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Abstract

North West University is a creation of one of many mergers between previous universities in South Africa. The process is partly thought to integrate previous advantaged and disadvantaged universities, often also previous white or black dominated universities.

Even though the merger of NWU has been perceived as successful by many, there are still problems and tensions between the campuses. This report will describe the integration process at NWU as well as handle people’s perceptions towards it and towards the changes brought by the merger. The study has been done through thematic open interviews by staff, management and students at two of the three campuses in the merger of NWU, Mafikeng and Potchefstroom. In our report we have found six clusters which we examine; responses to the merger, within and outside group, differences, history, social status, and within and outside process.

All through the report the traces from history and Apartheid are still visible in people’s minds and in the clashes between the groups. History also affects the social status of the groups, affects that today create problems for integration.

The merger was opposed by both parts, however inevitable. People from Mafikeng were found more critical to the merger, highlighting the different power relations between the campuses and fear of being swallowed by Potchefstroom. Potchefstroom in general did not see many changes and white people seem to be more worried about their individual future.

Once united as one university there is still a low grade of integration or interaction between the campuses and between the groups within them. There have been initiatives to enhance integration at an organizational level, this has though not affected the social level in a significant way. One reason to the lack of integration might be the domination of one culture group at each campus, at Potchefstroom Afrikaans, and at Mafikeng SeTswana. This domination has shown to hinder integration since minority groups either feel left out or have to assimilate to fit in. Differences between the groups also create misunderstandings and clashes in the integration process. However we have seen that the persons within the merger process tend to be more positive than the people outside of it. This might be due to increased interaction, better information and a possibility to affect the outcome that makes the people involved more positive then the ones not involved.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

Since the end of Apartheid and the construction of the new constitution there has been a strive in South Africa to mend the previous separation among people of different races. This process has also affected the school system where schools now are obliged to accept students of all races into their organization. Schools have a specific role in this strive since they are a part of and a minimization of the society in which they are situated, but also contain a possible and often assumed transforming power, by for example their domination of knowledge. (Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.383)

Due to the Minister of Education’s plan to rearrange the higher education in South Africa the former universities in Potchefstroom and Mafikeng did 2004 merge and became two out of three separate campuses under The North West University. (North-West University: 1)

“...both of the former universities accepted the inevitable and decided to make a success of the merger. The then universities realised the reconciling role this new institution could play and the obligation it had to the people in South Africa in fulfilling its role as a new, truly South African University.” (North-West University: 1)

This indicates that the North West University has the expectation of a successful integration between its campuses. But has the merger been a success? Has there been an improvement in the integration within the campuses and among them? These issues are what we want to investigate during our field study.

Mafikeng and Potchefstroom have their different racial composition. Mafikeng, both as city and campus, has a majority of black people and was a historical black university. Potchefstroom is a former white university as well as the city is largely influenced by white Afrikaans speaking people. Mafikeng and Potchefstroom are the two biggest campuses at the North West University.

Statistics from the NWU homepage says that year 2008 overall at the North West University there are 47% Black students, 4% Coloured, 1% Asian, and 48% White students. Thus the two campuses have different features regarding students enrolled in the education. Potchefstroom has a somewhat more even division between black and white students. Mafikeng on the other hand has a larger concentration of black students. There is also a difference in the number of students where Potchefstroom have 19803 students, and Mafikeng only have 6605 students, as of 3rd of April 2008. From this it is obvious that the two campuses have very different patterns. (North-West University: 2-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2008</th>
<th>NWU total</th>
<th>Potchefstroom</th>
<th>Mafikeng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We hope through our research to shed some light on the complex contexts and factors that might affect integration and on possible process problems and solutions to integration matters. Integration between people of different cultural groups is a present situation in most countries today and not least in South Africa. Therefore is research about integration important not only for developing countries.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain more knowledge about the depth, scoop and pace of the integration process in South Africa. More specific the depth, scoop and pace of the integration process at the North West University.

Questions

1. How do students, teachers and staff at NWU perceive their situation before and after the merger?
   - What changes do individuals notice and bring forward? How has the changes affected people’s perception both within and between the campuses?

2. What patterns can be found in the integration process?
   - What attitudes have individuals towards this process?
Chapter 2 - Analytical framework

We have chosen to use an analytical framework for this study, which means that we have combined some theories and methods in order to create an analytical framework that is suited for our research objective. Our field is a complex mixture of attitudes and actions from different actors; no single theory is broad enough to cover all aspects. Our analytical framework is put in a methodological approach based mainly on the ethnographic method.

This study was carried out in a qualitative and abductive tradition and as said based on ethnographic methods. Our analytical framework served as a guide in our practical research and analysis. Abduction is a methodological approach that lies in between the deductive and inductive tradition. It means that we can detect or draw conclusions about structures that are not presented in the empirical data. Our conclusion or findings gives a new insight into the phenomena that are examined, presupposed that our frame of interpretation is correct. However an abductive method can lead to a number of different conclusions and interpretations, where ours are only one out of many. Abduction is showing how something could be, instead of showing how it must be. This means that we in our report, from the empirical data found in our interviews, give them meaning in a larger structure about the situation at the North West University. We interpreted the data into codes that led us to a conclusion we found trustworthy. We can however never prove one single truth or answer in our report. (Danermark etc. 2003, p. 180-185)

The starting point of this report and the two main theories used are Allport’s Contact Theory and Blumer’s Interactionism. Contact theory was chosen due to its relevance in studying prejudice, integration and tensions between groups. An additional reason was that the theory has been applied in the educational field earlier by Moody. Interactionism is dealing with issues regarding more basic human functions and was therefore chosen, as well as its compatibility with contact theory.

Before presenting the theories further, the practical method is elaborated on.

2.1 Practical method

2.1.1 The field

The 10th of November 2007 our travel started towards South Africa and the North West University. Totally we spent 6 weeks in the region, 5 weeks in Potchefstroom and 1 week at Mafikeng. We performed interviews with staff and students at both campuses and the institutional office, entirely 45 interviews was conducted. We stayed in houses provided by the university on campus in both cities. Since the university soon after our arrival was closing for the summer the first week was spent interviewing students and some staff at Potchefstroom and the week after was spent performing all interviews at Mafikeng. The remaining weeks we remained in Potchefstroom collecting facts about the university,
performing more interviews, writing interview transcripts and analyzing. During weekends and free time we socialized with people around us and explored the environment. Almost every day we wrote down observations made. During our interviews and in conversations people were friendly and answered our questions easily and openly.

Our pre-understanding of the situation at the North West University was very limited. The information that had reached us beforehand was through the universities homepage and from one staff member at our university in Sweden that had visited the NWU earlier. Our knowledge of South Africa as a country was slightly larger, for example somewhat information about the former Apartheid system, Nelson Mandela and the countries history. Though none of us had visited the country before or possessed any specific experience regarding the situation.

2.1.2 Interviews

Performing interviews are a good way to get first hand information, especially in this research when our aim was to study how people perceived their own situation. An interview is as much other verbal interaction a form of conversation. The interviews differ from a regular conversation in the way that the roles are predefined; one is the “interviewer” and the other the “interviewed”. The predefined roles give two problems; (1) the power balance is different. This can be eased if the interviewer is aware of the problem and with this knowledge making the interviewed feel more relaxed. Being aware of this, our interviews have for example mostly been done in the setting of the interviewed or chosen by these persons which we believe contributes to minimizing differences in the power relations. (2) the interviewers questions are limited of the knowledge he possess in general and the amount of knowledge he has of the field. The problem can get smaller with a more open interview even if some areas, limitations and bigger questions must be outlined. (Aspers 2007, p.134-136)

In the light of this we have chosen to use a thematic open interview technique. A thematic open interview is open in the sense that the interviewer during the whole interview seeks to develop the conversation with the interviewed, but structured in the sense that the interviewer has determined a number of themes that should be dealt with. The themes can be connected with the theory but by letting the interviewed talk more freely and ask wide questions the theory is not in focus. The wide questions should try to make the person interviewed open up and involved in a discussion. Concrete questions are often better because it is easier for people to talk about. The ultimate is that the interviewer only has to follow up with questions like “How do you mean?” and so on. In this way the interviewer only determine the interview by bringing forward some aspects of what the interviewed is saying and leaving some behind. (Aspers 2007 p.137-142)

Our interviews have been conducted with help of questions but we have rarely used them as they are written. We have opened up with a question about the merger and if the interviewed has seen any changes due to it. What follows depend on the person interviewed, but we try to bring all our themes in to the interview by directing them in different directions and by asking large questions about the different themes. In Appendix 2 there is presented an overview of the themes. The precise questions differ from interview to interview according to what position he or she has and so on. The amount
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and how specific our questions were also differed according to how open the person interviewed was. One general tendency that we saw was that the students needed more guidance then teachers and staff. This means that these interviews were more structured and that they were more guided after our questions.

There are of course also complexities in this interview approach and method. The interaction between the interviewer and the interviewed always create some sort of relation between the two parties and that relation will have some form of meaning to the two. The interaction will be a part of the interpretation of the interview and the interviewer can by being there and how he acts affect the outcome; this do not have to be a problem as long as the parties understand each other. The interviewer should rather be open and interested then neutral. (Aspers 2007 p.138-139) Since the questions we researched about might be quite sensitive at times it was even more important not to let our own opinion shine through, and we tried to encourage the interviewed in his or her reflections. An interested approach was a must in order to make people talk about these subjects.

Occasionally we conducted our interviews with more than one person at the time. Especially students were often interviewed together with 1 or 2 friends. We approached students at and around campus and by choosing this technique many students were at the time accompanied. We do not believe this approach interferes with our findings in any vast way: students grouping together often already know each other and we approached them in an environment where they felt safe. Some students may have held back their own view, on the other hand others seemed to be more outspoken and discussed issues among themselves etc. Furthermore, at one occasion staff members were interviewed in groups. For our part this was not the plan but at one time the persons interviewed misunderstood our requests or felt they did not have time in any other way. Two teachers were as well approached at campus and interviewed in a pair.

In the interviews we have often used triangulation. This means that we tried to confirm or disconfirm information that we have heard from one person by asking another if they knew about this matter. For example: “We have heard that some people are concerned about finding a job when they are finished with their education, how do you feel about that?” or “Have you seen any changes?”: “No?, Haven’t there been new residences built?” etc. By this we get the information confirmed, get more insight in the matter or conclude that the perception was not an overall view. Because of our often wide questions that could give many different answers we sometimes felt that, as well as getting all views, we needed to get more specific answers. This means that the questions usually got more specific and altered when we got deeper in to our research and possessed more information. Interesting answers was for example given when we asked management about topics that the students brought forward. This method also has its difficulties and backsides. One is that the questions can guide the answers given by the persons interviewed. We have tried to not let this happen by asking questions of triangulating nature later in every theme or interview and first let the person answer freely. The answers have differed but many times the answer from the interviewed also opposed our question. Another difficulty is of ethical nature. It is the question of how much you can reveal of your collected data without hurting the persons already interviewed. We have tried to use the method with care. For example; not only take one
single person’s view and turn it in to a question, ask a more open question in the matter, not easily use this method over campus lines and so on.

The transcription of the interviews contains some quotes but is more of a description of what was said in the interview. We did not believe that writing the interview exactly would change the outcome or contribute further in any fruitful way to the understanding of our research. The actual words used are not always relevant to our findings and when they are relevant we wrote them as quotes in the actual paper or transcript. We also added if a person was using irony, laughter or different voices to establish a meaning if this was relevant. Even gestures or our notices are sometimes submitted in the transcription if they highlight the situation. This are though divided from what was actually said in the way that they were written in italic. These sections are the researcher’s own reflections and should be seen as interpretations. The researcher can not base his findings on feelings or observations during interviews that are not part of the empirical data. (Aspers 2007 p.149) We are often leaving out our own questions or inputs in the transcript because we feel that our questions are off less importance, it is the answers that give us the base of our analyse. We are aware that questions do play a role in the outcome of the answer and did therefore at times write down our participation and contribution in the transcript. To highlight in this issue is that there are always sound files, which is our real empirical data, to go back and listen to. The transcripts are written in Swedish, with English quotes.

When it comes to references and anonymity we have been allowed to use the names of almost all key-persons in the report, expressed by the persons themselves. The facts and quotes were carefully interpreted and written down in the transcripts in order to avoid any mistakes. Due to the sensitive subject of our research we tried to use as few names as possible and were careful when using them. Naming plenty of individuals and tie those to quotes will not contribute enough to our study to jeopardize or possibly enhance tensions. Interviewed students are not named, except at some occasions were students act as key-persons. We have also experienced, especially at Mafikeng, that some students were more reluctant to give us their names then in Potchefstroom. After some interviews we stopped asking for names because we experienced that the students seemed more at ease not mentioning them and that we, at that point, already decided not to use the student’s names in the paper.

References to interviews are done according to a number and letter system. The letters stands for P-Potchefstroom, M-Mafikeng and I-Institutional management, to show where the person interviewed belong. A number is given to each interview since we are not using or know all names of the persons interviewed. For example M1, P20 and I2. In the analyse the references of interviews are given in the end of each paragraph and at times in the text. The general pattern is that the analyse follows the references, with a break in between. At page 110 there is a list of all interviews: listed after the number and letter system, but with name or position at the university, race and gender.

When it comes to culture groups we often in our discussions generalize and refer to the groups “black” and “white” or Afrikaans, SeTswana, English or other black cultures. Since the Apartheid system and statistics today are divided in to the culture groups, white, black, Asian and colored, this division is as well present in our report. On the other hand the groupings used by us are also the ones used by most interviewed persons and are the culture groups mostly present at the university.
2.1.3 Observation

In the purpose of finding something about people’s means, interpretation of life and the world they live in, you have to study their “media”. Usually we think of language as media but also pictures and practice. (Aspers 2007, p.38) Based on this we, together with the interviews, also performed observations to fulfil our purpose and to make the result more comprehensive. For example, people often say one thing but do another. Observations are done by participating in activities of the objects studied, asking what they are doing, their opinion and interpretation. Through the interpretation process we gradually understood the social life that was studied. Also through what we, the researcher saw, heard, felt and so on. Observations are vital in themselves; examples are descriptions of body language, observations about whom is taking decision in a group, how people address each other, differences in clothing. Observations can also lead to that the interviews and the interview questions provide more depth to the research, this because the background and understanding of the field becomes greater. The observations were written down in field notes, this makes it easier for us as researchers to study them, reflect over and analyze what we have observed, from a distance and from a different and overall perspective. This technique is usually associated with cultural anthropology but is also used widely in other areas of social science. (Aspers 2007 p.103-109, 119-121)

A difficult part is not to let your own experience take over instead of the object’s view. We were aware of this troublesome matter but considered the positive effects to be larger. Also by knowing this possible bias it was easier to recognize and avoid it. Another critic against this technique is that the researcher has to be able to take part of the subject’s activities but not become a part of them, not take the role of the subject. This was less of a problem for us because our duration in the field was relatively short. Notable is also that the observations are not empirical data in themselves; this because they reflect the researcher’s view and the theory used. (Aspers 2007 p.103-105, 121) Our observations, as the interview transcripts, are written in Swedish. We wrote more observations in the beginning of our research time, this is the time you tend to notice more details. Later our observations became fewer and perhaps slightly deeper.

2.1.4 Limitations

One limitation that we would like to bring forward is the fact that the empirical world never can be captured in its true form. Blumer puts it like this; “Reality for empirical science exists only in the empirical world, can be sought only there, and can be verified only there.” (Blumer 1969, p.22) He means that we can never find true answers to our questions about the empirical world but that we should see science as a collective quest for these answers. (Blumer 1969, p.22-23) For this reason we would like to stress that our work is not the reality or it can not be generalized for the whole of South Africa or all Whites respective Blacks.

When leaving for South Africa we had planned a group exercise. It was not able to proceed due to lack of students available and also due to the fact that most students at Mafikeng did not have that much experience of socializing with white students. We chose to bring some of the questions meant for the group exercise into the regular interviews instead.
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At Mafikeng we found that there were posters noting our arrival and presence. The notes mainly encouraged people to accept interviews with us. This could have affected people’s attitudes, perhaps to a more favorable view of the situation at the campus. We do not however believe that this affected our research due to that we experienced as open and honest answers to our questions. These answers were not always in favor of the campus or the merger.

As well we only conducted our research at two out of three of North West University’s campuses; we did not investigate the integration at Vaal triangle in Vanderbiljpark mostly due to our limited time in field and size of our research.

2.1.5 Selection

The selection of interviews was made based on amount of time as well as relevance for the study. The total amount of empirical data collected was determined both by our limited stay in our field, the degree of difficulty to find interview persons and satiation.

The interviews with teachers, staff and representatives of different organizations were deeper and more detailed. This was because we believed that these people, chosen because of their profession and specific knowledge could contribute to the study in a useful and diverse way.

The methods we used for our selection is partly the snowball selection, which means that by using the field and persons in it, one can find cases or persons with the knowledge and characteristics that we are looking for. One of the disadvantages with this selection method is that it tends to articulate persons of a specific group or environment. (Aspers, 2007, p. 91) One way to go around this problem was to ask many persons for suggestions and also by asking for persons with different and specific features. This led us to also use role relative perspective and a strategic selection. (Aspers, 2007, p. 92) Here we have focused on interview persons with different rank, title, profession, race, views and area of knowledge in order to broaden the picture of the research. There is a potential negative effect in choosing key-persons in organizations and among staff, especially where persons have been recommended to us, as earlier stated. We do however believe that we, within the frame of the organization, have been able to sort out persons to cover many different attitudes within the organization. For students the selection was at times random in the way that we approached them at or around campus, but this also falls under strategic selection in the way that we approached different ages, gender, races and at different places around or off the campus.

Non-response, fall off or negative reply from our asked interview persons was 17 of totally 62 asked. Most of the fall off from students was due to studying for exams or otherwise tight time limits. One student did not speak English, only Afrikaans, and for this reason an interview was impossible. Fall offs from students was totally 13 and from staff 4. The staff’s reasons were as well lack of time or willingness etc.
2.1.6 Coding

Our coding process began already after a few interviews in the way that we tried to see patterns in the answers. The patterns slowly grew and changed gradually after more interviews were collected. After all interviews were put into transcripts we selected a few and carefully read them with the purpose of distinguishing patterns. Some patterns were already noticed during interviewing and some were new. In our case, finding defined patterns or clusters was hard due to the complex nature of our subject. A few larger patterns were detected and form our codes. The codes are: within and outside group, dominant culture & assimilation, responses to the merger, social status, history and within and out of process. After establishing the codes and their general content we gave each code a color, colors which we later on used to highlight the parts in the interview transcripts that belonged to a special code. Next step was to analyze our codes. We analyzed each code one by one, by reading and finding smaller patterns in the parts highlighted with that special code’s color. Some codes are very long, others shorter and with smaller clusters. Though some parts highlighted (examples, views etc.) later on turned out to be more suitable in other codes and therefore moved. This we do not see as a bad outcome since the process of analyzing was yet not finished. Highlighting was merely a way to organize our large material.

All sequences in the interviews used in the analyze are now marked with one color. This because the former system, with the amount of colors used, could easily seem confusing and become difficult to understand for an evaluator. As well because we moved many highlighted parts between the codes. For that matter, in each interview an evaluator can at present see what sections of the interview we have used in our analyze, though not to which part of the analyze it is used.

2.2 Interactionism

Here we will start to discuss and explain our theories. The theory of interactionism deals with some basic issues of the human being, issues of how a person perceives the world and how interaction between humans functions. The base of Herbert Blumer’s theory interactionism or symbolic interactionism can be laid out in three steps.

1. “…Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have to them.” – These include physical objects, other human beings, institutions, guiding ideals, activities of others.
2. The meaning of such things come out of or arise from social interactions with other people
3. The meaning influence and modifies the interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounter.

(Blumer, 1969 p.2)

These steps mean that the reality does not have a purpose in itself, instead it is what people themselves create that give them the tools and ways to interpret and understand the world around them. (Aspers 2007, p.45) Blumer mean, as many others, that our
understanding and interpretation of the world affect our actions and behaviour. What stands out according to him is step number two. Blumer and symbolic interactionism believe that the source of the understanding and meaning come from interaction between people. The meaning of a thing grows, for example, out of how other people act towards you in relation to this thing. Meaning is in other words social produced. The opposite belief is that things have a meaning in themselves and that meaning can not be altered or that the meaning is created by the person for whom the thing has meaning. The third step in interactionism gives that interaction can alter the interpretation and give new meaning to things. Blumer dived this in to two steps; first the person decides which things have meaning and what that meaning is by interacting with himself, secondly the person select, suspects, checks, regroup and change the meaning of these things according with new situations and direction of his actions. (Blumer 1969, p.2-5)

Symbolic interactionism’s view of some base concepts of society are here presented shortly;

**Human society and group life** – are consisting of human beings who are engaging in action singly, collectively or on behalf of the group. Two examples are culture as a concept and social structure that both derived from actions; for example customs, traditions, values, rules in culture and status, authority and prestige in social structure all spring form what people do and act toward each other. (Blumer 1969, p.6-7)

**Social interaction** – In group life and society the members have to interact. Many take this interaction for granted and are instead more interested in status position, culture, sanctions, roles, social system, attitudes, motives and so on. Blumer mean that the social interaction in itself is important and that social interaction is an interaction between actors and not between factors put to them. Interaction reforms the interaction; by interacting people have to take into account the action of the person they interact with and alter their own action. George Herbert Mead and Blumer make a difference between non-symbolic interaction and symbolic interaction (here using Blumer’s choice of word). Non-symbolic interaction is when we respond to an action without first interpreting that action, symbolic interaction is when we first interpreter someone’s action and then respond to it. The symbolic interaction gives that we respond according to the meaning the action gives us. The one that act also has a meaning with the action, it is when these two meaning are the same we understand each other. During this process human beings also have to take each others roles, this so one indicates what the other person should do. For example, the robber says to the victim “raise your hands”. (Blumer 1969, p.7-10)

**Objects** – according to symbolic interactionism there are three categories of objects; 1 – physical objects, 2 – social objects such as students, priests, mother, 3 – abstract objects such as morals, principles and ideas. An object is something that can be indicated or referred to. The meanings of objects can alter from different people and are social creations. (Blumer 1969, p.10-12) “…people may be living side by side yet be living in different worlds.” (Blumer 1969, p.11)

**Human being as an acting organism** – As said a human being can interpret other people’s actions, because the human has a “self”. In other words he can be an object to himself, for example a student, teacher or mother. People take different roles in different situations and therefore alter their approach and actions. A person can because of this address and interact with himself, one example is when you think you have done
something wrong or when a little girl play “mother” and act like her own mother. (Blumer 1969, p.12-15)

*Human action* – is constructed and guided from the person himself after interpreting the world. The motives that are considered are for example; wishes and wants, availability for their achievements, his objectives, actions of others, his image of himself, and the likely result of a give line of action. (Blumer 1969, p.15-16)

*Group action* – in short Blumer means that joint actions are build on the individual’s (in the group) mutual, recurrent and constant meanings. Repeated group actions are as much a result of an interpretation process as a new group action. An organization or institution Blumer means are also built up by individuals that by using given sets of meanings and by people acting on their interpretations of the situation. The interpretation people make as a group, are always made in the shadow of the group’s history and background. (Blumer 1969, p.16-20)

### 2.3 The Contact theory

If we compare Blumer’s interactionism and its basic premises with Allport’s Contact Theory we consider Contact Theory to be based on the same basic assumptions about how humans build up their reality. Contact theory was developed by Allport (1954) in his book, *The nature of Prejudice*. The theory is based on the notion that “contact between groups under optimal conditions could effectively reduce intergroup prejudice”. The theory contains four important characteristics for the contact situation to be optimal. These are; 1) equal status between the groups in the situation 2) common goals 3) intergroup cooperation 4) support of authorities, law or custom. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 752)

Pettigrew and Tropp take their starting point from Allport’s contact theory and his four characteristics. Institutional support is seen as extra important for a positive contact effect, even though all the conditions should be seen as interdependent of each other for a positive outcome. But instead of considering Allport’s optimal conditions as essential, they believe they facilitate prejudice reduction in a relevant way, but that diminishing prejudice within a group is possible even without all of the conditions fulfilled. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 753, 766) This is also where we have our starting point, and why we choose to elaborate and to combine the quite narrative theory with other theories in order to have a broader spectrum.

**Critique**

Allport’s contact theory has met some critique. One of the most common critiques is that the reduction of prejudice within the group may not be possible to generalize to outgroups. There is also the risk that contact under unfavourable conditions may instead increase prejudice and tension within the group. It has also been shown that even if intergroup contact may lower the prejudice at a personal level it has failed to do so at a group level, which would mean that contact may lower individual prejudice but not necessarily group conflict. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 752) Intergroup is in this case refers to a group of people having something in common that keep the group together and
keep others out of the group (the outgroup). In our context this could mean for example a sport club, classroom, student organization etc. These groups may be racially mixed.

This critique has been met by Pettigrew and Tropp in their article. There is always a bias in the selection of people joining in a mixed group, where prejudiced people tend to keep away from such activities, and tolerant people tend to be more interested in meeting others. However there seems to be a slightly higher effect of reduction of prejudice if there is no choice in the participation compared to the voluntarily participation. This could indicate that even prejudiced people entering a group involuntarily have the ability to change attitudes. This might be a good starting point for us though the merger between the campuses can not be seen as voluntarily made by all people, but that attitudes towards it can change over time. Pettigrew and Tropp also show that intergroup contact extends beyond the immediate situation and could be shown to have a generalized effect even to outgroups. The attitude towards the closest participants become more favorable, which is also the case to the closest outgroups both connected and not connected to the situation. The favorable relationship between contact and prejudice is spreading among samples of different age groups, geographical areas and contact environments which give the contact theory relevance in a broader field and different contexts. Contact theory is highly relevant when studying group interactions even beyond the field of race and prejudice which has been the ground for the theory. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 753, 759, 766) Answering the critique in this way gives both intergroup contact and the contact theory a high relevance both for science and for our research.

One important feature in Pettigrew and Tropp’s article is that Allport’s theory mainly focuses on positive factors for intergroup contact, while the authors stress the importance to also look after negative factors, caused by intergroup anxiety, which could create a hindrance to the contact. This intergroup anxiety refers to feelings of threat and uncertainty that people might experience in intergroup contexts, and grow out of concern of how to act, how to be perceived and accepted. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 767)

2.3.1 We and Them

As a complement we preferred to also use a theory dealing with the individual’s group belonging. The individual’s group identity is vital from a “we” and “them” perspective. What group does a person consider himself to be a part of and where is he excluded? Where is the boarder to “the others”? Words like “we”, “them”, “here”, “there”, “at home” and so on can indicate what group you identify yourself with. To point out is that a person’s group identity can be different in different situations and circumstances. (Olausson 2006 p.331) An organization in “we” and “them” have a base in the human beings social-cognitive need to differ between ego and alter, the own group and other groups, to mentally bring order to life. Often the own group are described positively and the “others” negative. (Nohrstedt 2006 p. 259-260) We will use the “we and them” terminology and Allport’s intergroup and outgroup theory parallel, as they are connected and show division between groups in a number of ways.
2.3.2 Contact theory applied in a school frame

Due to our specific school environment we have chosen to bring James Moody’s view of Allport’s theory into our analytical framework, due to the fact that he has used the theory in a school environment. Moody has rearranged the four concepts created by Allport, to fit the school environment. Therefore he has put together the second and third concept.

