes to exist (Nair, 2004: 236).

Vision

The organisation’s *vision* paints a picture for the future and provides information on the direction it intends to follow. The *vision* thus sets the organisation in motion from the stability of the mission and core values to the dynamics of the strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2004: 32).
Vision Statement

Our vision as a values-driven university is to be the leader in optimising the potential of our communities towards sustainable development in Africa. Having attained our vision we will be able to:

- Contribute to the transformation and development of our communities in terms of the full spectrum of their needs;
- empower our institution, staff, graduates and communities to contribute and compete, both locally and internationally;
- continue to make a major contribution to sustainable development in Africa.

Mission Statement

The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University is an engaged and people-centred university that serves the needs of its diverse communities by contributing to sustainable development through excellent academic programmes, research and service delivery.

Values and Principles

Inspired by the leadership qualities of Nelson Mandela in the transformation to democracy in South Africa, we are guided by the following eight core values and principles in our own transformation towards the NMMU:

- **Transformation for equity and fairness**
  We promote reconciliation and respond actively to past inequities.
  We strive to eradicate all forms of unfair discrimination.
  We treat all people fairly in accordance with the Constitution and Bill of Rights.
  We ensure that our staff and student profiles progressively reflect the demographic realities of South African society.

- **Respect for Diversity**
  We reflect and serve geographically and culturally diverse communities that enrich our university.
  We encourage a multiplicity of opinions and backgrounds.
  We seek ways to incorporate the voices and experiences of all communities.
We support internationalization through enrolment of international students, exchange of students and staff, diversification of programmes, promotion of collaborative research and cultural exchange.

- **People-centredness**
  
  We care about the current and future wellness of our students, staff and community.
  We foster a supportive and enabling environment that attracts and retains high quality students and staff.
  We strive to empower and build the capacity of people to realize their full potential.
  We support lifelong learning for all.

- **Student Access**
  
  We accept our key priority is to provide a quality higher education to all students who have the potential to succeed.
  We promote equity of access and fair opportunities so as to give every student the best chance of academic and professional success.
  We provide an accessible and affirming environment taking into account the diverse aspirations and needs of our students, including financial needs.
  We strive to increase equitable student enrolment in Business, Science, Engineering and Technology as per national imperatives.
  We commit to developing graduates and diplomats who are well-rounded, critical thinkers, entrepreneurial, innovative and employable.

- **Engagement**
  
  We engage with our stakeholders and communities with special emphasis on the Nelson Mandela Metropole and the Southern Cape.
  We develop programmes, conduct research and offer services that are responsive to community needs.
  We encourage reciprocal relationships with universities nationally and internationally, especially in Africa.
  We support the establishment of sound relationships with our student and employee representatives.

- **Excellence**
  
  We value and reward excellence in the performance of our people, and take pride in our programmes, research, facilities and services.
  We offer a comprehensive range of relevant academic programmes, emphasizing professional and technological education of the highest standard.
  We commit to institution-wide quality management and continuous improvement.
• **Innovation**
  
  We nurture creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship as integral to scholarship and the knowledge society.
  
  We promote and reward innovative research, teaching and learning practices that advance our institution and support sustainable development.
  
  We enhance our capacity for creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship and financial sustainability by establishing mutual partnerships with government, business and other community stakeholders.

• **Integrity**
  
  We act with integrity, communicate respectfully and accept responsibility for our words and actions.
  
  We require ethical, professional behaviour by all persons associated with the university.
  
  We conduct our activities in an accountable and transparent manner (General Prospectus, 2006:7-8).
Dear Mr Grimbeek,

RE.: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON THE MERGER AT THE NELSON MANDELA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

Your approval is requested for conducting research into the transformation process that occurred with the recent merger of the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth branch of the VISTA University and the Port Elizabeth Technikon. The title of the research is “An exploration of change and transformation at an institution of higher education using Anstey’s model of change and transformation.” This research is conducted under the supervision of Prof M Anstey and Mr DJL Venter.

The first objective of this study is to describe the organisational transformation process at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University between the years 2003 –2007.

The second objective of this research is to evaluate the success of the organisational transformation process at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University by using Anstey’s conceptual framework. This framework integrates the work of major change theorists as well as the balanced scorecard of Kaplan and Norton.

The research will be conducted by:

- Requesting personnel to complete a questionnaire on line via e-mail to indicate their perceptions on the transformation process.
- Obtaining information from relevant reports and financial statements that are available for public scrutiny.

