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ABSTRACT

There is a generally accepted view that organisations that perform well in any industry are able to do so because of their ability to attract, recruit and retain a workforce of high calibre. This research report has been necessitated by the impact of factors affecting talent management at higher education institutions. In this study, two variables are under scrutiny, i.e. organisational image and talent management. A quantitative research methodology was utilised to test the effect of organisational image on talent management using responses from 252 respondents to a self-administered electronic survey questionnaire. The research instrument was composed of four major sub-scales, i.e. Personal View, Job satisfaction and Career Path, General Image and Opportunities and Rewards. Statistical data analysis reveals that respondents differ on what they perceive to be important factors on talent management and their response is affected by matters relating to organisational image. Data was stratified and compared amongst different groups, i.e. gender, race, staff category, academic title, Peromnes grade, years of lecturing experience in this institution and total years of lecturing, Faculty and College/Division. These variables in personal/biographical data were examined in relation to how respondents responded in each of the four sub-scales. Whilst personal view and opportunities and rewards aspect of talent management matter, they do not take precedence on matters relating to general image and job satisfaction and career path.
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CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions face immense pressure to increase output, be it through research or student throughput. It is general knowledge that governments globally are looking at ways in which higher education institutions can be self-funding rather than relying on governments for sustainability (Smith, 2012). Bloom, Canning and Chan (2006) present that while two African governments are seeking to increase tertiary education funding, six are explicitly planning to decrease it. The restructuring of the funding formula for higher education institutions is inarguably a major issue in the transformation of higher education system, argues Fourie (1999). In terms of the new South African funding formula, higher research output means higher income from research activities; greater student numbers mean more income from the government. Higher education institutions require a strong image, which Ivy (2001) argues, is needed for higher student enrolment and greater income from donors. The success of higher education institutions in ensuring that they remain financially viable is also dependent on the institutions’ ability to attract and retain staff, especially academics. In other words, the funding formula for higher learning institutions makes academic staff the backbone for securing funding. These two aspects, i.e. image and talent management are intertwined. Ulrich (1997) in Bothma and Roodt (2012: 1) argues that “organisations strive for ways to improve employees’ job performance and to retain their top performers. This necessitates a valid understanding of the determinants of job performance and turnover”. This research however, intends to focus on retention and turnover.

Organisational image is “described as the overall impression made on the minds of the public about an organisation” (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2002: 4). “A good reputation is more valuable than money,” claims Publilius Syrus (Mail & Guardian, 2012). A reputation is the common denominator that helps us make judgements about issues in fields in which we are not expert, (Mail & Guardian, 2012).

According to Tsai and Yang (2010), the importance of organisational image in recruitment success has been established. It has also been established that the estimated cost of staff
Turnover and replacement of the lost talent is “between seventy per cent and two hundred per cent of the lost employee’s annual salary”, according to Kaye and Jordan-Evans (1999) in (Netswera, Rankhumise and Mavundla, 2005: 36). Turban (2001) confirms that organisations are facing complications in attracting suitably qualified applicants and further states that organisations spend approximately thirty one per cent of the Human Resources budget on recruiting and retention programmes. If these basic understandings and facts have long been established in other industries, how do they apply in the higher education sector? It is understood that African higher education institutions are experiencing unprecedented challenges such as a brain drain, be it to the corporate sector or to other institutions in other parts of the world (Teferra and Altbach, 2004).

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

A person’s choice of job starts with an individual making decisions of whether to pursue employment with a certain organisation, yet the reasons and factors driving these decisions remain unknown to prospective employers (Turban, 2001). Ivy (2001) argues that higher education institutions have an image which impacts on a student’s willingness to apply to that institution for studying, or a funder assessing an endowment opportunity or a firm assessing an institution for research and development partnership. As the workforce is key to any organisation’s success, the purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of organisational image on talent management within a higher education institution. De Ruyter and Wetzels (2000: 644) argue that the “role of image becomes more significant when competing services are perceived as virtually identical on performance, price and availability”. There is little writing on corporate image and its impact on higher education’s talent management processes. The problem statement is that there is an identified problem in the literature and a perceived problem regarding the role of an organisation’s image in terms of the calibre of talent that it is able to attract. This is being researched within the context of the University of KwaZulu-Natal.
1.3 THE RATIONALE OF THE RESEARCH

Every employer, to a varying degree, is seeking to attract and retain a highly skilled workforce. It is more so in a higher education environment where competition for exceptional talent is rife. The survival, longevity and image of each higher education depends on its ability to attract and retain exceptional talent. To achieve this, the sector has to recognize that there is a need for consistent effort to be exerted in improving the image of the sector.

The aim of the study is to assist higher education institutions in improving their talent management processes. This study will be of value to institutions of higher learning to improve their competitive image within the global education arena.

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study were to:

- Establish the role played by the organisation’s image in attracting and retaining staff in a higher education institution (Personal Views);
- Identify job-career paths factors that are considered influential in talent management (job satisfaction and career path);
- Identify elements involved in the creation of the organisational image (General Image) and
- Investigate factors considered by potential academics when applying or taking up a position at a particular university (Opportunities and rewards).

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The key research questions of this study were:

- What role does the organisation’s image play in attracting and retaining staff?
- What job-career paths factors are influential in talent management?
- Which elements are involved in the creation of the organisational image? and
- What factors are considered by potential academics when applying or taking up a position at a particular university?
1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES OF DATA

This section provides a description of the research methodology used in the study and gives an account of how the research was conducted. It details methods of sampling and data collection used, the analysis and interpretation, as well as the limitations of the study.

This study was conducted following the quantitative research methods. A questionnaire was sent to all employees that were the focus of the study, i.e. academics and support members of staff who were at certain Peromnes grading system used at the education institution under study. A statistical computer package (SPSS) is used to analyse data. Non-parametric tests are also used in the analysis of data for this study.

1.7 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

"Executives know the importance of their companies' reputations. Firms with strong positive reputations attract better people. They are perceived as providing more value, which often allows them to charge a premium. Their customers are more loyal and buy broader ranges of products and services. Because the market believes that such companies will deliver sustained earnings and future growth, they have higher price-earnings multiples and market values and lower costs of capital. Moreover, in an economy where 70% to 80% of market value comes from hard-to assess intangible assets such as brand equity, intellectual capital, and goodwill, organisations are especially vulnerable to anything that damages their reputations" (Eccles, Newquist and Schatz, 2007: 104). One can look at this matter from another perspective as articulated by Franklin in Eccles et al., (2007). Franklin says that “it takes many good deeds to build a good reputation, and only one bad one to lose it" (Eccles et al., 2007: 106).

The "war for talent" is becoming fierce. Shachar (2006) indicates that even governments of national states understand that competing for global talent is crucial as it (talent) may be snatched by other states which require the same skill and talent for their countries. As a result of this, consideration had to be made for the immigration laws in the United States of America. The scarcity of skilled employees has accelerated the problem of talent management for South African universities. Attracting top talent is becoming more and more crucial for
universities. The challenge of attracting skilled employees and retaining them is not only amongst the South African universities, but is part of a wider threat as South African universities find that foreign universities with the advantage of a strong currency are able to entice South African academics away from local institutions, and further reducing scarce human resources locally. The University of KwaZulu-Natal has a challenge in attracting talent. It is reported that fifty per cent of posts advertised are re-advertised as there were no suitable candidates found (Mosia, 2011).

Talent management is “an integrated set of processes, programs and cultural norms in an organisation designed and implemented to attract, develop, deploy and retain talent to achieve strategic objectives and meet future business needs” (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 18). Talent is the second issue that CEOs worry about after financial issues of the company (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 3). There seems to be little debate about the positive impact that strong talent has on business outcome, Lawler, (2008) in (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 4).

1.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- There may be constraints as the institution under study is familiar to the investigator;
- Sources of data, given the limited study in organisational image, are limited;
- Limited research in organisational image and talent management in a South African higher education context.

1.9 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This research consists of five chapters. Chapter one is the research proposal which serves as the study’s introduction. Chapter two provides an account of the known information around concepts of organisational image and talent management. Chapter three describes the research methodology used for this research study, while Chapter four presents the results and statistical analysis. Chapter 5 presents the recommendations and conclusions of the study.
1.10 SUMMARY

This chapter introduced the study by giving information around the two variables under study, i.e. the organisational image and talent management. In this chapter, a brief definition and importance of these two terms was presented. A critical link between funding for higher education institutions, image and talent management was established. The chapter went on to introduce the four objectives of this research, its limitations and formulated the problem statement for this research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Two, the literature relevant to the impact of organisational image on talent management within a higher education institution and associated industries is discussed. This chapter focuses attention on the conceptualisation of terms such as organisational image and other closely related terms such as organisational identity and reputation.

The chapter proceeds to review studies on attraction of students and how the issue of institutional image affects the processes. Other studies that looked at the concept of recruitment, applicant attraction and organisational image are highlighted and reviewed in this chapter.

The literature review also takes into account terms such as talent management and how it relates to what is commonly known as human resources management and what is referred to here as talent management. This chapter looks at factors that are known to affect the processes of talent management negatively. It looks at what is known around the factors affecting retention at higher education institutions in South Africa. The review examines the writing that has been undertaken to relate the existing literature to the research theme; the superiority of articles read is assessed, and the outcome will then be examined. The chapter presents literature on companies that have reputable images.

2.1.1 Terminology

Terms and concepts used in this study are:

- Organisation
- Organisational image
- Organisational identity
- Reputation
- Organisational identity
- Talent management
- Perceived external prestige
2.1.2 Defining an organisation

An organisation is a “consciously coordinated social unit composed of two or more people that function on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a common goal or set of goals” (Robins in Burton, Obel and DeSanctis, 2011: 9). McNamara (2012: 1) defines organisation, “in its simplest form, as a person or group of people intentionally organized to accomplish an overall, common goal or set of goals”.

According to Daft (2007:10) “organisations are social entities that are goal-directed, are designed as deliberately structured and coordinated activity systems and are linked to the external environment”. Organisations are composed of persons and their interactions with one another. An organisation exists when individuals interact with one another to perform vital duties that assist in attaining the organisation’s goals.

Having read these two definitions, it is apparent that organisations cannot exist without a social aspect. They are made of people and hence people are one of the pillars that make the organisation. People that are part of an organisation are also part of the environment external to it. This has a direct influence on how organisations are formed as the external environment has an impact on the formation of the organisation.

The second component in the definition of organisation is that the organisation has a goal. One may say that organisations may also differ in the goals they are pursing. A goal that is pursued by a particular organisation may appeal to some people while not to others. This is another component of organisational image in which people can look at the organisation and see if they can associate themselves with a particular organisation. The institution, which this study focuses on, has a vision of being “a Premier University of African Scholarship”. The vision of an organisation or a company appeals at a certain level for different individuals. To some, it may be appealing to the extent that they would wish to be part of that particular organisation.
Hamel (2007) alludes to Max Weber, a prominent German sociologist, whose ideal organisation had several distinguishing features:

- The allocation of duties were obviously outlined for every person in the organisation;
- The order in which positions were organised was based on the authority which was accorded to positions in the upper level of the organisation and lesser to lower positions;
- Technical competence or education determined the appropriate persons assigned against positions;
- Means of ownership was separated from those that monitored the enterprise;
- The application of rules and regulation was tighter for everyone in the organisation.

According to Weber, these are typical features that an organisation may exhibit. One may ask oneself whether these features are still applicable in today’s organisation. Existence of these features or the absence of these features in a particular organisation may create another impression from someone observing from the outside of the organisation.

2.1.3 Types of organisations

Sizes, shape and purpose for existence may serve to distinguish one organisation from another. Some organisations are designed by control, i.e. who controls the relationship between the provider of service and the one who receives service. Depending on the industry, this may be referred to as agency. Shapiro (2005) defines the agency relationship as where one party acts on behalf of another, for example, a law firm, an accounting firm etc. This aspect of principal-agent relationship takes the understanding of organisation to a more complex level. It may not be easy to classify organisations such as universities in the common understanding of principal-agent relationships. In most countries, universities belong to the state governments and would traditionally, receive a subsidy from the government. However, it may be overly simplistic to think that universities act on behalf of governments.

As mentioned above, organisations do vary in size, purpose i.e. some for designed for generating profit and while there are also non-profit organisations (Balmer, 2001). Some organisations operate in more than one country or continent while others are family-owned.
shops (Shapiro, 2005). Examples of organisations that exist beyond borders of one country are, central banks, international courts, etc. (Shapiro, 2005). The size of the organisation relates to the financial resources the organisation possesses. For instance, a university with multiple campuses across the country/province may project a different image to the one that a university with one campus does. The interest is on how these factors affect the decision to be made by a job applicant.

Another aspect that organisations vary on is the composition of their staff. Staff tends to vary in terms of technical knowledge, responsibilities and duties that also vary in relation to the level in the organisational organogram. While some organisations may require a large pool of highly skilled personnel to run such organisations, others may have a small pool of highly skilled personnel.

Furthermore, organisations vary in terms of structure. Some organisations have a highly formalised structure, i.e. hierarchy, which may be viewed as bureaucratic governance. A hierarchical organisation has its leaders making decisions about the whole organisation. Some organisations are not so formalised in their structure. Other forms that organisation may be structured through are specialisation, hierarchy of authority, centralisation, professionalism and personnel rates (Daft, 2007).

Contextual dimension is another way that differentiates organisations. Contextual dimension refers to factors such as size, organisational technology, environment, organisation’s goal and objectives and organisation’s culture (Daft, 2007). Leaders emerge as the organisation evolves and depending on the needs of the organisations. A combination of these factors helps create a unique organisational image, an image that is different from one organisation to the next.

Another way of examining organisations is through what Procter, in Ackroyd, Batt, Thompson and Tolbert (2005) categorises into a three level phenomenon, that is work groups, organizations and organized systems. Procter argues that it is a common assumption that
organising that occurs in groups occurs within organisations. This implies that groups may exist independently of an organisation.

Organisations may further be defined by their flexibility. Procter, in Ackroyd et al., (2005) explains the concept of flexible organisation in great detail. He argues that flexibility has only been based on how the organisation deploys its people appropriately, however, a focus should also be on the flexible outputs such as technology, labour and management (Ackroyd et al., 2005: 470). In other words, the flexibility of an organisation may have an impact on how an organisation is viewed.

From an organisation stems a term “organizational identity” which Albert and Whetten (1985) in Brown, Dacin, Pratt and Whetten (2006) define as “central, enduring and distinctive” aspects. Albert and Whetten’s definition has been interpreted to mean that not all organisations are identical, i.e. have the same features in terms of structures, their goals and behaviour by their stakeholders. These aspects are crucial as they set apart one organisation from another.