First there need to be an equal status among the participants. There should not be any hierarchy, which is important and hard to fulfill in a former legislated racially segregated society as the South African. Secondly there need to be cooperative interdependence, which means that people “should be organized around a common goal that cannot be achieved independently”. Third there need to be explicit support for racial mixing from the authorities is the context, which in a school environment are teachers, administration, coaches etc. (Moody 2001, s. 687)

Moody has given extra focus to extracurricular activities. These activities are believed to bring people together in a cooperative informal way, which could have a “spill over” effect even in everyday life at school. (Moody 2001, s. 680) This is possible to compare to Pettigrew and Tropp’s discussion about the decreasing of prejudice in an intergroup that has shown to give a positive effect even to outgroups. (See beginning of contact theory)

Administrational level

The success of the contact theory, i.e. increased cross racial friendships, is dependent on the hierarchical structures and activities within the settings of contact. Moody highlights student mixing opportunity, school policy and cultural environment as factors being of importance in these structures and activities. Even the overall school organization is an important factor to bring people together, in ways to higher the probability of contact as well as social interaction. One of Allport’s criteria is also emphasizing the authorities’ role; (4) support of authorities, law or custom. However, even if there is a visual integration among people of different races in a school that does not mean that it could not be racially segregated internally. The school might have an overview at the administrational level, but might not fully recognize the behaviour and attitudes among students. (Moody 2001, s. 707, 680, 682)

Moody states that friendship segregation is at highest in moderately heterogeneous schools, and declines within schools of higher heterogeneous levels. To concentrate minorities in a larger school may cause friendship segregation due to the fact that people prefer friends similar to them and will choose friends of the same race if possible. On the other hand do many minority students create a better potential of cross-race friendship centered in a large school. In other words is it important that the school organization make sure that the minority students do not cling together. (Moody 2001, s 679-681)

One way to achieve this is to try to mix students of different grades, subjects etc. that rarely meet otherwise. This could for example be handled by arranging the academic schedules differently. Extracurricular activities such as clubs, sports, student organization etc. are also important factors, especially with authority policies outlining the rules.
This can be connected with Pettigrew and Tropp’s finding that controlled participation can be a useful way to create integration within a group.

2.4 Integration

In the truest form Vandeyar and Killen (2006) mean that integration “is a process whereby one interrogates the quality of contact not only in the personal attitudes of teachers and learners but also in the institutional arrangements, policies and ethos of the school”. (Vandeyar and Killen 2006, p 383 according to Sayed 2001, p.254)

Moody (2001) mean that friendship formation is a complex process that involves similarity, balance and status. Even though obvious constrains for interracial mixing might be removed, there might still be implicit hierarchies and a different situational status. Former studies have shown that people are most comfortable and likely to socialize with similar persons, boundaries present or not. (Moody, James, 2001, s. 688)

In our view Vandeyar and Killen and Moody all seem to mean that there are two levels of integration, organizational and social. We find a division between the two levels useful for our research and will here portray the two.

Organizational integration deals with how the structure, rules and authority impact and contribute to the integration process. Shortly we see organizational integration as when all persons have the same rights, opportunities, respect and influence inside and in situations connected to the organization. The members have these demands fulfilled by rules inside the organization but they must also be perceived fulfilled by the members themselves.

Social integration deals with the social settings and how the integration process looks like outside of an organized environment. Shortly we consider social integration to be when friendship and social interactions is no longer based on race, group or culture differences.

Do both these levels have to be fulfilled in order to have a successful integration? Does everyone have to become alike or can people be integrated as long as they accept each other but do not spend time together? Are people integrated when they are treated the same and have the same rights or do they have to socialize to be considered integrated? And who is to judge people’s choice of friends? The concept of integration is complex and widely debated. These vital questions do not have a clear or simple answer according to us, but by stating that integration is a multilevel concept and by dividing integration into these two main categories, organizational and social; we can still outline our standing point, use and discuss the concept. In our research we will work with these two categories parallel and separate.
2.4.1 Integration at a school level

The level of integration that schools are striving for give consequences for their educational approaches towards racism and prejudice;

- **Multicultural education** – strive to create equal educational opportunities for students from diverse racial, social-class, ethnic and cultural groups. It strives to help all students to receive knowledge, attitudes and skills to function in one society and interact. Function with all the different groups in this society so the society works for the common good. (Banks 2001; Gay 2000 from Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.383)

- **Anti-racist education** – “an action oriented strategy for institutional, system change to address racism and the interlocking systems of social oppression”. (Del 1996 p.25 from Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.383) This perspective says that you should not only oppose overt racism but also subtle racism, stereotypes and patronizing attitudes. (Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.383)

- **Critical anti-racism** – is an extension from anti-racist education and means that we need a more complex way of looking at racism and its way of showing itself. (Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.384)

2.5 Summary of the Analytical Framework

In an attempt to make it easier for the reader we will here first list the main concepts of our analytical framework. Secondly create a figure of how our theories are bind together.

**Interactionism** – shortly means that the meaning of things, objects, moral, organizations, persons, roles etc. are created from social interaction. A person acts towards things according to the meaning of it. The meanings can be modified, regrouped and changed during further social interaction.

**Contact Theory** - is based on the notion that “contact between groups under optimal conditions could effectively reduce intergroup prejudice”. The theory contains four characteristics designed for optimal contact. 1) equal status between the groups in the situation 2) common goals 3) intergroup cooperation 4) support of authorities, law or custom.

**Intergroup & outgroup** – an intergroup is a group where interaction between the different groups occur. For example the members of a meeting make an intergroup, the students in a classroom. The outgroup is all individuals not present in the specific intergroup.

**We & them** or we-group – a “we-group” is a group an individual consider himself to belong to and which “them” or “the others” do not fit in to. We mostly refer to a “we-group” as an individual’s culture group.

**Moody** - emphasizes student mixing opportunity, school policy and cultural environment as important factors for integration.
Organizational integration - deals with integration inside an arranged environment and how the structure, rules and authority impact and contribute to the integration process.

Social integration - handles the social settings and how the integration process looks like outside of an organized environment.

Here is an overview of our theories presented. The division between organisational and social integration is not a theory rather a way of levelling and grading integration and are therefore not included.

Figure 1
Chapter 3 - Background

Older history

By the end of the 16th century both Dutch and British entered South Africa and started a period of colonization. During the years there were power conflicts between the British and the Boer people (Afrikaans) that derived from the Dutch colonizers. These clashes ended up in the Boer war (1899) that caused the Boer people severe casualties. By the peace agreement the two former Boer republics lost their independency. A common constitution was created for the South African union in 1910, in which the black people received no political or civil rights. (Landguiden-Äldre Historia)

The defeat by the British constituted to bitterness and a growing gap between the two groups of people. In the beginning however there was a fundamental common interest in using the cheap labor of South Africa for mining and farming. In 1913 there was created a law that gave 87% of the land to the white minority and 13% of the land to the black majority of the South African inhabitants. The British dominated the industries and this created a white Afrikaans working-class. Thus there were not enough white workers to uphold the production, and the recruiting of black people to more qualified tasks created protests among the white workers. At the same time the division of land combined with the inequality of the union constitution awoke strong reactions among black leaders. They formed an organization, which later became the base of the African National Congress (ANC). The Dutch church formulated a race division theology which was picked up by the Nationalist Afrikaans party. The Nationalist party won the elections in 1948 and demanded a strict division of races – Apartheid. (Landguiden-Äldre Historia)

Apartheid

The apartheid period lasted from 1948-1994 when the first democratic elections were held. During the apartheid regime there was a strict division of black, coloured, Asian and white people. Black people were demanded to live at special places, Homelands. They could not move or go where they liked, nor travel on the same bus, go to the same store or school as whites etc. The massacre in Sharpeville in 1960 became a turning point, when police killed 69 black people who performed a peaceful demonstration. The ANC party was forbidden which led them underground where they started violent resistance. The regime forces fought the opposition hard and 1962 Nelson Mandela, leader for the ANC, was arrested. This followed by a salient political period from the opposition. At the same time some Afrikaans persons started to cooperate with the English speaking trade and industry forces. They were dissatisfied with the economical situation caused by the apartheid regime. Increased violence frightened foreign investors and the economical crisis deepened. Economic sanctions and demands for increased human right for the black people were formulated internationally. By 1989 the communist countries fell in the Eastern Europe, and the argument of not allowing the ANC due to its communist inspiration lost legitimacy. 1990 the ban against ANC was released and so also Nelson Mandela. The following years more and more of the former apartheid laws and policies were eased, violence was decreasing and negotiations were
formed. In 1994 the first free democratic election was held, and the ANC won a great victory, mostly based on black votes. Nelson Mandela became president, although the three major parties in the elections had agreed to formulate a coalition government till the next election 1999. A new constitution was created 1997 and Nelson Mandela was later replaced as president by Thabo Mbeki. (Landguiden-Modern Historia)

As of the 20th of August 2008, the ANC party still has the majority of the votes and Thabo Mbeki is still president, but no longer the ANC party leader. ANC party leader is Jacob Zuma and there has been turbulence around him regarding corruptions charges. Severe economic and social problems are still present and 2008 there was a wave of violence against immigrants from other African nations. Protests have been raised against the government’s inability to deal with the economic differences and the unemployment is still high. (Landguiden-Aktuell Politik)

3.1 Educational history

The Nationalist Party (represented by the Afrikaans population) decided 1948 to segregate and differentiate education among cultural and racial groups, in order to seize control over the knowledge received by the different racial groups. (Johnson, David, 2007, s. 307) By 1995 the race division in education was eased. Estimated there is 7 million analphabets in South Africa today. At this moment there are still many students that do not study beyond the 6th grade and only around half of the students continue their education after they turned 16. Still the universities in South Africa are considered to be the best in Africa and nowadays half of the students enrolled are black. The student fees at university level have though been raised because money has been transferred to basic education. (Landguiden-Utbildning)

Since 1994 the legislation and policies have encouraged desegregation in the school system in total. Year 1996 the South African Schools Act formulized the desegregation of schools and created the opportunity for everyone, regardless of color, to enroll in the school of their choice. It is also formulized that everyone should have the right to receive education in an official language or language of their choice, as far that is possible. (Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.384)

The South African government decided to limit the number of universities and create larger institutions. The plan of the Minister of Education was to try to merge 36 earlier institutions in to ultimately 21 institutions. (North-West University: 1, MacGregor 14/6 2002) This was done according to four big arguments: overcoming of racial divide, improve equity profile, building capacity and enhancing sustainability through increased size. (Eloff, Breaking new ground)

3.1.1 Language and present educational patterns

Before 1994 South Africa had only English and Afrikaans as official languages, after the new constitution 9 different Bantu languages are also classified as official national languages. Afrikaans has it routs in the Dutch language, the Boer people and most of the coloured speak this language today. One 10th of South Africa’s population have the English language as their mother tongue, many more have English as their second
language. The Bantu languages are spoken by the different Bantu tribes, one example is SeTswana. There are also native groups, Khoikhoi and San, with their own languages, these 2 groups inhabit the land before the Bantu groups came. Most Asians in South Africa come originally from India and was recruited by the whites as workers. (Landguiden-Beforkning och språk)

In South Africa the language has now in many ways taken the role of barrier between the races. A trend for the recreation of former black and white schools after the fall of the apartheid regime has been a division based on languages. The situation has developed into using only one language as medium for teaching to keep schools predominately one raced. The language is direct linked with questions of access and power. (Johnson, David, 2007, s. 306, Vandeyar & Killen 2006, p.387)

3.2 North West University

The former universities, Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education (PUCHE) and the University of the North West, officially merged 2 January 2004. The Potchefstroom University is historically a white, Afrikaans, university and the University of the North West a historically black, SeTswana university. The councils of the two former universities decided to accept the merger, even if this was not the first choice of neither university. The decision was taken mainly based upon perceptions of the mergers political and legal inevitability. Among many reasons this particular merger was brought on by the South African government’s thought that a province as sparsely populated as the North West Province could not have two different universities. (Eloff, Breaking new ground) Below is presented first an overview of South Africa marking the North West province. To the right is the North West Province with Potchefstroom and Mafikeng placed in the east respectively north/centre of the province.

Image 1 & 2
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3.2.1 The merger

The present Vice-Chancellor of the North West University, Theuns Eloff, writes that the major obstacles to the merger was; resistance to change, low level of trust, the management model, a name, the seat and the language of the new university. The first two obstacles were handled, according to Eloff, by good communication and implementing a win-win agreement between the universities, more precise by formulating two golden rules. (1) Balance university unity and diversity in campuses, programs and culture. (2) They agreed to try to limit uncertainty but not rush issues. The next obstacle was to find a management model for the new university. Today the university is built up by one institutional office and three campuses. Each campus is equal and headed by a campus rector, the rector on each campus report to the vice-chancellor (the head of the institutional office and the university). (Eloff, Breaking new ground) This merger is unique in the sense that they used a multi campus structure model for the cooperation, a decentralized model that according to Eloff has been the key of success for the merger. The largest tensions between the campuses are avoided using this kind of model he means. (I1) More of the functioning of the model is presented under 3.3.3 Governance.

The rest of the obstacles resolved in compromises, the name became the North-West University with the institutional management in Potchefstroom and a multi-lingual agreement with English, Afrikaans and SeTswana as main languages, and at Vaal campus SeSotho. (Eloff, Breaking new ground) The Chairman of Council, Dr. LK Sebego, mean that the decision for a multi-lingual university was taken with the intension to give everyone the respect and recognition that you feel when your own language is spoken. The Vice-Chancellor commented in our interview on the fact that he send out all information in all three languages. To practice this multi-lingualism NWU use translation service. The university also tries to provide a simultaneous classroom interpretation in scarce or expensive study fields. They give this service in more then 400 periods per week, mainly at Potchefstroom and Vaal campus. (Annual report 2006 p.23, 49, and I1)

There are still problems left to face, for example the balance between equity and diversity. Eloff writes that “Diversity is a fact of life, unity however, must be worked at”. He mentions the balance between a diversity and unity also when it comes to the campuses and the management model. (Eloff, Breaking new ground) This issue is complicated further by the fact that the three campuses today are very unequally developed; both in resource and infrastructure but also the quality of teaching, research and effective management. The issue of historic imbalance is obvious, especially when visiting the different campuses of Potchefstroom and Mafikeng. It is seen on buildings, gardens and so on. The university try to addressed this by for example a maintenance plan for each campus and improving the capacity of the staff. Chairperson of Council, Dr. LK Sebego mentions that the university strive to create a united fee structure for the whole university. Year 2006 the registration fee at Mafikeng campus was 400 rand and the first tuition payment 2000 rand and at Potchefstroom and Vaal the same payments was 700 rand and 3000 rand. A common fee structure is needed, she means, for the reason that one can not pay more or less for the same degree. At Mafikeng campus the fee will be raised with around 10% per year. Sebego continues with writing that given
the bursaries and other financial support the gap between the previously disadvantaged and the privileged students are becoming smaller. The Institutional Plan mentions that especially the Vaal Campus still have to turn away too many academically deserving but poor students. (Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.25, 30, Annual report 2006 p.23, 57, Mafikeng campus plan 2006-2008, p. 22)

Other large hinders left is establishing a common value system, here Eloff writes about integrity, commitment and respect. Academic program alignments between the campuses are still to be finished, the alignments are done with the goal that a degree from NWU should have the same respect unrelated of campus; it is planed to be ended in mid 2009 according to the Institutional Plan of 2008-2010. At present 21% of the undergraduate and 6, 5% of the postgraduate have been aligned. Each campus will, though, still have some niche areas, including programs and research specific for that campus and different branches on similar degrees. Finally, one hinder is the vast distances between the campuses; the distance between Mafikeng campus and Potchefstroom campus is more then 200 km and between Mafikeng and Vaal about 300 km. (Eloff, Breaking new ground, Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.9, 14, 28 and M5)

In our interview with Eloff he says that the campuses do not have individual budgets. Money from each campus is gathered in the Institutional Office, and thereafter divided among the campuses (depending on demand and calculations of each campus). Each faculty at the different campuses gets money from the government according to how many students there are enrolled. The faculties also finance themselves by research and by other commercial funds from the society. These entire three sources role up to the campus budget, from where each faculty will apply for money calculating what is needed each year. That is where the institutional office interferes and considers reasons and motivations. The surplus at each campus is thereafter gathered and pays for example salaries to the institutional office. (I1)

3.2.2 Achievements and goals

Despite these hinders, the merger and the institution have gone forward and the vice-chancellor means that the core business are now running stable, they are growing and a solid foundation has been laid for further transformation. (Annual report 2006, p.41) Here follows examples of achievements:

- Legal merger is completed with the Statue in place August 2005.
- Governance structures are in place; Council, Senate, Institutional SRC (Student Representative Council). Appointments of senior management have been completed without legal or fatal political obstacles since 2004.
- Basic conditions of employment were completed by the end of 2004.
- Common HR and Financial IT system and student administrative system.
  (Eloff, Breaking new ground)

The student intake has grown so much as to the extent that the university had to set targets, Eloff also means that the quality of students on all three campuses has improved after the admission requirements were aligned and will be the same for all campuses from January 2008. In 2006 NWU was the sixth largest university in South Africa by student
numbers, with around 40000 students enrolled. Other steps forward are: The economy of the NWU has been maintained and there has been a growing surplus since 2004 until 2006. Performance agreements with managers and academic staff has been established, an attribute that Eloff write is probably unique to NWU. NWU has a new logo for the whole university; the logo is made up by three chains in different colours, representing diversity and unity. The NWU means that they have strengthened the student culture on all campuses by building on what each university previously had. One example is the new Soccer Institution at Mafikeng campus. As well the vice-chancellor write that while marketing the new university the campuses old history have to be included not to loose loyalty and commitment of its alumni. (Eloff, Breaking new ground, Annual report 2006 p.54, Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.30, 35)

Since the university is new, a new name and new identity, Eloff means in his article that it also has the ability to create a new strategy. Today the NWU strives towards becoming a balanced teaching-learning and research university, this goal Eloff also emphasized in our interview with him. (Eloff, Breaking new ground, I1)

- The **vision** for the NWU today is “To be a pre-eminent university in Africa, driven by the pursuit of knowledge and innovation”.

- The **values** are human dignity, equality, freedom, integrity, tolerance, respect, commitment to excellence, scholarly engagement, academic freedom and justice.

The vice-chancellor means that the merger was hard work and by no means easy, but also that the work to create their vision continues. (Eloff, Breaking new ground) This strive is as well mentioned in the Institutional Plan of 2008-2010 by being a value driven institution, both by the ambition to in calculate students not only with philosophical foundation of their field of study but also with principles of good citizenship, by developing a unique institutional culture based on the value system of the university and by develop a climate of understanding, appreciation and tolerance of different culture patterns. (Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.7, 16, 28)

3.2.3 Governance

The larger components of the NWU governance structures are: Council, Senate, ISRC (Institutional Student Representative Council) and Institutional Management. The university is built up by one centralized institutional management located in Potchefstroom and three separate campuses; Potchefstroom campus, Mafikeng campus and Vaal Triangle campus. Each campus is equal and described as “separate business unites”. The campuses are headed by a campus rector, the rector on each campus report only to the vice-chancellor; the head of the institutional office and the university. By having separate campus rectors the integrity of each campus is believed to be maintained, and the institutional office is thought to be the “glue” making cooperation work even horizontally. (Eloff, Breaking new ground, I1)
The NWU’s institutional office, the highest management, has 9 positions;

*Figure 2*

![Diagram of NWU's institutional office](image)

The vice-chancellor remarked in our interview with him that they have got critique on the new management model, the critics mean that they formed a federation and not *one* university. He means, though, that they formed the new management model after countless companies in the world and that the university has *one* higher management with some basic centralised responsibilities and also *one* Council, *one* Senate and *one* set of values policies and procedures. (Eloff, Breaking new ground, I1) The *Institutional management* is responsible for implementing the strategies, plans, budgets, policies and rules approved by the Council. (Annual report 2006 p.18)

The *Council* governs the institution, sets the strategic vision and direction and approves all strategic plans, policies and statutory rules. It is combined by 30 members, 18 elected by external stakeholders and 12 by internal constituencies. (Annual report 2006 p.14-17)

The *Senate* is another of the university’s governance structures. The Senate is in charge of the academic core business of the NWU, it regulates all academic, research and academic support functions of the university. The Senate is accountable to the Council. The Senate has various members from the whole organization, from the institutional management, from the campuses, from the students, the deans of all faculties and so on. The ordinary meetings were held 4 times during 2006 and for more specific tasks committees are formed. The NWU had year 2006 in total 14 faculties, 5 at Mafikeng campus, 8 at Potchefstroom and 1 at Vaal (Annual report 2006 p.52-54).

The *Institutional Student Representative Council (ISRC)* is made up by representatives from the 3 campuses separate *Student Representative Councils (SRC)*, which are elected on each campus. In 2006 the ISRC meet a difficult start when some members did not accept certain clauses in the Councils constitution, even if the
constitution prior had been negotiated and agreed on. The Student Office and Campus Rectors intervened which resulted in an improved constitution that in April 2006 was successfully in place. The ISRC fulfilled its obligations for the rest of the year, including taking part in negotiations regarding student fees and conducting new ISRC elections. (P16, Annual report 2006 p.69)

3.2.4 Overview in numbers

Following numbers are a summary of the statistics in Appendix 3.

Potchefstroom campus has a great majority of the students enrolled, year 2006 almost 27,000 students compared to Mafikeng that has almost 8,500 students and Vaal as the smallest campus with more or less 3,500 students. At the university as a whole there is 58% black (African) students and 37% white students. However there is a great majority of the staff at the university that is white, almost twice as many as black employees. Interesting to notice here is even that the division of students and employees are still made according to the old apartheid model with groups as; white, Africans, coloured, Asians, unknown etc. Something that is remarkable when trying to change these attitudes. (Annual report 2006 p.54-55, 63-64)

There is as well a difference in funding at the campuses, where 2006 Potchefstroom achieved a bit more then 27 million rand from university funds, where Mafikeng achieved a bit more then 1 million. On the other hand Mafikeng receives a bit more the 17 millions in external funds, where Potchefstroom only receives slightly more then 7 million. (Annual report 2006, p.57)

2007 the Potchefstroom campus was a head of Mafikeng and Vaal in research output in Masters degrees of more then 500 and are also ahead regarding PhD outputs and single articles (Mafikeng campus plan 2006-2008, p. 24). The Mafikeng campus has however made a decision to put more effort into developing the level of education and prioritise this before research (M 3).

The employment equity policy of the NWU is based on the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998, which is now implemented in the Employment Equity programme (EEP). This programme is guiding the university in employment matters. The policy states for example that there should be no unfair discrimination, direct or indirect, on any ground. The university should also strive to have an employment profile that takes in account the demographic compositions of the country. This is done partly through a selection process for employment where preference shall be given to candidates from designated groups, for example previously disadvantaged; such as blacks, female, disabled people etc. These designated groups should be represented in various occupational categories and levels. There should neither be any cutbacks for the sake of creating positions for employment equity candidates but rather set realistic targets for equality and reach these by growing internal capacity and recruit the best staff and students available (North-West University: Employment equity policy (draft), I2, Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.9).

As seen in one diagram at appendix 3 there is a majority of black employees at Mafikeng and a majority of white employees at Potchefstroom. The targets for 2010 is however to even out these numbers, even though there will still be a majority of black respectively white at each campus. Even in the institutional Office there is today an
The overwhelming majority of white people (92%). There are also targets to even out these numbers by 2010 however white people will still be in a great majority. At the university as a whole there is a strive to have a 50-50 situation in the employment by 2010, even though this probably will be divided at the campuses differently. (Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.30, Mafikeng campus plan, p.7-8)

The level of education of staff at NWU is also an issue; Potchefstroom campus was 2007 in the top of the education of staff at the university, regarding the number of Masters and PhD’s. Potchefstroom was ahead with around 100 Masters and more then 200 PhD’s compared to Mafikeng and Vaal. (Mafikeng campus plan 2006-2008, p. 20)

3.3 The Campuses

The two campuses, Potchefstroom and Mafikeng, are very diverse which are shown in for example their separate campus plans. Their hinders, goals and strives are greatly dissimilar. Also the historical backgrounds of the two campuses are highly different. Below we present some areas that both campuses have highlighted.

The Mafikeng campus was formerly known as The University of the North West. (FN 12/11 2007) It was the University of the SeTswana homeland and is situated near the provincial government of the North West Province also today. According to M8, every person in the community contributed what they could when starting the institution. (M8) In our field notes from 12th of November 2007 a staff member showed us around in Potchefstroom, and was at the same time telling us the history of the Potchefstroom campus. He said that the university was recognized in 1952 as Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education. Everyone was accepted to apply to the university; however the teachers needed to belong to a reformer church. There was cooperation with the previous satellite campus of Vaal already before the merger, as early as 1964. (FN 12/11 2007)

Employment equity

Both campuses strive to become more equal in their employment. Below the diagrams show that Mafikeng is still a more predominantly black campus in their employees and Potchefstroom predominantly white.

Mafikeng

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment profile</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mafikeng Campus Plan 2006-2008, p. 8)
Potchefstroom

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment profile</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potchefstroom Campus plan 2007, section B, p.20)

Potchefstroom campus plan show that the employment equity should stretch its targets within a realistic frame and recruiting shall be based on the best available staff. The aim is to be fully non-racial between years 2010-2020. These are estimated targets and the success of reaching them is also depending on the available pool of candidates which in some fields are limited. (Potchefstroom Campus plan 2007, section A, p.10, Potchefstroom Campus plan 2007, section B, p. 20) Mafikeng’s campus plan also discuss that reaching those targets is due to the number of qualified candidates available. But also that being unable to attract or afford the qualified candidates might endanger the success of the targets, as well as the risk of employing candidates whom not meet the minimum criteria will endanger the quality and efficiency. (Mafikeng Campus Plan 2006-2008, p. 9)

Development

There are indications of some general differences in the development between white and black areas in South Africa. As seen in diagrams from the organizations Invest North West and Pro-poor tourism pilots in Southern Africa, (Appendix 1), there seem to be a socio-economic division between black and white areas in the North West Province. The diagrams show literacy, percentage in poverty and human development index.

The percentage of black versus white persons in each region is estimated by us from the diagram as 68.6% black and 31.4% white in Potchefstroom, and 96.4% black and 2.1% white persons in Mafikeng. Mafikeng is named Mmabutho in the diagrams. As seen Mmabutho has almost a total domination of black people, compared to Potchefstroom where the numbers are a bit more even. There is however no domination of white in any city.

The population and literacy diagrams indicate that there is a slightly higher literacy rate in more racially mixed areas. In our case it seems like Mmabutho has 64% literacy rate compared to Potchefstroom at 72%. This indicates that in areas with more whites the percentage of people knowing how to read and write is higher. Even so the differences is not major, there are also areas with mainly black population that show high literacy rates. This factor is the one that differ the least among the 3 between black and whites.

The Human Development Index is measuring life expectancy, literacy and income. A comparison between the diagrams here shows a larger difference between areas that are predominantly black, compared to areas with more white people. Mmabutho is at rate 0, 52 compared to Potchefstroom at 0, 61. HDI is meant to show peoples ability to live a long and healthy life, to communicate, to participate in the life of the community, and to
have sufficient resources to obtain a decent living. In other words more black dominated areas have lower degree of this.

In a comparison with the population diagram the poverty diagram indicate that in areas with more white population the poverty rate is lower. In many areas with higher percentage of blacks the poverty rate is instead prominent. In Mmabutho the poverty rate is 55% compared to Potchefstroom at 35%.

This together with the differences in directions of the campuses, the development of the campuses etc. indicates that also Mafikeng and Potchefstroom as cities and campuses experience some of these divisions. Mafikeng has for example budgeted for The Science Foundation Year Programme for 2008. It is a programme specific for Mafikeng and will prepare students with a disadvantaged educational history entry into a Science or Commerce degree programme. It is a one year programme that will give these students foundational skills necessary for further studies at the University as well as raising the number and quality of students in these programmes. (Mafikeng Campus Plan 2006-2008, p. 17) According to our interviews with students we also know that there already are some foundations programs at work in Mafikeng. (M15) The focus on a foundation education at Mafikeng points to the difference in need for higher quality of lower education in the both cities.
Chapter 4 – Empirical data and Analyze

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter our empirical data collected from interviews and observations will be presented and analyzed simultaneously. We have decided to use our seven categories emerging from our coding process as a base for our theoretically inspired analysis. In our text most categories are looked upon and divided between an organizational aspect and a social integration perspective. Some categories are large, some minor but each category includes smaller headlines and themes.

When referring to the different categories this will be done by marking the headlines in a bold font. This is done to highlight different aspects of the analyses as well as to show the connections between the categories.

Our seven categories are:

Responses to the merger
- deals with questions such as what changes have a occurred after the merger, responses to those changes, how the cooperation is perceived and attitudes towards the future of the merger

Within and outside group
- brings up issues such as separation between culture groups, the question of language and social mixing

Dominant culture and assimilation
- discusses cultural dominance and its effects

History
- handles the role of history and its effects on the present situation

Social status
- debate the issue of social and economical status and its importance

Differences
- display the perceived differences between the groups, mostly cultural differences

Within and outside process
- argue whether individuals within intergroups and within the merger process are more positive towards the merger and integration
4.2 Responses to the merger

South Africa as a country have endured many changes the last 15 years and the merger process starting 2004 brought drastic changes to the higher education system and so also to today’s NWU. The merging process and integration has recently started and with them the changes. **Responses to the merger** refers to what kind of changes occurred but more important how people have perceived them. The largest themes in this code are Responses to change, Cooperation and Merger.