The questionnaire should take no longer than 20 minutes per individual to complete.
Employees will be invited to participate in the study. They will be informed that their participation is voluntary and the purpose of the study will be explained. Participants will be ensured that all information will be treated as confidential and that their anonymity will be ensured at all times. It will be assumed that participants who complete the questionnaire gave their informed consent. No identifying information will be collected by the researcher that could link any questionnaire back to any specific staff member (for example by an e-mail address or the IP address of the computer from which the questionnaire will be set). Feedback from the questionnaires will be automatically entered by the computer programme utilized and all data will be produced in group / cluster format further eliminating any chance of participants being identified. The computer programme utilized for this questionnaire will be programmed to shut down after 6 months of capturing the first data. Data generated from this research will be unavailable for re-use. Participants are also not likely to be exposed to any risk by participating in this study.

The RTI Committees of the Faculty of Arts and Business and Economic Sciences as well as the Research Ethics Committee (Human) of the University have approved this proposal on its merits as a research proposal, but I still need you permission, and if possible your support to conduct the research within the NMMU.

Included is a copy of the research proposal for your information. Hoping my request meets with your approval as this research will be submitted for a Master’s degree in Labour Relations and Human Resources at this University. A bound copy of the research will be available in the library on completion of the study.

Thanking you in anticipation

Yours sincerely

____________________
Prof. Iona Wannenburg
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY ON THE MERGER AT THE NELSON MANDELA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY (NMMU)

You are invited to participate in a study to determine employee perceptions of the recent merger at the NMMU. Please complete this questionnaire if you have been appointed at the University of Port Elizabeth, the Port Elizabeth branch of the VISTA University or the PE Technikon before January 2005.

Confidentiality of your responses:

Please note that your information will remain strictly confidential and anonymous since no identifying information will be collected that will enable us to link any questionnaire back to a specific staff member (for example an E-mail address or the IP address of the computer from which the questionnaire was sent). Feedback from the questionnaire is automatically entered by the computer programme utilized and all data is directly produced in group/cluster format. This will further eliminate any chance of being identified. The relevant committees of the University have approved this study. The results of this questionnaire will be included in a treatise that will be submitted for a Masters degree in Labour Relations and Human Resources at this University under the supervision of Prof M Anstey and Mr DJL Venter. A bound copy of the study will be available in the library after completion of the study.

Please ensure that all questions are answered. The questionnaire should take no longer than 15 - 20 minutes to complete.

To view the Mission, vision and Values, please copy and paste the following link in your Internet browser.

http://my.nmmu.ac.za/default.asp?id=9&nid=&mod=&bhcp=1

If you require any further information you are invited to consult the researcher Prof I Wannenburg at telephone 041 - 5042959 during office hours or by E-mail at iona.wannenburg@nmmu.ac.za
**PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE ON MERGER**

Please ensure that all questions are answered.

### 1. Biographical details
Please ensure that all questions are answered.

1.2 If you are an academic, please indicate your faculty
   (please select) ▼

1.3 If other, please specify
   

1.4 What is your Peromnes grade?
   (please select) ▼

1.5 Employment status?
   (please select) ▼

1.6 In which year were you appointed at the pre – merging institution?
   (please select) ▼

1.7 In which pre - merger institution were you appointed?
   (please select) ▼

1.8 State your gender
   (please select) ▼

1.9 State your age
   (please select) ▼

1.10 State your race
    (please select) ▼

1.10 If answer to 1.10 is other, please specify

If you require any further information you are invited to consult the researcher Prof I Wannenburg at telephone 041 - 5042959 during office hours or by E - mail at iona.wannenburg@nmmu.ac.za
# Personnel Questionnaire on Merger

Please ensure that all questions are answered.

## 2. Perceptions regarding the NMMU merging process

Indicate your response to the following statements concerning the merger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Reasons for the merger were clearly explained.</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The merger was conducted for sound reasons.</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The urgency of the merger was clear.</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Management successfully mobilized employees to participate in the merger.</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Labour organizations successfully mobilized their members to participate in the merger.</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:</td>
<td>[ ] Strongly disagree [ ] Disagree [ ] Neither agree or disagree [ ] Agree [ ] Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Task teams / Committees in the merger process

Indicate your response to the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Were you a member of one or more of the task teams / committees dealing with the merger?</td>
<td>(please select)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 If yes, to which task team (s) / committee (s) did you belong? (please select)
4. Task team(s) in the Merger Process

Please indicate your response to the following statements with regards to the management of the merger process:

4.1 The NMMU developed a clear Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to guide the merger process and behaviour of the relevant parties involved.  