### 2.1.4 Defining an image

Different terms are used to refer to the same phenomenon, i.e. organisational image. Other terms that are used interchangeably include institutional image, reputation, company image and so forth (Kim and Hyun, 2011). All of these terms are used to refer to the same phenomenon. For the purpose of this study, “organisational image” has been adopted and will be used in this study. Several definitions have been provided on this concept and one would like to borrow from these sources in order to formulate a working definition.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, the word 'image' has the following meaning/s:

a) “A representation of the external form of a person or thing in art; a visible impression obtained by a camera, telescope, or other device, or displayed on a video screen”

b) “The general impression that a person, organisation, or product presents to the public”.
For the purpose of this research, the second meaning would be embraced. A connotation that may be deduced from this is that a human being, goods or organisation offers a 'general impression'. It is simpler to maintain a general impression at a person level. By the same token, it is harder to maintain a generally good impression at an organisational level as there are various stakeholders who may indirectly purport to represent an organisation.

Cable and Turban (2001) in Tsai and Yang (2010: 48) define the concept of organisational image as “the set of beliefs that job seekers hold about the attributes of an organisation”. Inferences about a certain organisation result if there is limited or no information about the organisation about which potential employees require information. This is where the concept of organisational image comes in.

Another concept that is closely associated with image is reputation. Eccles et al., (2007) describe reputation as a function of perception. “A company’s overall reputation is a function of its reputation among its stakeholders (investors, customers, suppliers, regulators, politicians, non-governmental organisations, the communities in which the firm operated) in specific categories (product quality, corporative governance, employee relations, customer service, intellectual capital, financial performance, handling of environmental and social issues)” Eccles et al., (2007: 107).

Organisational image is therefore described as the “overall impression made on the minds of the public about an organisation” (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001: 303), and (Richard and Zhang, 2012: 572). Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) further explain that organisational image is related to factors such as “business name, architecture, variety of products/services, tradition, ideology and to the impression of quality communicated by each person interacting with the organisation’s clients”.

Another definition provided by Massey (2003) in (Botha, 2006: 18) defines the concept of organisational image as a consequence of a "shared meaning, knowledge and opinions of the organisational stakeholders". Massey in (Botha, 2006) explains that an image “is something projected by the organisation and something perceived by others”. These explanations of the
concept of organisational image provide evidence that is constructed in a two-way dialogue between the external stakeholders and organisms within an organisation. According to Botha (2006) the organisational image is the product of the organisation’s attempt to project a particular image while on the other hand stakeholders are forming their own perceptions of the organisation. It is the intention of this study to establish how this interaction between these two processes affects the process of talent management within a higher education institution.

Another perspective in viewing and trying to grasp the concept and process of organisational image has been provided by (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001). In their work, they explain that organisational image is made up of two components, i.e. functional and emotional. They also explain the functional component as being related to solid features that can be effortlessly gauged. On the other hand the emotional element is married with psychological proportions that are exhibited by moods and attitudes towards an organisation. Two processes are responsible for the development. One of these processes is the individual’s experience with an organisation. Secondly, the processing of information on the attribute that make up the functional indicators of the image has also been found to be responsible for the development of feelings that influence individual’s organisational image. Organisational image is then understood to be the result of the average process by which the public compares and contrasts the various attributes of organization (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001). Again, one needs to establish whether this interaction between an individual’s emotive behaviour has any bearing on an organisation’s talent management.

Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) argue that an organisation has various images that are distinct from one to the next, i.e. employees, clients and shareholders. The primary interest of this research undertaking is the individual within an organisation and those individuals with a potential to join a particular organisation.

2.1.5 Relation between “institutional image” and “institutional reputation”

Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) further distinguish institutional image from institutional reputation. The concept of ‘institutional reputation’ has been studied by economists, organisational researchers and marketing gurus. For economists, the concept has been studied
closely in relation to product quality and price. Chun (2005) presents that in Economics, the concept has been viewed as traits or signals, i.e. the perception held of the organisation by an organisation’s external stakeholders. For organisational researchers, the concept has been examined and closely associated with social identity and they interpret it as a vital and incorporeal resource which may considerably contribute to an organisation’s performance and even to its existence. Whatever the researchers and experts have come to define institutional reputation to be, the general agreement is that the essence of the concept is: it is a result of the past actions of an organisation (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001).

Chun (2005) identifies three schools of thought that were in use in an attempt to understand the concept. These are: evaluative, impressional and relational paradigms. What paradigm to employ depends on the type of stakeholder and that is “internal” versus “external” stakeholders. From the evaluative angle, the organisation is assessed on the financial performance, while an impressional paradigm uses terms such as image, identity and personality of the organisation (Chun, 2005). The relational school on the other hand, is based upon stakeholder theory which recognizes that different stakeholders may have different expectations of a company (Chun, 2005).

An interesting comparison and profiling has been provided by Balmer (2001) in (Botha, 2006). This comparison looks at different concepts such corporate image, corporate identity, corporate reputation and so forth and gives an overview on how they differ. A tabulated extract is provided below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept:</th>
<th>Key question addressed:</th>
<th>Explanations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate image</td>
<td>What is the current perception and/or profile</td>
<td>In relation to the immediate mental perception of the organisation held by an individual, group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate identity</td>
<td>What are we?</td>
<td>Also involves addressing a series of questions including: what is the business/structure/strategy/ethos/market/performance/history and reputation in relation to other identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate reputation</td>
<td>What distinctive attributes (if any) are assigned to the organisation?</td>
<td>The enduring perception held of an organisation by an individual, group or network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual identity (visual identification system)</td>
<td>What are the organisation’s symbols and systems of identification?</td>
<td>The organisation’s visual (and verbal) cues communicate what/who the organisation is. What/who was the organisation? What/who does the organisation wish to be? A mix of the above. To identify if there is clarity or confusion. To establish if it reflects or possibly inform current strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate communications</td>
<td>Is there integrated communication?</td>
<td>In relation to management, organisational and marketing communications. To establish if these are integrated in terms of management, philosophy and process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total corporate communications</td>
<td>Is there congruence regarding vertical and horizontal communication?</td>
<td>Vertical among corporate communications, corporate actions, performance and behaviours and with third parties. Horizontal as above but also congruency over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate brand</td>
<td>What are the promises communicated by the brand?</td>
<td>To determine if these inferences are accurate founded in reality (the promise/performance gap), shown in management commitment and underpinned/made explicit by effective communications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:1 - Key concept relating to organisational image. Source: (Balmer, 2001)

These concepts are related and have an effect on one another. It can also be that they overlap in what they seem to refer to and/or their conceptualisation.
The term "organisational image" can be traced back to studies that were carried out by Kennedy (1977) in Gotsi and Wilson (2001). Kennedy can be credited for having conducted studies which proved that employees were impacted upon by the way outside participants remarked about the organisation, Kennedy (1977) in (Gotsi and Wilson, 2001). Kennedy, and others, argued external participants come to experience an organisation and form their image thereof through an interaction with employees of that organisation, hence workers play a vital role in the process of forming a corporate image" (Kennedy, 1977 in Gotsi and Wilson 2001). This point is further emphasised by Herrbach and Mignonac (2004) when they firmly confirm organisational image as an “organisation's identity from the outside, that is, the externally produced symbols and interpretations made by outsiders about the company”. Outsider’s belief seems to matter most when it comes to an organisation. Phiri (2006) extends this notion of image and links it to a brand. Image and brand seem to be attached together. He argues that “marketing executives must find ways of improving the image and attributes of the brand that
lead to its successful repositioning in the marketplace” (Phiri, 2006). This notion of improving
the image of a brand seems to apply to the images of universities. For these to succeed they
must manage that brand image in a careful manner to achieve success.

One can extend the survey of terms and concepts related to organisational image to another term
which came to be popularised by Herrbach and Mignonac (2004) and this is term is "perceived
external prestige", referred to as PEP (Herrbach and Mignonac (2004). PEP is a concept
“describing the way members interpret and assess their organisation's reputation based on their
exposure to information about the organisation” (Herrbach and Mignonac, 2004: 77).

Herrbach and Mignonac (2004: 78) formulated four hypotheses: “that PEP is positively related
with extrinsic job satisfaction, affective organisational commitment and job satisfaction and is
stronger for marketers/salesman than for non-sales persons”. They established that there was
correlation between PEP and extrinsic job satisfaction. They further reveal that PEP was
correlated to intrinsic job satisfaction. Three other areas that were impacted positively by PEP
were extrinsic satisfaction, affective commitment and affective well-being (Herrbach and
Mignonac, 2004).

Gotsi and Wilson (2001) extended the understanding around the concept of organisational
image when they studied the importance of staff in the management of a company reputation.
This they did by scrutinising how organisations can investigate how they can boost workers’
action to represent and convey the brand values through their internal memorandums and
personnel management events. Gotsi and Wilson (2001), conclude that employees are crucial
when it comes to corporate reputation management. "Staff can assist in the differentiation of an
organisation from its rivals, since the public increasingly wants to know about the companies
that stand behind the brands and products presented to them" (Gotsi and Wilson, 2001: 101).
Gotsi and Wilson (2001) settled on an assertion that there is not enough scientific research to
complete the list of elements of corporate reputation management.
The study of reputation has been furthered by Eccles et al., (2007), when they published a paper labelled "Reputation and its Risks". Eccles at al., (2007) argue that it is far more important to manage reputation than to manage risk. This implies that if an organisation does not engage itself in activities of managing reputation it is bound to find itself managing risk. Eccles at al. provide a framework for proactively managing reputational risks. They further argue that “other forms of risk have been studied, however reputational risks have been ignored due to the lack of agreed definition and measurement of it”. Reputational risk can be determined by three elements and these are:

- Reputation exceeding its true character;
- How much external beliefs and expectations change, which widen or narrow this gap
- The quality of internal coordination (Eccles et al., 2007).

Reputation is nothing more than perception, which various stakeholders of the organisation display and hold. Bianchi (2010) asserts that “perception is every bit as important as reality, because in business, perception is reality”. This talks to whether reputation reflects the true character or behaviour or not, as this (perception) is a function that is independent of the behaviour of the individuals within the organisation.

Gioia, Schultz and Corley (2000) extend the scope of reputation, organisational image and corporate image to include the term “organisational identity”. They argue that organisational identity is portrayed as that which is core, distinctive and enduring about the character of an organisation. The question one should be asking in relation to the assertion by Gioia et al., (2000) is what is core and distinctive that makes institutions different from one another.

In a study by Tsai and Yang (2010), it emerged that corporate image is a multi-faceted organisation-level construct containing four facets and these are corporate product image, corporate service image, corporate citizenship image and corporate credibility image’. These four facets are understood to have some effect on organisational desirability.
2.2 TALENT MANAGEMENT

2.2.1 Defining “talent”
Silzer and Dowell (2010) trace the term “talent” back to the “ancient Greeks and Biblical times” when it was used to refer to a measure of weight, and then it evolved to refer to unit of money. Later, the term was used to refer to a person’s value or innate abilities (Silzer and Dowell, 2010). This definition does include people who have learned and acquired some abilities and skills.

Reference to talent differs from one organisation to the next. When some organisations refer to talent they may be referring to a pool of people with exceptional skills and abilities. In another setting, the term refers to the “individual’s skills and abilities and what the person is capable of doing or contributing to the organisation” (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 16). Yet in another setting this term may be used to refer to a specific person. This difference in understanding highlights the fact that different organisations have different priorities, and talent management is one of those aspects that tend to be prioritised differently by different organisation.

2.2.2 Defining talent management
Avedon, in Silzer and Dowell (2010), defines talent management as an “integrated set of processes and procedures used in an organisation to attract on-board, retain, develop and move talent as well as to exit talent to achieve strategic objectives”.

Silzer and Dowell (2010) define talent management as an integrated processes, programs and cultural norms in an organisation designed and implemented to attract, develop, deploy and retain talent to achieve strategic objectives and meet future business needs. It is further explained that talent management focuses on a range of activities that attract, develop, deploy and retain talent.

These definitions depict talent management as a process rather than a one-off activity. It is a series of activities that has a bearing on one another. The second definition encompasses what is crucial in the whole spectrum of talent management, i.e. cultural norms. Cultural norms are not dependent on what the organisation visualises or fantasises to achieve or the ideals. They are the realities of everyday of the organisation. Another important aspect one has to understand about
processes is that they have an element of being on-going. Processes have to be improved all the time.

An interesting definition of recruitment has been provided by (Chapman, Uggerslev, Carrol, Piasentin and Jones, 2005). They cite a definition by Rynes (1991) where recruitment is defined as "encompass[ing] all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals that are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy". This definition highlights the fact that some of the activities of the organisation may necessarily be made to have an effect on talent management (recruitment). However, in essence, those activities end-up affecting the recruitment. This highlights the importance of looking at all factors, including those factors that either directly or indirectly involved in the recruitment process as important.

Rynes (1991) in Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005: 902) defines attraction as “getting potential candidates to view the organization as a positive place to work”. This may encompass factors such as “having a positive affective attitude toward an organization, viewing it as a desirable entity and exerting effort to work for it”, Aiman-Smith, Bauer and Cable (2001) in Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005: 902). It may be worth noting three theories presented by Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005) in order to better understand the term “attraction”. These theories are:

**Environment processing metatheory** - there should be a distinction between the real and the perceived situation. How the perception of the environment relates applicant attraction;

**Interactionist processing metatheory** - this theory asserts that the interface between individual features and situation features results in desirability. This also relates to person-organisation fit which Kristof (1996) in Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005: 906) defines “as the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when (a) there is a similarity or match of some attribute and/or (b) one entity provides what the other wants or needs”;

**Self-processing metatheory** - this “involves attitudes and views related to person characteristics” (Ehrhart and Ziegert, 2005: 908).

Davenport, Harris and Shapiro (2010) argue that the best organisations see their people not only as individuals but also as a rich source of collective data that managers can use to make better decisions about talent. This argument makes it necessary for organisations to conduct research
studies around what affects their people, their viewpoint and trends they form on behaviour - including trends that are formed through attracting suitable individuals. According to this argument it is necessary for an organisation to understand the pool of people the organisation is attracting. By understanding the pool the organisation gains valuable data that it can use to improve on its recruitment and selection processes and procedures. Pouris (2007) argues that ranking of universities is vitally important as it may be used by potential employers as a screening device and indicators of research quality. Pouris (2007: 2) argues that “employers compete strongly for the acquisition of post-graduate students from reputable academic institutions”. The quality of research and the production of post-graduate students depend on the quality of lecturers and researchers in that reputable institution.

Talent management must not just coexist with many other organisational programmes and systems but it must also support and co-ordinate with them.

### 2.2.3 Talent management framework

![Figure 2:2- Talent Management framework](image)

Source: Silzer and Dowell (2010: 21)

The framework above indicates the relationship between business strategy, talent strategy and talent management. All these aspects of the organisation should be designed to influence the business results. Talent management programmes are not designed in a vacuum but to ensure that business achieves its business strategic objectives.

An organisation’s workforce is key to its organisational success. Organisations such as Google and others are beginning to understand exactly how to ensure the highest productivity, engagement and retention of top talent and then replicating their success, Harries et.al, (2010:}
54). Harries et.al, (2010) have identified six uses of talent analytics. These analytics are necessary in order to understand fully how to manage talent better.