**Organizational integration**

**Introduction**

We have detected many different responses to the merger and the changes it has brought to the two campuses. Dan Kgagile, Mafikeng’s campus rector detects many benefits from the merger for Mafikeng. In our interviews we have mostly found examples of stability, better management and facilities. Kgagile and his colleagues mean that the merger has been positive also for Potchefstroom; our interviews give example as increased diversity and political credibility and legitimacy.

On Mafikeng campus both staff members but especially students have in general seen more changes then their counterpart on Potchefstroom. Our interviews give both positive and negative examples of changes. Some positive examples are better management and structures, new buildings, new policies, less tumult and strikes. The negative responses mostly spring from the view that Potchefstroom in general have more influence and power then Mafikeng or that the merger brought increased fees.

On Potchefstroom campus the staff is dealing with some of the same cooperation and reorganization difficulties as Mafikeng. The students interviewed have not detected many changes, merely symbolic ones like a new name, new logo and the change to a non-Christian university. Instead people in Potchefstroom talk more about changes in the society in general.

It was a merger between unequal partners and this factor appears to play a large role in what responses and patterns we find. Allport’s characteristic equal status is missing.

**Responses to change - Pace of transformation**

First of all we would like to discuss the pace of transformation, in other words how fast or slow the changes are appearing. Many people have commented on this issue, especially the management. The Vice-Chancellor describes that in the beginning of the merger they decided to let the merger take time, to not let the change go to fast. He means that it is a difficult balance. His view is that if you change too fast a whole organization can die. Further he means that other mergers in South Africa have done just that, they have focused on symbolic changes and lost their core activity. Expressed by one member of the management on Mafikeng, “You can’t expect to be born and start running, that’s a
question of falling, walking and then running” (M 11). From 3 black students on Potchefstroom campus we received a similar response; they believe that the campus is trying to become more including towards everyone but that this process is slow. One director on Potchefstroom believes that if the national government had not demanded a program alignment, NWU would probably not have had energy to do so, at least not as fast. All these people’s responses indicate that they believe change takes time and that it can not happen to fast. There is also a purpose with having a slow change due to the fact that the two cultures have been so separated, and now need time to learn to accept and understand each other. (I1, P2, P15)

On the other hand we have received responses that ask for faster change. One director on Potchefstroom tells us that in his department there are 3 black staff members and he believes they are the only ones in the faculty. He blames lack of will and means that since Mafikeng is still black, the university as a whole and Potchefstroom uses this for a good appearance at a national level. Two black student from Potchefstroom would like more staff moving between the campuses,”the way things have been going, if we can continue doing what we are doing now it will take even a thousand years for the situation to change...an Afrikaaner to actually believe that...people should not be judged...on their colour of their skin, but on the content of their character” (P18). The same students comment that they believe that resistance to change is fear and that with time this will go away. (M14, M15, P15, P 18)

In general it seem that black persons at the NWU ask for more and faster changes, this may not be extraordinary since they have had less and changes may bring prospect. On the contrary white people seem more worried about the changes that are taking place and for their future, worried to lose standard, loose culture and worried about the chances of finding a job etc. As the Vice-Chancellor also says the balance between these two standing points are hard to find, but that one must be found. (I1, P6) A balance that actually let changes happen and at times pushes for them but on the other hand do not take away everything under people’s feet. In a changing time it seems important, more important then other times, to also have stable areas and familiar habits.

Responses to change - Lack of information

Over all there is a lack of information on the campuses, especially among students. The students seem to have very little knowledge about the merger, about the other campuses and the cooperation between them. Also students that are involved in different organizations lack information. Lack of information is show in ex. M16, M18, M20 and P3. In M14, a group of students on Mafikeng campus commented that they do not know what is going on in the merger process, nor nationally neither about the NWU merger. On Potchefstroom campus the fact that the students do not detect changes do also show their lack of knowledge of what is occurring. (P2 P3, M14, M16, M18, M20)

Some students seem to have a small and sometimes wrong understanding of the situation, but we can also find those that have a good idea of what is going on. One student in P6 believes that the NWU are trying to make Potchefstroom the administrational base, an opinion that is fairly near the truth. In contrast two students in P7, which attend their first year on NWU, have not heard about the merger at all. They
know the university has three campuses but when we spoke to them this was the first time they heard about the merger. They are also of the view that “…the others are satellite campuses…” (P7). (P6, P7, P8)

On Mafikeng the knowledge seems to be more superficial and often not based on personal experience. Some have knowledge about better gardens, sport centres or classrooms at Potchefstroom. Furthermore involved students seem to lack knowledge as well. In P13, one person involved with the campus newspaper on Potchefstroom mentions that maybe there are student newspapers on the other campuses but there is a lack of communication between the campuses so he does not have the information. (P13, P15)

Lack of knowledge indicates for one, that the merger does not affect students a great deal. Issues you are affected by you probably know more about and are more interested in. Lack of knowledge may also be a result of ignorance and lack of will to know. Secondly, it tells us that more information is needed to try to lower incorrect conclusions. It can be hard to reach out to all students or even all staff members, but it is a topic that needs constant attention. If more information reach out more persons may want to get involved. Already involved students are an important category to inform and update, since if they have information they can spread it further and come up with ideas of further cooperation etc.

Even if this is true two responses have also indicated that even if a person have information and understand the necessity of the change it can still be hard to deal with it. For example one student on Potchefstroom would like his teacher to read from the bible before an exam but he also realizes that the university has changed this because some students have other religious convictions. (P1, M3)

Responses to change - Uncertainty

Uncertainty is in general hard to deal with and the merger brought many doubts, especially in the beginning. One example from Mafikeng is that the educational standard of teachers was low before the merger; a person with a master could become senior lecturer. NWU needed an aligned employment promotion criteria. Mafikeng’s campus rector point to that for the staff at Mafikeng this was a stretch and in this matter the university decided to add teaching skills as a criteria and not only value education level. From Mafikeng we have found many concerns about organizational changes that create uncertainty. For examples new employment is done centrally, and regarding the alignment two interview persons feel they have no power over the outcome of the meetings with Potchefstroom. At Potchefstroom one involved SRC student implies that students are afraid of loosing the culture on Potchefstroom. Moreover language differences tend to create uncertainties. At Potchefstroom there is a fear among the Afrikaans students of an increased use of English in the future, and an opposite fear from English speaking students of increased use of Afrikaans. See more discussion of language in the category of within and outside group. Another area that the students in Potchefstroom show uncertainty about is their own future and their role in the South African society. A further discussion about this is given under future in history. (M3, M6, M23, P13)
Changes create uncertainty that at times can lead to fear and frustration, people do not know what will come or what their world will look like. For us uncertainty also has ties to lack of knowledge, in the sense that knowledge can create a higher degree of certainty.

Generally, interviews from Mafikeng show a bit higher degree of uncertainty. If each campus is studied separate it seems that on Potchefstroom students have more trouble with uncertainty and staff at Mafikeng. The staff at Mafikeng is one of the groups at NWU that have had to deal with most changes, this combined with that many perceive Potchefstroom as more influential. These people seem to feel a high degree of uncertainty. Many of them perceive that they have less control over their own situation and workplace. The staff at Potchefstroom seems to have experienced fewer changes and at this point in the merger it looks like they perceive their situation as changing in a controlled way. The examples above are of changes within the campus but furthermore the changes in the society as a whole seem to increase the student’s uncertainty, especially students at Potchefstroom. They feel uncertainty about their future, about finding a job, having to speak English, having enough money to provide for a family, crime rates etc. On Mafikeng the students seem to be calmer about their future and see more opportunities. This might also be due to the greater black domination in current politics which can create better opportunities for black people, better opportunities than they have had before.

Responses to change - Negative & Positive response

Even if negative sides of the merger are more frequently brought forward in our interviews, as are negative sides in many other areas of life, a frequent number of positive sides and reflections can be found. The members of the institutional management are in general very positive, seen in for example P16. Concrete and material examples are easy to find in interviews from Mafikeng, one example is extra classes before exams. Positive responses are found in ex. M1, M12, M13, M18 and M21. In Potchefstroom students have not detect many changes, merely symbolic. Students at Potchefstroom also give expression of hope for more changes in the future, more international cooperation, books in English, more translation service etc. Examples from Potchefstroom are given in P5, P1, P10 and P13. (M1, M12, M13, M18, M21, P1, P5, P10, P16)

Another side of positive response is when people desire to take active part in the cooperation and the changes. We see it as an optimistic factor for further integration, it gives further interaction, show will to change etc. These reactions and initiatives indicate will to compromise and will to create something new where everyone can work together. It also indicates a will to change your perceptions of the other group and work on your own “we-group” and their way of acting. One good example of this come from P15 were a director speaks about the “get together” that have been organized in the school of social and government studies so their staff can meet and socialize. (P13, P15, M5, M14)

Negative feelings are often perceived in a stronger way. At Mafikeng complaints deal with buildings that are not up to standard, many see no positive improvement from the raised fees, the merger negotiation process was not fair etc. Examples come from M12, M20, M15 and M7. From Potchefstroom one of the biggest
complaints is the removal of religion, as seen in P1 and P14. (M7, M12, M15, M20, P1, P14)

Signs of *resistance* are another pattern found. In a number of interviews there is mentioned resistance to change. Theuns Eloff, the Vice-Chancellor, touch upon the fact that various members of the Potchefstroom campus felt that they did not need to change; it was good as it was. At the same time members of Mafikeng campus thought they had the best university in the country, it were located in the capital of the province and it had been a university of an independent homeland. In M1, one of Mafikeng’s management staff mentioned that it is hard to get everyone on board and that it is going to take time. In our interviews we have received many comments regarding attitude and “mindset” and that these need to change. One clear example come from interview P20 were we discussed sport and one staff member said that Potchefstroom were going to have an intervarsity sport day with the Freestate University as they always had had - “…we’re not going to change a lot of things…”(P20). (I1, P15, P20, M1) In our field notes from the 10th of November we detected a resistance towards the change of names of the streets in Potchefstroom, where the today more Afrikaans names are being changed to more African names of for example heroes from the independence. One person said that “old people” always will stick to the Afrikaans names. (FN 10/11 2007)

A resistance to change can also be seen in the relation between the culture groups, this is further linked to *within and outside group*. A person interviewed at the institutional management has seen some resistance in the staff at Potchefstroom towards black employees. Further resistance is thought to come due to the affirmative action in employment. Shortly the Employment Equity act 55 of 1998 contain targets to employ more black staff at Potchefstroom and more white staff at Mafikeng. Some people stress the inequality of employing a black person before a white person whom they claim judges more the colour of your skin than your merits. I2 although believes that it is people that still want to keep the “status quo” that stress this and with that attitude there will not be any change or at least not in the pace needed. He highlights the importance to make a person realize that this is something that is good for the business and for the campus both from a justice and an efficiency perspective. (I2)

Both campuses show resistance to change in almost all areas, areas such as language, resources, academic, administrative, culture etc. It is hard to change your ways and habits and when a great deal of things are changing the persistence can easily grow deeper. There can also be seen a pride in keeping your own culture and not change until the other part do or you get something in return. At NWU we have two parties that have been separated for a long time and between the groups their have been no interaction. The groups have functioned on their own and on their own terms, this applies especially to Potchefstroom. Our findings indicate that the resistance also is a bit harder on this campus. Though this could also be due to the fact that Potchefstroom may be the stronger partner in the merger and for that matter not been forced to change as much. On a social level Potchefstroom see more changes due to black people coming in to the campus and society and this may also create a stronger resistance in this area. In Mafikeng many changes occur on an organizational level but these seem in some cases easier to deal with.
For more discussion and examples of reluctance to change see also category dominance and social status.

Cooperation

The merger is relatively new, there is a vast distance between the campuses and as the Vice-Chancellor says, most of the students and staff will never meet anyone from the other campus because they have no reason to do so. Contradicting to these facts there are cooperation and direct contact between the campuses and between the persons on them. Examples of cooperation are: distance courses, aligning study guides and subjects, teachers moderate each others exam questions, choir events etc. Responses to the cooperation between staff on both campuses are seen by some to function well while others totally disagree. Though as commented before there are many negative responses to the cooperation or lack of cooperation, two students on Potchefstroom campus feel for example that moving between the different campuses are hard because of the language difference. (P16, P18, P20, I1, M1) A pattern we have detected and found interesting in the cooperation is the distinguished views and responses regarding smaller and bigger settings, time aspect and a common goal.

Cooperation - Smaller occasions

In groups with fewer members we have detected a more positive view of how the cooperation is functioning. Many examples come from the academic alignment process were teachers and persons responsible meet in smaller groups. The over all response regarding this process seem to be that it works well and that you can make you voice heard. Even if there are complaints the persons interviewed usually end up saying that the cooperation is satisfactory. As shown under the headline of language in within and outside group, people also tend to have a more positive experience of language differences when in small groups. Probably, partly because English is more used, but also that power relations between the participants are weaker and you get a more personal relationship to the members of the group. M5 says that "...the more they talk to each other the more they’ll find one another, and begin to build a relationship and a confidence." (M5). (M4, M5, P21)

Two separate interview persons, one from each campus, mean that they in their cooperation work after consensus decisions and both campuses have the same power. (M7, P21)

Examples of negative feelings, found in M5, M3 and P21, deal with the higher work load that comes along with the process, it is hard to speak English when it is nobody’s mother tongue and hard to align because the previous programs are so divers. (M3, M5, P21)

A few negative responses seem to go deeper, for example that some academics think they are experts on their field, difference in culture, difficulty to make everyone agree, that Potchefstroom decide the meeting structure etc. In contrast to the last statement one teacher and one director from Potchefstroom mean that in their experience the other campuses often relay on Potchefstroom to begin the work. One says that they expect them to have filled out “forms” and present a base that they later can
work from. "I don’t know why but it seems like the people from the other campuses are always looking at us, we must do the ground work and then we are going and tell them that this is how you can do it, or you must do it."(P21). (P13, P15, P21, M3, M5)

In higher management they often meet in smaller groups and many times during a longer time frame. Perceptions from these meetings are for example; good and focused, useful consensus decisions and never voting in meeting etc. This can be seen in M3, M1, M5, P19 and P16. A person from higher management point to that the members have to get to know each other, it seems especially so because of cultural differences. After getting to know each other, a person can let the other members be dissimilar. Though she means that at one point a decision have to be made: this is the way we will do things in our group and cooperation. (M1, M3, M5, P16, P19)

Cooperation - Bigger occasions

In a larger group it seems harder to cooperate in a satisfactory way. Each individual can not get their voice heard, they do not know each other, culture differences seem to be a bigger issue etc. From the NWU’s Senate we have got one very negative view. The member describes that voting is used and that Potchefstroom campus has more votes which gives that Mafikeng always loose. (M4) According to our finding Potchefstroom’s advantage is due to their larger size as campus and larger number of faculties. Enhancing this issue, the general perception from Mafikeng seems to be that members from Potchefstroom often agree with each other.

From the Council we received similar response. Prof. Mqosa Mahao (Executive Dean of the law faculty on Mafikeng campus) was a member of the Council but year 2007 he resigned, he says he did not feel he could operate and felt like he was a “window dressing”. He experienced he had no influence and his voice did not count. Additionally he means that the Council from the beginning was more or less half black and half white but during the years it has been “packed with white”. Consensus decisions are often used in the Council, Prof. Mahao foretells they almost never vote, but since the Vice-Chancellor is the one making the final decision he feels this favours Potchefstroom. Though it seems it is not only the university that decides what members the Council has, also the Ministry of Education appoints positions for example. A number of high managers have resigned from Mafikeng and according to Prof. Mahao the reason was that their voice had not been listened to. (M7, M8)

Another occasion that involves a bigger group is the ISRC, Institutional Student Representative Council. Professor Hendre Reyneke, dean of students on Potchefstroom campus, told us that it was hard to create an ISRC. The SRC’s come from different cultures and to create a constitution was hard. Potchefstroom is mostly white and Vaal and Mafikeng dominated by black students, which have caused that Vaal and Mafikeng understand each other better according to M9. However another student means that Vaal and Potchefstroom are more similar. Differences also show themselves in that Mafikeng having more political motives and demands, however now diminishing. Workshops were used for the students to get to know each other, however Professor Hendre Reyneke thinks it is a problem that the members of the ISRC and campuses SRC changes every year. (P14, P16, M9)
In larger meetings the use of Afrikaans is greater, which seems to create frustration among some English speaking participants. Especially then they earlier have had conversations with the same persons in English in a small setting. Frustration is also generated from people feeling they have less power to influence the decision in a larger setting. This discussion is also handled under language in within and outside group.

Cooperation - Analyse

Over all, at the organizational level, it seems like the cooperation is fairly successful. Even if there are mistrust and feelings of domination expressed. Here follow the patterns gathered.

First, in bigger occasions members often feel that their voice are not heard, they can not easily get to know the other members and the contact may give a negative response. In a smaller setting it seems like the members more easily get to know each person and find their own systems and compromises among the members. In the same way, the group belonging and the division between the group seem to play a less significant role in a smaller group. In group size, we consider smaller groups to include 2-10 members and bigger settings 11 members or more. Though the numbers for a positive outcome can vary and in larger groups positive intergroup relations are not excluded. The patterns beneath are perhaps one way to incline the importance of the size of the group. In within and outside group we will later see a similar pattern regarding language in smaller and larger groups.

Pattern number two seems to be linked with time. Cooperation during a longer time seems more fruitful then short time cooperation. The members get to know each other better and the relationship becomes more personal.

Third, situations were members are having the same status, for example being “teachers” in the alignment processes seem to help breaking power relations. On the other hand for the students in the ISRC there seem not to be any real equal status. All involved are students but there are still perceived differences in power from the different campuses, which can have bad implications in trust of the other. It can perhaps also be that teachers keep their professionalism better then students and are more used to cooperate. If linking equal status with the other characteristics or pattern found it may so be that it is harder to uphold unequal status and separation between the groups when for example the group is smaller and the members get to know each other better. Equal status is one of the perquisites in Allport’s contact theory which in this case can be shown to have relevance for the cooperation.

Allport also says that working towards a common goal is a requirement for positive interaction. Linked to this, an our fourth pattern, we have reason to believe that the persons involved in for example the alignment process have a small and more defined goal. While in the situation of the ISRC, council or senate the goals are many and not always agreed on. The ISRC handle very different questions because the students at the campuses perceive different problems. This may cause a greater variety of topics to handle and their agenda may not be the same. If we link this to the contact theory, cooperation and intergroup interaction in bigger groups, during a shorter time frame, with members not experience equal status and with a defuse common goal seems to at times increase prejudices instead of decreasing them.
A detail that is worth mentioning is that some cooperation existed before the merger and according to the members in that cooperation the partners was more equal then after the merger. (M7) This shows that a will or need to cooperate from the start gives better cooperation. On the other hand persons reluctant to cooperate and perhaps with a greater prejudice would not choose to cooperate on their own. Even if these individuals may be the ones needing it the most. Another aspect of this matter is that when cooperating without pressure the form for the cooperation is determent by the members, as it is now the university often have a certain structure for the cooperation. As well in a voluntarily cooperation the characteristics equal status and common goals are most certain present.

Merger

As we have heard from many persons the merger was and is a process of giving and taking, though some questions seem hard to compromise in, for example the language questions. (M4, M12)

Merger - Loose one’s culture

In the beginning both Potchefstroom and Mafikeng was afraid of being swallowed by the other campus. Two black students at Potchefstroom experience the merger as accepted by Potchefstroom only after they were assured they could preserve their culture, and that it was not really a voluntarily choice from the campus. Theuns Eloff says that all campuses were unwilling to merge and Anette Combrink describes that all campuses went into the process with their own selfish motives of keeping some part of their identity. (M18, I1, P19)

At Mafikeng campus the feeling of being swallowed was stronger and may at times live on today. For example one interview gives the example of Potchefstroom taking old policies and giving them out to the other campuses. The merger between the two unequal partners created the concept of “potchification” and being swallowed by Potchefstroom. Campus Rector Anette Combrink describes the carefulness these perceptions demanded. “no we weren’t equal, not in numbers, not in finances, ... simply we were better resourced we had better management, we had overtime done things better, more effectively, more efficiently, so ja perceptions played an enormous part”(P19). (M3, M4, I1, P19)

The general opinion is according to Prof. S.N. Mashego (Vice-rector: Quality and Planning on Mafikeng) and Thuens Eloff however that the feeling and use of “potchification” is fading. Other views from Mafikeng come for example from a director that means that efficiency stand against democracy. According to him the NWU is today more run as a company, not everything can be effective but neither everything democratic. One student from Mafikeng feels that the campus lost its identity as a university for the poor, today no one remember why the university was build in the first place. (M1, M6, M8, I1)

From Potchefstroom’s side the campus had to open up when the merger came, a previous closed environment was exposed to a bigger world. One student at
Potchefstroom says that even students at Potchefstroom today are afraid of changes and loss of culture. One example comes from a student who comments on Potchefstroom leaving their Christian profile and of a change in political oriented questions in which the state is now more involved. Their culture, ways and thoughts are challenged and sometimes changed. (I1, P1, P13)

From the management side the Vice-Chancellor means that as long as there is a common base on all the campuses it is up to each campus to create their own campus culture. For example Mafikeng have more international students and there for another environment. Though there are also things that are common, one example is ceremonies. Ceremonies are going to be more alike in the future and there are attempts to create a more united organizational culture. (I1)

The merger was influenced by fear of superiority by the Potchefstroom campus and the suspicion that they would change as little as possible in order to maintain their culture and language. There is still not a strong feeling of belonging to the same university which we will discuss more later on. As we can see further in within and outside group, under unwillingness to change, the suspicion against one another is still very present and can be traced back to the history. These influences can with reason still be thought to be affecting people’s way of thinking and perceiving their reality. The fear of loosing one’s culture can also be seen under future in history, were one black person means that blacks have to change many of their ways also on a global level, since the global culture are more western and less similar to the black cultures.

When linking this with the part about uncertainty we can see that fear, frustration and doubt are born when big changes and compromises have to be done. Especially when there is lack of trust between the parties and between the campuses. It is although probable that these negative feelings will fade away as new ways of acting becomes clearer. This can as well be linked to another category, resistance to change. People are scared of losing their ways and thoughts, their culture and maybe even their identity and they do not know what will come out of it. New ways has to be found, or as one interviewed person put it finding “equilibrium”, but the process getting there is frightening. (M7)

Merger - Less control & centralisation

Our interviews show much negative response from Mafikeng towards that the administration and institutional office now are situated in Potchefstroom. Examples are the move of Human Resources and reorganizing the administration. Another more specific example is that there now are certain dates for handing in forms. This is found in for example M6, M23 and M8. Two black students at Mafikeng mean that now everything is done at Potchefstroom. According to a director, decisions about the budget are taken at the head office (in Potchefstroom). He says they are asked in the beginning of the budget process but later on just delivered a final result. New employments are as well done centrally and he believes it makes people scared. (M6, M8, M20, M23)

Students at Mafikeng are commenting on the higher student fees and some mean that Potchefstroom have the power over these decisions. Many people at Mafikeng seem to
feel run over and have less control over their situation. As we discussed, some staff at Mafikeng have left their position, one reason given was feelings of no power to influence. Similar responses, regarding worries that Mafikeng will be come closed for poor students, have been received in for example M9 and M20. There are opinions that the institutional office now is dominated by persons that have a narrow view of the situation at Mafikeng and for black people. Additionally there are interviews showing a more positive attitude, those that believe in the management or see that the physical distance between the campuses makes it hard. (M5, M6, M7, M9, M13, M20)

In Potchefstroom we have found one reaction that was slightly similar. One director means that the structure have changed since the merger, he believes that the relationship between him and the management has changed. He says for example that now the management listens but barely acts. The same director comment that the budget has not decreased since the merger but the organization has grown and they have not received more money. He considers the reason to be that money from Potchefstroom has gone to Mafikeng. (P21) Both campuses seem to feel that more decisions are taken over their heads, however with a bigger organization this can be hard to avoid.

One reaction that stands out is when one teacher told us about an incident with schedules not working. She meant that there were nowhere to turn to get help on Mafikeng campus regarding this issue - ”We are waiting for them to tell us. I don’t want that! As if I can’t think now.” (M5) In her opinion, it is easy to say that Mafikeng can not do anything, in that case they will neither have any responsibilities for the outcome. But soon Mafikeng can not do anything alone she says. (M5)

This is a reaction that can be connected to uncertainty and the fear and frustration it creates. This has very much to do with centralisation and the loss of power and influence to a higher level. People feel uncertain about what will happen. On the other hand the reactions also go back to the power struggle or social status between the campuses and culture groups. As we can see the reactions are much stronger at Mafikeng then at Potchefstroom, in our opinion not only because the Institutional office is nearer to the later.

Merger - Resources

The campuses resource situation was at the time of the merger poles apart and today this is still in countless ways true. Here we describe how the resource situation at the two campuses is perceived and what areas people are struggling with. Social status further deals with the consequences of this division. Two examples are educational standard of employees and facilities. The Vice-Chancellor declares that all campuses today have better economy, more stability, more research, more students applying etc. On the other hand our responses show great dissatisfactory with the division of resources, again mostly from Mafikeng campus. Examples of resources discussed are buildings, teaching equipment, money for postgraduate students, gardens, knowledge etc. Also that improvement is not good enough, for example new houses that already have broken roofs and small rooms. Responses from Mafikeng sometimes show anger and envy towards Potchefstroom, seen in for example M4, M6 and M12. One person goes so far as to say that Mafikeng is still on “Bantu-stand” level (referring to the apartheid separation in
resources). Contradicting views from Mafikeng is that the matter has been dealt with and that resources are hard to cooperate in. (I1, M2, M4, M6, M7, M12, M17, M20)

On Mafikeng campus many things have improved but many students and staff seem to think the improvement is not enough and with two other campuses to compare with the frustration increases. For the students the raised fee is a large issue and as some students say in M14, they do not feel they get what they pay for. The fee will in a few years be the same on all campuses but the question for the students is if the standard will. (M8, M9, M14, M20) The campuses are working as separate business units and they are responsible for planning their own budget. Money from the university is only one of three income sources. Though for the students and staff the facts and time aspects do not always play that big part.

From Potchefstroom we have not detected many responses concerning the resources. But as one view showed in the earlier section, and the vice-chancellor point out in his interview, Potchefstroom feel they sometimes have a lower standard now then before. On the contrary one student that is involved with SRC in Potchefstroom means that it is fantastic that the resources can spread, that now students have more choices and the standard of the alternatives are more levelled. He means that now persons do not have to choose “the whole Afrikaans thing in Potch” and can still receive a good education. (P12, I1)

The concerns for the two campuses regarding resources are widely ambiguous, which show how important the issue is for the NWU and that the question has to be dealt with one way or the other. On Mafikeng there are many areas to improve and this will take time, though people ask for faster response. On the same time maintenance has to be done on Potchefstroom as well.

Merger - No changes

Many interviews give examples of changes but we have also received a number of responses which mean that nothing has actually changed. Professor Madoda S Zibi told us that in interviews with persons that are going to leave their position at the University, some describe that nothing has changed on the campuses. Mafikeng is Mafikeng and Potchefstroom is Potchefstroom. Black versus white. Two black students from Potchefstroom campus considered the merger to be non existing; “The concept of merger, so far I just view it as...two universities that are running under the same name but gain things differently...”(P18). Further they feel that there is no effort to bring the different cultures together. One explanation many have mentioned is the physical distance between the campuses. (M5, M11, P4, P18, I2)

On Potchefstroom many students mean that “everything is just the same”, stated by for example P2, P3 and P13. From both campuses students mean that they know nothing about any cooperation. Ewoudt Cloete, publisher for the student newspaper WAPAD on Potchefstroom campus, means that the newspaper has not changed apart from that it is now using the new logo instead of the old. One student, also from Potchefstroom, means that the reason she does not know of any changes is because she is “…not touched by it...” (P4). Other students on Potchefstroom have seen changes but mostly symbolic once
like campus colour, changed signs on campus, more black student and the name change. Though some students have detected changes in for example their syllabus, translators in the classroom, teachers from Mafikeng or Vaal evaluating practical tests etc. (P2, P3, P6, P8, P9, P13, M16, M18, M20)

From management’s point the view is quite different. On Potchefstroom management level one person means that there have been many changes to the environment at the campus. The campus and the community have had to open up and consider other groups, which he sees as positive. Lower staff members also seem to have seen more changes then the students. One teacher that came after the merger feel that colleagues employed before the merger ask themselves “what’s next?” (P15, P16, P19)

Even if many changes have occurred the foundation on both campuses seem not to have changed profoundly, although Mafikeng had more visible changes. Especially for students that are not involved in organisations or cooperation, few changes are detected. From Potchefstroom some consider the merger not to be a concern to them. The students at this campus are not faced with many of the changes or problems around it, reasons could be dominance, social status and history which all will be discussed separate. At Mafikeng students have noticed a few more changes and more students seem concerned about the merger. At Mafikeng the merger is important in the way that it can play a role in person’s lives. The merger can give them chances they did not have before, but it can also just be a front and not change the real situation or opportunities. What way and direction the merger takes are of greater concern in Mafikeng then in Potchefstroom. As mentioned before students from Potchefstroom seem more concerned with changes in the society and the life after university, then changes at university level.