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4.2 The task teams / committees were introduced early enough in the merger to make a valuable contribution to the merger.  

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4.3 The task teams / committees had the necessary leadership skills to drive the process.  

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4.4 All stakeholders were adequately represented in the task teams / committees.  

☐ Strongly disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Neither agree or disagree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly agree

4.5 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

If you require any further information you are invited to consult the researcher Prof I Wannenburg at telephone 041 - 5042959 during office hours or by E - mail at iona.wannenburg@nmmu.ac.za
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Please ensure that all questions are answered

5. Task team’s performance
In your judgement overall, how did the task team (s) / committee (s) perform with regard to the following criteria?

5.1 Setting goals.
5.2 Planning the work to be done.
5.3 Delegating responsibility.
5.4 Solving problems.
5.5 Monitoring progress.
5.6 Achieving set goals.
5.7 Any comments, especially if poor option were selected:

6. Resistance to the merger
Please answer following questions

6.1 Was there any resistance to the merger in your department?

6.2 If your answer to question 6.1 is yes, what percentage of your department (s) staff resisted the merger? Rough estimate

7. Reasons for resistance to the merger
What were the reasons for the resistance to the merger? Please tick the relevant option / s
for your response:

7.1 Reason / s for the merger.
7.2 Timing of the merger.
7.3 Mission / purpose statement of the NMMU.
7.4 Vision statement of the NMMU.
7.5 Values of the NMMU.
7.6 The way / manner in which the merger was managed.
7.7 Educational reasons.
7.8 Fear of the unknown.
7.9 Fear of job insecurity.
7.10 Loss of expertise.
7.11 Reduced resource allocation to our department.
7.12 Resisted the leadership.
7.13 Any other comments regarding reasons for the resistance to the merger?

If you require any further information you are invited to consult the researcher Prof I Wannenburg at telephone 041 - 5042959 during office hours or by E - mail at iona.wannenburg@nmmu.ac.za
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Please ensure that all questions are answered.

8. **How staff showed there resistance to the merger**
   If members in your department were resistant to the merger, how did they show their resistance?

8.1 Complaints were voiced.
8.2 Motivation to work was lost.
8.3 Work related errors and mistakes increased.
8.4 Absenteeism increased.
8.5 Lost of loyalty to the organisation was noticed.
8.6 Work slowdown occurred.
8.7 Threats to go on strike were voiced.
8.8 Strike action occurred.
8.9 Any other comments regarding reasons or the resistance to the merger?

9. **Managements’ response to resistance**
   If members in your department showed their resistance to the merger, how did management treat them?

9.1 Everything possible was done to obtain members’ commitment.
9.2 Support and/or counselling were offered.
9.3 New skills training were offered.
9.4 Members were co-opted into the different task teams.
9.5 Reward packages were negotiated.
9.6 Threats were made that contracts would not be renewed.
9.7 Threats were made that promotion/s will be withheld.
9.8 People were manipulated for example by twisting or distorting facts, spreading false rumours, withholding information.
9.9 People were sidelined/ignored/not consulted.
9.10 People were blackmailed.
9.11 People were transferred.
9.12 People were threatened with dismissal.
9.13 People were dismissed.
9.14 Other, specify:

Treatment directed at you  Treatment directed at other
Any other comments regarding aspects covered by previous statements
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10. **The mission / purpose statement of the NMMU**
Please respond to the following statements regarding the mission / purpose statement of the NMMU:

10.1 NMMU has a clear mission / purpose statement.

10.2 Customers or clients to be served are identified.

10.3 Needs that the NMMU has to satisfy are stated.

10.4 How the mission / purpose has to be achieved is clear.

10.5 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

11. **Comparison with situation prior to the merger**
To what extent do you agree that:

11.1 NMMU has a clearer vision.

11.2 NMMU’s vision is translated into clearer measurable performance objectives.
11.3 People are more certain about how they can personally contribute to the attainment of NMMU’s performance objectives.