Thomas and Wise (1999) argue that recruitment is an essential motion for organisations. Recruitment serves three chief purposes, a) to cultivate a source of applicants at minimal cost; b) to assist the institution in certifying that its staff are typical of the population they come from, and, c) to guarantee that the interviewee’s pool is made up of contenders who have the required level of education to perform the job (Gatewood and Feild in Thomas and Wise, 1999).

### 2.2.4 Challenges to effective talent management

It is argued that challenges to effective talent management can be at two levels: there are challenges at organisational level and there are also challenges at human issues level (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 753). At an organisational level here are the issues that have been identified:

- Poor alignment of talent management programs with strategy;
- Subjective talent decision making;
- Change in CEO;
- Sudden shifts in business markets or economy;
- Lack of alignment with organisational norms and values;
- Acceptance of differential investment in talent;
- Complex design;
- Breadth of talent management expertise required;
- Costs of talent management interventions;
- Poor introduction and execution;
- No consensus on definitions of leadership or potential;
- Poor or no outcome measurement;
- Oversupply or undersupply of talent;
- Lack of transparency;
- Differences between talent management and business cycles.
At a human issues level (Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 762) list the following:

- Manager or leader or resistance;
- Individual resistance;
- Lack of senior leader support;
- Consideration for life-balance issues;
- Engaging employees in nonstrategic areas.

These challenges have been identified across organisations. It is not clear how many of these challenges are applicable to a higher education set-up and, more so, in a South African context. It is an assumption that these have been researched in a Western environment and largely in a corporate sector: reference to CEO serves as a proof of their originality. It has been generally established that a corporate environments and higher education institutions do not necessarily share the same set up. This can be deduced from the articulated penned by Gray (2011: 78) where he argues that if “HEIs (Higher Education Institutions) could find an appropriate form of corporateness to govern their forms of organization, they would be better able to fulfil their roles in both social and economic settings with least cost to their core functions of academic activity: promoting high levels of research, teaching and consultancy”.

2.2.5 Six uses of talent analytics (extracted from Harries, et.al, 2010)

a) Human-capital facts:

This requires that data such as individual performance, contingent labour use, head count, turnover and recruitment processes underway is available and timeously. This is valuable data. Unless the organisation understands these facts in its organisation, it is difficult to develop intervention programmes. This can be exemplified by an organisation that needs to devise strategies that attempt to improve its attraction rate. However, if that particular organisation does not understand its turnover, the “why’s, “when’s”, “who’s” and “what’s of turnover, it cannot intervene effectively. In other organisations this data is collected annually and it is a standard practice. The collection is not conducted as a sporadic event conducted when a manager has remembered.
b) **Analytical HR**

This level integrates data received at the human-capital level with intervention at a particular section of the organisation. This helps understand for example, why there has been a “great exodus” in a particular sector of the organisation.

c) **Human-capital investment analysis**

This analysis helps one understand which actions in an organisation have the greatest impact. An example of this analysis would be to analyse which section has the higher revenue in the organisation and this would have an impact on which section would receive the management’s attention for intervention. The leadership of an organisation can decide whether to intervene in all situations or to intervene only in a situation where the section, which has the highest impact, is affected.

d) **Workforce forecasts**

This step requires staff turnover, succession planning and business opportunity data to identify potential shortages or excesses of key capabilities long before they happen. Relating this to the study’s focus, an organisation needs to understand when it is likely to experience a shortage in its skilled and highly valuable staff. As a result, plans can be made well in advance to circumvent an otherwise dire situation that would have happened had it not conducted a workforce forecast analysis.

e) **The talent value model**

This model seeks to understand what value the current employees have that make them stay with the organisation. The value can then be improved in order to ensure that a higher retention rate is achieved and also to ensure that what is being “sold” to the potential employees has the potential to attract.

f) **The talent supply chain**

Analysing talent also requires an approach from the supply chain discipline. Turnaround times are also critical in understanding talent. It is critical to understand how much time
is needed to attract a particular talent as that may affect whether the organisation may be able to attract the talent it is interested in.

Talent management has been understood to involve “attracting, retaining, developing and motivating highly skilled employees and managers” (Noe, Hollenbeck and Wright, 2008: 22). This view provided by Noe et al., (2008) is a holistic viewpoint on the management of staff. Attracting new staff is not an isolated activity not linked to other activities of the university recruiting. This activity of recruitment and attracting may be facilitated or hindered by the image that organisations possess. Members of the public possess an image about a particular organisation and that organisation may be in a good position to use that organisational image to its advantage.

South African universities have been known for decades, to be classified along racial lines. Linked to that is the issue of academic excellence which also follows the pattern of racial divide. Some universities have been branded as top performing institutions in the country, which is also linked to racial divide. Owing to that, they are able to attract funding for research. As they are able to attract funding, they will also be able to attract high performing academics by meeting their extrinsic needs. While this happens to these high performing universities, their counterparts, which are not so glowingly branded as high performing, suffer the consequences of not being attractive enough for the highly valued academics to consider them as their employers. Herrbach and Mignonac (2004: 76) argue that "an organisation's external image exerts a direct influence over its external stakeholders such as clients, suppliers, shareholders". This point is directly linked to the issue that a university faces, some struggle to overcome and some do not have to pay attention as it pays "dividends".

2.2.6 Aspects normally included when referring to talent management.

Silzer and Dowell (2010) identify aspects of human resources management that are normally included. This exercise is important as it highlights what aspects can be expected to affect talent management. For this study, it is important because it highlights certain features that would be expected to affect organisational image.
These aspects are:

- Recruiting
- Selection
- Promotion
- Placement
- Assignment
- On-boarding
- Assimilation
- Retention initiatives
- Performance management
- Training development and learning opportunities
- Reward and recognition programmes

(Silzer and Dowell, 2010: 20)

One hypothesis is that when an organisational image is affected, these aspects of talent management will also be affected in one way or another. This view evident from the two studies by (Tsai and Yang, 2010), mentioned later.

2.2.7 Factors found to be affecting employee retention

Netswera et al., (2005) have identified at least eight factors that have an effect on employee retention:

- Discriminatory practice;
- Economic relevance and sense of purpose;
- Management and governance;
- Institutional track record and growth potential;
- Salaries and other benefits;
- Work environment;
- Staff development and promotion opportunities, and
- External environment
The presence or the absence of these factors may lead to high staff turnover in an organisation. Netswera et al., (2005) conclude that staff who have witnessed or experienced discriminatory practices in an organisation tend to depart from that organisation while those who are treated in a favourable manner tend to stay. Netswera et al., (2005), further maintain that employees who perceive themselves as having reached a ceiling in their growth in that particular organisation, in other words, there were no opportunities for them to be promoted, tend to leave an organisation to another where they think that there are opportunities for growth. Younger employees tend not to like to stay in one position for longer than ten years because that would mean there are no salary increases other than inflation-linked increases. This study by Netswera et al., (2005) further maintains that even though salaries and benefits are important, a working environment and an external politically stable environment are equally important when considering remaining with a particular institution of higher education.

These findings imply that a potential job applicant would be encouraged or deterred to apply by the mere perception of the presence or absence of these factors. The question for employers would then come to be how they then integrate these factors in creating a positive organisational image for both current and potential employees to remain or consider the organisation as a credible employer? The important element about these factors is that they in turn become the image which individuals consider when looking for job opportunities.

Challenges in the retention of knowledge workers have also been identified in India (Tymon, Stumpf and Doh, 2010). It has been proved to be a challenge to retain knowledge workers beyond two to three years (Tymon et al., 2010).
2.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANISATIONAL IMAGE AND TALENT MANAGEMENT

2.3.1 A review of studies on organisational image and talent management

Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) note that marketing gurus have acknowledged the impact of institutional reputation and image on consumer behaviour even though there is no evidence to prove it. This acknowledgment worsens the situation for establishing the relationship between organisational image and talent management. Since organisational image and reputation result from feelings and individual experiences, it becomes more difficult to measure and/or predict the effect these may have on talent management.

As indicated earlier, talent management encompasses the whole process of employing an individual, from attracting individuals with potential and retaining employees. There were suggestions that employees, particularly in studies in academic institutions, with longer length of service had higher job satisfaction than those employees who had just joined academic institutions. This would have implications for talent management and how organisational image differs for employees who joined an institution in different times. If one follows this assumption, one would expect to have a positive organisational image amongst employees who have a longer length of service than among those employees who recently joined the institutions. Oshagbemi (2000) looked at how level of job satisfaction differed among employees with different lengths of service. Another aspect of length of service that Oshagbemi looked at is the length of service in higher education (termed “LSHE”) and “length of service in present university” (termed “LSPU”). These two concepts are crucial in that one is able to distinguish whether one is “not happy” with the institution or just that the academic world has not enjoyable to one’s self.

Oshagbemi (2000) further observes that academics do not necessarily resign from the university because they are dissatisfied with that institution. Academics are rather not assured of promotional opportunities in their own institutions, hence they may be tempted to search for them elsewhere. A trend has developed where academics apply and get appointed at a higher academic level than in their current institution (Oshagbemi, 2000).
Oshagbemi (2000) further states that it is not always easy to pinpoint a linear relationship between these two variables. In this study by Oshagbemi (2000), it is further discovered that job-hopping amongst academics, does not necessarily lead to greater job satisfaction. In fact, academics that remained in their original institutions had better job satisfaction than those that were changing academic institutions. For this study, the implications are that the organisational image is expected to be better as one’s length of service increases compared to employees with a shorter length of service.

Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) studied the aspects of “image and reputation of higher education institutions in students’ retention decisions” and have looked at three concepts i.e. institutional image, institutional reputation and customer loyalty. The study was conducted in order to assess the impact of institutional reputation as well as the interaction effect on the student’s retention decision. Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) assert that “understanding the role of institutional image and reputation helps management to use them more effectively in a communication strategy aimed at enhancing the institution’s positioning statement, and as such contributes to a better understanding of these two constructs”. In summing up the results from Nguyen and LeBlanc, one can say that even though the study was of a service sector, it is advisable to include other moderating factors in the relationship between institutional image and reputation and customer loyalty. The research findings also assert that managers of service organizations should not consider exclusively intrinsic attributes or quality, which is considered to be the cornerstone for customer loyalty.

A study conducted by Chapman et al., (2005) investigating the “applicant attraction to organizations and job choice”, is another study that reveals what aspects of organisational attractiveness are important to potential employees. This was a meta-analytic review in that it reviewed 298 previous studies for relationships and disagreements in those studies. Data was drawn from the Psychology database for the period between 1967 and 2002; ABI Inform and ERIC. Here are the following concepts which the study by Chapman et al., (2005) focused on:

- Recruiting outcomes:
  - Job pursuit intentions - outcome variables measuring a person’s desire to submit an application, attend a site visit and interview;
- Job-organisation attraction - applicant’s overall evaluation of the attractiveness of the job and/or organization;
- Acceptance intentions - assess the likelihood that an applicant would accept a job offer if one were forthcoming AND
- Job choice - choosing whether to accept a real job offer involving an actual job
  - Predictors:
    - Job and organisational characteristics - job attributes
    - Recruiter characteristics - influence from the recruiter
    - Perceptions of the recruitment process – perception of whether interpersonal treatment by the recruiter is appropriate
    - Perceived fit - person-organisation fit
    - Perceived alternatives
    - Hiring expectancies
  - Moderating effects
    - Applicant’s gender
    - Applicant’s age
    - Applicant type

In essence, Chapman et al., (2005) expected that if there is a higher presence of favourable predictor content from the applicant, there is a higher likelihood that the person would pursue and accept the job offer in a particular organisation. Of course, the situation was expected to be moderated by factors such as age, gender or applicant type. Applicant type was coined to refer to the context, that is, the context in a laboratory research setting (non-applicant) that would predict a different outcome than in the recruiting context.

The results of the study by Chapman et al., (2005) can be summed by the following statements:
- Characteristics of both the job and organisation were important determinants of recruiting outcomes;
- Conduct during the recruitment is also an important factor in an effort to increase the likelihood of a favourable recruitment outcome;
• Subjective factors such as perceived person-job fit, perceived person-organisation fit were the strongest of them;

• Two moderators had a remarkable impact on the relationship between recruiting outcomes and predictors and these can be summed up as follows:
  o More women than men used information gathered during the recruitment process in their decision making process;
  o There was little variation between laboratory research and recruiting process. However, there is one challenge for laboratory research in that it is near impossible to simulate the job choice context because the consequences of that choice are not immediate.

In another study Turban (2001) investigated the organisational attractiveness as an employer on college campuses, and interesting factors were examined. The assumptions of the researcher were that the initial application decisions are influenced by a potential applicant’s impression of the firm’s attractiveness as an employer (Turban, 2001). According to evidence available at the time, early impressions of an organisation have impact on later decisions about the individual’s job choices. When job seekers put in their applications, little may be known about the organisation/s that they are submitting their applications to, hence they make their assumptions based on information provided during the recruitment activities. Recruitment activities also provide information about organisational attributes because they are designed to emphasize the organisation’s positive aspects (Turban, 2001).

There is also evidence that familiarity with an organisation will have a favourable impact on its ability to attract qualified candidates (Turban, 2001). In terms of brand management theories, there is evidence which suggests that people tend to favour what is familiar. There is also evidence which suggests that applicants who are also students tend to be influenced by perceptions from faculty staff at the college. Turban (2001) formulated an hypothesis in the study around recruitment activities, organisational attributes, familiarity with the firm and the role of the perception by university personnel.
The measures that were used in the study by Turban (2001) are:

- Organisational attributes:
  - Factor 1: Company Image items
    - Concern for the environment
    - High ethical standards
    - Overall public image
    - Involved in the community
    - Product quality
  - Factor 2: Compensation and job security items:
    - Benefits
    - Compensation
    - Job security
    - Financially sound
    - Treatment of employees
    - Opportunities for advancement
  - Factor 3: Challenging work
    - Opportunities to learn and develop on the job
    - Challenging work assignments
    - Training and development programmes
    - Competence of personnel
    - Opportunities to use latest technologies

- Recruitment attributes:
  - Factor 1: Campus activity
    - Interacting with student organizations;
    - Visible on campus;
    - Investing time, people and resources in the graduate and undergraduate educational process
    - Interacting with key faculty members
    - Advertising on campus
    - Sponsoring of campus events
• Concerned with improving the educational process of graduate and undergraduate students
• Interacting with placements department
• Co-op or intern employment opportunities
  
  o Factor 2: Recruitment material
  • Recruitment materials
  • Job fair presence
  • Recruitment brochures
  • Pre-interview presentations
  • Recruitment video
  
  o Factor 3: Recruitment process
  • Handling of the job offer;
  • Handling of the site visit
  • Providing prompt decisions to applicants about their status
  • Quality of recruiters

• Overall familiarity with firm
• Attraction to the firm
• Interviewed with the firm
• University personnel measures
  ○ Image as an employer
  ○ Frequency of seeing a firm representative on campus

The study by Turban (2001) reveals that:
• Recruitment activities are related to attraction;
• Two organisational attributes scales (company image and challenging work) were significant, supporting hypothesis 1 above;
• Correlation analyses reveal familiarity has an impact on organisational attributes in a direct and indirect manner;
• Behavioural variable interviewed with the firm, was not related to attraction to the firm or to the organisational attributes.
In a study by Tsai and Yang (2010: 49), organisational attractiveness is defined as “applicants’ willingness to pursue jobs and to accept job offers in an organisation”. Turban (2001) investigated organisational attractiveness and found that it is influenced by recruitment activities such as corporate recruitment advertisements. In these studies by Turban (2001), it has been discovered that individuals make their own inferences, which are often subjective, about the organisation. These shared perceptions are often associated with the name or property of the organisation.