Future of the merger

The future for the university is debated and contradicting views exist. Two big issues are brought up: If the campuses would de-merge if possible? And if they will become one single university? The vice-chancellor means that at this stage none of the campuses would like to de-merge if the opportunity rose. (Eloff, Breaking new ground) Other persons in high management positions indicate the same thing. On the other hand on Mafikeng campus we have found divided responses. Some are positive to the merger and its future, others not. One negative respond come from a director at Mafikeng. He means that the high management describe the merger as the best one in South Africa, but when it comes to people dealing with each other in a professional way there is a long way to go. A teacher, also from Mafikeng, would even like to de-merge if possible and go back to how it was before. “...it is like a forced marriage. You know a forced marriage you are never happy in it, especially when you marry a very rich husband and you are from a poor family so its sort of, you know you have to patronize him, because he provides you...with what you need, so it becomes...a one sides issue. You are forced in to bed with someone you don’t want, it never works” (M4). (I1, M1, M3, M4, M5, M6, M11, P 19)

Some interviews brought up the issue of becoming one single university, the issue of creating a “we” feeling for the whole university. Found in for example M2, P16 and P17. As seen in the previous section, students especially on Potchefstroom have not detected
many changes or feel concerned by them. And as the Vice-Chancellor says, the majority of individuals at the university will not have any reason to meet over the campus lines. One student from Mafikeng also proclaimed his concern of only being a campus of a university and not *the* university. To create one single university, with students and staff viewing themselves as members of the same university, will take a long time. As well to get investors, the state, parents and future students, to see NWU as one single university will be time-consuming and need a lot of effort. On the other hand it seems like the management is working towards creating one university, for example one of the vice-chancellors goals is to assure that when someone graduated from NWU the employer should not need to ask what campus the diploma is from. One positive input in this issue is a comment from a SRC student from Potchefstroom, he already considers himself as a part of NWU. (P13, P16, P17, M2, M13, I1)

The overall view we can see towards the future is a careful optimism. There are countless problems, but numerous persons want to try and create a new university that fit into the new country that is evolving. Many are looking for new ways to deal with hinders, one being the question of language. On Potchefstroom students feel for one that they want to keep Afrikaans while others comment that English is the language you need in the rest of the society. If the university will be seen as one in the future they have to work hard and maybe also in the long run tie the campuses closer together.

**Social integration**

In this code we have not found many patterns of social integration. Due to that the code concerns the merger and due to the fact that the social integration has not yet proceeded so far. Some of the social changes that have occurred are dealt with in within and outside group and dominance. Though we have detected a few signs of social integration regarding the merger which are discusses beneath.

**Responses to change - Positivism & Will to change**

In the sociology department there have been initiatives of “get togethers” were staff meet and socialize. An initiative we see as a good example of individual actions and of will to integrate. Johan Zaaiman, director of the School of Social and Government Studies, means that they today have a good relationship between the staff on the different campuses in their department and that these “get togethers” have been successful. He detects more understanding and confidence in each other. Even so there are also those that do not consider “get togethers” to be important or feel negativity against members of the other campuses. He does not know if anyone has contact in their free time, but he hopes that is the case. Also a director from Mafikeng observes a need for people to get to know one another better. He sees a need for people to meet more and be honest towards each other. Hopefully these initiatives can be more spread in the future. (P15, M6)
Responses to change - Uncertainty & Resistance to change

Resistance to change and uncertainty exist also on a social level, often stronger. We will here bring examples from the sport sections at NWU. At Potchefstroom we interviewed two players in the rugby team, and according to them the rugby institution functions well between the different culture groups on the field, they all know the rules etc. The players are friends also off the field but have sometimes different interests. A similar response was found at Mafikeng when talking to two soccer players, they mean that they talk English at the field but outside the field the SeTswana speaking players often speak SeTswana. (M22, P20)

The reasons can be many but these responses indicate that resistance to change is stronger in a social setting. In addition it indicates that uncertainty is higher on a social level. In meeting, on the field or in the classroom there are more common rules that create some sort of certainty. As said reasons for these patterns can be many and we will deal with them further in almost all sections of our analyse, in **dominance, within and outside group, social status, history and differences**.

Cooperation

One good initiative from the higher management is the organization of a social interaction event, “fun day”, for staff members on the different campuses. Most people we have spoken to give positive response from this day. A member of the higher management means that it is not the outcome but the meeting between people that is the main point. People have to meet and challenge their prejudices and maybe this can make people start thinking of themselves as a member of a common institution. For students a sport day will be organized between the campuses two times next year, in February and in October. As well, an institutional manager for student affairs and sport on a university level has recently been appointed to coordinate events between the campuses. Other detected cooperation for students on a social integration level, is the cooperation and events the choirs from all campuses have had. (I2, P16, P20, M13, M11)

These initiatives are all good and hopefully they will continue in the future. If we connect the social integration with the patterns found about small or big occasions in cooperation, we would like to advocate socializing also in smaller groups. One good example is the initiative for “get-togethers” at the social department, though a promotion and suggestion from a higher level could be needed for the idea to also take place in other departments. In many interviews people have had the view that you can not force people to socialize and this is true, but you can make it easier, create opportunities and even promote it. Today this is missing at most places at the NWU but the merger is young and the process has just started.

Another positive response we found comes from a teacher at Mafikeng, she told us that she today has a few friends at Potchefstroom, she can call them if there are any problems and they also discuss other things except work. She means that who you “click” with is very individual. Contradicting is another teacher’s comment that when the meeting is over the white sit and eat lunch at one table while the black sit at another. The teacher himself breaks this pattern and this is often seen with suspicion. (M5, M6) In these cases we can see that contact on an organizational integration level, between
individuals from different groups, can something result in more then work relations. But contradicting not all people “click” as one interview persons put it and none can be forced to do so, as discussed in within and outside group.

Summary of Responses to the merger

The merger was done with unequal partners, which has affected many attitudes towards it. In general persons from Mafikeng have been more critical to the changes that the merger brought, but do also ask for faster changes at present. Persons at Potchefstroom have on the other hand not experienced that many changes, and probably not had to give up so much in the merger process. The merger process has been framed by feelings of uncertainty, lack of control and power, more strongly experienced at Mafikeng. However there can be detected a reluctance to change from both groups. The merger brought fear of loosing one’s culture, especially by Mafikeng where the expression “potchification” was funded. It also brought more centralization and less individual control. This seems to have been perceived more negatively among the staff at Mafikeng regarding the administrational level, and among students at Mafikeng towards resource differences and the raised student fee.

The pace of transformation is one factor highlighted, where it seems that it is mostly black people asking for faster changes, while whites are more worried about the changes in society and for their future. However it seems like the foundation of the campuses have not changed to a great extent, even though some more visible changes have been seen at Mafikeng.

It seems like group size, time, specific common goals and equal status can affect the outcome of cooperation. In a smaller group people tend to be more positive then in a larger setting, as well as cooperation during a longer time and with clearer common goals have been perceived as positive and may increase prejudices to a larger extent.
4.3 Within and outside group

This category is screening different groupings both between and within the campuses, the tensions between them and also some possible solutions to these tensions. The category is related to the “we and them” concept. The concept describes that a person identifies himself with a group identity, an identity that can vary depending on the situation and the circumstances. The concept indicates for example creation of prejudice about “the others”. At present, in our context there are two dominant groups at the different campuses, at Mafikeng SeTswana and at Potchefstroom Afrikaans. Because of the domination of one culture and language at each campus the category dominant culture and assimilation is closely connected to the category of within and outside group. For this reason they are analyzed in relation to one another. In our work we have referred to the code of dominant culture and assimilation as simply “dominance”. The main themes in the code of within and outside group are Language and Mixing socially.

Organizational integration

Language among staff

The language question has a high relevance at NWU and is closely connected to both categories of within and outside group and dominance and is therefore analyzed as a whole under this first category. The language question has caused and is still causing frustration and problems. We will under this headline describe what has been done on an organization level in relation to language, and how it has been perceived.

Language has caused large problems in cooperation and meetings, but also between colleagues of different languages within the both campuses. Most of the meetings, especially with fewer participants are held in English. Though there is a tendency that Afrikaans is spoken from time to time, something that is troublesome for non Afrikaans speaking participants. The use of a new interpreting system is one way to solve the language problems, to cooperate and to accommodate all. It has been experienced as a positive change for some persons, for example M1. He says that most of the meetings he attends are in English, documentation is in Afrikaans but translated if the material is large. Others experience the interpreting as a sign of reluctance and domination. Some negative consequences are that the non Afrikaans participants become less active in the debate, participants also experience that they have a harder time expressing opinions in a second language. Some responses tell that the interpreting technique is disturbing, there is a fear of loosing information and things might be spoken “over their heads”. These negative attitudes can for example be found in M4 and M7. It has been experienced especially provocative when participants at meeting, that know and can use English, still choose to speak Afrikaans. Some participants speak English in smaller meetings but switch to Afrikaans in larger groups, which strengthen this critical view. "Here is the joke...you sit down in a meeting and you have to put on headphones...let’s say you’re an Afrikaaner you want to say something in the meeting, one time you...speak in Afrikaans, I have to put on my headphone, then the next time when you speak you speak..."
in English. I mean I don’t get it!” (M12). Some suggest that since English is everyone’s second language it would be most equal if meetings and talking in social situations would be held in English. (M1, M4, M5, M7, M12)

Dan Kwagile, Campus Rector at Mafikeng, says the policy is meant to function so that everyone should be able to speak their own language, i.e. that interpreters should be used. However he sees that people (referring to black people) rather speak English than their mother tongue and he also underline the fact that SeTswana never has been a “working” language. For example he personally would have problems writing a memo in SeTswana. P19 state that also Afrikaans speaking persons have to put a great effort sometimes to speak English and that speaking English is a challenge for everyone. (M3, P19)

In smaller meetings it seems that people are more accommodated; English is more frequently used, power relations are less noticeable, members acquire a more personal relation to each other and your opinion are more easily heard. In larger meetings it seems frustration is greater; persons speaking English in a small meeting are using Afrikaans in larger meetings, it is probable that the lines between the groups is sharper and people experience less power to influence decisions. Differences between larger and smaller settings are further discussed in responses to the merger. A difference in the view of the interpreting system is also seen, where mainly black persons notice it as problematic. There are also some black people considering it as a way to shut them out, which is on contrary to what the system was thought to do.

Language among students

The organizational level of language problems handles mainly students at Potchefstroom because the interpreting system is primarily used there. More about the language problems at Mafikeng is presented at the social level beneath.

Students at Potchefstroom experience the language differences as difficult, especially common among students from minority language groups. According to Anette Combrink, Campus Rector at Potchefstroom, black students have a tough time with the Afrikaans language. To accommodate them and other non Afrikaans speaking students there is an interpreting system used in the education in campus specific courses. This system has according to Theuns Eloff, NWU’s Vice Chancellor, been received positively and is now helping about 300 students. (I1, P19)

However it is mainly white students that believe the interpretation system to be a positive development for accommodating black students. Though not all white students interviewed have personal experience of the interpreting system in class. White students in P7 and P10&P11 say that interpreters are not used even though they know it is thought to. They believe that a person would feel “out” using interpreters. Not many of the white students perceive the negative sides of the interpreting system, negative sides that many black students highlight. One person in the high management state that having interpreting systems is only one step ahead towards the solution. He declares that the students using headphones in class always will have a secondary message and that the Afrikaans students gain more than the non Afrikaans. Some black students in P2
strengthen this critical view mentioning that the information is “filtered” and that nuances in the Afrikaans language is not able to translate. P18, two black students, have heard black students saying it can be difficult to follow lessons, and that students fail courses because of difficulties understanding the lessons and the material handed out. Furthermore some comment that the use of interpreters is the choice of the teacher, if the subject exist at other campuses, and that interpreting in that case is principally done in classes with a larger number of black students. One student tell us that if there is a majority of black students in the class the teacher sometimes ask which language they want to have the class in. P15 teaches in English in his classes at Potchefstroom and has not received many problems from the Afrikaans students. (P2, P4, P5, P6, P7, P10&P11, P15, P18)

As an experiment there will next year be translation from English to SeTswana at the Mafikeng campus. This is due to findings from Potchefstroom that black English speaking students after a while stop using headphones when they learned enough Afrikaans to understand the teaching. This is thought to improve the Mafikeng students’ English knowledge. The reasons are that many students knowing English as a social language have problems understanding for example chemistry lessons in English. There is also a mandate from the government to develop SeTswana as an academic language. (I1)

It seems like most black students agree with black staff that the interpreting system can be disturbing, and a way of enhancing separation. There are as well some white students highlighting the fact that it can be disturbing or that you would feel odd using the headphones. One person in management also observes problems with the secondary message reached out to the black students. However since it is planned to use interpreting system at Mafikeng too, it seems like it is something that will be enhanced and that constitute a goal in itself, not a step towards another solution as the person in management says. In this situation it is also important to think about the many other language groups existing. Especially at Mafikeng where the minority groups also may have a hard time understanding the English language and have a low knowledge of SeTswana, which will cause them to be even more left out.

Even if accommodating both languages in teaching, Over Heads and notes handed out or written on the blackboard are more frequently in Afrikaans. This has been revealed to be a problem for the English speaking students, and also noted by one white student. Having lectures and material in two different languages has been experienced as difficult even for Afrikaans students. One student has also expressed that it can be hard to find English literature in a class where the literature is originally in Afrikaans. P6 says they solve their problems of having English literature in Afrikaans classes through getting notes in Afrikaans from older students, a possibility that must be seen as limited for black English speaking students. (P2, P6)

It has been perceived from some black students as a problem when asking questions and getting answers in English because some teachers’ lack of English skills. P2 says the answers turn out to be short and without as much explanation or examples as the Afrikaans students can get. There is also a problem if an Afrikaans student asks a question in an English class; he will usually receive the answer in Afrikaans. This can have the effect that students ask less questions and some black students say they are
uncomfortable raising questions in class. The black students in P2 say they have to prepare much more than the Afrikaans students before class in order to understand. For this cause they lack time and sometimes do not attend class. On the contrary white student’s experience that black students have the chance to ask questions in English, and that most students take that chance. The teacher in P17 has not experienced any real difficulties with having mixed classes. He experiences the use of interpreters in class as positive and none disturbing for the teaching. He says study guides are usually available in English and exams are given in both languages, which also is the opinion of P7. As a counterpart for the difficulties experienced by English speaking students P2 says there is a facilitator system where you can go before exams getting help and advice from older students, get old notes etc. an option that has been met positively by some of the black students. (P2, P3, P6, P7, P8, P9, P17)

We experienced that in some cases at campus it is difficult not knowing Afrikaans. At one office we saw a student union poster as well as commercial for a band playing, all in Afrikaans. The same was true for menus at restaurants both on and off campus, where we either have to ask the waiter or our accompanying friends for a translation. (FN 30/11 2007) Apart from missing out on information on posters etc. and thereby maybe missing out on some of the campus activities, it is most likely experienced by English speaking students as tough and sometimes embarrassing not understanding for example menus. This may cause that these students choose not to go to those places.

Language in group works

When working in group most white students experience a tolerant attitude and English is spoken if there are non Afrikaans speakers in the group. P6 believe that most white students feel comfortable in speaking both Afrikaans and English, even though the persons interviewed never been put in the situation where he has to choose what language to use. One black student experienced the opposite when she says that the Afrikaans students were reluctant to speak English. Even though the majority of both black and white students often consider English to be spoken at group works, to what degree differs. Some black students say that English is spoken when they write the report, but during discussions in the group Afrikaans is more frequently used. In some case the papers handed in also have to be in Afrikaans, which must lead to that non Afrikaans students have less control over the result, and therefore also more often feel shut out of the group. In what language papers are handed in differs although between subjects and teachers. (P2, P6, P9)

Language in organizations

Two students believe that it is equally easy for black and white students to be a member in a student organization. Yet one student in P6 says taking part in student organizations might be easier if you know some Afrikaans. She supposes it is harder for English speaking persons to fit in to at least her organization, due to the use of Afrikaans when speaking and in meetings. Some students have said that voluntarily work in organizations can improve your potential at the work market later. It might be opportunity that black
students miss out from if they can not take part in organizations due to language problems. (P6, P10&P11)

Using Afrikaans in organizations must be considered as a hinder for black students to take part in that kind of social life at campus, and can also widen the gap between black and white students. Being active in the student life also means involvement and probably a greater feeling of belonging at the campus, a feeling that especially black students seem to often lack.

Reluctance to speak other languages

The perceived reluctance to speak English is creating frustration by both black students and staff. Two teachers from Mafikeng are at a lecturing day at Potchefstroom to learn about new systems for teaching, but due to that some of the lectures are in Afrikaans they are not able to attend all the meetings, which they feel is very frustrating. "We are supposed to be attending something here...it’s written in Afrikaans ... we can’t hear...any word in Afrikaans. There were presenters...in Afrikaans...don’t know that language so we went out ... we’ll go back when the presenters going to do it in English." (M23). They believe that the use of a “universal language” (supposedly English) would be necessary. They estimate that there are at least 4 persons from Mafikeng attending that do not understand Afrikaans. Further they believe that all the participants and presenters know English. (M23)

There are more critical views among black students. One view considers interpreting as a way of keeping non Afrikaans students out, seen in for example P18, P4 and P3. They point to the fact that English is not their first language, and that they struggle to speak it. They mean that they made an effort learning another language, and feel that their effort should be returned from Afrikaans speakers. One other view presented by a students is critical to the way of “trying to fit in” and adopt. She means that she is not interacting on an equal basis and it is more a matter of assimilation then interaction. However there are students that have met reluctance from both black and white students to learn each other’s language. (P1, P2, P3, P4 P6, P10&P11, P18)

Both students and staff point to factors of inequality. Black people experience it unfair that they have to speak their second language, when Afrikaans speakers resist doing the same. This frustration can be understood, especially at a university level where most people are thought to know English. At an academic level it could be understandable that people think that the education of staff and elected members at meetings should be so high as to know how to use at least basic English.

We can furthermore sense a kind of pride in the more critical views and reluctance to “assimilate” into the other group’s language. As one student above express it, it has to be a matter of interaction and not assimilation. In situations where one language group is dominant, the pattern demonstrates that the interaction between the groups has to be handled carefully in order for the minority not to feel forced assimilated or unequal to their counterpart. As a result of this finding we believe that teachers and management should emphasis this concern. Since the university has a multi-linguistic policy all languages can be used, though when working with persons that do not know
your language some additional rules might be necessary for all students, and staff, to feel accommodated.

The previous separation of the different groups and the historical implications that were put to them during apartheid are still vibrant in the reluctance to compromise and make efforts to understand the other group, as seen in history further down in the analyse. Especially if the person does not feel that he achieves the same effort back. The use of Afrikaans especially when socializing in group works, organizations or at free time might sometimes hinder black and white students mixing. Obviously socialization and integration will become easier if people speak or understand each other’s languages, or at least learn the basic words, if so only to show goodwill.

Language in the future

Language is a concern in the future for all students. At Potchefstroom there are black students afraid of an increase of Afrikaans at the campus, and some claim they have heard from teachers that next year all the classes will be held in Afrikaans. A similar fear is expressed by two white students concerned that the use of English will increase. They describe the use of Afrikaans as important for the profile of the campus as well as a factor for students to choose Potchefstroom. (P2, P6, P8)

Language might be one of the main areas of clashes between the different cultures, and is clearly creating fear and irritation both among students and staff. Fear of loosing one’s language is visible, and may be one reason for reluctance to speak “the other” group’s language. There is also a frustration and fear of excluding others with having two dominant languages at each campus. According to our findings an increase of the interpretation system is sought and budgeted for both at Mafikeng and at Potchefstroom, but we have not found many signs of changing teaching languages or profile languages at the different campuses. Increasing the interpretation system can also have its backsides in growing separation and a justification for not trying to discover a common language accepted by all. By keeping Afrikaans at Potchefstroom as well as increasing SeTswana interpretation at Mafikeng the campuses tend to neglect and shut out other language groups attending the university, for example Zulus or Vendas.

Another view comes from Professor Madoda S Zibi who says that some parents want their children to attend English schools, because English is an important language internationally. P13 believe that it would benefit the Potchefstroom campus if more English speaking students enrolled. He additionally believes more teaching in English would be an asset since in the future English will be used more frequently. The same opinion is shared by some parents of students at Mafikeng whom wish not to teach their children in SeTswana because they think they will be isolated and have fewer opportunities in the future. (I2, P13, M15, P6, P8)

Clearly language and language skills is important for the future in many ways, both at workplaces and socially. Due to these personal motives of knowing more languages we can see an opportunity for learning different languages on a voluntarily basis, which can improve integration and understanding as a positive side effect.

Over all we would like to emphasise, like many students so have done, that English is not a first language to many persons at NWU and could perhaps in the future
be strived to become a more common language between the groups. For that matter a change of campus or teaching language may not be necessary, instead a common language that are used in smaller occasions where no translation is possible. For example in group works, students groups, happenings, social occasions etc. We notice that the language today in many ways is a means to keep a distance to each other. A promotion to learn more languages on a voluntary basis could be one way of promoting languages and bring up the discussion, promoting to learn not just English but also Afrikaans and SeTswana. The language discussion will continue on social integration.

Social integration

Language

As seen at the organizational integration level, the language barrier has shown to be a barrier for minority groups at both campuses. It is more particularly shown outside the organizational setting when people socialize.

In the Student Representative Council (SRC) at Mafikeng, English is spoken at meetings, however when socializing it is often done in SeTswana. This is not perceived as a problem by M19, at least not among the SeTswana speaking persons who experience that non SeTswana speakers quite quickly learn the language. It is yet perceived that without speaking SeTswana it will be hard to have a whole educational period at Mafikeng, as well as being a part of the society. This picture is shown in M22 for example. Because of this some students are taking SeTswana classes. However M22, as a non SeTswana student, also believes that learning SeTswana can be challenging in a positive way. (M9, M19, M21, M22)

The same pattern is shown during and after schoolwork. Most students at Mafikeng state that in class there are no problems regarding language because the classes are held in English. However students tend to speak SeTswana in social situations outside the classroom or when the teacher is not present in class. (M9, M19, M21)

At both campuses the dominant group considers language being less of a problem. Additionally, they perceive that the minority language group sooner or later learns some of the dominant language. The minority groups on the other hand tend more regularly to feel left out of social encounters because of lack of language knowledge.

The leaders and teachers appear to lack knowledge of how the students socialize outside the classroom or sports field. In these situations the language or culture has not been expressed as a problem from any of the sport leaders at the two campuses, seen in M2, M11 and P20, while it is expressed frequently by students. However M23 say that even teachers, at Mafikeng, often socialize using SeTswana. This could lead to that even non SeTswana speaking staff experience it difficult not knowing the dominant language. (M2, M11, M23, P20)

Even when able to force the use of one language at an organizational level, for example in larger meetings, it is much harder to influence people to speak another language when socializing privately. In this case it is up to the individual and his/hers will of accommodating and knowing another individual. This can be shown at both Potchefstroom and Mafikeng where the minority groups stress the fact that they feel they
have to learn the majority language to fit in. There is considered little will from the majority language group to learn or speak another language. This pressure can cause that the culture groupings enhances. However when having a dominant culture at the campuses, it must be seen as a somewhat precondition that the minority language groups by time learn some SeTswana or Afrikaans, at least if socialization among the groups is a goal. This prerequisite is present in many cases regarding integration where a minority is acting in an environment dominated by a majority group, like for example among immigrants moving to Sweden, where it is necessary to learn the Swedish language to function in society. Still in South Africa the largest problem is that all these groups call South Africa their home-country and no language is in an overall majority. This makes it more difficult for some persons to adapt to others. It is not possible to force people to speak another language, especially socially and since the SeTswana is so strong at Mafikeng and Afrikaans at Potchefstroom it is possible that minority languages at the campuses need to adopt. However it is important to emphasize that even the SeTswana and Afrikaans speakers need to have an open mind and a tolerant attitude towards other language groups.

Mix socially at campus - introduction

One big challenge for the university is the great distance between the campuses which makes it difficult for people to meet and socialize. The majority of students and staff will not have any reason to meet persons from the other campuses. The possibility for social integration between the campuses should therefore not be exaggerated according to Theuns Eloff the Vice Chancellor. Nonetheless work is done in order to overcome these problems. There was organized a “fun day” for staff recently, that was perceived as something positive according to Theuns Eloff. Yet P15 considers that the hardest thing is to make people understand the necessity of these days, and that the eventual socialization between people during the day might not be as rigid in the long run as was hoped for. M6 says that there is also the possibility that it is people with an already “open mind” that attend these events, and that it might not be these persons that need these days the most. (11, P15, P16, M6)

Mix socially - groupings

Tendencies of grouping together in “we-groups” socially after the professional work is over are present not just after the “fun day” but also after meetings or other formal encounters. At a professional level the differences are less obvious; the groupings tend to show themselves more in social settings and at a personal level. Similar patterns can be found in sport, where a difference in mixing on and off field can be seen, as well as division among students during and after group works. Groupings seem to follow the same patterns as language when coming to the difference between social and organisational integration.

P 21 has, on the contrary, encountered no problems socializing with colleagues at the other campuses. At management level problems seem less evident than at a faculty level, which might be due to the closer work during longer time, as well as management have been on team building camps etc. This can be linked to the discussion
in **responses to the merger** under cooperation before. M6 believes that this behaviour of grouping together is a mix of arrogance, ignorance but also uncertainty of how to behave and interact with people of another race or language group. (P21, P20, M1, M6)

As said, people generally cooperate within an organizational setting, but off field, out of classroom, meeting etc people tend to cling together with their own cultural group or “we group”. This pattern has been highlighted by players in M22 and P20 at both Mafikeng and Potchefstroom. On field everyone is friends and culture and language differences are not so visible. Culture differences are on the other hand more visible off field and the groupings are strengthened. These tendencies have as well been detected by a teacher at the “fun day”. P 15 mean that after the games there was still a tendency of separating into groups and the social interaction between the participants was limited. Even in group work these tendencies seem to be visible. There is a trend that students separate, if choosing your group members yourself. Reasons given are generally that one work with people that live close to you, for convenience. As P5 states, you tend to work with those living at your hostel or hostels close. Others say that they choose to work with white students “instinctively”, and mention that you choose people that you know and work well with (M22, P5, P6, P15, P20) According to us, many black people seem not to stay at hostels (see housing further down) which could further generate a separation also in group works. Even outside the classroom these tendencies of grouping together in “we groups” has been shown, as mentioned in language above.

Two rugby players at Potchefstroom mean that groupings have more to do with whom you are similar to. "..*its normal way of life, to people from the same kind like to associate with people from the same kind...*” (P20). This does not have to be in a negative way though, they say. While this example is not only on a social level, it is still outside an organised environment and decisions lay at the individual. Yet P5 state that working together would not create a problem, it is just the practical setting that differs. Another student says it would not be a hinder for him. The teacher P15 also experiences groupings sometimes in his classes, and says he comments it when it happens. The teacher P17 often arrange mixed groups, and have heard no complains about that. (P5, P15, P17, P20)

As mentioned before and as our theory states, people tend to have fewer problems to work together when having a common goal. In social mixing common goals do not always exist and it seems to be harder to create a framework for it. There is neither always equal status among the participants, at least not perceived. Even though people in the group may have the same degree or have same level of education, there is still reason to believe that status differs regarding race or language etc. This is seen before in **responses to the merger** as well as partly in *Allport’s contact theory*. In this section the discussion of intergroup and outgroup also plays a part. It is more common and accepted to cooperate and socialize in one setting, for example divided into a group by the teacher, but not common to continue the socialization outside that group. Choosing group mates of another race may not either be accepted by people in the outgroup or others in your intergroup. This is why it sometimes can be fruitful if the teacher forms the groups.

