

This paper was downloaded from

**The Online Educational Research Journal**  
**(OERJ)**

**[www.oerj.org](http://www.oerj.org)**

OERJ is an entirely internet-based educational research journal. It is available to anyone who can access the web and all articles can be read and downloaded online. Anybody can submit articles as well as comment on and rate articles. Submissions are published immediately provided certain rules are followed.

## **Restructuring the Academic landscape: Co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture, University of Swaziland**

**Dr Boyie Sabelo Dlamini [boyiedlamini@hotmail.com](mailto:boyiedlamini@hotmail.com)** He is a lecturer in the Faculty of Education, University of Swaziland. Research interests in Educational Change and Management, Education Policy, Assessment and Gender education.

**Dr Salebon S. Simelane [simelane@uniswa.sz](mailto:simelane@uniswa.sz)** He is Registrar, University of Swaziland.

**Simon P. Maphanga [Maphanga@uniswa.sz](mailto:Maphanga@uniswa.sz)** A researcher, University of Swaziland.

### **Abstract**

*This study was designed to examine the co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Swaziland in 2014. This study was guided by these questions: what were the pushing and pulling factors which initiated the co-branding? how it was managed and expected to boost faculty diverse activities? Data collection procedures involved interviews and content analysis of relevant documents (University's Annual Reports; University Strategic Plans and other documents). Ten members of the academic staff including Deans and Directors were interviewed. The study revealed that the co-branding was initiated by market-forces. Ideas were debated, using University's structures: Faculty Boards, Deans' Committee and Senate. The results revealed that co-branding was expected to market the diverse programmes to different clients, mainly for attracting external resources and Scientists. The findings show that the co-branding process was guided by the mission, goals and objectives of the University and the Swazi government's national development goals.*

**Keywords: Branding, Co-branding, Faculty of Agriculture, Educational Change, Higher Education, Consumer Sciences.**

### **Introduction**

#### **Background and Context to the study**

The education system and higher education system in Swaziland have experienced some visible and invisible changes since the 1960s. The establishment of the joint University of Bechuanaland, Basotholand and Swaziland in the 1963 was perceived as the starting point of educational change in higher education in Swaziland. Before independence, the Kingdom of Lesotho was known as Basotholand and the Republic of Botswana was referred to as Bechuanaland.

In the 1960's higher education was in a state of change in these nations. In 1972, the Faculty of Agriculture in Swaziland was established and in 1975 the government of Swaziland, Botswana and Lesotho made an education juncture by establishing the University of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. These governments aimed at providing education to all members states' citizens. These nations and their governments recognised the importance of skills-oriented education in addressing the problems of food insecurity and unemployment. Agricultural development was viewed by all member countries as one crucial part in shaping

their economies. The Swaziland agricultural sector was perceived as the Mainstay of the economy and the majority of the Swazis population depends on small-scale agricultural activities (Imbokodvo National Movement Manifesto, 1973).

Higher education has been in a continuous change process since the 1970s'; for example the brief professional working relationship between Basotholand, Bechuanaland and Swaziland which broke up just after a year lead to the formation of the University of Botswana and Swaziland in 1976. These Universities operated together until the establishment of the University of Swaziland in 1982. The structural changes were also accompanied by additions of academic programmes crafted to address current societal challenges (University of Swaziland Report of Vice Chancellor 2012-2013; 2013-2014). The continuous change process is also observed in Faculty's objectives. The Faculty of Agriculture's objectives for example, have been changing for the past years (University of Swaziland Report of Vice Chancellor 1986-87; 1987-88 and 1989-90). These changes were not unique because other institutions have experienced similar changes in other countries. Tight (2013) noted that the nature and identity of higher educational establishments in the United Kingdom has changed remarkably.

The University of Swaziland, the oldest institution of higher learning in Swaziland has three Campuses with different Faculties: the Luyengo Campus for the Faculty of Agriculture now changed to the Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences, Kwaluseni Campus the main Campus and the Mbabane Campus for the Faculty of Health Sciences. These Faculties have distinctive mandates. The University of Swaziland has become the hope of Swazis and the main vehicle for transmission of culture and knowledge, democratisation of society and the breaking down of historical elitism (University of Swaziland Report of Vice Chancellor 2012-2013; 2013-2014).