Tsai and Yang (2010: 49) observe that “any loss of highly qualified applicants may decrease the utility of the selection system”. As one has observed that it is not enough to study only the individual behaviours when it comes to talent management, however, other factors such as organisational image have to be scrutinised in detail in order to further understand talent management.

Tsai and Yang (2010) conducted two studies where they tested seven main hypotheses around concepts of corporate product image, corporate service image, corporate citizenship image and corporate credibility image based on the conceptualisation by Keller (2000) in (Tsai and Yang, 2010). They used a sample from the banking industry of Taiwan. Participants were chosen from 45 domestic banks of Taiwan and 38 foreign-owned banks. Keller discovered that there are associations in the perceptions of consumers that may be classified in the above-mentioned four categories. Keller defined corporate product image as referring to the common attributes, benefits and innovativeness that the product is perceived to possess. In a higher education industry, this product is deemed to be the quality of degrees and certificates the university produces. Also, the value placed by consumers on higher education can have an impact on whether higher education is high quality or not. The second term that was coined by Keller is ‘corporate service image’, which refers to employee behaviour of that organisation when servicing customers. This is an important factor which influences customers’ formation of a favourable corporate image. Another term formulated by Keller is ‘corporate citizenship image’, which encompasses the organisation’s policies and practices towards the environment and social responsibility. The last term to be coined by Keller is ‘corporate credibility image’, which refers to the company’s expertise and trustworthiness.
Tsai and Yang (2010) formulated hypotheses around these concepts mentioned above on their Study 1 and Study 2: “Corporate product image, Corporate service image, Corporate citizenship image, Corporate credibility image and organisation attractiveness”.

In Study 2, Tsai and Yang (2010) were examining three factors in relation to organisation attractiveness. These factors were:

- Need for affiliation;
- Environmental sensitivity and
- Materialism

The need for affiliation was defined as “the need to establish friendly and sociable relationships with others, and represents activity engagement behaviours that develop a direct relationship between the person engaging in the behaviours and others” (Tsai and Yang, 2010: 55). If an organisation is concerned about its relationship with its customers and employees, a spill over effect may lead to an inference that the organisation is willing to provide a positive and stable environment for personal interaction. The second concept studied by Tsai and Yang (2010: 55) is “environmental sensitivity, which represents a person’s concern for the environment”. This concern for the environment by the individual may affect their personal decisions. The final concept studied by Tsai and Yang (2010) is materialism, which Richins and Dawson (1992) defined as the “importance ascribed to the ownership and acquisition of material goods in achieving major life goals or desired states” (Richins, 2004: 210). Richins and Dawson (1992) in (Richins, 2004: 210) conceptualised material values as encompassing three domains: “the use of possessions to judge the success of others and oneself, the centrality of possessions in a person’s life, and the belief that possessions and their acquisition lead to happiness and life satisfaction”. People may use materialism to define their own success and that of others. These three domains are vitally important when it comes to choosing which company to work for and whether that company may fulfil one’s material needs. Individuals may assess a company and decide whether to join or not as an employee.
The results for Study 1 revealed that corporate product image, corporate service image, corporate citizenship image and corporate credibility image were significantly correlated, hence supporting the first four hypotheses. However, there were negative correlations between individual-level of organisation attractiveness, applicant’s age and applicant’s gender.

The results of Study 2 revealed an insignificant correlation between need for affiliation and organisation attractiveness, thereby disconfirming hypothesis 5. There was little evidence to suggest that materialism will affect organisation attractiveness, either positively or negatively.

The five studies highlighted above have focused on organisational image and its impact on the organisation’s ability to attract and retain staff. These studies have focused on a variety of industries, including the banking sector, and on retention of students and a university having an attractiveness of companies. These studies overlap a great deal and span a long period of time with one study being traced to the early 90’s. It can also be noted that none of these studies are on attracting staff for higher education institution. Furthermore, none of these were based on the South African context. This poses a challenge to the applicability and generalizability of these studies to the South African and higher education contexts. It is for these reasons that the researcher embarked on the current study on talent management within a higher education institution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Key dimension</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>Products and services</td>
<td>• The company’s ability to offer high-quality and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision and leadership</td>
<td>• The company has a clear vision for its future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is or would be a good company to invest in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The looks like a good company to work for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company communicates regularly to its stakeholders and customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTN</td>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>• The company looks like a company with strong prospects for future growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>• Those running the company have the power to make necessary decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial performance</td>
<td>• The company looks like a company to work for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company maintains high standards in the way it treats its people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance is verified against expectations from the company’s management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company’s ability to offer high-quality products and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB Miller</td>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>• The company maintains high standards in the way it treats people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Products and services</td>
<td>• The company’s ability to offer high-quality products and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company looks like a company that would have good employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company promotes skills developments among its staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication by the company to its external stakeholders is simple and clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick ‘n Pay</td>
<td>Financial performance</td>
<td>• The company has excellent leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision and leadership</td>
<td>• It is or would be a good company to invest in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace environment</td>
<td>• The company recognises the importance of redressing the imbalances of the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company supports good causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company tends to outperforms its competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company maintains high standards in the way it treats people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilever</td>
<td>Financial performance</td>
<td>• It is or would be a good company to invest in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad-based economic empowerment</td>
<td>• Performance is verified against expectations from the company’s management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace environment</td>
<td>• The company tends to outperforms its competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company looks like a company that would have good employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The company’s ability to develop innovative products and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Profiles of companies with reputable image (Mail and Guardian, 25 May 2012)
Table 2:2 above presents a profile of companies with attributes that coincides with what has been found by previous studies, in particular a study conducted by Netswera et al., (2005) where they looked at the factors affecting staff retention at higher education institutions in South Africa. The commonalities amongst these different profiles and industries indicate that employees look for similar conditions irrespective whether it is a corporate environment or an institution of higher learning. These factors also have an effect on organisational image discussed above. These commonalities emphasise one thing: that there is a need to look into factors affecting the image of an organisation as that may have an effect, negative or positive.

2.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has placed considerable emphasis on defining and describing the two concepts, i.e. organisational image and talent management. It has looked at how these concepts relate to other concepts. However, research detailing how these two concepts relate to each other has remained under study.

Chapter Two has considered studies in the area of student attraction and the impact of organisational image on such activities. Furthermore, concepts such as reputation and profiles of companies with reputable images have been considered.

The issue at hand is the attraction of best talent within a higher education sector. There was a debate around the issue of lower standards within South African Universities. According to Ndlovu (2010), only one South African University featured in the world’s top 200 universities. Organisations that have good quality academics are more likely to attract a better student base. Ndlovu (2010) is of the following view: “It seems as if our universities don’t understand the rules of the game”. It is these sentiments that lead to a quest to dig deeper for an understanding of issues affecting talent management within a higher education institution. Could it be because of organisational image, which world ranking is part of, that South African universities have a challenge in attracting “best minds”. Meyer and Litheko (2007) argue that the driving force behind the 21st century company is its people. This also gives reasons why one needs to further the understanding of talent management and factors affecting the process.
CHAPTER 3 : METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with the description of terminology which has been used in this study that is generic in the research, in order to put the argument presented in this chapter into context. The chapter then proceeds to detail the methodology used in conducting the research. It gives an account of how this research study was conducted and it outlines sampling and data collection procedures. It also contains details of the pilot study.

3.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Gray (2009) differentiates between research and organised research. He then quotes Sekaran’s (2007: 4) definition of research as a “systematic and organized effort to investigate a specific problem that needs a solution”. On the other hand, he cites Gill and Johnson (2002) when they define “organised research as being about how (process) to solve real problems (content).

Research methodology can then be defined as “approaches to systematic inquiry developed within a particular paradigm with associated epistemological assumptions” (Gray, 2009: 581). Examples of paradigms that an inquiry may be formulated upon are experimental research, surveys, grounded theory action research and so forth. This research study focus on survey, as it was deemed appropriate to the problem statement and objectives.

3.2.1 Qualitative research

A qualitative study is a “means for exploring and understanding the meaning individual or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2009: 4). Creswell (2013) lists some characteristics for a qualitative research process which are common to what Struwig an Stead (2001) have identified.

Struwig and Stead list four features of qualitative research, namely:

- The participants’ and researcher’s perspectives
The researcher is expected to understand issues being researched from the view of the participants (Struwig and Stead, 2001).

- **Contextualism:**
  - The argument from the perspective of the qualitative research approach is that "human behaviour does not occur in a vacuum" (Struwig and Stead, 2001).

- **Process:**
  - This characteristic of qualitative research emphasises that there is an interrelatedness of events. What happens prior to the event may have an impact on what may happen thereafter.

- **Flexibility and the use of theories:**
  - Qualitative researchers tend to rely less on theory in providing a framework for doing research.

The qualitative research approach uses research methods such as participant observation, archival source analysis, interviews, focus groups and content analysis. These research methods employ less numeric and quantitative data analysis when compared to the quantitative research approaches.

### 3.2.2. Quantitative research

Quantitative research is “a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variable” (Creswell, 2009). In another definition, quantitative research design is defined as “a form of conclusive research involving large representative samples and fairly structured data collection procedures” (Struwig and Stead, 2001: 4). In both these definitions, it is clear that a researcher largely conducts research in a setting that is not natural to the participants. This is one of the major tenets where the quantitative and qualitative research paradigms differ. By differ, is meant that one research method tends to be one end of a range while the other lies on the other end of the continuum (Creswell, 2013). While the quantitative research permits, and to a greater extent, researchers to conduct research outside a natural setting, qualitative research is based on the principle of conducting research in a natural setting for the participants. Another difference is in the preconceived concepts and testing of theories. As shown from the two
definitions provided above, qualitative research methods are largely based on testing of theories. Qualitative research methods take a different stance: they are not conducted with an aim to prove a theory.

Struwig and Stead (2001: 4) list the features of a quantitative research:

- Constructs (variables) and their measurement;
- Causality: this research type is concerned with causal relationship, i.e. cause and effect. This is a research design which is concerned with establishing whether there is a relationship between independent variables and a dependent variable, the extent of the relationship and then measuring the amount of the effect that the independent variable has on the dependent variable;
- Generalisation: being able to generalise results beyond the confines of the research sample. The issue about this concept is that sampling matters must be ratified, i.e. the sample must be representative enough to all elements of the population in order to generalise legitimately;
- Replication: with this concept, researchers try “to determine the extent to which findings are applicable to other contexts” (Struwig and Stead, 2001: 6). If a research study complies with the tenet of this concept, other researchers will be able to repeat the study in other settings.
3.2.3. **Summary of the difference between a ‘qualitative’ and a quantitative research design** (Gray, 2009: 200):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemological positions</th>
<th>Quantitative Methods</th>
<th>Qualitative Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between researcher and subject</td>
<td>Distant / outsider</td>
<td>Close / insider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research focus</td>
<td>‘facts’</td>
<td>Meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between theory / concepts and research</td>
<td>Deduction/confirmation</td>
<td>Induction/emergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of findings</td>
<td>Nomothetic</td>
<td>Ideographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of data</td>
<td>Data based upon numbers</td>
<td>Data based upon text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3:1- Summary of the difference between ‘qualitative’ and a ‘quantitative' research*

3.2.4. **Adopted methodology: quantitative using a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire**

This study is informed by a positivist paradigm. A paradigm is a “cluster of beliefs and dictates which for scientists in a particular discipline influence what should be studied, how research should be done, [and] how results should be interpreted” (Bryman and Bell, 2007: 25) and (Eduardsen, 2011). An example of a paradigm is positivism. According to Newman (2000: 516) in (Struwig and Stead), positivism is a “research paradigm that combines a deductive approach with precise measurement of quantitative data so that researchers can discover and confirm causal laws that will permit predictions about human behaviour” (Struwig and Stead, 2001: 5).

This study was designed in accordance with the principles and tenets of exploratory research design. According to Gray (2009), this kind of research design is suitable where not enough is known about the phenomenon and researchers seek to explore what is happening and to ask questions about what is happening. Khuboni (2003) offers another description of exploratory case studies where he explains it as “the research attempts to illustrate new and possibly innovative practices adopted by particular companies”.

42
As highlighted in the previous chapter, where issues around the concept of organisational image were highlighted, the available literature does not cover all aspects. Literature that is available does not cover talent management within a higher education institution setting. This research did however, use the concepts that have been discovered and studied in other industries in order to build knowledge for this industry, i.e. higher education in a South African context.

Owing to the large number of the population under study, a quantitative research method was adopted for this study. A survey was conducted by sending of a 5-point Likert Scale questionnaire using electronic mail as a means of reaching the participants. Surveys are defined “as studies that are usually quantitative in nature and which aim to provide a broad overview of a representative sample of a large population” (Mouton, 2001: 152).

The five-point Likert Scale had answers arranged as follows:

- A: “strongly disagree”
- B: "disagree”
- C: “neutral”
- D: “agree”
- E: "strongly disagree”.

Respondents had to respond to 38 statements by indicating their most appropriate response in one of the five points of the scale for each statement.

A sample must represent the population from which it was drawn. Representativeness, rather than using the entire population, is when one understands the difficulty in acquiring responses from each and every member of the population (Gray, 2009: 148)

3.2.5. Triangulation

Denzin is largely credited with the move toward integrated research that mixes methods (Olsen, 2004). According to Singleton, Straits and Straits (1993) in Oppermannt (2000: 142) triangulation is “the use of multiple approaches to a research question can enable the researcher to zero in on the answers or information sought”.
There are three different types of triangulation approaches, (Denzin, 1978), namely:

- Methodological;
- Data and
- Investigator

Methodological triangulation denotes the usage of extra research methods in measuring the same object of interest as opposed to employing a single research method (Oppermannt, 2000). An example of this approach would be researching the phenomenon of talent management through interviews as a data collection method in the first instance and then using questionnaires in a second method of investigating the same phenomenon.

Another type of triangulation is data triangulation, which refers to “using the same approach for different sets of data in order to verify or falsify generalizable trends detected in one set of data” (Oppermannt, 2000: 142). The last type of triangulation is investigator triangulation, which simply refers “to making use of different investigators with a different background” (Oppermannt, 2000: 143).

In essence, triangulation approaches are employed in order to eliminate possible or detected bias. Bias may result owing to the investigator or the method being used. Triangulation is, therefore, employed to overcome problems of bias and validity (Oppermannt, 2000).