Another characteristic we have seen is common rules. This is according to us an important feature that might ease some of the clashes in a setting lacking some of the other characteristics, for example equal status. It seems that a common goal is
important, but for cooperation common rules of how to achieve that goal is also significant. Common rules, agreed on either by the parts in the group or by authorities, can act as a structure for people in the group. As well the members have something to refer to if they feel neglected or mistreated.

An example of these rules could be that in group works with an English speaking students the paper have to be handed in English, as well as discussions should be in English to accommodate all. Rules of behaviour in the cooperation can also help to bridge some of the differences between the groups.

Mix socially - domination & common interests

For making students at the campuses socialize one problem seem to be the strong domination of Afrikaans respective SeTswana students at the two different campuses. When asked if there are any white students at Mafikeng M15 laughs a bit and says that the only non black persons at the campus are two Indian. However students say that there are some coloured students, and among the teachers and staff there are some white and coloured. The student’s opinion seems to differ a bit in the composition of black and white students at Mafikeng, two students say that there are 2 or 3 white students. The relation inside campus to white persons is though yet mostly through teachers. (M15, M21)

At Potchefstroom the percentage of black persons is a bit larger; the Campus Rector says there are 20% black students at campus. However P7 do not consider there to be many black students at Potchefstroom, and suppose they are at Mafikeng instead. One white student in P7 says she had much more black friends in high school than now at university. The domination and relation between SeTswana speaking students contra non SeTswana speaking students can be imagined to be the same as the relation between white and black student at Potchefstroom. (P7, P19)

The domination of one group at the campuses can cause that students in their everyday life, in hostels or in class do not encounter anyone from the other group. This takes away the opportunity to meet, a feature Moody highlights in our theory. The differences in perception of amount of black students at Potchefstroom also indicate that white and black students do not mix or socialize at the same places.

In ways of meeting friends P7 says they have friends from earlier years in school, or they meet new friends in bras (bbq). They do not meet so much new people when they are out dancing for example. At Potchefstroom there is a tendency among the students to form groups according to their culture and language. P1 highlight this is his interview where he says that "some people just tend to stay with their cultural type of friends and others don’t really bother" (P1). M22 present the view that at Mafikeng the pattern is similar. The interviewed means that it is more common that people from the same cultural and language background group together and those friends are found within the group you feel comfortable. In this case it tends to be within your own language group too. (P1, P7, P20, M22)

One black student in P18 thinks it is hard to make friends with white students at Potchefstroom because of differences and separation into groups. He says: "...say that we’ll have a brai for example, just a simple brai and you bring Afrikaans people they would not quite mix with anybody, they would make their own formation ..."
that’s why most of the time we have a brain we don’t even invite them...by the end of the day the party would be a bit boring because they’re isolated and to include them is a lot of work.” (P18). He believes that this mostly have to do with how you are brought up and taught. An opposite opinion is met in P6 where one student says that friendship between races is becoming more common and that “we don’t mind that much anymore” (P7). One student says they do not have any problem mixing socially with English speaking students (but is referring to white English speaking students.) Two white students think that there will always be people not accepting friendship over race lines. They mean it is more natural to become friend with people that are like you and share the same values. Though they think it would be interesting to learn from each other and believe that will happen more naturally in the future. (P1, P7, P18, M15, M22, P6)

P18 makes another example where one of the interviewed describes a situation where you can be friends with someone at campus, but when meeting the same student downtown with his parents, he will not greet you. (P18) In a situation like this social environment as well as history, class etc. play a large part. This example also shows how a person can act differentially depending on which group he belongs to at present. Socializing with someone from another race includes problems such as language, culture differences etc. You may not feel at ease or know how to interact with that person different to you, also because of the prejudices and perceptions that you bear with you. There is reason to believe that mix socially still is met with suspicion from others, related to our theory of intergroup and outgroup, as well as we and them.

While domination of one group is one reason why integration between the groups is difficult, there are also others; lack of will, pressure from others in your “we group”, no exposure etc. Another reason we can see here is that it is also natural that you find your friends among the ones that are similar to you, you have things in common with and that you feel comfortable among. We do not consider this strange in any way, most people want socializing to be fun and comfortable. Outside one’s “we-group” or cultural group it seems to be hard to find these factors. As we have seen in our interviews, the chances of having friends from another race can not be exaggerated. More details on this discussion are found in the final analysis. Being comfortable with other races can though be worked on. One person above said she has friends of both races, but that she had more black friends at high school. This can of course be due to the percentage of black students in your high school versus that of the university, but may also reflect attitudes and systems at the university or the community surrounding it. It seems that finding occasions or a place where all students can feel comfortable to meet is important and at NWU not very common. If white students are finding new friends at brais, the possibility that they will meet a black friend there must be seen as limited. P16 and I1 perceive that friendship cannot be forced instead it has to be on a voluntarily basis, a view that we very much share. (P16, I1) On the other hand opportunities to meet, school policies, teachers’ approaches, the opinion of your “we-group” etc can play a big role in how strong the will gets. See more opinions about this in the future of social mixing below.

Black students on Potchefstroom have been critical to the way that white students interact which they say shut them out. However this is a process that runs both ways and it can be worth wondering how many black students are willing to change their own behaviour or thoughts in order to accommodate white students. Obviously as stated
in P18 before even black students feel a reluctance to invite white people to parties. Also in our field notes there is one black student saying that he avoids going to a party with mostly white people, because he can not bare their ignorant attitudes and political views. He felt he had to assimilate to fit in, and could not socialize in a natural way. (FN 16/11 2007) However to understand attitudes and views may be important even for black people to see the fears and frustrations of the white people. There is reason to believe that even black people are scared and reluctant to meet and understand white people.

Mix socially - off campus

At Potchefstroom black and white students may go out partying to the same places but they seem to seldom go there together and from our observations it is also rare that they mix while out. We went out with some black friends one night. The first bar we went to was quite mixed and a relaxed atmosphere, while when we went on to another place, we felt that people were looking a bit odd at our mixed group. (FN 16/11 2007)

P5 says that at the more popular student clubs in Potchefstroom such as Bourboun street, Midnight and Impala often play Afrikaans music. The two students also indicate that many students go to Drakenstein (the bar at campus) to watch the rugby games shown there. P5 see black and coloured at these places, but think that they might prefer to go elsewhere or have parties at home. Two students in P6 say that black students more often go partying in Ikasheng (the township in Potchefstroom), a place which not quite accepted that white students go to. (P5, P6, P9, P18) During our lunch with two students at Drakenstein we do not see any black student celebrating the end of the recent exam. (FN 12/11 2007) Under headline different treatment there is presented a view that means that black students are not always let in to the clubs in Potchefstroom, which of course might be one reason that not many black students are seen there.

Since Afrikaans music and rugby is closer connected to the Afrikaans culture there is reason to believe that black students may not always feel comfortable in those settings or at those clubs. It also gives that white students will get less opportunity to meet black people at a social level. Related to the theory our findings once again show that one of Moody’s a prerequisite of creating mixing opportunities is limited. This might also show the lack of knowledge among the white students of the reasons why not so many black students go to “their” places. None is highlighting the fact that black students may not always be comfortable at these places.

When we were invited to parties in Potchefstroom and Mafikeng we saw differences in socializing between black and white students. For once we did not feel that people were very comfortable in speaking English, at least not longer conversations. At Mafikeng we met more positive attitudes towards the use of English, although SeTswana is preferred people do willingly speak English to us. To add here is of course the greater use of English at Mafikeng compared to Potchefstroom. At one party in Potchefstroom the music was mostly, what was told to us, Afrikaans. The dancing was slower, a kind of foxtrot. When some people became a bit more “wild” and danced more “freely”, this was excused. (FN 16/11 2007, FN 17/11 2007) This stands in contrast to the nightclub Bourboun street, where the music was more international and the dancing more “free”. We did some observations this night. Going out as a mixed group we were somehow in
between the division of black and white students at the club. Our group was mixed with black South Africans and white or coloured internationals. Most black people danced and socialized in one corner of the dance floor. It seemed like everyone knew which area of the club that was unofficially for white and for black people. Some black people tried to socialize some with the white students, and some white students came and said hi to some black students. However there was no real mixing at the club, we only saw two people, except our group, one black and white that danced together. We also detected a different way of dancing between the groups, where the black or coloured people danced closer and more intimate while the white danced more reserved, also as described above from the first party we went to. There were also more black people at the dance floor when it was played RnB compared to techno or rock. (FN 16/11 2007) At a home party with friends of mixed races, our black male friends liked to dance a lot and danced together with each other, something that we do not think many white males do (FN 29/11 2007). At a party in Mafikeng we also saw a difference in partying where the dancing was much closer and “wilder” then at Potchefstroom, a very different dance style. (FN 24/11 2007) These observations show the differences in socializing, and also the division that is made even at a club where both races are partying.

Regarding sexual relationships between the races, P6 says it is not quite accepted that a white and black person is a couple, at least not in Potchefstroom. Two persons believe that there is a more tolerant attitude towards this in other cities, for example Cape Town. For being in a relationship in Potchefstroom, they believe, the persons “really have to be in love”. On the other hand they also consider it is becoming easier for younger generations to have mixed relationships and that relationships between races are increasing. One student in P6 says that he personally could not be together with a person of another race, but that it is a personal choice. He believes that children from a mixed relationship could have greater difficulties to fit in. (P6, P10&P11) One of our friends during our stay, a white female exchange student, had a relationship with a black South African. She experienced it to be controversial sometimes; people looked at them weird when they were together, came up to her asking if she needed help or if she was ok etc. She experienced this very frustrating at times. (FN 16/12 2007)

Potchefstroom’s history of being a traditional Afrikaans city may be shown in the attitudes above, yet sexual relationships between races might be hard to accept anywhere in South Africa. Since mixing socially often is seen as a problem it must be understood that relationships is even one step further and a situation were it is excepted are not yet reached. possible reasons might be the fear of not fitting into your “we-group”, friend group, family etc. when having a partner of another colour. A perceived acceptance of this is positive and shows that attitudes are starting to change. The same question of relationships has not been discussed at Mafikeng, one reason for this is that those questions were not highlighted by the persons interviewed. Being controversial questions we did not bring the topic up ourselves, but it was an area that was easier included in the discussions at Potchefstroom where both black and white students are more present. We do not therefore have any knowledge of sexual relations between different cultures or language groups at Mafikeng.
Mix socially - future

There have been noticed a change of mindset and more frequently mixed groups at Potchefstroom by the Vice Chancellor. Even the Campus Rector, Anette Combrink, shares this view that friendship between races is becoming more “relaxed”. Three black staff members of Mafikeng agree with this positive picture. Professor Madoda Zibi highlight that it is important to let people be suspicious to a certain level. Due to the fact that people have been separated during such a long time they now have to challenge their prejudices and revaluate them. Both Hendre Reyneke, dean of students, Professor Madoda Zibi and Vice Chancellor Theuns Eloff say that integration will come gradually but is nothing that can be forced. (I1, I2, P19, M5, M23)

Theuns Eloff brings up the active work of integrating students in for example hostels, and encouraged mixed participation in for example sports activities and organizations. It is worth noticing that it is mostly white people at Potchefstroom that are positive to the development, as well as persons in the higher management. No black staff at Potchefstroom at a campus level has been found to interview in order to find their opinion. There have been a recent cultural survey that will show the attitudes towards different areas of the merger, answered by staff at both campuses. This survey will however not handle student’s opinions on the merger. (I1, Eish! November 2007)

Summary of Within and outside group

The main content of this category is that the cultural groups still are separated. The separation is caused by a variety of things, among them language and culture differences, as well as the historical separation between the groups. The two largest codes we have found in this category are language and mixing socially.

Between the groups it can be observed a pride and reluctance to change and a fear of loosing one’s culture and language, combined with suspicion of the other group’s effort. This is shown in the attitudes towards the interpreting system that is perceived quite negatively by both black students and staff. Feelings of being left out, having a secondary message and being patronized are common. We have also seen a reluctance to speak another language; especially socially the dominant language at each campus is used. Socially the language differences create a division between people and can diminish social interaction between the groups.

People tend to cling to their culture or race. Mixing socially is still not common or accepted by all. It seems that working or doing sport together cause less problems, while mixing socially with the same people is less frequent. Many people bring up the cultural differences as reason for not integrating, and it seems like neither white nor black people do have any strong will to change and try to understand the differences.
4.4 Dominant culture and Assimilation

This category describes the hegemony of one culture group at each campus. It also shows the effects this domination has on both campus cultures and towards the minority group that often feels they have to assimilate to fit in.

Organizational integration

Many signs of dominance and assimilation on an organisational level are highly connected to the merger and for that matter some observation and patterns are instead dealt with in the code responses to the merger. Both at Potchefstroom and Mafikeng we have detected some responses that indicate that underlying racism at times still are present at the campuses. Examples below are mostly from Potchefstroom due to the more visible division and tension between black and white students. Racist attitudes at an organisational level in for example housing can most likely be found at Mafikeng too, even though this has not been expressed in detail in the interviews. At Mafikeng the different treatment at a social level is more present which is why Mafikeng’s problems are described more under the social integration headline. Here we will show examples how domination and discrimination expresses itself inside the organisation.

Different treatment

Many persons highlight the importance of changing mindset and attitudes for a successful integration to take place. We see that once again the history logically play a large part in the way people perceive each other. Perceptions are nothing that changes completely by rearranging organizational structures. Different treatment, both visible, as in the example below, and perceived is obviously creating hinders for integration and equality.

Two black students share a critical view and claim that when a black student over perform a white student in class or at campus level, he or she is not given as much credit for the achievement as a white student would be given. They believe that the spirit of white superiority is still present at times at Potchefstroom campus. “If the black guy over perform the white guy then it sends the wrong message to the people...that black people can do better then us.” (P18) The students encountered this experience when divided into two groups doing a project. The teacher divided them into two groups of three black students respectively two white students. The white students had a more preferable working room and a computer, compared to the black students. This division among the students is described as becoming gradually. P18 experience that the white students are relatively open the first year at university, but that the division is becoming more visible with time in the institution. It is for example the white students that get to drive the car if a group is going somewhere or is given responsibility to handle money. This creates a difference among the races of the students. (P18)

In an organizational setting the use and influence of Afrikaans is seen as one way of dominating the campus. In some organizations and in the Student Representative Council (SRC) Afrikaans is used. In the SRC this is motivated by fact that
the two non white students involved do understand and speak Afrikaans. Problems with culture differences are minimal in the SRC one black student in P12 says, and believe that this can be due to that he lives in a hostel which helped him to understand the way the SRC works and to understand the Afrikaans culture. The Potchefstroom SRC maintains some of the old traditions, for example that they start the meetings with a prayer, the national anthem and the PUK song. The domination of white students in the SRC is explained by P14 to be because of the larger percentage of white students at Potchefstroom. However there are two portfolios that have to be filled by students from minority groups. She experience that black students are active and put a lot of effort to choose the right person for these portfolios. (P6, P12, P14)

The campus newspaper WAPAD is mainly Afrikaans even though there are a few articles in English. The staff at the newspaper is still dominated by white students, which P13 believes is due to the mindset that the newspaper is more directed for white students. (P13) This may keep black students away for applying for posts, reading the newspaper and also reduces the articles in English.

There is a student organization called “Cosatu” at Potchefstroom, which is supposed to help students with matters of mistreatment of different kinds. They bring the case higher up to the management. This organization has according to P2 mostly black students involved. The lack of white students receiving help from Cosatu maybe due to that they do not have as many problems as the black students. (P2)

It has shown earlier, in within and outside group, that the language differences are creating problems in for example cooperation and students organizations. There is reason to believe that the domination of the Afrikaans language in organizations, school paper and the SRC can be seen as an obstacle for English speaking students to involve. To add is that the traditions kept in for example the SRC can be disturbing for non Christian students. Maybe at least formal organizations such as the SRC need to reform slightly in order to accommodate the greater variety of students at the campus.

Even though not expressed in any interviews the same situation probably exist at Mafikeng. There, almost all black students come from backgrounds of living together with black people or SeTswana. Neither are they exposed to white people or in a great extent to other black culture groups in their everyday life of at the campus. P18 do however think that black South Africans does not have the same will of shutting other people out of their culture as the white Afrikaans culture have (P18). The more visible pattern at Mafikeng is the division within the black students regarding of what culture or language group you belongs to. Black people’s separation during the Apartheid is still present in the occasionally racist attitudes toward each other; see more under the unwillingness to change headline. As seen above white people at Potchefstroom have more influence and black students have a harder time fitting in, as well as the black minority groups have problems fitting in at SeTswana dominated Mafikeng.
Limited employment

Two students in P18 criticize what they see as limited variation of employees or former students that are being employed at Potchefstroom. We have no knowledge of to what extent it is true that the campus is employing former students, however year 2006 7 of 9 members of the institutional management had degrees from the former Potchefstroom University. (Annual report 2006 p.18) They claim that the campus is afraid of critical persons and this is why they hire “safe” individuals. They believe that this at times is unconscious, but that Potchefstroom although is conscious about having the “right” persons employed. They consider one prerequisite in order to be employed is to speak Afrikaans, which is not so common among black people. (P18) To what extent the campus have language requirement in employment we do not have knowledge about, it is not something we have encountered during discussions. However the Vice Chancellor has highlighted the necessity of learning some Afrikaans in order to be accommodated at the campus in the long run. (I1)

M7 is critical to the setting of the council, which he considers to consist of a majority of white people. He believes that a council of mostly white will not for example criticize the vice chancellor or force questions about equality. (M7)

Employing persons that are “shaped” in the campus spirit certainly includes the risk of having less critical employees. On the other hand it must be understood that a former student may have valuable knowledge of traditions and the system at campus, which causes less misunderstandings and errors. Most misunderstandings and prejudices in this area we believe are due to lack of information or visibility into the process. However this mistrust is creating a problem itself, handle it in a different way and discuss openly about these perceptions would probably help reducing some prejudices. Maybe there has to be a clearer motivation of why a person is employed, as well as presenting a future plan of how to shape for instance the council to be more equally represented over the race lines.

Social integration

Different treatment

Some actions at the organisational level have been perceived as racist, and this perception is also present in a social setting. One example presented to us is that discussion topics can change to easier and less advanced ones once a black person enters the room. M6 is highlighting the façade of professionalism that underneath hide feelings and attitudes of superiority and racism, and stress that a change of mindset needs to be addressed. One teacher at Mafikeng is critical and claim that the structure must be equal before there will be an equal socialization. (M6, M7, I2)

The problem seems to be present at both Potchefstroom and Mafikeng. It is worth noticing that at Potchefstroom it is black persons highlighting these problems, and no white interviewed persons. Different treatment does affect the organisation and when present the organisation must handle it. But racism is not born only within an organisation and do not stop existing outside of it. It is the same discrimination that proves itself inside the organization as outside in a social setting. As shown in social
integration in language as well, the social side of these problems is much harder to deal with. Changing a mindset is something very abstract. At a social level there are neither any clear rules of how to act, and actions tend to be less thought through. Moreover people have different roles depending on the situation they are in, for example being a teacher versus being a father. Connected to the more professional roles there should be obligations of non discrimination. However it is probable that people act differently depending on their role and that being including in one role does not have to change the actions when possessing other roles. See also discussion in within and outside group of different roles in different environments or “we groups”.

In a community setting some black students of Potchefstroom have met racism, for instance when going out at night. At one of the more popular clubs for students they have been denied entrance with arguments such as there have been black people fighting before, or that they are asked for their student cards even though it is not a student club. Even though open racism is not common in our interviews, according to the examples here, the history of racism and excluding black people is still present at times. As M15 say ”...I’m not going to lie, Potch, the whole town is still regarded to be very racist...”. Other black students feel they are not welcome at the campus, and have met attitudes that they should rather stay at Mafikeng or other black campuses. (M15, P9, P18)

The social environment outside the campus is also shaping people’s view of each other. If black people are seen as problematic at one of the popular clubs, the perception is likely to stick in some people’s minds even in other settings. Due to the minority of black people in Potchefstroom it is also easier that this group will get a bad reputation from a few bad acts of black people, then if there were more black people showing the opposite. People tend to view the “others” as a group, not as individuals, which enhances the prejudices.

Unwillingness to change - Mafikeng

This headline shows in a more visible way the reluctance to change that exists among the dominant groups at each campus. At Mafikeng the phenomenon of xenophobia is mentioned in some interviews and perceived as a problem that still exists, yet becoming rarer. The antagonism is perceived, by I1, to be greater towards black people of different groups then towards white people, in Mafikeng’s case mostly SeTswana contra non SeTswana groups. Mafikeng is a historically SeTswana dominated region and these tendencies are still vibrant. Some teachers come from other African countries since the days when Mafikeng was a homeland, and some believe there is still sensitivity towards these foreigners to steal the jobs for the SeTswana population. (I1, M6, M9)

In our field notes one of our friends describe his situation being a non South African studying in Pretoria. Being an exchange student he met attitudes such as: he must be rich coming to study in South Africa hence people asked him for money, and that he occupied space at the university for South Africans. At Potchefstroom he now mostly has friends among the exchange students and his relationship with black South African people is mostly professional. (FN 6/12 and 12/12 2007)

Other students have experienced this xenophobia, both as SeTswana and non SeTswana speaking students. Among them there are explanations about a lack of will
to work and cooperate with persons from another culture and difficulties from the non SeTswana groups to fit in and being accepted, example in M9. M16 present their difficulties as being of a minority culture group to fit into the SeTswana dominated campus. They feel discriminated because of the differences in language and cultural expression. They experience that they are being treated worse, regarded as poorer and been called names etc. M14 believe that many students “hide” their cultural background and are reluctant to show their cultural heritage by fear of discrimination. (M9, M14, M16)

There is nonetheless work done at the Mafikeng campus to bridge these attitudes, through for example the international student day where different cultural expressions were demonstrated by the students. Some students also express an interest and will to learn from other cultures. The recently started student organization “culture union” was started by students as a forum for different kinds of culture and art expressions. The organization is trying to create a better understanding between the cultures through for example the planned “intervarsity multicultural event” where students from all cultures will be involved in the process of showing their cultural expressions. M16 says it is mostly students, and not staff, that contain a non tolerant attitude, which according to them might be due to their lack of exposure to other cultures. (M14, M16)

We have not heard any expressions of being met by racism among the staff members at Mafikeng, even though there is reason to believe that it can exist. Own initiatives as the “culture union” is a great step, and may especially be so since it is taken by students and not enforced from the management level. This can grant it more credibility among the students. Initiative, as for example a culture union, is less visible at Potchefstroom where the problems between black and white students in a social environment are little addressed.

Unwillingness to change - Potchefstroom

Potchefstroom is still considered to be Afrikaans influenced, and is as P13 says a small world of its own as a result of a small town centred around one university. Even in the work environment Potchefstroom is still profiling itself as an Afrikaans campus according to one teacher. Two black students from Potchefstroom claim that there are donations made from the society to Potchefstroom campus in order to maintain the Afrikaans culture. True of not it illustrates how strong the perception is of the domination of Afrikaans culture and the perceived will to uphold it. (P13, P15, P18)

M7 believe that people still view each other according their race due to the domination of one race at each campus. The historical division in advantaged and disadvantaged campuses is still creating tensions according to him. The maintaining of the Afrikaans culture and language is seen by two black students as a way of keeping them out; first by the colour of their skin and now by the language. However Anette Combrink explains the necessity of maintaining Afrikaans as an academic language in order for it to not die out, which has occurred with other languages. Although, Theuns Eloff says he have seen a difference in attitudes at Potchefstroom, where they no longer wants to be perceived as a white Afrikaans campus. (P18, P19, I1, M7)
The language and the strong Afrikaans culture have created frustration and division between people. However, it is also understandable that the will to preserve one’s own culture is enhanced in a country with plenty of different cultures and languages. The problem for the Afrikaans culture might be the strong connection it has to the domination in the earlier Apartheid era, a past that is hard to wash off even though there is a will to do so. The same pattern can be found at Mafikeng that also has a close connection to the area through language and culture. It seems like the homeland system during Apartheid did create strong connections to your “we-group” and a division to “others”. These strong influences of the dominant cultures both at campuses and in the society tend to shut others out.

As a response to the critique that is sometimes given to white people and their actions, we have seen attitudes by two white students that consider they are not to be blamed for the events during the Apartheid era, since they were only children when it occurred. There are attitudes of “get over it” and move on, since it was twelve years since the end of Apartheid. Some students also feel blamed and treated unjustly when now trying to bridge the traces of Apartheid. (FN 12/11 2007) These attitudes are reasonable since many of the students today were young during the end of the Apartheid, both black and white. However, it has shown that the historical traces still affect people’s minds, as well as attitudes in society and at campus, which needs to be addressed. People also get affected by their “we-group” that still can contain racist attitudes. The attitudes and mindsets of people do not change just because of an independence declaration, but is something that needs to be highlighted and worked on in order to disappear. Clearly it is ungrateful to be criticized when trying to bridge the problems. It is however harder to change already negative attitudes, and an attitude like “getting over” indicate that people do not really understanding the depth of the problem.

According to Professor Madoda S Zibi the history still plays a part also in the choice of campus. The strong campus identity may be appealing for white students as it still is dominated by the Afrikaans culture. Some changes are made to accommodate a more diverse group of students after the merger, for example that the Christian profile of the campus is now less visible. Never the less one white student says the spirit will never be taken away. Many white students also say they chose to study at Potchefstroom because of the campus culture, atmosphere and because of the use of Afrikaans and the previous Christian profile. Other reasons are that the city are small and alike their hometowns, that friends recommended the campus etc. Potchefstroom campus is also considered by three students to be more directed for white students and Mafikeng is more directed for black students and more often their logical choice. P12, a black student says now students do not have to accept “the whole Afrikaans thing in Potch”, and that they have other options, other campuses to choose between. (I2, P1, P4, P10&P11, P12)

Some black students at Potchefstroom say that arrangements, for example concerts or other social events, mostly appeal to the taste of white students. P13 believe that the language differences are the main reason that black or English speaking students do not attend activities. One white student assumes that many black students do not feel at ease in Potchefstroom due to the domination of Afrikaans both in language and in culture. A black student at Potchefstroom describes the community as firm and people socialize mostly with one kind of people. He considers that white people from his
hometown are more open than they are in Potchefstroom, where believes people are afraid of change. (P1, P2, P12, P13)

Unwillingness to change - Analyse

Although merged it seems like there is still a division between races at the campuses. Worth mentioning is the lack of knowledge about the merger seen in the category of responses to the merger, which may explain why some students still picture the campuses as, divided. It also demonstrates the lack of interaction between the groups. It seems that reluctance is most recognized in traditions and social situations, and mostly perceived as a problem by the minority groups at the different campuses. Tendencies of not fitting in, feelings of a forced assimilation and unease in showing cultural expressions can be seen among black students at Potchefstroom and among students from other culture groups than SeTswana at Mafikeng. This can be witnessed in the perceived xenophobia at Mafikeng, present even if diminishing. It is important to notice that even black people from other countries do not always feel at ease socializing with black South Africans. It seems like tensions and lack of understanding is present in almost every social mix. However it seems that the strength of lack of understanding between groups is also determined by how different the cultures are from each other.

There can be seen an unwillingness to change from the majority groups at the campuses, but also a reluctance by the minority group. Suspicion is still strong. Probably both majority and minority groups have to sacrifice some and negotiate to create an environment sustainable for everyone. The majority groups tend to not see or do neglect the differences or the problems their own action can cause towards a minority group. Some persons inside the majority group have highlighted that not knowing their language can be hard. However none have any suggestion of solution to the problem. It is rather the minority groups that have demonstrated the problem areas, and it seems like the minority and majority groups do not discuss between each other.