11.4 Our Departments objectives are better linked those of the overall organisation.

11.5 NMMU has a clearer strategy to achieve its financial objectives.

11.6 More funds are allocated to departments.

11.7 People feel more uncertain about the NMMUs financial future.

11.8 Our departments performance compares more favourably with that of other tertiary institutions.

11.9 Our department delivers a better service to the university after the merger.

11.10 NMMU graduates compare more favourably with graduates of other universities.

11.11 NMMU has better facilities to deliver a quality service to students.

11.12 NMMU has better support services to deliver a quality service to students.
its students.

11.13 NMMU has more efficient administrative processes to support all its services.

11.14 Site allocation has not affected our department’s performance negatively.

11.15 People in our department have more skills to achieve the objectives of the university.

11.16 People in our department have clearer performance targets according to which they are assessed.

11.17 People in our department get more regular feedback from their supervisor / s on their work performance.

11.18 People in our department are learning and updating their skills more frequently.

11.19 People in our department are more creative than before the merger.

11.9 People in our department are more creative than before the merger.
11.20 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:
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Please ensure that all questions are answered
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12. The value system of the university
Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding the value system of the university. The value system of the NMMU is supported by:

12.1 Appointment procedures of the university.

12.2 Reward systems of the university.

12.3 Relevant policies of the university.

12.4 Behaviour of top management.

12.5 Behaviour of middle management (departmental level).

12.6 Behaviour of fellow employees.

12.7 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

13. The culture of the NMMU
Please indicate your response to the following statements concerning the culture of the NMMU:

13.1 Compared to the situation prior to the merger all stakeholders identify more strongly with the NMMU.

13.2 NMMU is putting more
effort into the development of its own culture (shared values / beliefs / purpose in work).

13.3 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

14. The culture of the NMMU
Compared to the situation prior to the merger, indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:

14.1 We have more top performers / academics in our department.

14.2 We have more top performers / academics in our department relative to other similar departments in the country.

14.3 NMMU attracts more top performers as employees than other universities in the country.

14.4 NMMU loses more top performers than other universities in the country.

14.5 NMMU develops and trains more employees to be top performers.

14.6 NMMU pays better salaries to attract top performers.

14.7 NMMU pays better salaries to retain top performers.

14.8 NMMUs pay systems have improved.

14.9 NMMU acknowledges exceptional performance much more.

14.10 NMMU investigates more ways of
motivating higher levels of performance in their employees.

14.11 NMMU encourages Entrepreneurship much more.

14.12 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:
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15. The value system of the university
Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding the NMMU staff ability to create value for its stakeholders since the merger:

15.1 The quality of the academic programmes have improved.

15.2 The organisational structure of the NMMU became a barrier in getting the work done.

15.3 The decentralised decision making systems have made it easier to get the work done.

15.4 NMMU staff has become less responsive to student needs.

15.5 NMMU staff has become more responsive to community needs.

15.6 NMMU staff has decreased their research outputs.

15.7 NMMU staff has increased their innovation / entrepreneurial outputs.
15.8 Staffs work performance has become more linked to reward systems.

15.9 NMMUs relationships with relevant stakeholders have increased.

15.10 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

16. Information / communication received from management
Please indicate your response with regard to the information / communication received from top management during the merger:

16.1 Information was supplied at regular intervals as the merger progressed.

16.2 Sufficient information was supplied.

16.3 The right kind of information was provided.

16.4 The information was trustworthy.

16.5 Although efforts were made to communicate issues concerning the merger people felt they were not heard.

16.6 People were merely asked to rubber stamp decisions that had already been made.
16.7 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:

17. **Success of the NMMU merger**
Please indicate your response to the following statements concerning the success of the NMMU merger:

17.1 Top management led the NMMU merger process effectively.

17.2 Middle management (departmental level) led the NMMU merger process effectively.

17.3 Student admissions to the university has increased.

17.4 Graduates with skills necessary to meet the needs of the country have increased.

17.5 Student profiles are a better reflection of the demographics of the South African society.

17.6 Staff profiles reflect the demographics of the South African society much better.

17.7 Academic programmes are better designed to meet regional needs.

17.8 Academic programmes are better designed to meet national needs.
17.9 Research are more linked to national developmental needs.

17.10 Research capacity of the NMMU has increased.

17.11 Fragmentation of the apartheid past has been reduced.

17.12 Inequalities of the apartheid past have been eliminated.

17.13 For all its problems the NMMU merger has been a success.

17.14 Any comments, especially if strongly agree / strongly disagree options were selected:
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