In this study, the data was analysed using various statistical tool available in SPSS computer programme. In that way, one was searching if there were patterns of similar results when using different statistical tools.

3.3  POPULATION

A population can be defined as the total number of possible units or elements that are included in the study (Gray, 2009: 148). Another definition provided by Struwig and Stead, (2001: 109) refers to population (universe) as the aggregate (combined total) of all elements about which
information is sought. Struwig and Stead (2001) further explain the concept of population as being made up of:

- Elements;
- Units;
- Extent and
- Time.

For this study, the population included the following kinds of employment at the university:

- Permanent members of staff- comprising both academic and support members of staff;
- Long fixed-term appointees- also comprising both academic and support staff;

### 3.4 SAMPLE

At times, populations are too large and make it impossible to include all elements or units of the population. This then requires a researcher to find a way of studying the population, by including in the study, representative elements of the population. This is what is called a sample. Sampling refers to the method of selecting a subset of the population, i.e. sample. Sampling methods used differ depending on research design and the purpose a research study is designed for. A sample is chosen on the basis that it is a representative sample of the population (Gray, 2009: 148).

There are several alternatives to sampling which can also be grouped into two forms, either probability or non-probability sampling. Struwig and Stead (2001) explain non-probability sampling as a sampling technique where the probability of any particular member of the population being chosen (into the sample) as unknown. Personal judgment of the researcher plays a role when a non-probability sampling technique is used. With a non-probability sampling technique the inclusion of a member is unknown, whereas in the probability sampling technique every member of the population has a known probability of being included (Struwig and Stead, 2001).

Besides the impossibility of including all elements of the population, a researcher may, because of cost and time, consider using a sample of the population. Furthermore, in studies that involve
animals and human beings, it may be unethical and, or impossible to include all elements of the population.

For this research, the sample included the entire population of 3053 permanent and long fixed-term employees as at October 2011. The rationale for including these employees is that they are directly involved in academic and administrative aspects of the university and it is presumed that they possess valuable knowledge and experience on their process of being attracted, recruited and retained at the university.

The reason for excluding other levels of staff is that the study focused on skilled employees only. Executive Management at the university was excluded as the focus of the study was on management levels. In addition, some items in the research tool investigated the impact of leadership on an organisation. Out of the 3053 employees, responses were received from 252 respondents, being an 8 percentage response rate.

3.5 VALIDITY

Validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration (Eldeeb, 2006). Gray (2009) puts it in a much simpler form and refers to validity as a way of ensuring that a research instrument measures what it was intended to measure. There are also ways of ensuring that an instrument is valid. (Struwig and Stead, 2001). Edmonds and Kennedy (2013: 3) define validity as "the extent to which the outcome accurately answers the stated research questions of the study". The question being whether the measurement tool measured what it intended to measures. Validity is vitally important in all quantitative research studies.

Edmonds and Kennedy (2013: 5-6) list four ways of testing validity and these are:

- **Internal**: the extent to which the outcome was based on the independent variable as opposed to extraneous or unaccounted for variables;
- **External**: the extent to which the results can be generalized to relevant populations, settings, treatments, or outcomes. This is also known as content validity;
• **Construct:** refers to the extent a generalization can be made from the operationalization of the theoretical construct back to the conceptual basis responsible for the change in the outcome;
• **Statistical conclusion:** refers to the extent to which the statistical co-variation (relationship) between the treatment and the outcome is accurate.

The questionnaire was pre-tested on several people who have an academic background and their opinion on face validity was confirmed.

### 3.6 RELIABILITY

Reliability is an “indication of consistency between two measures of the same thing”, Black (1999) in Gray (2009: 158). It is essentially concerned with producing the same results irrespective of a difference in time of administration, being administered by two different persons.

Black (1999) in Gray (2009: 159) identified five ways of assessing the reliability of a research instrument. These five ways are:

• **Stability.** This is also known as test-retest reliability. It is concerned with measuring the scores achieved on the same test but on two different occasions. This kind of a measure is inappropriate where the construct is potentially unstable (Gray, 2009: 158)
• **Equivalence** – measured by comparing the responses of a set of subjects with responses made by the same set of subjects on another instruments.
• **Internal consistency** – assesses the extent to which a questionnaire is homogenous.
• **Inter-judge reliability.** This type of reliability check is concerned with consistency of observations when more than one person is judging.
• **Intra-judge reliability.** Another way of measuring consistency is through taking a set of observations or scores and repeating them. This kind of measure is good for eliminating bias that may be due to a respondent responding favourably in order to please a researcher and vice versa.
According to Salkind (2012: 113) a test "cannot be valid if it is not reliable because only when a test can measure something reliably, time and again, can it accurately measure what it is designed to".

The Cronbach’s alpha score for each of the four subscales was as follows:

- Personal View: 0.94
- General Image: 0.88
- Job Satisfaction and Career Path: 0.87
- Opportunities and Rewards: 0.84

These scores indicate that the questionnaire was reliable. Cronbach’s alpha is "a commonly used test of internal reliability and it calculates the average of all possible split-half reliability coefficients" (Bryman and Bell, 2007: 164).

3.7 QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION (REFER TO APPENDIX 2)

The questionnaire was constructed using the four objectives that the study set to investigate and these were as follows:

- To establish the role played by the organisation’s image in attracting and retaining staff in a higher education institution (Personal Views);
- To identify job-career paths factors that are considered influential in talent management (job satisfaction and career path);
- To investigate factors considered by potential academics when applying for or taking up a position at a particular university (Opportunities and rewards) and
- To identify elements involved in the creation of the organisational image (General Image).

Besides the personal and biographical information questions, which were placed at the beginning of the questionnaire, the instrument contained twelve (12) statements on the concept of Personal View; nine (9) on Job Satisfaction and Career path; seven (7) on Opportunities and
Rewards and ten (10) on General Image. Based on the pilot study conducted prior to the actual research, some items were modified for errors and minor compatibility concerns.

This section contains measures of institutional image, institutional reputation and customer loyalty, as was used in Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001). Each measure contained four items except for customer loyalty which had five items. An example of the item for “institutional image” measure was “I have always had a good impression of my current employer (institution)”. The final section contained items that were adapted from the studies by Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001), Lemmink et al., (2003), The Sunday Times (2010) and Turban and Keon (1993). An example of the item that would be found in this section is a statement that says: “The University gives jobs to people with talent”. This section was asking participants to give their opinion on certain aspects of the University.

For Section B and Section C, participants were asked to indicate their response to a statement and the responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In other words a Likert Scale was used.

3.8 PILOT STUDY

A pilot has been defined as "a small-scale run through of the survey and can be used to check questionnaire coding and methods of analysis" (Edmonds and Kennedy, 2013: 68). The purpose of conducting a pilot study is to eliminate any errors in the questionnaire as it is rare that a questionnaire may be right the first time. It is therefore, useful to eliminate these errors before conducting the real study (Edmonds and Kennedy, 2013).

The pilot study was conducted using staff members of the College of Health Sciences’ Finance Section. This group consisted of members of staff of which one was at Grade 12; three were at Grade 11; one at Grade 10; one at Grade 9 and one at a Grade 8. All were Support Staff. In total, there were seven (7) participants in the pilot study. They were requested to make comments about anything that they experienced about the questionnaire. Some of the comments made were:
• “Questions were simple enough”;
• “Time taken to complete the questionnaire was less than ten minutes”
• Respondents suggested changes be made to questions that were vague, double-barrelled and leading. This was done AND
• There were of the view that face validity was achieved.

Some of the problems experienced while conducting the pilot study include:
• Non-return of the completed questionnaire by two pilot study research participants, despite sending reminders and their having given consent to be part of the study. This non-return resulted in the delay of the research study.

This problem was expected to present itself with the bigger research group in the main study. Pilot study respondents were excluded from the main research study.

3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS (REFER TO APPENDIX 1)

"Ethics are sets of moral principles or norms that are used to guide moral choices of behaviour and relationships with others" (Blumberg in Gray, 2009: 69). Ethics would then prescribe how research should be conducted in a manner that is responsible and morally defensible (Gray, 2009).

In this research study, the structure, research methodology and the questionnaire were submitted to the university’s Ethics Committee for approval. The study was found be in compliance with the ethics principles and approved (appended herewith). These principles include (Gray, 2009: 73):
• Avoid harm to participants;
• Getting informed consent;
• Privacy of participants;
• Avoid the use of deception.

Some of the ways of ensuring compliance with the above principles were to circulate the questionnaire via an email with a website hyperlink. Responses were returned anonymously to
the sender. This method of gathering data ensured that the privacy of participants is observed. This also ensured that there would not be any victimisation against for having responded to some (or all) questions in a particular way.

The questionnaire also contained a statement to the effect that participation in the study was voluntary. Participants would then tick a statement to give consent before commencing with answering the questions.

### 3.10 FIELDWORK AND DATA COLLECTION

A survey, according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison in Maree (2007: 155) is “set out to describe and to interpret what is”. According to Maree (2007: 155) surveys have two typical characteristics, and these are:

- Samples are usually big - from a few hundred to a few thousand;
- Many variables are measured and multiple hypotheses are tested.

A survey can be conducted by telephonic interviews, face-to-face interviews and posted questionnaire.

Fieldwork started by acquiring consent from the gatekeepers to approve conducting a study on the university’s premises.

For this research, a survey questionnaire was emailed to 3053 employees who met the criteria as mentioned above, using Questionpro Software. The survey was sent on 07 October 2011 and was closed on 01 November 2011. Respondents were sent kind reminders about the survey, to ensure they responded. In total, 252 questionnaires were completed and submitted. This represents a response rate of 8%. Ideally, a greater response rate would have given greater confidence in terms of being truly statistically sound. Roscoe in Sekaran (2003: 295) proposed that sample sizes larger than 30 and less than 500 are appropriate for most research.
3.11 DATA ANALYSIS

SPSS version 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois) will be used to analyse the data. A p value <0.05 will be considered as statistically significant. Frequency distribution tables (n and %) bar graphs and pie charts will be generated to describe the responses to categorical variables. Simple descriptive statistics in the form of the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum value will be summarized for continuous variables. Cross tabulations (Pearson chi-square or Fischer’s exact test as appropriate) will be used to assess the association between categorical variables. Non-Parametric tests like the Kruskal-Wallis test and The Mann U Whitney test will be used for comparing the personal views of different categories.

3.12 CONCLUSION

This chapter has highlighted various paradigms, terms and concepts, such as qualitative and quantitative research methods, reliability and validity used in research methodology. It has discussed the research methodology informing this study. It further described the population and sample and has explained how data collection was conducted and ethical issues pertinent to the conducting of fieldwork. Finally, a pilot study was presented and issues that came up while conducting the pilot study were highlighted.

The following chapter contains the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data collected in a manner described in Chapter Three and discusses the results. There are three sections in this chapter. The first section presents frequencies in the data collected. The second one presents analysis using mainly two statistical tests, i.e. Kruskal-Wallis Test and Mann-Whitney U Test. The data is also analysed using the mean rank and p-value tools of statistics. The third section discusses the results taking into account literature already available.

4.1.1 Response rate

As mentioned in Chapter Three, a survey email was sent to 3053 members of staff. Completed and submitted questionnaires were 252. Those who started the survey were 366 and it included 252 of the completed and submitted questionnaires. Figure 3 below presents the response rate for the research study:
4.1.2 Data Normality

Q-Q Plots tests were conducted to find out if the data is normal. The test is that, if the data falls more or less on a straight line, then one can conclude that data is normal. All sub-scales, except for the Job Satisfaction and Career Path, fulfilled this requirement.

4.1.3 Homogeneity of Variance

Although the Job Satisfaction and Career Path data did not comply with the requirements of normality of data, it however met the requirements of homogeneity of variance. The table below shows that homogeneity of variance for all sub-scales was in compliance with this requirement. The significance levels were above <.05 for all sub-scales.
### Test of Homogeneity of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td>1.725&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction and Career Path</td>
<td>1.174&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Image</td>
<td>1.062&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and Rewards</td>
<td>1.289&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:1 - Test of Homogeneity of Variance
4.2. DATA FREQUENCIES

This section focuses on the frequencies of the data as included in the research instruments and the data presented will be based on the first twelve items of the research instrument used.

4.2.1 Gender

Figure 5 presents the gender.

![Gender Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 4:2- Gender**

Figure 4:2 reveals that 60 per cent were females.
4.2.2 Race

Table 4:2 presents the distribution of race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:2- Race

Table 4:3 above indicates that the majority were of African race, with 37.3%. These figures may be in line with the population from which the sample was drawn but not in line with South African demographics. In spite of this progress towards Black Economic Empowerment, it would appear from the limited responses that perhaps the university is moving in the right direction in this regard.

4.2.3 Age

Table 4:3 reflects the range of age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:3- Age description

Table 4:3 presents the distribution of age. In simple terms it reveals that the youngest respondent was aged 25 years old while the oldest was 65 years old. If further depict that the average age is 42 years old. It further presents validation of age as per good practice of data management. It further reveals that the age range was normally distributed. The above table conforms to the standards of good data. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality was also
done to validate the age distribution in the data. It revealed that the age was normally distributed and therefore, conformed to good statistical data.

### 4.2.4 Frequencies of age

Figure 4:3 below indicates that 75 per cent of respondents were between the age of 25 and 49 years. This agrees with what makes up the bulk of the workforce at the institution under study.

![Age Frequency Chart](image)

**Figure 4:3- Age**

**Figure 4:3- Presentation of age**

The greatest frequency was aged between 40 and 44 years, indicated by 50 respondents, translating to 19.84 per cent of the total respondents. One may infer that the greater number of respondents had far more experience, either within the institution or outside the institution. Normally, people in their 40’s would have been working for a considerable time. It may also be assumed that these respondents would have fair assumptions about the institution under study given that they are not young.
4.2.5 Campus base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard College</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietermaritzburg</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westville</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:4- Campus base

The Westville Campus had the largest number of respondents amongst five campus of the institution under study. It may be noted that Westville Campus was the largest in size in terms of staff and student population when compared to the other four campuses.
4.2.6 Staff category

Table 4:5 presents the distribution of staff categories in the institution under study. There are three staff categories, namely, Academic, Support and Technical Staff. According to general descriptions, Academic Staff are those members of staff who are generally involved in teaching and research as their key performance areas. The second category is Support Staff which is mainly involved in the administration and support of the main activity of the University, i.e. teaching and research. This category does not involve itself in teaching and research, although some may get involved in research. The last category is the Technical Staff. This category is mainly tasked to support the teaching and research endeavours in the provision of the technical know-how and is mainly laboratory staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Academic</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td>39,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>56,7</td>
<td>56,7</td>
<td>96,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:5- Staff category

Support Staff constitute the largest grouping of respondents compared to Academic and Technical Staff.
### 4.2.7 Highest qualifications

Table 4:6 presents the highest qualification that the respondent has attained.