Housing

Potchefstroom campus has popular hostels on campus where students live together in corridors. According to an informal talk with a staff member at Potchefstroom, the campus today contain approximately 14500 students, have 25 residences and 4500 students living in them. (FN 12/11 2007) There is a quota for the composition of black students in every hostel, a rule which has created some frustration. A friend of a black student had to move out in order to leave space for other white students, which he experienced hard. One student estimates that among 120 hostels there are 10 that are mixed. P15 have earlier been responsible for hostels, and see it as a positive change having mixed hostels now. He describes the critical balance the needs to be maintained, where the percentage of either white or black students must be handled carefully in order that none of the two groups feel uncomfortable and move out. (P9, P12, P15)

Prof. Hendre Reyneke highlight the importance of having the supportive structures of quoting black students into the hostels since many of the students are not used to live together with another culture and can find it hard at times. He believes that most hostels are accommodating students by speaking languages for everyone to
understand, but there are some hostels that mainly speak Afrikaans which create problems. In P10&P11 there is a belief that the campus does not put any effort into making black people feel more welcome in the hostels. Peer groups in the hostels consisting of older students are employed to control eventual difficulties in the hostels, help people accommodate and shall report if there are some problems. The students working in peer groups are trained by personal at the student counselling, who is the unit that is reported to if there is found any trouble. Peer groups are also supportive in everyday matters if a student has problems with studies etc. (P10&P11, P16)

Forcing integration like this is clearly creating frustration and difficulties. A person has to interact with people he may not choose by himself. Black students are also challenging the Afrikaans culture and traditions as shown in the problems mentioned below. Quoting systems like this clearly creates clashes in the interaction, and must be handled with care. However we see it as a positive step, a step that on organisational integration level can create a positive outcome at a social integration level. Without control it would probably take a long time until white and black students were living together and longer time to accept such a composition. To achieve integration it might be necessary to have this forced integration seen in the housing at Potchefstroom. Without this is also probable that the different groups more rarely would meet or have to socialize in their every day life.

Both P12 and P5 believe that black students prefer to live alone in apartments and not in hostel. Some reasons are considered to be the large majority of white students in the campus residences, as well as the increased freedom that is given living off campus. Two black students at Potchefstroom have the perception that accommodation forms is handed out earlier to Afrikaans schools, which give them priority. They feel that only when all rooms possible are filled with white students there is room for a black student. In opposition to this the quoting system described by Porf. Hendre Reyneke above exists. The two students also say that the hostel floors are divided after race; with the black students at top of the buildings and that a white and a black student never share a room. To the second opinion we do not have any knowledge if it is true or not. P18 say that before 2004 the houses shared by exchange students were mixed in colour, which they no longer are. Mixing the houses was good because they learned from each other and met people from other cultures. Living together is one way of reducing the prejudices of each other they say. (P5, P12, P18)

Assimilation

Housing and especially the hostels at the Potchefstroom campus have quite a lot of traditions and rules one need to take part in and accept in order to stay. In our field notes the 16th of November there is a student describing that as new you have to be engaged in all activities. There are also certain times of staying in for example, that you have to abide to. (FN 16/11 2007)

Due to the many rules and traditions in the hostels at Potchefstroom, there exists an experience of being assimilated by the white hostel culture, where opposing to that culture or not participating may cause you your room. P5 state that you get very loyal to your own hostel. “I heard that in some cases it’s harder for them to adapt. Because they have to try and fit into the framework here...it’s difficult for them to suddenly just
going into a hostel that's 90 or 95% white, ...but it's only for a start, after a few weeks they are just a part of it.” (P1) This adoption have been experienced by a few black students as troublesome as they feel they can not do or act as they want, and have heard complains of for example music choice and making parties. P9 says “Say you come from a different background, they come from a different background, it's not clicking” (refers to housing) (P9). He also say that he would rather live in “...a place there were more of my own, can do my own things that I wanna do, at the time I want to do it...see I don’t like all this meeting stuff” (P9). Two students in P6 highlight this problem of black students not acting according to white student’s traditions, for example playing loud music on Sundays (the resting day for many Afrikaans students). They experience this as ignorance as they believe that the black students can not avoid noticing that all the white students are resting. P7 is of a different opinion, she says she and a black girl at her hostel are friends, and state that she have not had any problems living with black people. (P1, P5, P6, P7, P9, P10&P11)

It seems that the ignorance mentioned above runs both ways. There are none of the groups expressing any real attempt to accept the others way of doing things or to actually discuss or negotiate a solution that can be accepted by all. We can also distinguish some lack of knowledge about why the other group is doing things the way they are, as well as mistrust and sometimes fear of this different way of acting. It seems that some people still are not used to mix with people of other races or have the knowledge enough to challenge their prejudices. We experienced this mistrust when we prepared for our stay at Mafikeng. One student from Potchefstroom was worried about us going there, what we should do during the weekend, what people we would socialize with, we had to be careful etc. He was also worried by the resources and people at Mafikeng and their ability to take care of us. The same person said that we probably would be better received when people knew we are Europeans and not Afrikaans. (FN 15/11 2007) This show also that people are aware of the tensions between the groups, and that it also can be hard being Afrikaans at Mafikeng. As well the opposite is true, where black English speaking students sometimes feel it is hard to be at Potchefstroom.

The way of having to adopt or assimilate to the traditions and Afrikaans culture is often met by suspicion by many black students, as stated above. On the other hand we have seen that the blacks living in hostels are more positive to the hostel culture compared to the more critical black voices not living there. This may be connected to the category of within and outside process. Hostel culture is not so vibrant at Mafikeng, and we have not received distinct problems living together from Mafikeng as we have from Potchefstroom. However it is probable that the same tendencies exist even at Mafikeng, conclusions drawn from the problems stated above of for example xenophobia.

The reluctance to change or understanding is resulting in that the minority group feel that they have to assimilate to fit in, which create frustration and probably cause some students to avoid living in hostels. This leads to that people miss out of opportunities to meet and interact. Over all we think that a wider dialog and a more open environment is needed. As seen in within and outside group the groups are divided and the lack of communication seems to also exist inside the hostels. Additionally the dominance of one group over the other makes it hard to meet on an equal level. Together this may create a situation were prejudices may not lower in the pace wanted. Connected
to this is our discussion in the final analysis about the level of friendship needed; it is fair enough to accept each other or does it require people to actually socialize and by time become friends to be integrated? In a hostel setting it can be harder not to interact and socialize because you live together on a limited space. However living in hostels is a common accommodation form at many universities where people of different countries or languages have to find a way to live together, not necessarily being best friends.

Summary of Dominant Culture and Assimilation

In sum, both campuses consist of one dominant culture group, at Potchefstroom Afrikaans and at Mafikeng SeTswana.

Minority groups at both campuses often experience they have to assimilate to the dominant culture in order to fit in. The hegemony of the dominant group can be seen as conscious or unconscious but is in either way perceived negatively by the minority groups. There is an unwillingness to change by the majority groups at both campuses. Minority groups felt being treated differently from the dominant group, and also cases of racism, hidden or outspoken. Differences between the minority and the dominant group cause clashes in for example living together or socializing, and there have been some negative responses to the efforts to correct the domination through for example affirmative action or quotation.
4.5 History

In this section we will discuss what role the history has for the present and how it reflects the relation between people. A division between organizational and social integration will not be made in this code due to its lack of bearing.

According to Blumer’s theory interactionism the history and its heritage influence how people and groups interpreter things and how they act. With a history like South Africa’s, were events in the past are very distinct and the Apartheid occurred fairly recently, which cause that features and traces are until now highly present in the society. Responses collected demonstrate that the Apartheid division between black, coloured, Asian and white are still current. Separation between black and white can be seen in within and outside group and is a subject that runs through out our thesis. Below we bring up a number of examples of how history affects today. Alongside the whole thesis there are as well many other examples of how the history plays a role in the present situation.

Heritage

Even if the different culture groups or races today cooperate and work together many people act upon earlier understandings. In a number of interviews the issue of blacks and whites not trusting each other is presented. According to a white staff member from Mafikeng black people still carry a lot of anger and hurt. On the contrary he says that many white still think they have a special position and can not accept that everyone now is equal. P18 mean that black and white do not discuss these important issues such as racism, due to guilt and fear of each other. (M5, M6, P18) We have found divisions not only between blacks and white but also between SeTswana and other black cultures, present at Mafikeng campus.

South Africa’s history divided the races and favoured white people, also universities were divided by race and the white universities had more resources and influence. Mafikeng as being a previously black university had fewer resources and as one interview persons put it; Mafikeng was not a university by choice. Due to the Apartheid system the SeTswana speaking people had to form a homeland and cluster together. (I1, I2, M11)

Many reactions we have received from Mafikeng bring up the history as an excuse and demand for better treatment now. A counter reaction to these views comes from a black student on Mafikeng, who claims that black people also have a responsibility for the history and the way they handled the university in Mafikeng. He says that development takes time and Potchefstroom have been working hard to get where they are today, indicating that so must Mafikeng. Although the Apartheid regime put money into the institution at Potchefstroom, the education was not free. He declares that blacks at times expect too much without any accomplishments or even anticipate receive it for free. The Mafikeng campus rector, Dan Kg wagile, raise the same issue. "I always fight them against this thing of blaming your past. You stick so much to the past and you say because you're poor and you come from a historically disadvantaged background, now you want the world to sympathize with you, without you doing anything
to say I deserve that.” (M3) He tries to tell students not to blame the past something that are not always very well received. (M3, M7, M12)

The history as far as we can detect play a major role in the reality of today’s South Africa and how the groups interact, view the “others”, view themselves and their own situation. For instance black persons have feelings of revenge, inferiority etc. White persons instead feel feelings of superiority, guilt, fear of losing their standard, and among some younger people a perception of a need to forget and move on.

Effects

Furthermore the history seems to shape how people deal with issues and how they act. Since the history and its events is one factor that taught the different groups different ways of handling problems and issues, it is creating problems and misunderstandings today. We bring forward two examples of this, both coming from Mafikeng. Many examples have been present in our interviews about how Mafikeng campus before was very political and how strikes was common. M12 means that this part of the history has affected the way black people protest and negotiate, according to him black people are not used to negotiate and discuss issues as white people’s tradition is because of the historical neglect of incorporating them into that situation. During apartheid the only means of protest black people could use were strikes and social disobedience etc. Nevertheless, there may be more explanations for differences in behaviour. The next example deals with the occasions when someone wants to break away from these patterns of behaviour. M9 tell that during Apartheid black people had a common goal and enemy, nowadays when a person has registered for the university he does not care about the ones that can not afford the university. (M3, M9, M12)

Many black people seem to be more individual and go their own way today. This can also be seen in the comment from M3, who means that students are more devoted to their studies at Mafikeng now, then before. (M3) Challenging the previous strict roles of each race is controversial for both black and white people and a discussion it further held in within and outside group under mix socially.

Future

This section will not handle the future for the merger instead how people, mostly students, perceive their own individual future and in someway the country’s future.

One pattern found when talking to students is that they are some what frighten towards their personal future. Black students are more positive and calmer towards their future then white students, although some still feel that their chances of finding a job are limited. One student mentions that diverse languages skills often are required, and perceptions exist that white people own more companies which could hinder to find jobs for black students. Another student from Mafikeng believe that she have to work extra hard to get a job, due to the fact that there will always be someone that has a degree from another better university applying for the same job. However in general there are many black students that have a positive attitude towards their future. (M15, M18)
From white students responses confirm a greater fear for the future. As well, a few older persons interviewed have mentioned the fact that many white people move out of the country. Dan Kg.wagile, Mafikeng’s campus rector, means that whites today feel affected by the empowerment of blacks, especially white men start to feel worried about the employment equity act since it prioritize them last. The employment equity act gives blacks and females priority when applying for employment. The applicant must still fulfill the requirements for the position but white men are none the less least on the list. One students in P6 present three issues that he believe all South Africans have to accept and deal with; crime rate, health care and high tax. P6 also say that a person have to have a high-quality education to be able to live in a good neighbourhood etc. The three issues and education all requires a great deal of money to handle. On the other hand he considers South Africa to have great potential and he means that the future of a person depends upon his or hers own attitude. White students mention languages as well. One student talk about the trouble of study in Afrikaans since most work places later on will use English. They believe the change at the workplace to be a chock. (P6, P10 M3)

One white student also shows a fear of how the country is being ruled now. One example given is the electricity that regularly is shut down at different places around South Africa to save energy. This was not experienced before 2004, and she believes that the current government do not know how to maintain the power net etc. (FN 1/12 2007) Additionally we imagine that these power breaks can be due to that our belief of the government aiming to include more households in the power net, and upgrading previous powerless households. This means not necessarily bad maintenance but rather a too slow development of the power net, but the actual reason we are unaware of.

The largest factor for the difference in hopes and fears towards the future is according to us where the students start from an economical and social perspective. Most black students still come from poorer backgrounds. These students see a possibility to improve their situation, especially with an education. White persons instead see themselves loose standard and influence. These students feel that their prospect and opportunities are limited or non existing. They experience the future as harder than for their forefathers, and do not always know how to deal with this. The mentioned employment equity act and its implications have been discussed by white students. Related is the importance of education, which seems to be perceived even more vital for whites then among black.

During a discussion with one of our black friends we come to talk about the different cultures and their futures. He experiences that in order to coexist there have to be a negotiation. He believes that white people want him to exist in their world, but not become like them. He finds this to be a dilemma that whites not are willing to accept him as equal. We also talked about the western culture and its hegemony in the world. The western cultures of which the Afrikaans culture ought to be considered closer related to than the black cultures do. For a white South African it must in that sense be easier to adapt to the present global culture. Our friend feels he have to adopt to it in order to success and believes that black people can no longer act and live as they want in this increasing global culture. (FN 16/11 2007) This discussion is also enhanced by notes
from our meeting with the “culture union”, a student organisation at Mafikeng. They describe what they see as an increasing “culturalization”, that different cultures become similar, in both South Africa and globally. Good parts of this are that most people can communicate in English, such as us meeting them. The bad part is that it is hard to combine and take part in others cultures without creating a common culture and hence loosing parts of you own. (FN 21/11 2007)

Summary of History

The history caused division between the groups, and these traces still play a large part in people’s minds and prejudices about one another, as well affecting the society. Acting and attitudes can be traced back to history, as well as many of the differences seen in the category of differences. History also affects the trust of one another between the groups. It seems like more white people are worried about their future then black people. White persons seem frightened to loose economic and social status, while black persons appear more hopeful towards the future. This may have to do with the empowerment of the black people, as well as the work done to even out the inequalities of Apartheid.

Some belief that the separation between the groups at university level can be a hinder for life after university where the groups are more mixed. A few black people have as well shown fear that they will loose their culture and have to be integrated into a global culture that is better adjusted to a white culture.
4.6 Social status

Social status or social position refers to the prestige and respect associated with a person’s position in the society. This analyze will deal with the impact and importance of social status at NWU and among its cultural groups.

Organizational integration

Social stratification

As commented before, the general opinion is that the merger occurred between unequal partners. One large aftermath of this is explained by a person in management position at Mafikeng campus. M1 tells us that at the time of the merger Mafikeng was a badly run institution. Other responses indicate the same thing. He means that many key positions was not appointed or occupied by unqualified staff. When the time came to create an institutional management the persons involved in the merger process looked at all campuses for recruitment. Since Mafikeng lacked many qualified employees they could not provide the institutional office with many members. Mafikeng’s Vice Chancellor at the time applied and is now the vice-principle on NWU’s institutional level. M1 means that the former Vice Chancellor was the only employee that came from Mafikeng and this gave fire to the suspicion of Mafikeng being swallowed by Potchefstroom, hence the term “potchification”. M1 also means that another issue contributed to the feeling of being swallowed; new policies that had to be settled. The new university decided to look at the policies from the old universities and most policies accepted came from Potchefstroom. (M1, M3, M12, P19)

As seen in responses to the merger there are a division between the campuses in resources. One clear example comes from Mafikeng and its law faculty. According to Prof. Mqosa Mahao, Executive Dean of the Law Faculty on Mafikeng, Mafikeng have about the same number of students as the faculty on Potchefstroom but only half of the staff. Another concrete example is that on Mafikeng campus students can not have friends or family staying in their room more then 2 days and there are no other place to stay on campus for visitors. (M7, M21) Contrary we have the knowledge that there exist guesthouses for visitors on Potchefstroom campus.

Potchefstroom was as well much larger then Mafikeng at the time of the merger and still is. Anette Combrink means that Potchefstroom tried to have a 50/50 attitude along the merger, even if Potchefstroom are much bigger. Nonetheless persons at Mafikeng are troubled by this fact today, in senates, councils and ISRC. For further details see responses to the merger. (M4, M12, P19)

M7 means that 4 years after the merger there are only around 7 black employed of 140 at the institutional office. He means that this white dominated group constitute the persons that are supposed to create a new university, where everyone feels included. An opposite point comes from Anette Combrink, Campus Rector on Potchefstroom campus. She told us that it is still hard to find qualified black staff for high positions, on a teacher level it is
easier. Further she expresses that there is still a division at Potchefstroom between the support personal, which is mainly black, and higher positions that are mostly occupied by whites. (P19, M7)

We have ourselves seen differences in social status according to race at the Potchefstroom campus, yet this is the campus with the most racially mixed staff. In our field notes from the 12th of November 2007 we noted that black people in for example an office together with white people usually had “lower”, less important jobs. At for example the internet café there was a black person in the kiosk while there was a white person at the reception desk. As well all gardeners, cleaning staff and servants were black or colored. (FN 12/11 2007) The reasons for this may be many, education level and available persons for the job being some. However one must think that a division like this likely has some kind of affection on the way the students and the white staff positions themselves compared to black people.

As seen, in areas as resources, education and size Potchefstroom have the advantages while, as pointed out in many interviews, Mafikeng have less and often feel swallowed and inferior. It seems that greater efforts have to be carried out to change the unequal status at an institutional level. Some attributes are hard to avoid or change quickly, as the difference in resources at the campuses or qualification of staff. Yet the new institution contains more white staff and may therefore also have more “white” influence. For one, as mentioned in responses to the merger a number of high positioned staff from Mafikeng have resigned and left the university. M7 means that they felt they could not influence and M6 says Mafikeng is afraid of loosing the critical staff members. The resigned staff members from Mafikeng had high education, an education that possibly could have suited the institutional office, though we lack knowledge if these persons were qualified, was offered any place or if any position were available. The process of transformation can not halt and the institutional office must in many circumstances be the motor of this process, also when it comes to their own transformation. (M6, M7)

The facts and perceptions above indicate that the influential power in the merger and in the present NWU tend to lay among a higher percentage of white persons then black. Secondly it indicates that the social status for whites is profoundly higher then for blacks. Over all the whites have often higher education, more influential work positions, better economy and so forth.

Another sign of white person’s often higher social status is shown in the alignment process, P21 and P15 indicate that the other campuses often relay on Potchefstroom to take the first step. (P15, P21) This could indicate that others see Potchefstroom and their mostly white staff as having more knowledge and experience. Furthermore it indicates that members of the white group (Afrikaans and English) acquire a higher social status. As mentioned the reasons can be various, for example history and education level. This could additionally be linked to dominance and that fact that the white group in many situations, at Potchefstroom and at a university level, are the dominant group in numbers.

Social status is not only something that you or your group create, but includes the way others perceive you. Changing these perceptions and images is one great challenge for the future, making social status not depending on race but other qualities. There exist positive changes that try to bridge the gap between the two groups, the
merger in itself was one. Another person from P21 deals with a teacher from Potchefstroom that says he has discussed helping teachers on Mafikeng getting a higher personal education. (P21) Equal education is vital for the cooperation and merger to move forward and for the power relations and social status to move away from racial lines. As shown earlier and in Allport’s category equal status between the groups is one important prerequisite for a successful integration.

Campus status

As indicated above our interviews give an outline where all NWU’s campuses do not obtain the same status. Responses give that this is true also regarding the degree. The overall view from students at Mafikeng is that a degree from Potchefstroom has a higher value then one from Mafikeng, seen in for example M18 and M23. One student believes that in a job interview a person from Potchefstroom will be able to express themselves better. From Potchefstroom some students differ in their view but most share Mafikeng’s perception. One student means that the diplomas will all have written “North West University”, not mentioning campus belonging. Oppositely, two other students mean that the name change does not matter for most employers; they still know the university under the old names of Potchefstroom and Mafikeng. (P6, M12, M18, M23)

The same pattern exist when three black students at Potchefstroom told us that they partly decided to apply to Potchefstroom campus because of the quality on the education, they had heard that the quality was not as high on Mafikeng. Besides, two students mean that some students from Mafikeng want to move to Potchefstroom. One student at Mafikeng also means that persons occasionally make funny faces when talking about Mafikeng. (M10, P2, P18)

The findings show that the merger has not yet taken away the image or status from the previous universities. The history plays once more a big part in this, especially since today’s employers often are from older generations and brought up in the old system. One graduated student in P6, attending Potchefstroom campus, says she believes the campus she attended played a big role when a company recently offered her a job. (P6) Though the university is working to level the standard on all campuses and align programs.

Economical status

Since we had read about disturbance regarding raised student fees before leaving for South Africa we asked students in our interviews if they were familiar with this topic (Mail and Guardian, 15th March 2006). At Mafikeng students often brought up the subject on their own, compared to Potchefstroom where it was often a theme we introduced. At Mafikeng many students finance their studies with loan, seen in M20 and M19. In a field note one student believe that 70% of the students use loans and 30% are financed by their parents (FN 17/11 2007). On top of that many students seem to choose Mafikeng campus partly due to the financial side, which is shown in M15, M16, M19 and M20. (M15, M16, M19, M20)

On Potchefstroom we know four students using loans, all black, found in P9 and P2. P4, a white student, responded that she pays for the education herself. Further, in
Potchefstroom white students in P5, P7 and P8, lack knowledge if their own fee has risen. One student even mean that white people need an education to get by in a country not so friendly towards whites, and that they will pay almost anything for an education. "...you would mostly pay at any price...you would keep your mouth...” (P6). (P2, P4, P5, P7, P8, P9)

This is a contrast to Mafikeng where there is strong opposition against raised fees and the pace of it, seen in M10, M13, M19 and M20. M21 believe that students will soon have difficulties coming self-sponsored to Mafikeng. M8 and M9 are afraid that the campus will become more and more closed for poor students. In M23 a teacher at Mafikeng enhances the contrast when he says that he would very much like to continue working as a teacher but the salary is too low. (M8, M9, M10, M13, M19, M20 M21, M23) Other economic issues are found in our field notes, where one student said that the schedule they have now with breaks up to three hours between the lessons, are difficult for poor students. Some could not afford buying lunch at school and did not have time enough to go home and eat if living off campus. (FN 18/11 2007)

The economic contrast between the campuses have been pointed out before, here we can more clearly see the difference in the economic status of their members. The raising of fees worries many students at Mafikeng. Some mean that it is necessary to raise them but the pace has to slow down. Others are worried that the fees will shut out many students from the campus and worried that the poor students will lose the chance to gain a better future. The raise is understandable in the way that all students at the university must pay the same price for the same education. Though, as mentioned under resources in responses to the merger, there are students questioning if it is the same standard on all campuses and question the justice in paying the same amount for different standards. The management refers to loans and bursaries to help poor students.

There are suspicion that the loans given to Potchefstroom’s students are larger then the loans given to Mafikeng students, perceptions are that they cover both students fee and housing at Potchefstroom and in Mafikeng only student fee. There are also opinions that Mafikeng needs more funding due to its many poor students. (P9, M20)

There are many contradicting views in this matter and many appear to be based on good reasons. The spring 2007, when we were at Mafikeng campus many students had left the campus before exams, due to unpaid student fees. The rumour said that 2000-3000 students left. We asked the campus rector, Dan Kgagile, about this issue and his explanation was that it was not to a great extent an economical issue but more about academic performance. All those students that preformed academically well was assisted, totally 93 students. If a student have good results in the end of the year there are founds of assistance he meant. (M3) An overall conclusion is that the pace of raising student fees need to slow down, and that more alternatives for less fortunate students should be considered. Including efforts to upgrade Mafikeng campus as fast as possible in order to diminish the perceptions of injustice.

The problem of having poor students is not new for the Potchefstroom campus and management. According to an unofficial interview in our field notes the 12th of November 2007 a person says that the former Potchefstroom University started three community involvement programs for poor students, of which one started 1988 with
giving students around Vaal extra education in six subjects. This program’s aim was to upgrade students to be ready for a university level. There was also one program for upgrading teachers giving them extra education during holidays. (FN 12/11 2007) This kind of programs and ways of thinking is constructive for the problems faced at Mafikeng. There is most likely also a requirement of better understanding and attention of the poor students’ situation and their needs. Even small rearrangements in for example a schedule can become large obstacles for poor students. In order to enhance these suggestions, it could be useful to do an evaluation of the students’ perceptions and experiences, like the climate survey done for staff and teachers.

Social class

A further pattern identified is closely tied to the section above and deals with the division in social class and mixing. For example, there is a difference in the problems Mafikeng and Potchefstroom bring up in the ISRC “...students at Potch might fight for a student parking for example. In our campus...we have got enough student parking, it’s just that students does not have enough cars...” (M10) Similar response comes from Anette Combrink, campus rector at Potchefstroom campus. She can see a difference in some of the subjects and hinders brought up in institutional meetings by persons from respective campus. Anette Combrink highlight yet another angle when she says it is hard to find black students that have grades good enough for some educations, for example engineering. Additionally one student on Potchefstroom says that there are not so many black students in IT, one believed reason is lack of computer skills. One teacher in Potchefstroom believes that the kind of students attending the two campuses is different. Mafikeng is more directed towards the public sector and Potchefstroom he means are trying to catch all students. (P1, P19, P21, M10)

Some of these differences can be connected to within and outside group in the sense that the groups lack knowledge about each other due to the lack of mixing and culture differences. This can be led back to the division between social classes and their different concerns and realities.

In two interviews these factors are even brought up by the interviewed. One teacher on Mafikeng is of the opinion that differences relate more to class than race or culture. As academics and teachers they prevail in the same economic class, and claim that she can have greater problems with someone from her own race or culture if they are “up there” or “down there” (referring to different levels of class). A SRC member on Mafikeng is of the same opinion. He believes that when black people talk about not having money to study etc. most whites can not fully understand. But he also considers this to be normal, and hick-ups will always happen. M12 is strengthening this view when he claims that the difference lay more in being a previous advantaged or disadvantaged university, rather than culture differences. (M5, M9, M12)

There is a perception of an already existing division between the campuses regarding class, where higher classes seek Potchefstroom, including black students. (FN 17/11 2007) Usually class follow race lines, however within the races class can create sharper lines. It is also more likely that rich and poor people have common problems within their class and that can connect them over the race lines.
The issue of student fees can further illustrate this matter. In general on Potchefstroom students had less knowledge about raised fees, about the demonstrations that took place in Johannesburg and no knowledge if their own fee had risen. On Mafikeng this was a big question and debate, especially concerning their own fee. Yet even here some lacked knowledge. In general, black students had more information about the issue then white students.

P8 and P3 are examples from Potchefstroom that lack knowledge about the raised fees. Other students in P9, P2 and P5 know there have been difficulties with the student fees at other campuses such as Johannesburg, but have not noticed any concern among the students at Potchefstroom. ”...I know Raul is more black... it’s not good areas where they stay so, so they don’t have the foundings to pay... and I know when they were showing it on TV, the strikes, it was mainly black people that was striking, so it didn’t affect our campus that much, or the students that much.” (P4) “...I am not racist but their black, usually blacks that, mm I don’t know, are protesting because for them it’s harder..... it affects them harder then it affects us” (P7) Quotes come from interviews with white students at Potchefstroom. From a black student at Potchefstroom we discover another situation, the student has heard from a friend that students at another university were going to skip classes. (P2, P3, P4, P5, P7, P8, P9)

This pattern is not to say white or black students are ignorant but to display that they do not posses information about each others’ situations. Moreover they do not appear to discuss these issues between the groups. Reasons for this could be culture, history and class. Clearly economic difference also contributes to divisions between people. Note that class division occurs not only between white, blacks or colour but also inside the groups. Linked to the xenophobia mentioned in within and outside group, this is present at Mafikeng where two students of another black culture group feel they are perceived as poorer and of a lower stand. Similar patterns among white students have not been noticed by us.