#### Highest Qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD / doctoral</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including registration with statutory bodies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year or more bachelor's degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Honours degree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bachelor's degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A national diploma</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A post-matric certificate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A matriculation / Senior Certificate / Grade 12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:6- Highest qualification

As the institution under study is a higher education institution, it is therefore not surprising to see that at least 84.9 per cent have at least a three-year post-matric qualification. In that grouping 25.4 per cent of respondents have at least a master’s degree as the highest qualification.
The Academic Staff were fairly distributed among the faculties with the exception of Law which had a significantly low number of respondents. Academic Staff composed 39.3% of the total sample of respondents. In this group, respondents from the Faculty of Health Sciences and Medical School made up 35.4% of the total group of Academic Staff.
### Division/College in which Support/Technical Staff are based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/College</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>13,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12,3</td>
<td>20,3</td>
<td>33,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>43,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law and Management Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>50,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15,5</td>
<td>25,5</td>
<td>75,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>,8</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>77,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>83,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>87,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>90,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>93,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>95,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>,8</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>96,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>,8</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>98,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>,8</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>99,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Management Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,4</td>
<td>,7</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4:7- Division/College in which Support Staff work*
The majority opted to remain anonymous. This affirms that the study was conducted within the ethical principles of conducting research. It may also be worth-noting that various divisions/colleges were represented in the sample that responded even though it may be a small number.

4.2.10 Title of Academic Staff

Figure 4:5 - Title/Rank of Academic Staff

Figure 4:5 shows that the majority of Academic Staff were at a lecturer level. The lowest number of respondents was from the category of senior professors/professors with a frequency of six respondents.
Figure 4:5 shows that the majority of Academic Staff were lecturers. This is in line with the total number of academic staff at the University of KwaZulu-Natal which is composed of fifty-three per cent academic. See Figure 4:5 which shows the composition of the population of Academic Staff at UKZN. The lowest number was from the category of senior professors/professors with a frequency of six respondents.

**Figure 4:6- Academic staff at the University (in percentage)**

The second largest number was from Senior Lecturer category. This is also in line with the population composition of Academic Staff at the University of KwaZulu-Natal which reflects that Senior Lecturers are the second largest group with 19% recorded as Senior Lecturers. From these figures, it may be inferred that at least 42%, which is a sum of all Senior Professors/Professors, Senior Lecturers and Associate Professors, will be in possession of a PhD. This is generally considered positive in that in the higher education institution sector, a PhD degree is valued. This may translate into positive image by the University’s stakeholders.
4.2.11 Peromnes grade of the Support/Technical Staff

The institution under study uses what is known as Peromnes grading system to evaluate the worth of the job, thereby according each job a level and thereof the salary range that fits to that grade. This system of grading jobs is mainly used for Support and Technical Staff. The smaller the numeric grade the higher the worth of the job and the means the job will also be in the higher level of the organisational hierarchy. Table 4.8 presents the grades of Support/Technical Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8- Peromnes grade of Support/Technical Staff

One notices that there are grades which were originally excluded from the sample, i.e. Grades 2, 3 and 14. The questionnaire was only circulated to participants in Peromnes Grades between Grade 4 and Grade 13. What may have happened is that the respondents think of themselves as
being in one grade yet on the system they are captured differently. Alternatively, those who received the email shared with other colleagues who were not included in the survey.

4.2.12 Years of experience as an academic

Table 4:9 presents the total number of years of experience of the Academic Staff, irrespective of the institution. In other words, it is the number of years each Academic Staff has been lecturing in their entire lifetime and is not restricted to the current employer.

Total years of experience in lecturing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0,0 - 4,9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15,15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,0 - 9,9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24,24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,0 -14,9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17,17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,0 - 19,9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22,22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,0 - 24,9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,0 -29,9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,0&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:9- Total years of lecturing experience of Academic Staff

Table 4:9 depicts that more than 56 per cent of respondents had less than fifteen (15) years of lecturing experience. Generally, experience is associated with knowledgeable and highly skilled individuals as one would have been in the field for some time and has gather knowledge around the field of his/her trade. One may begin to be recognised by his/her peers as a leader in the discipline after being in the discipline (e.g. in writing and publishing). It is worth noting that at least 43 per cent of the Academic Staff had more than 15 years of experience. This fact may boost the perception amongst stakeholders, particularly students, in that they are not guided by novices in the field.
4.2.13  Number of years lecturing at this university

Table 4:10 below reflects the total number of years the Academic Staff had been lecturing at this institution under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Valid Per cent</th>
<th>Cumulative Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0,0 - 4,9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28,28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,0 - 9,9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30,30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58,59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,0 -14,9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16,16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,0 -19,9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13,13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,0 -24,9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,0 -29,9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97,98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,0&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:10- Years of lecturing at this university

Almost 75 per cent had spent less than fifteen years at the current institution under study. Less than two per cent of the respondents had lecturing experience of 30 years or more.
4.3. DATA ANALYSIS

This section of the Chapter Four presents data analysis using various statistical techniques.

4.3.1. Generic descriptive statistics

The data collection instrument had four sub-scales built within it. From these sub-scales, the mean for each sub-scale was calculated. The mean for each sub-scale was as follows:

- Personal View- 36
- Job Satisfaction and Career Path- 30
- General Image- 30
- Opportunities and Rewards- 16

These means were calculated based on the number of items within each sub-scale and each response, which would be accorded 1 for “strongly disagree”, 2 for “disagree”, 3 for “neutral”, 4 for “agree” and 5 for “strongly agree”. For example, the Personal View sub-scale had twelve (12) items and that meant that each individual respondent would have had to score below or above 36 in order to be regarded either generally positive or generally negative on that particular scale.

Table 4:11 presents the descriptive statistics of all respondents for each of the sub-scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal view</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>35.8214</td>
<td>10.20799</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction and</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>31.5714</td>
<td>7.11928</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Image</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>34.0833</td>
<td>6.80674</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>16.6389</td>
<td>4.96527</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:11-Table of Descriptive Statistics
It is apparent that in two sub-scales, i.e. Personal View and Opportunities and Rewards, respondents were overall negative, while in other two sub-scales, i.e. Job Satisfaction and Career Path and General Image, respondents were more on the positive side.

The following sub-sections reveal where exactly the differences in responses that made in these sub-scales are.
4.3.2. Objective One: Establishing the role played by the organisation’s image in attracting and retaining staff in a higher education institution (personal view)

Items:

1. I have always had a good impression of my current employer (institution).
2. The current employer has a good reputation.
3. In my opinion, the University has a good image in the minds of students, staff and the community.
4. I believe that the University has a better image than its competitors.
5. In general, I believe that the University always fulfils the promises it makes to its students, staff and other stakeholders.
6. I believe that the reputation of my current institution is better than other universities.
7. I will continue to do business with the current institution.
8. I would recommend my current employer as the best employer institution in the country.
9. I believe that the image of my current University played a role in my decision to join it as its employee.
10. The reputation of my current employer has played a role in considering it for employment.
11. The University's image has played a role in continuing employment services at this University.
12. I would encourage friends and relatives to consider employment at this institution.

Overall, staff was less positive as the mean achieved was 35.82 which is less than a subscale mean of 36. In a Likert scale ranging from one (1) which is “strongly disagree” to five (5) which is “strongly agree”, a mean of 36 would have to be attained in order to state that respondents were either negative or positive on twelve statements for the “Personal View” subscale. With a mean of 35.82, it is clear that respondents were generally less positive on this subscale. In other words, these statements could not be linked to staff’s decision on whether to take a job offer at the University of KwaZulu-Natal to remain in their current positions. In simpler terms, staff would have taken the position irrespective of their personal view about the institution. To find out whether there were significant differences amongst different categories of respondents, two tests, i.e. Kruskal-Wallis Test and Mann-Whitney U Test were conducted. These two tests reveal, firstly, if there are differences and secondly, where those differences are within certain units of descriptors of respondents.
4.3.2.1 Staff category

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there were significant differences amongst three (3) staff categories, i.e. Academic, Support and Technical staff. The Kruskal-Wallis Test yielded a p-value of <.000, which is statistically significant in terms of difference.

**Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>104.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>143</td>
<td><strong>144.35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4:12- Personal View- Mean Ranks- Staff Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4:13- Personal View- Kruskal-Wallis Test- Staff Category*

Since the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a significant difference in how respondent replied, it is important to dissect and find out where the difference might lie. The notable difference is between Support versus Academic and Technical Staff, i.e. Support Staff were more positive in responding to the above-mentioned items compared to Academic and Technical Staff respondents. This is shown in the above “mean rank” columns. Both Academic and Technical Staff were less positive.
4.3.2.2 Gender

Another variable that might have contributed to the final results of the test on Personal View being low is the gender of respondents, hence the Kruskal-Wallis test had to be conducted to investigate the attributes of this variable.

Mean Ranks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>131.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:14- Personal View Mean Ranks- Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>6908.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>11958.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:15- Personal View- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Gender

The above tables (4:14 and 4:15) show that respondents did not differ significantly, as reflected in the p-value of <.222, in responding to the Personal View Sub-scale items in terms of gender, however it is noted that females, with the mean rank of 131.05, were generally more positive in responding to these items compared to males’ mean rank of 119.59.
4.3.2.3 Race

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed a p-value of <.000 when comparing respondents in terms of race.

Mean Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>153.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>116.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>147.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:16- Personal View- Mean ranks: Race

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>62.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:17- Personal View- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Race

A notable difference amongst different race groups is that between African and White, and Indian and White. Following that dichotomy was the difference between African and Coloured. African and Indian were more positive compared to White and Coloured. Africans were the most positive with a positive mean rank of 153.77 compared to Whites’ mean rank of 68.88.
Tabulation of p-values across races:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.029</td>
<td>&lt;.592</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>&lt;.029</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.076</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>&lt;.592</td>
<td>&lt;.076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:18- Personal View p-value Summary: Mann-Whitney U Test: Race

All those that are highlighted in red are below the significant level of <.05, meaning that there is a significant difference when responses to Personal View items of respective race groups are compared. Their responses to items in this sub-scale substantially differed.

Figure 4:7- Personal View-Means: Race

Figure 4:7 above indicates the means of different race. Visually, Whites have a significantly lower than means of the other three groups.
4.3.2.4 Faculties in which Academic Staff lecture

Kruskal-Wallis Test in Table 25 revealed that the p-value of <.039 which is lower than a significant level of <.05.

**Kruskal-Wallis Test: Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty in which you are lecturing in:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4:19- Personal View Mean Ranks: Faculty in which Academic lecture*

**Test Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>14.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4:20- Personal View- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Faculty in which Academic Staff lecture*

The Kruskal-Wallis test shows that there is a significant difference in how Academic Staff respondents in different faculties responded to items in the Personal View sub-scale. The p-value of <.039 confirms that. Furthermore, the test reveals that the Faculty of Health Sciences and Medical School had mean ranks of 67.36 and 55.12, respectively and thereby ranked higher
than all other faculties. The least positive respondents were from the Faculties of Humanities and Law with mean ranks of 33.17 and 34.25 respectively.
Mann-Whitney U Test

Summary tabulation of p-value comparison: Faculty of the Academic Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Medical School</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Management Studies</th>
<th>Science and Agriculture</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Studies</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:21- Personal View-Tabulation of p-value comparison: Faculty in which Academic Staff lecture
4.3.2.5 Division / College in which Support/Technical Staff work

A p-value of <.434 means that there is no difference that may be attributable to different Divisions/Colleges in which Support/Technical Staff work. In other words, any difference that may be caused by different Divisions/Colleges in which Support/Technical Staff while in responding to Personal View Sub-scale items is insignificant.

Kruskal-Wallis Test

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division / College you are working in:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>88.21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law and Management Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>88.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>36.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>44.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>122.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It may be worth noting from the above tables that Registrar’s Division, Colleges of Law and Management Studies and Health Sciences recorded the highest mean ranks of 122.75, 88.80 and 88.21 respectively while Research and Risk Management Services had mean ranks of 36.50 and 44.25 respectively. Other than that, there is no significant difference in how respondents from different Colleges/Divisions responded to the items in Personal View items.

### 4.3.2.6 Academic Title

Further, one needed to investigate whether there was a statistically significant difference in how Academic Staff at different academic ranks responded to the items in Personal View sub-scale.

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your academic title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Professor /</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tutor / Tutor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:23- Personal View- Mean ranks: Academic Title/Rank for Academic Staff
The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that there is no significant difference amongst different academic ranks. The p-value of <.076 confirms that, the Senior Tutor / Tutor were higher in terms of being positive with their mean rank of 66.25 followed by Associate Professor with the mean rank of 55.10. The less positive amongst this group were Senior Lecturer with a mean rank of 36.74, with the Senior Professor/Professor group ranking just above Senior Lecturer grouping with a mean rank of 41.17.
4.3.2.7 Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff

Further, one needed to investigate whether there was a statistically significant difference in how Support/Technical Staff at different Peromnes grades responded to the items in Personal View sub-scale.

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Peromnes Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>95.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:25- Personal View-Mean Ranks: Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff
Table 4:26- Personal View-Kruskal-Wallis Test

The above tables present the p-value and the mean ranks of Peromnes Grade for Support and Technical Staff. The p-value of 0.642 means that there is no significant difference amongst different levels.

4.3.2.8 Years of lecturing experience

There was no significant difference in how Academic Staff with differing years of lecturing responded to Personal View sub-scale items. Furthermore, it may also be inferred from the p-values (<.683 and <.606) that there is no significant difference in those respondents who have a longer service at the University compared to those who have just joined the institution.
4.3.3. Objective Two: Identify job-career path factors that are considered influential in talent management (Job Satisfaction and Career Path)

**Items:**

If I needed better career opportunities now, my current institution would be my first choice.

The University:

i. Encourages job/post changes within the institution.

ii. Gives challenging job/post.

iii. Offers work variation.

iv. Have various international units and/or clients which provide interaction to academic staff that is beneficial.

v. Offers a possibility of an international career.

vi. Makes information concerning the institution widely accessible.

vii. Offers a stable working environment

viii. Promotes collegiality

ix. Has sufficiently provided me with means and resources to conduct research activities of high scholarly work.

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that staff was more positive as the mean of 31.57 was an overall score for Job Satisfaction and Career Path. The mean score indicated above is higher than the generic mean for this sub-scale which is 30. It is not worth dissecting the responses as the score was generally positive and hence no further investigation was necessary.
Figure 4:8- Job Satisfaction and Career Path-Mean: Staff Category

The above graph indicates that amongst staff, Technical staff had the least positive responses when it came to job satisfaction and career path. It is also noted that Support and Academic staff had means which were positive as both had means above 30.
4.3.3.2 Race

Figure 4:9 - Job Satisfaction and Career Path-Mean: Race

Figure 4:9 shows that Africans and Indian/Asians had higher more positive means which were above the generic mean of 30 when responding to Job Satisfaction and Career Path items. On the other hand, Coloured and Whites had their means below 30 which is viewed as less positive.
Figure 4:10 presents that Academic staff from the Faculties of Health Sciences, Medical School, Law and Management Studies responded in a positive manner as they all had means which were above 30. The least positive respondents were from the faculties of Education, Humanities, Engineering and Science and Agriculture.
Figure 4:11- Job Satisfaction and Career Path-Mean: Your Academic title

Figure 4:11 depicts means of Academic Staff according to their academic ranks. In this graph, Senior Lecturers are shown to have the lowest mean in this group and their mean was below 30 which indicated that Senior Lecturers, generally responded negatively in the Job Satisfaction and Career Path sub-scale items.
4.3.4. Objective Three: Identity elements involved in the creation of the organisational image (General Image)

Items:

The University:

i. Considers ecological responsibility.
ii. Gives serious consideration of social affairs (e.g. HIV/aids).
iii. Is financially sound/healthy.
iv. Has frequent improvement on processes, and/or services.
v. Can be regarded as a leading higher education institution.
vi. Has prominent individuals from the society associated with it.
vii. Has graduates who are successful and/or make a positive impact in the society.
viii. Is located in a friendly city.
ix. Has the right leadership (executive management) lead it to new frontiers.
x. Has vision statement (to be the premier university of African scholarship) that appeals to me.

As in the Job Satisfaction and Career Path sub-scale, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that respondents were generally more positive with a mean of 34.08. This mean is higher than 30 which is generic one for the sub-scale. This is the only sub-scale amongst the four sub-scales of the instrument which received a significant score above the generic score. Therefore, there would not be a need to dissect the differences amongst different groups.
4.3.4.1 Staff category

Figure 4:12- General Image- Mean: Staff category

Technical Staff continued to show the lowest level of positive responses. Figure 4:12 shows that Support Staff were the most positive groups while Technical Staff had the least positive responses when responding to General Image sub-scale items. Despite being lowest, Technical
Staff attained a mean of 31 which was above the generic mean of 30 for the General Image subscale.

4.3.4.2 Gender

Figure 4:13- General Image- Mean: Gender

Figure 4:13 show that both male and female had means which were positive as these were above the generic mean of 30.
4.3.4.3 Race

Figure 4:14-General Image-Mean: Race

Figure 4:14 is the mean of race category and it shows that Whites had the lowest mean. In other words, Whites were less positive in responding to the 10 items of the General Image sub-scale.
4.3.4.4 Faculty in which Academic staff lecture

Figure 4:15- General Image- Faculty in which Academic Staff lecture

Figure 4:15 above shows the General Image possessed by Academic Staff. It shows that respondents from the Faculties of Education, Engineering, Science and Agriculture and Humanities had the lowest means and below the generic mean of 30. Respondents from
Faculties of Health Sciences, Medical School, Management Studies and Law responded in a positive manner.

4.3.4.5 Division / College Support/Technical staff work in:

Figure 4:16- General Image- Mean: Division/College for Support/Technical Staff work in

Notable in Figure 4:16 is that Support Staff in Risk Management Services had the lowest mean compared to respondents from other divisions. All other divisions had means above the general mean which means that they gave positive responses when responding to the General Image sub-scale items.
Figure 4:17- General Image-Mean: Academic Title

Figure 4:17 reveals the mean scores for Academic Staff according to their academic titles/ranks. It further reveals that Senior Lecturers were the least positive with a mean below 30 while all other academics in other ranks had means which were above 30.
4.3.5. Objective Four: Investigate factors considered by potential academics when applying or taking up a position at a particular university (Opportunities and Rewards)

Items:
The University:

i. *Gives jobs to people with talent.*

ii. *Offers possibility for a faster career.*

iii. *Treats employees fairly.*

iv. *Gives me enough recognition and acknowledgement for what I do.*

v. *Offers me the right salary package based on my experience and qualifications.*

vi. *Offers benefits that are sufficient for my retirement.*

This is the second sub-scale with the least positive score. The mean score in this sub-scale was 16.63 which is lower than 18 a generic mean. One had to investigate further the causes that may be attributable to the less positive responses in this sub-scale.

4.3.5.1 Staff category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Staff category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>116.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:27-Opportunities and Rewards-Mean Ranks: Staff Category
The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a p-value of 0.038 which means that there is significant difference in how different staff category responded to the items of Opportunities and Rewards sub-scales. The mean ranking reveals that Support Staff responded in a more positive manner compared to the other two attributes of the variable.

4.3.5.2 Gender

Mean Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities rewards</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>126.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>7544.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>19172.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:28- Opportunities and Rewards-Kruskal-Wallis Test: Staff Category

Table 4:29- Opportunities and Rewards-Mean Ranks: Gender

Table 4:30- Opportunities and Rewards-Kruskal-Wallis: Gender
The p-value for comparison between males and females reveals that there is no significant difference amongst these groups in how they responded to Opportunities and Rewards items. The mean ranks also confirm and further show that females were a more positive group than the males.
4.3.5.3 Race

Kruskal-Wallis Test: Mean Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>144.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>129.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>103.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:31- Opportunities and Rewards- Mean ranks: Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:32- Opportunities and Rewards- Kruskal-Wallis test: Race

Africans were more positive indicated by a mean rank of 144.12 while Whites were the least positive of all the race groups.

Summary Tabulation of p-values across races

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.067</td>
<td>&lt;.179</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>&lt;.067</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.067</td>
<td>&lt;.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>&lt;.179</td>
<td>&lt;.316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.598</td>
<td>&lt;.034</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:33- Opportunities and Rewards- Tabulation of p-value: Race

The significant difference amongst different race group is found between African and Whites as well as between Whites and Indians.
Similar to results of other sub-scales that have been presented, Whites remain the least positive groups in the Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale, while Africans were the most positive of the group with a mean of 18.
### 4.3.5.4 Faculties in which Academic Staff lecture:

#### Mean Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty in which you are lecturing in:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:34 - Opportunities and Rewards - Mean Ranks: Faculty in which Academic Staff lecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:35 - Opportunities and Rewards - Kruskal-Wallis: Faculty in which Academic lecture

Tables 4:34 and 4:35 show the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test and the statistical difference amongst Academic Staff from different faculties. In terms of the Kruskal-Wallis test, there was no significant difference in response from Academic Staff that may be attributable to their difference in faculties.
Figure 4:20- Opportunities and Rewards-Mean: Faculty in which Academic Staff lecture

Figure 4:20 above tallies with the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test. Figure 13 is the result of an ANOVA Test, comparing means. Respondents from the faculties of Health Sciences and the Medical School were the most positive groups when responding to Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale.
### 4.3.5.5 Division / College in which Support/Technical Staff work:

**Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division / College you are working in:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and Rewards College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law and Management Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:36- Opportunities and Rewards- Mean Ranks: Division/College in which Support/Technical Staff work
Opportunities and Rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:37- Opportunities and Rewards- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Division/College in which Support/Technical Staff work

There is no significant difference in how Support/Technical Staff in different divisions responded to items of Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale. This is evidenced by the p-value which was greater than >.05.

4.3.5.6 Academic Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:38- Opportunities and Rewards- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Academic Title
Figure 4:21 above confirms the result of Tables 44 and 45 of the Kruskal-Wallis test. The means for the Academic Titles show that Senior Lecturers were the least positive groups when responding to the Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale items while Senior Professor/Professor and Senior Tutor/Tutors were the most positive groups. The ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis Tests revealed the same results on the means of these groups. Despite that, results are not statistically significant.
### 4.3.5.7 Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Peromnes Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:39 - Opportunities and Rewards- Mean Ranks: Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:40 - Opportunities and Rewards- Kruskal-Wallis Test: Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff
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Figure 4:22- Opportunities and Rewards- Mean: Peromnes Grade for Support/Technical Staff

Figure 4:22 above reveals that, statistically, there is no significant difference in how respondents gave their responses to items of Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale.
4.3.5.8 Years of lecturing experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:41- Opportunities and Rewards- Mean ranks: Years of lecturing at this University
There is no significant difference in how Academic Staff respondent with different years of service at the university responded to the Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities and Rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>35.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:42- Opportunities and Rewards- Years of Lecturing at this University
4.4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.4.1. Objective One: Establishing the role played by the organisation’s image in attracting and retaining staff in a higher education institution (Personal View)

Literature:

There are three notable studies on the concept of organisational image, sometimes used interchangeably with institutional reputation on the subject of organisational image, corporate service image as coined by Keller (2000) and corporate brand. Lemmink et al., (2003), Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) and Tsai and Yang (2010) are the three studies from which this research draws largely. Tsai and Yang (2010) base their research on what Keller termed corporate image. Lemmink et al., (2003) made a distinction between general factors, which in this research is termed general image and what they termed corporate employment image. Corporate image influences corporate employment image which has an impact on the intentions of students putting employment applications to that particular company. Both general factors and corporate employment image were found to have a profound impact on intentions to apply for employment and therefore leading to increased exposure to the company. This research also took an overview of concepts of institutional image and institutional reputation as presented by Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) in the study of these concepts in relation to student retention. In their study, the relationship between these two concepts was strongly significant.

Fieldwork:

The overall impression of the findings for this objective is that respondents did not link their decision on taking up the position with institutional reputation, image or personal view about the institution. There are other factors that may account for their taking a post in this institution. This assumption tends to be more applicable to Whites as well as academic staff from the faculties of Humanities and Law. The influence of institutional image and institutional reputation as presented by Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) in the study of these concepts in relation to student retention may not be readily applied in the field of talent management.

It is also interesting to note that senior tutor/tutors were highly positive despite the fact that they are the junior groups amongst academics. There was also no significant difference amongst the
respondents of different Peromnes grades. Likewise, years of experience could not account for any difference in this sub-scale.

The difference in reaction to institutional image by certain different stakeholders is guaranteed (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001). This may also be applicable and explain the difference in response by different staff categories, Academic staff, faculties from which academic staff are lecturing and Peromnes grades for support/technical for this research. The contrast of response in academic, that is the senior lecturers who were less positive than other groups of academic staff is also explained by Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001). The issue of different responses to institutional image is further anchored by a response from both genders, whereby males and females recorded no difference to items in the Personal View sub-scale. These findings emphasise the view that institutional image has an emotional component built within it (Nguyen and LeBlanc, 2001). Nguyen and LeBlanc (2001) acknowledge that even though the effect that institutional image and reputation have on consumer behaviour is recognised, there is no empirical evidence to prove this.

4.4.2. Objective Two: identify job-career path factors that are considered influential in talent management (Job Satisfaction and Career Path)

Literature:
According to Luthans (1989) in van der Zee (2009) high or low employee turnover rates, absenteeism and grievances lodged are factors that indicate whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction exists within organisations. In other words, these factors have a major impact on talent management of each organisation. According to Smith, Kendal and Hulin (1969) in van der Zee (2009), there are five facets of job satisfaction and these are:

- Satisfaction with work itself;
- Satisfaction with pay;
- Satisfaction with co-workers;
- Satisfaction with supervision and
- Satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.
Fieldwork:
Results of this study are consistent with those found by Mcwatts (2005) in the study on job satisfaction among academic and support staff at a higher education institution in that there was no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction of support and academic staff. While Mcwatts found that academics were more satisfied with their jobs than support staff, this research found that in the institution under investigation, support staff were more satisfied with their jobs than academic staff were. This research found that amongst academic staff, senior lecturers were the least satisfied group. This may suggest that some, or all, facets listed by Luthans (1989) in van der Zee (2009) are affected. Hoole and Vermeulen (2003) conclude, after conducting a study on different pilot categories that job satisfaction may also be influenced by prestige and promotional opportunities which were available to pilots in the passenger airlines compared with those involved in firefighting. They further conclude that pilots in the passenger and commercial airlines experienced higher job satisfaction that may have been emanating from higher responsibility. Pilots in agriculture did not have that sense of responsibility and being protected by being in bigger airlines.

Senior lecturers were less positive than all other academics. The staff was generally more positive as the mean in this sub-scale was above the generic sub-scale. Academic and support staff were positive while technical staff were not so positive. Whites and Coloureds were least positive as their mean was below the generic mean. According to an advert placed by the University of KwaZulu-Natal in the Sunday Times (2010) newspaper, there is a decrease on the percentage of White academic staff, from 53 per cent in 2010 to 33 per cent in 2012. The faculties of Education, Humanities, Engineering and Science and Agriculture were less positive. Health Sciences, Medical School, Law and Management Studies were highly positive.
4.4.3. Objective Three: identity elements involved in the creation of the organisational image (General Image)

**Literature:**
This objective contained more items which were associated with or meet the definition of corporate social responsibility. Carroll (1991a) in Albinger and Freeman (2000: 243) defined corporate social responsibility as referring to “a business entity’s attention to and fulfilment of responsibilities to multiple stakeholders which exist at various levels: economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic”. Albinger and Freeman (2000) hypothesised that corporate social performance improves the attractiveness of an organisation to job-seeking applicants.

**Fieldwork:**
Results confirmed their hypothesis in a study of job-seekers with different levels of job choice available to them. Results from this study support earlier findings on the concept as studied by Albinger and Freeman. One of the items in this sub-scale includes a statement on the calibre of the institution’s leadership and its capability of taking it to new frontiers. In a study by McCarthy (2009) where changing of leadership profile and its impact on retention of Black talent were examined, the relationship between these two variables could not be revealed. Generally, positive as the mean was above the generic mean. Respondents believed that the institution’s general image was positive. All staff offered positive responses with regard to this sub-scale. The least positive were technical staff. These respondents were followed by senior lecturers. Both males and females were positive and did not differ significantly on how they responded to items of General Image sub-scale. Racially, Whites ranked items of the General Image sub-scale lower compared to the other three racial groups. One may infer from these results that the general image of the institution in the mind of the Whites is not glowing.

The general image of the institution was less positive in the minds of academic staff in the faculties of Education, Engineering, Science and Agriculture and Humanities. It was however, more positive in the minds of academic staff from the faculties of Health Sciences, Medical School, Management Studies and Law. Aside from the differences within groups, which were insignificant, results show a positive correlation between general image and talent management.
4.4.4. Objective Four: investigate factors considered by potential academics when applying or taking up a position at a particular university (Opportunities and Rewards)

**Literature:**
Judging by the mean obtained, respondents felt that the institution lacked in these aspects. These aspects, especially the monetary ones have been identified by Smith, Kendal and Hulin (1969) in van der Zee (2009), as forming the facet of job satisfaction.

**Fieldwork:**
This is another sub-scale where the obtained mean was below the generic mean, and that may suggest that staff were rating in this sub-scale negatively. In other words, respondents did not think that their institution:

- Gives jobs to people with talent;
- Offers possibility for a faster career;
- Treats employees fairly;
- Gives me enough recognition and acknowledgement for what I do;
- Offers me the right salary package based on my experience and qualifications and;
- Offers benefits that are sufficient for my retirement.

Staff category also had a significant difference in how respondents offered their responses in this sub-scale. Technical staff was the least positive of the group.