Social integration

From a social integration point our interviews do not provide much when it comes to social status, due to the fact that not many black and white persons are mixing on a social level. A pattern we do have noticed is a distinction between how the two groups socialize and what kinds of resources the groups are used to in there free time. Some white students said they were going away on vacation during summer for example, something that not many blacks mentioned. (P5, P7)

It could be a mix of reasons behind why the groups differ in behaviour; history, cultural, class, economy and to some extent the development of the city the campus is situated in. In Mafikeng many mentions that there are little to do at campus and in the city. For example students at the soccer institution mention it hard not to have anything to do, there are no big malls etc. This can be found in M2, M14 and M16. M15 says that a new cafeteria was promised to increase the student life at Mafikeng, but nothing has yet happened in 5 years. (M2, M14, M15, M16)

In our field notes we detected people highlighting the lack of activities at Mafikeng campus, and the danger of going outside the campus at night. We also saw the differences in activities at night at the campuses, where Mafikeng clearly had fewer
activities. The only place open on campus in the evening was the cafeteria/restaurant where people could sit and talk. There was also less variety of food here than at Potchefstroom. (FN 16/11 2007, FN 17/11 2007) Potchefstroom offer more on and off campus alternatives both during day and night time. During our time at Potchefstroom we spent time and did interviews at for example the school restaurant and at cafés outside school. We did also go to bars or cafes at night outside campus, and there was a variety of clubs open in the weekends. (P14, FN 16/11 2007)

Summary of Social status

Social status refers to the respect and status you get or are given in society, connected to for example a person’s economy, education etc. There is a great division in social status among the white and black people, a division that also divides the campuses. Potchefstroom and white people in general have better economy and resources, and greater influence, while Mafikeng have many poor students and deal with problems different from the ones at Potchefstroom. Less resources and lack of activities are perceived as existing at Mafikeng. There is also a perception that a degree form Potchefstroom has a higher status the one from Mafikeng.

Differences in social status create problems in cooperation and understanding between the groups. Perceptions of different social status injured for example the trust in the merger process, and there also seem to be a lack of understanding about the other’s different social situation regarding for instance student fees. The economical status is higher at Potchefstroom where not many students consider raised students fees as a problem, while many students oppose it in Mafikeng. Some interviews also highlight class as a factor of division instead of race, and that people in the same class better understand each other and have the same problems. It is also perceived that people of higher class are attending Potchefstroom and those of lower class Mafikeng.
4.7 Differences

This category is describing a variety of differences between the races, students, campuses etc. the way people perceive the differences, hinders they cause and the work that have been done bridging them. Usually the differences tend to be cultural; people simply have different ways of viewing and acting toward things. In many ways this code coincides with Blumer’s theory interactionism in our theory chapter. These differences can generally be drawn from the different cultures and the historical division of the races, but also a lack of knowledge about the differences and a reluctance to accept them. We would also like to emphasize that social status could play a part in the differences between the groups.

Differences have been detected in many areas and they are present in most of our codes and analyses. Beneath we have chosen to bring up some of these differences; those that persons themselves have highlighted, that we believe display the situation and are of importance. Other areas as language and mixing socially also include many differences between the groups but these we have discussed under within and outside group. The same is true for the ISRC and their composition and work, which we have handled under social status and within and outside group.

Organisational integration

Introduction

The different history of each campus has affected its features of today. Potchefstroom is a campus dominated by white Afrikaans students, with a Christian background, and a more vibrant student life than the other campuses. Mafikeng was a relatively new university dominated by black students, mostly SeTswana speaking, and with a higher percentage of international students. The Vaal campus in situated in an industrial metropolitan area with few people from the countryside. The different campus cultures at Potchefstroom and Mafikeng are highlighted by two black students at Potchefstroom. The differences are making cooperation complex, and there is a need of different approaches in ruling and handling each campus says I2. (I1, I2, P16, P18) As will be shown below these different prerequisites and features of each campus have influenced people and sometimes created problems and misunderstandings.

We would like to highlight that the cultures in the object studied are very far apart in many ways. In early times they developed on different places on earth and with different influences and history. The cultures did probably not interact to a great extent before the Dutch and English settlers came to South Africa in the 16th century during the era of colonization and after the Dutch arrival the cultures did not mix greatly. Instead at one side the colonizers and the other the colonized, and after that the Apartheid era separated the cultures. What we want to illustrate is that cultures that originate from distant geographical places, that have not interacted during a long period of time and perceived to be unequal, have a harder time integrating than cultures more similar and with a more
common history. This goes back to the history code, and give that the cultures in many cases have huge differences in the way they see and do things and a middle ground may be hard to find.

The findings above is highlighted by P2, three black students at Potchefstroom, that says it is easier to be friends with coloured then white students. The interviewed persons do not specify why, but differences in culture are according to us one of the strongest suggestions. P6 says that the white English speaking students do not have the same culture as the Afrikaans students, but do understand that culture better and respect it (more then black students). This is also stated in P20 where two rugby players say that they in some ways feel closer to the English players then the African players, but that there also are differences between them. (P2, P6, P20)

Two students from a different culture group at Mafikeng describe the culture differences between being of this culture group and being a SeTswana, where this culture group have more vibrant cultural expressions in the way they dress, act, eat etc. They claim that SeTswana individuals sometimes seem not to want to show their culture or their heritage. (M16)

The examples above show that working or socializing with someone more alike your culture wise is easier than with culture groups more distinct from you. These differences are however not simply divided according to race lines. Seen in the interview M16 above as well as the headline among students below, there are problems cooperating with different culture groups even among black students at Mafikeng. Even among the black people there are cultural differences making that different groups cooperate differently with each other. Also among English and Afrikaaner there is reason to believe that some culture differences can be an obstacle to cooperation and socialization. Both the language and culture differences, as well the history and earlier contradictions between the groups can yet create problems.

Culture differences in cooperation

The large cultural differences affect even the cooperation between the groups. There were and still are differences in the organisational culture at the campuses. Below we will highlight some examples of this.

There are great differences in the history of negotiation and the way decisions are made. As mentioned in the history part striking has been the major way of protesting and to make your voice heard among the black people. This M12 believe still affect their way of negotiating. M1 describes the culture in previous black universities as questioning people regardless of the persons rank or authority. (M1, M12) We saw traces of this in the meeting we attended with the SRC at Mafikeng. It seemed like everyone wanted to gain some influence or power and make his or her voice heard. People were also suspicious about other suggestions and wanted decisions to be written down and interpreted correctly. (FN 19/11 2007)

M1 mean that the Afrikaans culture is a culture of respecting and listening to people superior or in leading positions. This is for example perceived in the voting process. "Potchefstroom always votes as a block...a person from Potchefstroom voting against... Potch, it never happens. But...if you are from the Mafikeng campus... in a
meeting ... then you have somebody from the Mafikeng campus that was voting against...

Something that the Mafikeng campus wants.” (M12) (M1, M12) The history of being a
minority may have affected that Afrikaans cling together more, even in decisions. It is of
course not the case that people do not have own opinions, it could simply be that they are
more used to negotiate their opinions and reach a common decision or simply not outing
there opinion in a larger meeting. As seen above the differences between the groups are
quite distinct, which of course affect the way people cooperate and negotiate with each
other.

We have detected a lack of trust among more black than white students and staff, both
among their group but also in the cooperation between black and white people. This
mistrust can be caused by the separation of black people in the history and the lack of
experience of having someone of your own race as superior, plus a lack of trust of
authority in general, probably because of mistreatment by authorities in the past. On the
other hand white people have had reason to stick together more, as being a minority.

In black African tradition one discusses a decision for a long time and
includes many persons in the process. This makes it more difficult to take fast decisions,
as in the Afrikaans manner, where an authority’s decision is highly respected as seen
above. These differences in decision making did for example create problems in the
merger. I2 states the challenge that lays in managing the differences to include everyone.
One way of doing this have been the use of consensus decision, a more black African
tradition that was adopted and now often been used in meetings and cooperation.
According to P19 the positive outcome is that everyone is included in the negotiation
process, and it increases the outcome of the decision, instead of more authoritarian
decisions. (P19, M7, I2)

Another difference in cooperation is highlighted in I1. There seem to be a
problem of having information reached out to everyone in the organisation; there is a
feeling that people at Mafikeng do not read for example emails, where their tradition is
more oral information. (I1)

It seems like people from Mafikeng are more individual in their decision making and less
willing to obey for authority, something that may be historically affected as shown by the
examples above. To overcome these problems it is important to highlight and discuss
them to point out that they exist and so persons can have a chance of dealing with them.
This is especially important since many of these differences are not immediately visible.
Patience and thinking in new ways is really a challenge but a necessity to create a
common system for dealing with issues and handling practical things, at least inside the
organisation.

Among students

For students, cooperation is most common in group works. At Mafikeng one student have
experienced that it is easier to cooperate with students coming from other parts then
Mafikeng, SeTswana students have been experienced being hard to cooperate with. The
example is saying that they cooperate better with students from for example Swaziland,
even though one of the interviewed persons is SeTswana herself. Two other students at
Mafikeng say that in schoolwork there is no time for culture differences, and that cooperation is not a problem. Not speaking SeTswana could however make the cooperation harder they say. P2, a black student at Potchefstroom, experience it hard to work with white students at Potchefstroom due to differences in language and culture. (P2, M19, M21)

One teacher notice the composition of the group by the papers handed in. If it is a homogenous group the papers are discussed more in detail, while if it a diverse group the papers have a more superficial tone where the participants first had to understand each others views. (P15)

Even though no specific examples are given why cooperation can be tough, there is obviously a difficulty when participants arrive from diverse cultures and do things another way. This regard also to what degree you are used to negotiate. Of course it is always easier cooperating with people that think and do the same as you. Given the example of the teacher’s interview above there is clearly a struggle understanding each others views among a mixed group of students. We consider this struggle of understanding the other´s standpoint and culture as a basic necessity for all people at the campuses, as this understanding is the base for respecting and accepting the way people act and interact. In the beginning the cooperation may have to take a longer time, for the purpose that the cooperation in the long run will go smoother.

The sport area

There is a division in the amount of interest in sports and kinds of sports at the different campuses. Black students are used to play soccer, basket ball or volleyball while white students usually play rugby, netball, hockey etc. (P20, M22)

Ricky van Rooyen, sport manager and head of sports department at Mafikeng, says that the interest for sports is not as vibrant at Mafikeng as it is at Potchefstroom. He though sees an increased interest the more the students are exposed to the sports. Two students at Mafikeng strengthen this view and say they would like to have the same kind of rugby academy as in Potchefstroom, and they think a lot of students would like to play. In P20 someone say that they at Potchefstroom find more black players among the younger boys, believing that this have to do with an increased introduction of the sports in earlier years as well as more integrated schools. P20 mean that it is likely that exposure in the past and in schools now affect the students´ interest, leading back to history. There are also other differences among the players. Afrikaans rugby players are said to be more religious, often praying before a game and in is the kind food preferred by black Africans and Afrikaans students. This is according to P20 not a problem, and people respect everyone´s ways. (M11, M15, P20)
Social integration

Culture differences in acting

The way people do things, apart from speaking different languages, is one of the major areas of difference and difficulties. The black African culture can easily be misunderstood by the western culture, according to M1. For example it is not accepted in African culture that a younger person is looking an older person in the eyes, something that a western tradition can be interpreted as dishonesty or anxiety. On the other hand black people experience it rude when white students continued to stand up in the same room as an older person, in black cultures a younger person sit down immediately. (M1)

Black people are usually speaking with a higher voice, in order to show honesty, which is perceived by white people as shouting. On the other hand the lower voices in which white people speak seem to be interpreted by some black person as dishonest and secretive. P14 have seen these differences in the ISRC as well, but say that when used to it now, it is no longer a problem. (P6, P14)

It seems like black people easier talk about sex and relations, and in a more direct way then Afrikaans people. There are more jokes and more insinuations of sex at Mafikeng then at Potchefstroom. One student in our field notes said that in South Africa you do not talk about sex, religion, politics and money. (FN 17/11 2007) We assume that this person, being a white student, is referring to the white Afrikaans people in South Africa.

These differences and the interpretation of them are of course generalized, yet show a picture of how the groups can misinterpret one another. To remember is that the views mentioned mostly comes from an outside perspective and it is not often expressed by persons about their own group. One black student means that white persons see all blacks as the same and do not recognize the differences among the black cultures. (FN 16/11 2007) Clearly differences cause misunderstandings in both cooperation and in socializing, and can create problems according to M1. He himself is although inspired by the differences and believe that it is possible to learn from them. This positive view is strengthened by three students at Potchefstroom campus. (M1, P10&P11, P13)

There are however a more critical voice in M4, who believe that the different and new way of thinking needed will be hard to establish. As she expresses it "...it is like east and west and the two shall never meet." (M4). P15 also says that culture differences will always create hick-ups and misunderstandings, and one student at Potchefstroom says that there is still no real understanding between the culture groups. P16, strengthened by M1, claims that the largest differences are cultural, due to the historical separation between the groups. P16 means that this is especially visible among people from rural areas, still conservative, where black and white people do not mix. According to M3 the division between black and white people has been so sharp that they now do not have knowledge of the others or how to cooperate. (M3, M4, P13, P15, P16)

When discussing housing we have detected many differences, especially highlighted at Potchefstroom. P9 experienced that when he and some black friends had a party, they were met by reluctance from white students. Difficulties to fit in as a black student have
also been expressed by a white student who however says that through discussions about the problems they are usually solved. One student in P6 is a manager over a housing complex off campus and has experienced problems with culture having races living together. One example is that most white students consider Sundays to be the resting day, a holy day when you do not for example meet friends, play music or drink alcohol. He have experienced that other culture groups do not respect this which creates irritation. P16 have worked with residences a long time at Potchefstroom campus. In the beginning he saw many clashes between the cultures, while now seventeen years later he sees less of these problems; something he believes can be due the university’s work with them. (P1, P6, P9, P16)

When many cultures are living together there must be mutual respect, and even with one culture more dominate the another everyone can not be forced to act in one way, this aspect we discuss further in dominance.

The different ways of doing things did create complications in the beginning of the merger, but M1 is now positive and mean that people have negotiated and accepted each others ways. There can still be disputes in the way people address problems, but this is something that is kept in the meeting and people are still friends when leaving the room. M6 contradicts this and says that there is still no real interaction between the groups, and that possible cooperation at an organizational level still does not give much spill over effect at a social level. (M1, M6)

Even though there probably have been an improvement in the socialization and cooperation after the merger, we have not experienced being at the campuses or in our interviews that the social interaction is present to a great extent. People still tend to cling to their group at both campuses, see more of this in mix socially at within and outside group. Mixing socially is still a problem that needs to be addressed and worked with.

Culturalization

One staff member at Mafikeng describes that new student’s behaviour not always correspond with the behaviour at the campus, but that this behaviour by time is included in a “culturalization” where people learn how to act in a common institution like the campus. “You learn to live the way the people that you socialize with.” (M5). This process is also described by the Campus Rector at Potchefstroom, Anette Combrink. She says that understanding culture differences is a process that has to run both ways, and there will soon become a common culture. She highlights the example of African time, that in the work environment have almost disappeared and that everyone is used to be on time to meetings etc. (P19, M5)

It is likely that there will be created some sort of common culture in the way things are done at the university. Hopefully this is also spilling over to a social level where people starts integrate with each other. However this process of “culturalization” must contain equality in order for it to be a negotiation between the cultures rather then one culture assimilating into another. See within and outside group. As seen in the future of history, there is also a described fear of being integrated into a global culture, loosing one’s own cultural expressions. Possibly it would bet better to create a common
culture at an organizational level, but let people be more different at a social level and accept and tolerate that.

Fear has been described as a hinder for integration and understanding by P18. Naturally the history of being separated causes prejudices about the others, prejudices that now create fear when forced to be challenged. Discussing differences and misunderstanding is probably the best way of solving them and increase understanding between people according to both us as stated by M3 above. (M3, P18)

Summary of Differences

The purpose of this category is to demonstrate the differences between the groups, perceived both by the group itself and by others, and to show the problems and misunderstandings they can cause. Potchefstroom is perceived as whiter, conservative and Afrikaans, while Mafikeng is blacker, previously disadvantaged and has a majority of SeTswana people. The differences between the groups of blacks and whites at Potchefstroom and between SeTswana and other black cultures at Mafikeng cause clashes and misunderstandings. The differences between black and white people also create cooperation problems at a staff level, and could generate fear and frustration of the others.

These differences can generally be drawn from the different cultures and the historical division of the races, but also social status. We have seen a lack of knowledge about the differences, as well as a lack of understanding and acceptance of them. Differences tend to cause lack of trust and prejudices between the groups. However there are some that believe that by time there will be “culturalization” and created a common “culture”, a system of how to do things at the university and that this could diminish the culture differences.

Bigger differences found are for instance ways of negotiation and taking decisions, the view of authority, interest in sports, addressing older persons, sexual openness and social interaction.
4.8 Within and out of process

This part will only deal with issues on an organizational integration, due to that fact that it handles the distinction we have found between the persons that are involved in direct cooperation with the other campuses or the merger and those that do not take active part. Within the campuses we have found indications of a similar distinction between the students living mixed in hostels and those living outside the hostels, mostly seen at Potchefstroom.

Patterns

First of all we can see that the management for NWU and for the campuses, the persons that are most involved, are very positive towards the future and the changes that occur. Theuns Eloff, the Vice Chancellor, believe 90 % of all members of the campuses are positive to the merger. He has seen a more positive attitude among the ones that are taking part in the merger process in some way. (I1, M1, M3)

In our collected data we have found a quite clear division between students that are involved in the merger and students that are not. At both Potchefstroom and Mafikeng the difference between involved and non involved students are demonstrated in the amount of knowledge they possess. This is for example shown in M16, M21 and P7. Involved students are those that are active in student organisations or such at the campuses. At Potchefstroom the pattern shows itself more in how many changes students have seen or how concerned they are with the merger, seen in P9 and P4. Involved students show more knowledge and thoughts about the merger then non-involved. One SRC member even sees himself as a member of NWU. (P4, P7, P9, P12, P13, M16, M21)

As detected before in responses to the merger, generally students at Potchefstroom have not seen many changes.

On Mafikeng campus this show itself for instance in how strong student’s negativity are towards the changes and the merger. Numerous non-involved students seem especially negative. These can be found in M8 M15 M16 M18 M20 M23 and P18. One example is when students say something similar to “Potchefstroom do everything”. A response from an interview with two black students at Potchefstroom shows the same pattern. The involved students, mostly SRC members, are more positive and detect more nuances in the problems the campus and the university face, as seen in M9 M10 and M12. M10, a member of the SRC on Mafikeng mean that being a member in the SRC opens your eyes and let you see more then just parties and studies. Mafikeng’s campus rector, Dan Kg wagile, says that they try to inform and change the attitudes of their SRC and then expect the message to reach other students through them. This could be one reason why the change between SRC member’s views and the regular students’ differ. (M3, M8, M9, M10, M12, M15, M16, M18, M20, M23, P18)

From a staff perspective similar patterns were detected. At Mafikeng involved staff seems less negative, though here the pattern is not as clear and some involved staff are as well very negative (M1, M3, M4, M5, M6, M7). Not all interactions are favourable, and as Pettigrew and Tropp highlights interaction can enhance prejudices.
instead of decreasing them. Also described in responses to the merger under cooperation. These negative experiences seem more common in a larger group, which is also related to the above category.

At Potchefstroom the outline among the staff follows the students in some way. One teacher point out that not many changes have occurred for regular teachers or lecturers if they are not involved in the alignment process or other cooperation. This indicates that they, as the students, have not been exposed to changes to a great extent. Further more, one director means that many teachers on a lower level in the administration do not feel they need to cooperate. At Potchefstroom as on Mafikeng, there are some involved members of the campus that are more positive and include more nuances in their views. (P12, P15, P21)

One teacher involved in the alignment process from Mafikeng means that colleagues outside the cooperation do not always know how and why things happen and the implementation can at times become hard. People become worried and feel that they do not fit in after the reorganisation of the programs, even though she says she tries to inform them. On the same time she means that the colleagues trust their representatives and when problem arrive they discuss and deal with them. These comments illustrate that once outside the cooperation you can not follow the process, therefore uncertainty and worries increase. Another possible cause could be that the person feels powerless in the process, expressed by two teachers from Mafikeng. Contrary, the persons actually involved in the process are involved in creating the changes. For that matter they still have some power over the situation and have full knowledge of facts and why things happen. (M5, M23)

An overall analyse of this code would be that persons within the process and cooperation in general are more informed and positive to the merger. The code also designate that a direct interaction lowers your prejudice as Contact Theory indicates. However as stated before less positive outcome seem to be a fact in larger groups, in short term cooperation, with no specific common goal and non equal status. Related to the within and outside group under mix socially, common rules within the groups may ease the negative feelings. On the other hand some people involved in the process are still negative. This can be due to that they feel forced to be in a situation they did not choose themselves or that they feel their view is neglected. However it should also be noted that the ones that are positive and involved in the process and interaction may have chosen to do so and may for that matter have had more information, interest and positive attitude from the start.

Summary of Within and outside process

In summation people within a process, being inside the merger process, meetings, alignment process or the ISRC for example, seem more positive to the changes then people outside these processes. It appears that more students and staff at Mafikeng outside the process perceive things negatively, however in different levels. The same seem to be true for some black students at Potchefstroom also them outside the process. At Potchefstroom the people outside the process seem to detect fewer changes and have
less knowledge, but are in general not so negative. These feelings might have to do with a lack of knowledge which cause uncertainty and fear of the changes. This code highlights Allport’s Contact Theory where contact with the other group decreases prejudice and enhances integration.
Chapter 5 - Final Analyse in relation to the Theory

In this part of our analyse a comparison will be done with what we found through our research in more direct relation to our analytical framework. This analyse will begin discussing Blumer’s theory about humans way of interpret their surrounding and how and if our study subject could be incorporated in this framework. Proceeding is a discussing about the integration process at NWU and in what way Allport’s contact theory is applicable to it. The chapter finishes with a conclusion and suggestions.

The basic assumptions in Blumer’s theory about interactionalism seems to agree with the reality in our study object, yet the reality is more complex and complicated. What we want to find out is how this process appears, especially Blumer’s step 3 and how the process of interpretation is perceived and experienced.

**Blumer’s steps:**

1) “...human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have to them.” – these include physical objects, other human beings, institutions, guiding ideals, activities of others.

2) the meaning of such things come out of or arises from social interactions with other people (Blumer 1969, p.2-5)

These 2 basic assumptions seem to be compatible with the findings, but there are different social situations that in some cases may stand against each other. The objects can in these different settings mean different things. One example is that in a school situation among one’s friends it exists one view of blacks or whites, but in an environment including my family and relatives the way of thinking may be different. We have noticed that in some cases you may even have to choose which view and social group that is most important to you, family or friends/school. It is though hard to say if persons chose one view because of their belief in it, or do it because of their own culture group’s pressure and dominance. This can be related to the relation between Pettigrew and Tropp’s intergroup and outgroup. For example, the positive feelings a person may have working with someone of a different race in an intergroup, may not be able to express or act on in a group outside this setting for example with other friends or family.

Our findings indicate that the social interaction received when young and the meanings then produced are slightly more important. For example the view of blacks/whites you get through early school, family, relatives, early sports etc. As young you may not be exposed to many different social interactions, especially in a segregated country as South Africa. The students we interviewed lived their early years in the Apartheid environment but even today, according to our findings in within or outside group and dominance, a separation between groups are common. The same pattern can be seen in many other countries, for example in Sweden where there sometimes are a lack of integration and interaction between Swedes and immigrants.
3) the meaning influences and modifies the interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounter (Blumer 1969, p.2-5).

Our analyses state that people in most cases act upon what answers their meanings give to them in the situation, for example meanings of “black” or “white”. In this way your prejudice or meaning influence your interpretation process and your actions. This is shown when persons seem to be uncertain, frustrated and scared in a new unknown situation. These are unknown situations where your meanings do not give a satisfactory interpretation and you do become uncertain of how to act or your actions are not coherent with the current situation. On the other side, in the case a person act as I expected him to, it will strengthen my old meaning.

Here Blumer describes the process in step 3 in more detail:

First the person decides which things have meaning and what that meaning is by interacting with himself, secondly the person select, suspects, checks, regroup and change the meaning of these things according with new situations and direction of his actions (Blumer 1969, p.2-5).

“Himself” in this case is interpreted as my pre-understanding, earlier exposure etc. regarding the meaning of a thing. Step number two may for example be when I am in a new situation and have to reevaluate my earlier assumptions. It should be noted that the process described by Blumer may strengthen prejudice/old interpretations as well as change them. People handle change of meanings differently, it is individual how easily and by which degree you are able and willing change and also how open you are to new interpretations or how grounded your previous interpretations are. We have seen that changes at many times, especially in large amounts, create a negative response, see responses to the merger.

Additionally we have seen that even if a person changes his meaning of a thing in a certain situation or as in our cases about individuals, the person can still generalize about the group. Some critique against Blumer’s theory is that it seems to be hard to change the view of blacks/whites in general even if you have friends whom are black/white. Yet it may also simply be that a person has had countering experiences from other interactions. For example a person with a black friend can still believe that black’s are noisy due to the fact that he or she have met black people who is, or heard the same. These “old” grounded meanings appear hard to change. It seems that changing negative opinions about a group is harder than changing positive opinions.

In our study object persons from different culture groups do not often meet and for that matter do not need to regroup, check or change their meanings of things. Additionally responses and observation show that most persons try to avoid intercultural interaction, especially on a social level.
Blumer mean that the social interaction in itself is important and that social interaction is an interaction between actors and not between factors put to them. Interaction reforms the interaction; by interacting people have to take in to account the action of the person they interact with and alter their own actions. (Blumer 1969, p.7-10)

Our findings partly conquer with this view; the interaction itself is important but important is also factors and environment surrounding the social interaction, which affects the actors. We have seen that people actually interacting more frequently with the other group see more sides of “the other” as well as having an improved understanding about differences etc. Though not all interaction creates a positive outcome and here some factors appear to play part, for example social status, dominance, unequal status. Even group size and the actors relationship with the outgroup and the outgroup’s attitude seem to matter. Yet even in this case the interaction itself is still happening between two actors and one actor can not interact with only his predetermined meanings. The factors can be found in **within and outside group, dominance and responses to the merger**.

The symbolic interaction gives that we respond according to the meaning the action give us. The one that act also have a meaning with the action, it is when these two meanings are the same we understand each other. During this process human beings also have to take each others roles, this so one indicates what the other person should do. For example, the robber says to the victim “raise your hands” (Blumer 1969, p.7-10).

In an interaction between actors Blumer means that you have to be able to “take” each others roles to be able to understand the other, which can be difficult when you can not interpret the other’s actions. We have seen many example of this which in our analyse is named **differences**. Furthermore, as mentioned before, we have seen that when a person do not know how to act, he or she feel uncomfortable, uncertain, scared and therefore may avoid interaction.

With this view, the specific cultures that integrate become important. In our study object the cultures are mainly SeTswana and Afrikaans, but also English and other black cultures such as Venda and Zulu. As we discuss in **differences** the main cultures involved at NWU are highly different and they have not interacted a great deal, this which makes the integration difficult. Contrary Afrikaans and English are more similar and tend to cooperate easier; the same is true for SeTswana and other black cultures. Also Pettigrew and Tropp highlights that the specific differences between the groups involved have to be outlined and worked on. An important feature in this field is the way the cultures are used to negotiate, something that has bearing on cooperation and the merger process.
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Objects – according to symbolic interactionism there is three categories of objects; 1 – physical objects, 2 – social objects such as students, priests, mother, 3 – abstract objects such as morals, principals and ideas. An object is something that can be indicated or referred to. The meaning of objects can alter from different people and are social creations (Blumer 1969, p.10-12). “...people may be living side by side yet be living in different worlds.” (Blumer 1969, p.11)

All people and groups have different perceptions of what it means to be for instance student, teacher and also different views about morals and ideas. As mentioned a complexity appears when different meanings meet. Another difference we have detected is the way the groups address authority: Whites do not as often challenge a decision from an authority, while blacks are used to express their opinions towards the decision more direct and frank. In addition this leads to different pictures about how a white or black person should be and behave, which in our study object is very important. It may also be confusing for a person when the view of himself is challenged and he is not perceived or approached in the way he expect and view himself.