There was no difference in gender responses. Any differences may be statistically insignificant to result in a different interpretation. Both genders had positive means. Loosely, this may be interpreted as respondents receiving fair treatment across gender lines. There was a significant difference in responses from different race groups in the Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale items. White and Coloureds were less positive in this sub-scale.
Being in different faculties did not contribute a significant effect in how respondents responded to the Opportunities and Rewards sub-scale. Besides the respondents from the Health Sciences and Medical School, it can be concluded that respondents felt that their opportunities and rewards were barely adequate. Health Sciences and Medical School were positive about the opportunities and rewards. It is common knowledge that people in the medical profession are remunerated fairly well compared to those in other professions, hence the results concur with this general knowledge.

Senior lecturers felt the opportunities and rewards were barely adequate in their current employer. A simple conclusion from the results of this sub-scale and in comparison with the results from other sub-scales is that individuals do stay with an organisation despite being unhappy about the opportunities and rewards and its reputation and image, as long as the general image and some facets of job satisfactions are covered. It is presumed that, since senior lecturers are members of staff who would have recently been promoted to this level after completing a PhD degree, which is a minimum requirement, their salary expectations are higher than what the institution offers.
4.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the frequencies of the data collected. It went on to dissect any differences on the responses provided using mainly the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests to investigate where there may be attributable differences of responses. Statistical tools such as mean, mean ranks, range, p-value were used to compare and analyse data further. It highlighted the areas of where the difference where found. These statistics have the following highlights:

- There was a significant difference in terms of the different respondents responded to items in the personal view sub-scale and that personal view could not be linked to any job offer recruitment decision.
- There was no significant difference in how respondents responded to items of general image and job satisfaction and career path sub-scales.
- There was a significant difference in how respondents responded to items of opportunities and rewards and that responses offered were generally less positive;

All tables and graphs in the second part of this chapter were revealing where the significant differences were.

The chapter ended with a discussion section highlighting the literature currently available. The following chapter will discuss the difference in detail and present recommendations for the institution concerned, if necessary.
CHAPTER 5 : RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents trends in employment in a South African context before making conclusions and recommendations on the findings of this study. Conclusions and recommendations are based on the discussion presented in Chapter Four of this study. In order to put the research into perspective, the conclusions and recommendation for each research objective occurs around the context presented below. It is almost impossible to discuss talent management and not make reference to job satisfaction. The chapter outlays some of the conclusions that may be reached out of this research on organisational image and talent management in a higher education institution.

5.2 THE EMPLOYMENT TRENDS IN SOUTH AFRICA

It may be imperative to highlight the trends in employment in South Africa as the conclusions and recommendations on findings for each objective will be within the context to be highlighted.

It is generally known that South Africa has high rates of unemployment, inequality and poverty. Burger and Woolard (2005) profile the employment trends in South Africa for the period between 1995 and 2002. These factors have earlier been profiled well by Bhorat (2004) in his paper on the trends in the employment.

Bhorat (2004) and Burger and Woolard (2005) highlight that even when the South African economy is growing, it cannot create enough jobs to absorb new job seekers that enter the job market. Indirectly, this information quashes the view that the economy has a jobless growth. To put it in other words, only 40 per cent of the new job seekers to the labour market would find jobs. This information traces the causes for an indefinite problem of unemployment in South African and it, somehow, explains why the problem of unemployment persists. In 2002, the unemployment rate, based on an expanded definition of unemployment was 41 per cent and this was higher when compared to the figure of 30 per cent in 1995. “In 1995, the unemployment
rate for Africans was 37%, whereas the unemployment rate for Whites was much lower at 6%” (Burger and Woolard, 2005: 9). “All four groups experienced large increases in their unemployment rates between 1995 and 2002, but since Africans comprise the largest part of the total population and have the highest unemployment rate, the bulk of the ‘newly’ unemployed (86%) were African” (Burger and Woolard, 2005: 9).

Another aspect influencing the labour market in South Africa is the historical racial exclusion of Africans in the economy of South Africa. In fact, racial exclusions underpin all matters relating to the labour market in South Africa. The exclusion of African persons in the economy is more apparent in the labour market than any other sector. The population of the unemployed is largely composed of Africans.

Again, the historical racial exclusion of Africans is also evident in the skilling of the African people. Burger and Woolard (2005) point out that having completed secondary or some form of tertiary education alleviates the chances of being unemployed. According to the report by Burger and Woolard (2005) Africans remain at the bottom of the list when comparing the list of skilled workers according to race. Only five per cent of Africans were skilled in 2002 and this was so even in 1995. Using the same criteria, Whites have increased the pool of skilled workers from 23 per cent in 1995 to 33 per cent in 2002. It is an obvious fact that skilled workers earn better remuneration, benefits and opportunities.
Skill composition of employment, by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5:1- Skills composition of employment, by race*  
*Source: adapted from Burger and Woolard (2005)*

Furthermore, these factors influence the inequality profile amongst races, Africans being the worst affected. Burger and Woolard (2005) also note that there is an emerging graduate unemployment problem and this is commonly found in the education and training graduates. In South Africa there is a large supply of low- and unskilled labour, which trade theory predicts would result in specialisation in the production of goods relying heavily on the use of this type of labour. It may be worth noting that the province (of KwaZulu-Natal) in which this institution (University of KwaZulu-Natal) is based had the second highest unemployment rate at 47 per cent in 2002 (Burger and Woolard, 2005).

It is also worth-noting that the labour market in South Africa has experienced a shift towards the service sector. This may render some skills offered by workers obsolete. Another shift and increase in the labour market players has been that of a significant increase in females in the labour market. Figures show that “although the male labour force grew at an average annual rate of 3.5 per cent, the female labour force grew twice as fast” (Burger and Woolard, 2005: 5).
The above outlines what was the state of labour market in 2002. It is not surprising to note that none of these problems have changed, towards a positive state even in 2011. Results of Census 2011 reveal that unemployment is still rife. Here are the highlights of the labour market from the 2011 Census:

National labour market results from Census 2011 (South Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>FIGURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>51 770 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>13 180 077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Age</td>
<td>33 238 752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption rate</td>
<td>39,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICIAL DEFINITION**

| Unemployed                | 5 594 055  |
| Not Economically Active   | 14 464 620 |
| Labour Force              | 14 774 132 |
| Unemployment rate         | 9,8%       |

**EXPANDED DEFINITION**

| Unemployed                | 8 779 621  |
| Not Economically Active   | 11 279 054 |
| Labour Force              | 21 959 698 |
| Unemployment rate         | 40,0%      |

Table 5:2- National labour market results from Census 2011, South Africa  
5.3 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.3.1 Objective One: Establishing the role played by the organisation’s image in attracting and retaining staff in a higher education institution (Personal View)

Conclusion:
A conclusion that may be drawn from these findings is that from the limited sample of responses, staff at the institution has a less positive view about the institution they work for. Academics, especially senior lecturers, seemed to be a group that has less positive perception of the institution. It has been argued in Chapter Two of this research report that, key to positive organisational image and good organisation’s reputation is its stakeholders, especially employees.

Recommendation/s:
The institution may at some point need to improve on its image and reputation amongst certain groups of staff. This recommendation is made with a qualified statement in that there has been only eight per cent responses rate. Therefore, the recommendation would be constrained in making further generalisation to the whole population.

5.3.2 Objective Two: identify job-career path factors that are considered influential in talent management (Job Satisfaction and Career Path)

Conclusion:
A trend amongst different categories of respondents is that respondents were generally positive about the nature of their work, i.e. is challenging and meaningful. There may be differences in some categories of respondents, however, the overall impression is that there were a positive job satisfaction and career path.
**Recommendation/s:**
The University may need to attend to issues of job satisfaction in some categories of staff, especially, technical staff. This recommendation must also be qualified in that there was a far less responses from technical staff. This makes it in impossible to a conclusive recommendation on matters relating to technical staff.

5.3.3 Objective Three: identity elements involved in the creation of the organisational image (General Image)

**Conclusion:**
A conclusion that may be drawn is that potential employees would like to see the company or organisation that they work for having a positive image. Results indicated that, in general, respondents were very positive about the general image that the institution has. There is a unanimous agreement in the responses received that the general image of the University is more positive than any other facets of this research. This means that respondents believed that general image had some impact on their decision to take up the position at the University or remain in their current institution. This means that issues such as ecological and social, financial soundness of the institution, an institution’s vision are important in attracting the potential talent and in retaining employees.

**Recommendation/s:**
The University needs to keep up a good general image in order to attract and retain talent. These factors may seem distanced from talent management, however, there is unequivocal response that these are associated with good talent management tenets.
5.3.4 Objective Four: investigate factors considered by potential academics when applying or taking up a position at a particular university (Opportunities and Rewards)

Conclusion:
The overall impression is that respondents were generally less positive in this sub-scale. This may be interpreted as saying that respondents stayed in their current positions despite a lack of adequate salary for the job they do. Within this sub-scale, it is interesting to note that respondents felt that their retirement savings were adequate. It may be that some aspects of remuneration are not adequate. There were also differences amongst different categories of staff as well.

Recommendation/s:
There seems to be a need to have tremendous intervention around issues of opportunities and rewards. Respondents gave an unequivocal response in relation to issues of opportunities and rewards. The rewards and opportunities may not require improvements, but the information and communication to staff around this issue may not be adequate.

5.4 CONCLUSION

The objective of this research work was to find factors relating to organisational image that may affect the process of talent management. While it appears that respondents rated the items measuring Objective One (Personal View) in a less positive light, the aggregate responses on Objective Two (Job Satisfaction and Career Path) and Objective Three (General Image) were positive. It seems that issues of general image and job satisfaction and career path are critical for respondents to take a post and/or be associated with a particular institution. Whether Opportunities and Rewards are adequate or not, that may be a secondary issue to staff or potential job applicants. This is signified by a less positive response in items for these two sub-scales.
In all sub-scales, one factor remained common which is that males and females did not differ significantly in any of the scales. This may be interpreted as that any intervention in terms of improving the image of the organisation may not be differentiated according to gender. In a light interpretation, males and females feel that they are being treated equally.

5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Patterns suggest that senior lecturers were less positive in all the sub-scales of the instruments. Following that pattern were the Whites who also seem to rank their responses low in most of the sub-scales. Another pattern worth mentioning is that for academic staff who were in the faculties of Education, Humanities, Engineering and Science and Agriculture. It may prove difficult to manage talent in these spheres of the institution. Therefore, it may be worth a study to look at the factors affecting image, job satisfaction and career path and opportunities and rewards amongst these segments of the population. In that way, several other factors that may compound problems would be avoided. Problems such as turnover, low productivity and so forth would be reduced, if not eliminated.

5.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

While results of this study may not be generalised to other settings, it is worth mentioning that Senior Lecturers need attention as their responses have come up as less positive. This group is critical to the survival of the institution in a sense that their age allows them to change jobs and geographical location much easier than other groups. It is group that has ambitions to move towards higher ranks in academia and they have the expertise and/or the potential to do that. Failure to retain such a group could mean that talent management processes are disturbed and the reputation of the institution and its ability to provide quality education might be at stake.
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This questionnaire is divided into **THREE sections**. All sections are mandatory, except where it is not applicable to one’s situation. Participants are kindly requested to answer this questionnaire, your time taken and participation in this research activity will be highly appreciated.

**SECTION 1**

Section 1 contains statements requiring you to select (fill in, where applicable) the information that best describes you and relates to your biographical, education and general employment history details.

**1.1 BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

1.1.1 Gender:
   a) Male
   b) Female

1.1.2 Race:
   a) African
   b) Coloured
   c) Indian/Asian
   d) White

1.1.3 Please indicate your age

1.1.4 Please indicate your highest qualification you have obtained:
   a) PhD / doctoral
   b) Specialist (including registration with statutory bodies)
   c) Master’s degree
   d) 4 year or more bachelor’s degree
   e) An Honours degree
   f) A bachelor’s degree
   g) A national diploma
   h) A post-matric certificate
   i) A matriculation / Senior Certificate / Grade 12

1.1.5 Staff category:
   a) Academic
   b) Support
   c) Technical
### 1.2 GENERAL INFORMATION

Please indicate the information that is best applicable to you.

**Campus you are based:**

| a) Edgewood | b) Howard College | c) Medical School | d) Pietermaritzburg | e) Westville |

**FOR ACADEMIC STAFF**

1.2.1 Faculty in which you are lecturing in:

| a) Health Sciences | b) Medical School | c) Law | d) Management Studies | e) Science and Agriculture | f) Engineering | g) Education | h) Humanities |

1.2.2 Years of lecturing (all lecturing experience including experience outside your current institution)

1.2.3 Number of years lecturing at this University:

1.2.4 Your academic title:

| a) Senior Professor / Professor | b) Associate Professor | c) Senior Lecturer | d) Lecturer | e) Senior Tutor / Tutor |

**FOR SUPPORT STAFF**

1.2.5 Division/College you are working in:

| a) College of Agriculture, Engineering and Science | b) College of Health Sciences | c) College of Humanities |
1.2.6 Your Peromnes grade

**SECTION 2**

Section 2 contains statements that describe the extent to which one may perceive one's current employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1= strongly disagree</th>
<th>2= disagree</th>
<th>3= neutral</th>
<th>4= agree</th>
<th>5= strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>I have always had a good impression of my current employer (institution).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>The current employer has a good reputation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>In my opinion, the University has a good image in the minds of students, staff and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>If I needed better career opportunities now, my current institution would be my first choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>I believe that the University has a better image than its competitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>In general, I believe that the University always fulfills the promises it makes to its students, staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>I believe that the reputation of my current institution is better than other universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>I will continue to do business with the current institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>I would recommend my current employer as the best employer institution in the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>I believe that the image of my current University played a role in my decision to join it as its employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>The reputation of my current employer has played a role in considering it for employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12) The University’s image has played a role in continuing employment services at this University.

13) I would encourage friends and relatives to consider employment at this institution.

SECTION 3

Section 3 contains statements which may express the extent you agree or disagree with.

How would you consider the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The University:</th>
<th>1= strongly disagree</th>
<th>2= disagree</th>
<th>3= neutral</th>
<th>4= agree</th>
<th>5= strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) gives jobs to people with talent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) offers possibility for a faster career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) treats employees fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) encourages job/post changes within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) gives me enough recognition and acknowledgement for what I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) offers me the right salary package based on my experience and qualifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) offers benefits that are sufficient for my retirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) considers ecological responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) gives serious consideration of social affairs (e.g. HIV/AIDS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) is financially sound/healthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) has frequent improvement on processes, and/or services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) can be regarded as a leading higher education institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) gives challenging job/post.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>offers work variation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>has various international units and/or clients which provide interaction to academic staff that is beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>offers a possibility of an international career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>makes information concerning the institution widely accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>offers a stable working environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>promotes collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>has prominent individuals from the society associated with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>has graduates who are successful and/or make a positive impact in the society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>is located in a friendly city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>has the right leadership (executive management) lead it to new frontiers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>has sufficiently provided me with means and resources to conduct research activities of high scholarly work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>has vision statement (to be the Premier University of African Scholarship) that appeals to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: TURNITIN REPORT