People take different roles in different situations and therefore alter their approach and actions. (Blumer 1969, p.15-16)

Our study we have seen examples of this were people would be friends in the University environment but did not greet each other when meeting in another environment. A person has different roles as for example student, son, etc. These may include different meanings and behaviour when entering the different roles. The roles but also in what context and environment the role exist seems to play a big part. See within and outside group. There are some situations were it seems easier to alter one’s meanings and behaviour, for example in a smaller group, when working towards a common goal and during a longer time, when everyone knows the rules and the interaction is done by equal participants.

In these situations the person does not have the same pressure from their other roles or their “we-group”. Changing your perceptions could occur in a meeting, but when you go to lunch the old meanings and behaviour can easily come back. This is an example of intergroup and outgroups in Contact Theory. In named case your “we-group”, in the outgroup, are so dominant that the experiences from the interactions in the intergroup are hard to uphold. This has been proved to be true in some of our interviews dealing with cooperation, and is shown in dominance.

Human action – is constructed and guided from the person himself after interpreting the world. The motives that are considered are for example; wishes and wants, availability for their achievements, his objectives, actions of others, his image of himself, the likely result of a give line of action. (Blumer 1969, p.15-16)
This basic assumption agrees with our findings. This assumption could strengthen the division of cultures and economic class in the way that persons will group with others that have the same perceptions, availabilities, image of himself etc though they want to achieve the same goals. In the same way it can hinder them to interact with persons of other perceptions. This could be one explanation of many why different culture groups and social groups do not interact and integrate more.

The interpretation persons make as groups, are always made in the shadow of the groups history and background (Blumer 1969, p.16-20).

History has affected almost all perceptions in South Africa, examples of this can be found throughout our paper and especially in the history headline. Meanings, actions and interactions are highly coloured by the history and its events. However we can also see that meanings and perceptions have changed in the short time after the end of Apartheid and the beginning of the merger.

Group action – in short Blumer’s mean that joint actions are build on the individuals in the groups mutual, recurrent and constant meanings. Repeated group actions are as much a result of an interpretation process as a new group action. (Blumer 1969, p.16-20)

We have seen that the actions in groups with members of different meanings face a harder time acting together and must first deal with the different meanings. A group action can change if there are new influences but the interpretation process will not change the action of a group if there are no new influences in it. In a situation were one culture group are dominant all individuals are often not included and the group action is done accordingly to the majority’s meanings. One example at Potchefstroom is the withholding of traditions, illustrations can be found in dominance and responses to the merger. It can also be worth noting that new group actions can change towards being more positive or negative for integration.

An organization or institution Blumer mean are also built up by individuals that by using given sets of meanings and by people acting on their interpretations of the situation (Blumer 1969, p.16-20).

In our study we can observe this in the manner the management of the NWU is trying to create a common institutional structure and common rules. Common rules is one pattern we have found that tends to enhance intergroup relations. Common rules in the sense of authority policies (Moody) and controlled participation (Pettigrew and Tropp), can be found even in our theory as an important part to create integration. Many people have related to an academic or professional culture that they consider being general. Institutional common meanings or culture could support people to cooperate inside the organization. The difficulties we have detected when black and white people interact
could in this way be fewer inside the organization. Common rules can be created top down from the management or created bottom up from the members in the organisation. Essential for creation of such rules is of course that all cultures are included in the process and get equal status in this newly created culture or rules.

Yet it seems like this process in some cases lack one of the prerequisites of Allport, the one of equal status. Some people believe that people at Potchefstroom and the Afrikaans culture have greater influence and consider them to be larger in number of representatives etc. This can be contra productive and result in increased suspicion and reluctance among people in the organization instead of creating a feeling of a common institution.

Another angle of problem is when the management’s policies are brought back to the campuses, especially Mafikeng, it is sometimes received by the people outside the process with suspicion. This can be seen in more detail in within and out of process.

**Contact theory:**

- 1) equal status between the groups in the situation
- 2) common goals
- 3) intergroup cooperation
- 4) support of authorities, law or custom (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 752).

1) Generally in South Africa the characteristic of equal status between groups is not fulfilled, in our research neither within nor between the campuses. Potchefstroom often constitutes the dominant part at a university level, and “Afrikaans” and “SeTswana” as dominant parts at the campus levels.

Equal status are one of Allport’s four prerequisites for integration, however we have noticed that integration may occur without this prerequisite fulfilled. This will be discussed further on. On the other hand unequal status does constitute a problem and is a characteristic that have to be notified and highlighted. There seem to be some characteristics that can assist to create more positive intergroup relations and decrease an unequal situation. These characteristics are seen in step 3. One way to ease unequal status per se is the composition of the group, for example an equal representation from the two campuses. As well trying to group people of the same “level”, for example people with equal position or education.

Though we have seen that a situation officially many times can be equal but that individuals experience it differently, the meaning people give to each other and how they see themselves in the context play a large part. One example is the ISRC. Additionally we believe that an intergroup could benefit from being lifted out of its regular surroundings and that work needs to be done at a social integration level as well. See **responses to the merger** for more details. Responses that demonstrate more equal situations come from institutional meetings, the alignment process and sport situations.

The characteristic of equal status seems to be present more often in situations regarding organizational integration. At an organizational level the interaction can in some ways be controlled and designed. This interaction is often forced and the actors have certain roles, for examples being a teacher. As the general situation in the South African society provide an unequal status, the culture groups are often divided and unequally dominant, which makes it difficult to achieve an equal situation at a social
level. In a social surrounding there is less control, fewer rules and less forces that pushes for integration.

2) Our interviews demonstrate that many persons at an organizational integration level and within the merger process seem to have common goals. Yet it seems that when the goal is more specific, exemplified in the case with the alignment of programs, it is easier to work together towards it. With a looser more abstract goal, which might be the case of the ISRC, the cooperation becomes more difficult and so also the integration between the members. The reason might be that with a more specific goal the actors more easily see the purpose and necessity of the cooperation, the goal and the actions that have to be taken and hence easier finds agreements. Around a more specific goal it might also be easier to create common rules of how to achieve it. Moreover the situations providing common rules are favourable, where all actors of the group know or new rules are created by the group. One example of this is in sports activities.

As shown both before as well present here; common goals are more frequently current at an organizational setting than in a social one, where it is harder to fulfil, and it is also less likely that people of different races socially have or will create common goals.

3) Intergroup cooperation is highly present for some individuals, for others non existing. Involved students and many teachers are members in intergroups, other students and teachers are not within the integration process and have no reason to for example meet over campus lines. The characteristic is mostly present regarding organizational integrations. Between the campuses we see intergroups more frequently and in a longer duration on higher levels, but also among lower staff in the alignment groups and students in the ISRC. Inside the two campuses we can see intergroups of teachers within faculties and departments, among students in hostels, classrooms, organizations and in sport etc. Intergroups containing whites and blacks are more present at Potchefstroom, while at Mafikeng the interaction is mainly between SeTswana and other black culture groups.

According to our findings there are some favourable characteristics that seem to enhance positive intergroup outcome; smaller groups with fewer members, the representation is equal and the participants have an equal status, cooperation during a longer time period, specific common goals, and common rules. These seem to affect the cooperation in the intergroups also outside the specific setting and additionally the members can be more resistant to pressure from outgroups.

4) On a national level there are both support and pressure from authority, due to laws stating that the merger is mandatory and stress employment equity etc. From the NWU there is support and sanctions from institutional management on an organizational level. Through for instance structure, policies dealing with human rights, equity and diversity, they are trying to establish general values for the university. Even in this step the unequal status is present, in the sense that national sanctions often are influenced by black individuals, and contrary sanctions from the institutional management are more often influenced by white persons. This could create suspicion and reluctance to implement the decisions demanded.
Among students we have noticed examples regarding non authority sanction in the classrooms. In the classrooms the teachers are the authority and their actions can be both positive as well as counterproductive towards integration; for example placing black and white students in different groups in group work, giving responsibilities to only white students etc will rather hinder integration than enhance it. The possibility exists also that some teacher may feel there are no direct sanctions or initiatives for cooperation between the campuses, which could cause less initiative to do so by oneself. We have detected different approaches in different faculties in their attitudes towards cooperation.

Connected to the views by Vandeyar and Killen in our analytical framework, we have seen that NWU today is mostly positioning itself on a Multicultural education level regarding work toward integration in the sense that work for equal educational opportunities is in focus. This can be seen in for example the interpreting system. Some attempts to reach even the second step of an anti racist education has been taken shown in for example the values at the university, work for human rights, policies of employment equity, peer groups in hostels etc. However we have not detected any defined work yet done to subtle racism, stereotypes and patronizing attitudes, which is required at this theoretical level. It would demand a greater interference by the management in social encounters inside the organisation and an active work with changing attitudes and mindsets. This leads to that the NWU not yet is at step three of working in a more complex way with racism. However the merger is still in a fairly initial stage and it is positive to see that the NWU are advancing up these theoretical steps. Nonetheless as we emphasize later on, attention to the social level in the institution is needed for continued work.

On a social integration level there seem to be less work done and as well harder to accomplish. As some members of NWU management put it, you can not force people to be friends. We have detected attitudes of that so far the merger might not be in the state where working with social integration is possible, at least not sanctioned from a higher level. Social integration may in general also be hard to create top down, as well as the distance between the campuses makes a social integration process harder. Moody means that increased cross racial friendships or social integration is dependent on the hierarchical structures and activities within the settings of contact, he highlights among others mixing opportunities. To remember is therefore, that efforts on the organizational level can produce social integration. Some initiatives have been taken in order to enhance integration at an organizational level, with the hope that they will spill over even socially. Further on in the integration process the management might have to take a more active role to promote social integration through for example suggest departments and faculties to have social “get togethers” by themselves etc. One positive step was the “fun day” that was held. In these cases smaller groups may tend to have a more positive interaction, which is why it could be useful for departments and faculties to have private “get togethers”. Some faculties and departments have taken own initiatives to social integration. The same is true for teachers, where some work with integration among their students while others do not pay enough attention to the matter and might even be counterproductive for integration.

Through our research we have seen that language is a highly concerned question. The present situation seems to increase the division between the groups, seen in
within and outside group. The NWU have a multi language policy and the campuses use different languages in teaching. Generally, on the management level English is used and in the cooperation between the campuses in official larger meetings the use translation is present. However on lower levels there seem to be missing a clear policy, of for example how to handle language difficulties in student organizations. There is a necessity for some clearer rules decided from a higher level of how to bridge the language problems in mixed organizations, group works etc. since on a social level people tend to use their first language at both campuses.

But instead of considering Allport’s optimal conditions as essential, Pettigrew and Tropp believe they facilitate prejudice reduction in a relevant way, but that diminishing prejudice within a group is possible even without all of the conditions fulfilled (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 753, 766).

Our research enhances this view. All characteristics are found, but not in all situations and the one that is missing frequently is equal status. The level of characteristics present differs according to situation, setting, people etc. The areas that include some or all of Allport’s characteristics seem to have a better integration than the ones that miss some of them. One example is the alignment process vs. the Senate.

In our social integration perspective the characteristics seem to be less present. However one important point even highlighted by Moody is that organizational integration can lead to social integration. The mixed hostels at Potchefstroom campus are one interesting case where the policy directly could result in social interaction. The policy itself contributes to sanction from authority. One bigger intergroup is created as well as smaller ones inside the hostel in form of committees and activity groups. The abstract common goal of living together is defined by the more direct common goals and rules to agree on. The characteristic that is less present in housing is equal status. All are students but the Afrikaans outnumbers the blacks, coloured, English and Asian in all hostels. Another example is that the hostel traditions at Potchefstroom campus, annual events and sports played, are to a higher level Afrikaans traditions. Moody means that extracurricular activities with its informal setting easily give a “spill over” effect on everyday life or social integration. We can also gather a slightly more positive attitude against whites from black students living in hostels than those that do not, see within and out of process. However this spill over effect is not always extended, as seen in for example rugby or soccer teams where the activities at field seem not to spill over socially. It is also important to remember that this spill over effect may not always be positive. Further discussion is found in next paragraph.
...reduction of prejudice within the group may not be possible to generalize to outgroups. There is also the risk that contact under unfavourable conditions may instead increase prejudice and tension within the group. It has also been shown that even if intergroup contact may lower the prejudice at a personal level it has failed to do so at a group level, which would mean that contact may lower individual prejudice but not necessarily group conflict. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 752)

Negative attitudes of assimilation and not fitting in have been detected among black students. As seen above our views and findings enhance Pettigrew and Tropp’s view. One example is the senate and council, which seem to be intergroups with relatively many members presenting negative feelings. Feelings such as domination and being run over are present. It seems that the negative intergroups lack some of the characteristics that we mentioned before under step 3. In this case there exists a relatively large group size, more abstract goals, lack of common rules, and often unequal status as well as mixing people of different positions.

Our interviews have shown examples where persons after a meeting or outside class activities do not interact with the other group. This can be seen in within and outside group and dominance, but also in our division between organizational and social integration throughout the paper. In addition, generalizing about blacks or whites as a group widely occur even though the individual has contradicting personal experiences or black/white friends. Blumer’s discussion about persons taking different roles and having different meanings in different contexts is useful here.

Moody also states that “To concentrate minority in a larger school may cause friendship segregation due to the fact that people prefer friends similar to them and will choose friends of the same race if possible. On the other hand do many minority students create a better potential of cross-race friendship centred in a large school.” (Moody, James, 2001, s 679-681). In other words a person often has friends similar to himself, if possible. This gives that separation tend to increase. The minority students may have cross-race friendship but if there are few minority students the patterns seem to be of an assimilating kind. However we have seen if the groups have to cooperate in intergroups, the chances of positive integration can be higher if the size of the minority group is sufficient in a certain situation to stand against the pressure to assimilate by the larger group.

Integration is according to some more similar to assimilation. One example is black students in hostels in Potchefstroom. Change in general and especially negative contact during a process of change can also make that the “we-groups” close themselves even more towards the others and become even more cautious about keeping their culture and traditions. This was shown in the merger process, especially in the beginning. This is though a state that is hard to avoid, but never the less important to understand and deal with. Feelings of pride can also easily be detected during a process of change, a reluctance to change if no effort is seen in the counterpart’s reactions.
However there seems to be a slightly higher effect of reduction of prejudice if there is no choice in the participation compared to the voluntarily participation. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 753)

Without the government’s decision to merge the two Universities it would most likely not have happen and without continued demands from government and management there will probably not be much integration between the campuses. Both the merger and the ongoing alignment process are mandatory processes. However we have seen that voluntarily based cooperation is regarded to be the most positive since the participants feel a will to cooperate. The risk in this case is although that it is only the already positive that would join in the cooperation. For this reason forced integration may reduce prejudices with a higher rate, though the outline of the interacting is more important.

We believe it to be important to make people understand why a merger and integration process is needed to see the common goal and trust the rules of the process. This importance of having enough information and a transparent system, as well as the pace of transformation of the changes is not brought up by our theory, but according to us important factors. Pace of transformation signify that fast or big change can create more negative than positive outcomes. People in a setting like the one in South Africa also need time to change and revaluate their pre understandings. In pace of transformation it is positive to have a certain amount of force at organizational integration, however not too fast and less exercised force at a social integration level. One can never force people to socialize or be friends, but one can give people the opportunity to meet socially. In this case the management can provide support and structures such as housing, sport and “fun days” etc.

...stress the importance of also look after negative factors, caused by intergroup anxiety, which could create a hindrance to the contact. This intergroup anxiety refers to feelings of threat and uncertainty that people might experience in intergroup contexts, and grow out of concern of how to act, how to be perceived and accepted. (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006, s. 767

Feelings of uncertainty can be caused by differences, lack of knowledge about each other and the merger, little exposure to the other group, distrust, unequal status etc. Negative factors are important to find and understand in order the uncertainty to be reduced. The actual work of detecting these factors and address them can be seen as lacking from a management perspective. Such negative factors form a part of the social interaction between people which is hard to control, but what can be done is to facilitate settings of understanding. Examples can be found in within and outside group and responses to the merger.
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5.1 Conclusion

The merger has gone forward and many changes have occurred. At the same time South Africa’s historical background still lies as base for people’s perceptions. The cultural groups are still in many aspects separated and demonstrate a great number of differences. Cultural differences are one but also social and economical. These differences and the historical background create uncertainty and distrust towards one another. The separation between the culture groups and the domination of one culture at each campus at NWU tend to create a feeling of assimilation by the minority groups and difficulty for the individual to challenge the meanings that exist in its “we-group”. What we have seen is that in an integration process the pace of transformation play a large role in the sense that a balance have to be found between pushing for change without losing the foundation.

People generate their understandings of themselves and others from interaction with others, but also from interaction with the pre-understanding that you carry with you. In the forming of these pre-understandings you group belonging and culture seem to be important. Belonging to an intergroup can help change your understandings, both in a positive or negative way depending on the interaction. However it seems as if members of the outgroup or a person’s “we-group” are strong enough they can form an obstacle for people to act upon the new understanding achieved in the intergroup.

We have detected a few characteristics that appear to facilitate positive intergroup outcome. The characteristics are; smaller intergroup size, groups designed to further equal status, cooperating during a longer time frame, common rules, specific common goals and authority sanctions. Some of them fit in to Allport’s theory.

The overall environment at NWU contains all Allport’s characteristics but many situations do not. Especially the characteristic of equal status is lacking. However, Pettigrew and Tropp states that this must not be a hinder and integration can proceed anyway, which can be seen also in our findings. In South Africa an equal status between the groups is something that appears to lay far in the future, mostly due to the history of differences in social status and the strong separation between the groups which create dominant environments. Integration and cooperation needs to function even in this “dysfunctional” setting. As seen above some additional characteristics can help ease this “dysfunctional” setting in intergroup interaction. We have also seen, in within and outside process, that the persons included in an intergroup are in general more positive to the merger and the integration.

The NWU is mostly working with organizational integration and lack in work on the social integration and addressing attitudes. Generally we conclude that changes on a social integration level are harder to create and hard to force. At such an early stage in the merger encouraging social integration seem hard. Moody states that the school can have an overview at a higher level, but often fail to recognize attitudes at a social level. The organization can also, as Moody discusses, create opportunities for individuals to meet. It is therefore important to recognize even the social level in an organization, as organizational integration can change and create social integration.

Here we would like to revert to the discussion about what is integration and to what extent groups have to mix to be considered integrated. The main question in this
debate we consider to be the issue about whether persons have to actually socialize over race and culture lines to be considered integrated. Should individuals not be allowed to be friends with whoever they desire as long as they respect and tolerate everyone? We generally believe that an individual have the right to choose what friends he want, and similar background and culture can play a large role in what persons he enjoy socializing with. Nevertheless in our study we have found that the choice of friends is not always up to each individual, in the sense that their “we-group” or culture group, friends and family have preferences on what friends to have or not to have. Friendships within or outside your own cultural group should not matter not to you, neither to the groups you belong to. The environment needs be open to accept all options. Our study shows this lack of openness and respect towards the other culture groups and towards mixing groups. At times examples of more severe lack of respect between the culture groups are also present, where the person neither wishes to integrate with the other group, nor is it accepted by the environment.

Suggestions

Language is one of the largest areas of separation between the groups, and also one way to keep the dominance of each culture group at the campuses. We consider that more openness towards English is required at Potchefstroom, maybe not necessary as teaching language but policies regarding group work and questions in class as well as student organizations, campus newspaper and restaurants need to be bilingual. At Mafikeng campus, the language seem to be a problem at a social integration level, people tend to have less problems and experience less domination when using everyone’s second language organizationally. But also here language needs to be managed at a social level. People have to be aware of the issue and its implications, though what language spoken in a social setting is personal.

Another issue that can be managed is the unequal and social status. From an authority perspective the campuses require to be more equally resourced, the institutional management require more black members, cooperation can be formed in smaller groups during a longer period of time including members with similar education etc. Increased use of English can also help the unequal status socially. Other means could be to address and encourage other cultures than the Afrikaans or SeTswana in student events, concerts, student newspaper and hostels.

There is also a need to highlight the differences and prejudices many people have found disturbing in interactions. Workshops or discussions about these issues may be useful in order to see and challenge the prejudices. As the situation is today there is little evidence that these things are dealt with. It might also help to have a more structured setting for discussions since the topic is sensitive.

Finally a further step is the one mentioned before that social integration has to be addressed at an organizational level. Policies of social integration at all levels in the organization are additionally required, from policies regarding group work and student organizations to interactions in the Senate. Having thoughts of social change, when planning the organization, can help to form more favourable situations for integration. As well, keeping in mind the characteristics for intergroup interactions, in order to enhance social integration from an organizational perspective.

*Building a Rainbow Nation*
Hence, our conclusion would be that the process is underway, but expresses itself at different pace at different levels – organizational and social – and takes different shapes at Potchefstroom and Mafikeng campus.
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6.1 Interviews and observations

Interviews

Students

M8 – Student, Black, Male, former member of the SRC on Mafikeng
M9 – Student, Black, Male, member of the SRC on Mafikeng
M10 – Student, Black, Female, member of the SRC on Mafikeng
M12 – Student, Black, Male, President in SRC on Mafikeng and board member in ISRC
M13 – Students, Black, Male, member of the choir
M14 – Smaller group interview with students (around 7), all Black and members of the student organization, Culture Union (CU)
M15 – Two students, Black, Male
M16 – Two students, Black, Female and Male
M17 – Student, Black, Male
M18 – Two students, Black, Female
M19 – Two students, Black, Female
M20 – Two students, Black, Female
M21 – Two students, Black, Female
M22 – Two students, one Black and one Colored, Male, en rolled on the soccer institution at Mafikeng
P1 – Student, White, Male
P2 – Three students, Black, Female
P3 – Student, White, Male
P4 – Student, White, Female
P5 – Two students, White, Female
P6 – Three students, White, 2 Male and 1 Female
P7 – Two students, White, Female
P8 – Student, White, Female
P9 – Student, Black, Male
P10&P11 – Two students, White, Female
P12 – Student, Black, Male, member of the SRC on Potchefstroom
P13 – Student, White, Male, member of the SRC and editor of the students paper WAPAD on Potchefstroom.
P14 – Students, White, Female, President of the SRC and ISRC
P18 – Two students, Black, Male
Staff

I 1 - Theuns Eloff, Vice Chancellor of the NWU, White, Male
I2 - Prof. Madoda S Zibi, Director: Diversity, Equity and Human Rights, Black, Male
M1 - Prof. S.N. Mashego, Vice-rector: Quality and Planning on Mafikeng, Black, Male
M2 - Mark Olkias, Manager of the soccer institute, White, Male
M3 - Dan Kgwagile, Campus Rector on Mafikeng, Black, Male
M4 – Teacher, Black, Female
M5 - Fisa Lembede, Teacher and involved in the alignment process, Black, Female
M6 - Jobst Bodenstein, Director of the Community Law Centre, White, Male
M7 - Prof. Mqosa Mahao, Executive Dean of the law faculty on Mafikeng campus, Black, Male
M11 - Ricky van Rooyen, Sport manager and head of sports department on Mafikeng, White, Male
M23 - Two teachers, Black, Male
P15 - Johan Zaaiman, Director of school of social and government studies and Teacher, White, Male
P16 - Prof. Hendre Reyneke, Dean of students and part of the Potchefstroom campus management, White, Male
P17 - Schalk Meyer, Director of centre for community law and development, White, Male
P19 - Anette Combrink, Campus Rector at Potchefstroom, White, Female
P20 – Group interview with James Y Stoffberg, Director of sport and Mervyn Taylor, Organizer of the rugby institution and two rugby players/students, all White and Male
P21 – Prof. Renier J. van Rensburg, Director of the school of Business Management and Teacher, White, Male

Field notes

10/11 2007
12/11 2007
15/11 2007
16/11 2007
17/11 2007
18/11 2007
19/11 2007
21/11 2007
30/11 2007
1/12 2007
16/12 2007
6/12 and 12/12 2007
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These numbers here and below are estimated from the diagrams above each calculation.

*Potchefstroom*
Total 185000
Black 127000 – 68,6%
White 58000 – 31,4%

*Mmabutho*
Total - 280000
Black – 270000 – 96,4%
White – 6000 -2,1%
Temba – 67%
Ga-Rankuwa – 72%
Brits – 69%
Rustenburg – 66%
Mankwe – 65%
Potchefstroom – 72%
Venterdorp – 51%
Klerksdorp – 68%
Christiania – 52%
Wolmaransstad – 42%
Schweizer-Reneke – 38%
Delareyville – 45%
Lichtenburg – 56%
Madikwe – 51%
Mmabotho – 64%
Phokwani – 46%
Vryburg – 52%
Kudumane – 46%
Huhudi – 36%
Percentage Population in Poverty (Source Data: WEFA Regional Economic Focus, 2001)

Source: PPT in Practice (http://www.pptpilot.org.za/Poverty_NorthWestProvince.pdf)

- Temba – 50%
- Ga-Rankuwa – 44%
- Brits – 38%
- Rustenburg – 33%
- Mankwe – 58%
- Potchefstroom – 35%
- Ventersdorp – 68%
- Klerksdorp – 45%
- Christiana – 55%
- Wolmaransstad – 68%
- Schweizer-Reneke – 67%
- Delareyville – 79%
- Lichtenburg – 61%
- Madikwe – 68%
- Mmabotho – 55%
- Phokwani – 75%
- Vryburg – 49%
- Kudumane – 74%
- Huhudi – 75%
The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite, relative index that attempts to quantify the extent of human development of a community. It is based on measures of life expectancy, literacy and income and analyses people’s ability to live a long and healthy life, to communicate, to participate in the life of the community and to have sufficient resources to obtain a decent living. The HDI can assume a maximum level of 1, indicating a high level of human development, and a minimum value of 0 (PPT in Practice).
Appendix 2 – A-schema

Basic
Name
Position – Task?
Duration at NWU
Why NWU?
Use your name?

Merger
Changes?
Difficulties?
Benefits?

Language and Culture
Race?
Difficulties?
Difference?

Future
Personal?
Merger?
South Africa?

Cooperation
Group work?
Cooperation within
and between campuses?
Student fees?

Social situation
Students:
Free time?
Student organization?
Sport?
Living?
Teachers: Socialization outside work?
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Appendix 3 - Overview in numbers

Students enrolled in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mafikeng campus</th>
<th>Potchefstroom campus</th>
<th>Vaal Triangle campus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8487</td>
<td>26877</td>
<td>3372</td>
<td>38736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006 p.54)

Race and gender

Racial and gender composition of the student body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10300</td>
<td>20131</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12745</td>
<td>25894</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14292</td>
<td>22436</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006 p.54-55)

Race and gender composition of the employees 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006 p.63-64)

Financial assistance

Financial allocation to undergraduate students from the NWU’s own resources in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Value (R million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University funds</td>
<td>Potchefstroom</td>
<td>27 659 583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University funds</td>
<td>Vaal Triangle</td>
<td>1 844 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University funds</td>
<td>Mafikeng</td>
<td>1 139 916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund</td>
<td>Potchefstroom</td>
<td>1 346 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund</td>
<td>Vaal Triangle</td>
<td>69 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NWU</td>
<td>32 060 539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006, p.57)

Financial allocation to undergraduate students from external sources in 2006
Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Value (R million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External funds</td>
<td>Potchefstroom</td>
<td>7 891 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funds</td>
<td>Vaal Triangle</td>
<td>2 233 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funds</td>
<td>Mafikeng</td>
<td>17 783 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funds</td>
<td>Telematic Learning Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NWU</td>
<td>27 908 333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006, p.57)

Outputs

Following have graduated from NWU in 2006 (as at 1 May 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mafikeng campus</th>
<th>September 2006</th>
<th>766</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April/May 2007</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potchefstroom campus</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April/May 2007</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaal Triangle campus</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April/May 2007</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Annual report 2006 p.59)

Employment

Employment patterns at the North West University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 Baseline</th>
<th>October 2007</th>
<th>Targets 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafikeng Campus</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potch. Campus</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaal Triangle Campus</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Office</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWU total</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Institutional Plan 2008-2010 p.30)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment patterns</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWU Summary</td>
<td>49% (56% 2010)</td>
<td>51% (44% 2010)</td>
<td>50% (53% 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mafikeng campus plan, p.7-8)

Resignations during 1 January 2007 – 31 October 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mafikeng Campus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potchefstroom Campus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaal Triangle Campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWU total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Institutional Plan 2008-2010, p.29)

Appointments made during 1 January 2007 – 31 October 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mafikeng Campus</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potchefstroom Campus</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaal Triangle Campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Office</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWU total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Institutional Plan 2008-2010, p.29)