Over the past decades, the oldest institution of higher learning of Swaziland has changed its operations because of different social forces such as marketing forces and economic challenges/dwindling of financial resources. Kotler (1979) noted that for a long time colleges were increasingly feeling the pinch of rising costs and decline of revenues. From 2010/11 academic year resource allocations in institutions of higher learning in Swaziland were governed by the constraints of the economic challenges facing the nation. The institution has to compete for institutional funding and other resources in an increasingly competitive country with its sluggish economy. This has become a market and social force to reckon with. To an extent this challenges the institutions' well-crafted mission and strategies deployed by the University of Swaziland. It also challenges the institutions' marketing strategy and creates a marketing problem for the institution which needs to be addressed. Kotler (1979) once claimed that all organisations including educational organisations have marketing problems and need to understand marketing processes and consequences. He stated that marketing is not only a business function but also a valid function for non-business organisations.

The increasing complexities of students' bursaries and challenging management of scholarships from the Swazi government, economic related challenges and the issue of government subvention dependency led the university to understand that it has some

competitors in consumer places and it has to respond with relevant strategies and disciplined commitment. These existing challenges have led to academic restructuring process which aimed at reflecting and accommodating multifaceted institutional pressures from clients. This institutional history suggests the nature of the higher education in Swaziland which has become complex. The institution has changed continuously through its history and in the continuous change process it designs some mechanisms to respond to environmental pressures (University of Swaziland Report of Vice Chancellor 2012-2013; 2013-2014; University of Swaziland Strategic Plan 2014/2015). Barrow (1996) noted that some institutions usually resolved pressures through an array of institutional structural changes and responses. This includes re-naming, branding the institutions and adapting new innovations, a complex matter to be considered by due process (Tight, 2013).

It is increasingly recognised that educational systems in higher education in particular, cannot adequately respond to the needs of the economy unless they are subjected to pressure to adapt new innovations in teaching and administration. In today's society, for example, competition and financial pressures has become normal among institutions of higher learning (Tight, 2013). This has initiated institutional reforms which include the introduction of university-private sector partnership and departmental restructuring process, renaming and branding of faculties. More often than not, the restructuring reforms aim at making institutions more efficient and effective in teaching and learning and use of financial resources. For example, institutions are required to reduce their financial dependence on state and be financially proactive and be ready to diversify their financing base (Tight, 2013). This has become more necessary during a period of financial constrains or stringency, where institutions regularly re-invent themselves in an attempt to equip themselves to face their educational challenging and changing circumstances. Rudolph (1990) noted that socio-economic challenges sometimes forces organisations to engage into a process of soul searching and critical self-assessment and redefinition and repositioning themselves.

The co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture has led the university to the adaption to market pressure and to keep pace with knowledge change and societal challenges. Sometimes, Universities have diversified their programmes and join the marketing economy in order to function effectively and strive in their changing and challenging environments (Tight, 2013). Financial realities, for example, sometimes they bring pressure to higher institutions and therefore facilitates structural changes and resources commitment to specific areas (Gumport, 2000). Higher educational institutions are increasingly exposed to external forces, expectations and are expected to be relevant to current societal demands and be useful for the economy and different clients. They are also expected to be characterised by greater institutional diversity and multi-functionality (Brenna, 2008). Institutions of higher learning are regularly re-inventing themselves and marketing themselves in an effort to better or improve their practices in relation to their changing socio-political circumstances (Tight, 2013). This may include adding an academic programme, swift programme adjustment and students satisfaction as a marketing strategy to position the university to attract new clients and thus increase the revenue base. Universities are expected to continue striving for

relevance and clients' satisfaction through different marketing strategies to avoid losing legitimacy (Gumport, 2000).

The critical part in the marketing of universities is its image and the position they occupy in the educational and socio-political environment (Treadwell, 2003). Elements such as the image of the university have effect on students' decision to enrol in that particularly university (Stevens et al. 2008). Designing a desirable university image and branding are important factors for the success of an institution of higher learning because higher institutions have now moved into a competitive era where students' enrolment and resources are a challenge (Steven, et al. 2008).

### **Branding and Co-branding in educational establishments**

In most parts of the world, educational activity is a function of actions and interactions of government sector and business sector (Kotler, 1979). The education sector depends on grants from the business sector and subversion from government sector. This is a challenge because of currently Education Administrators are struggling to keep educational organisations alive in the face of rapidly diminishing financial resource crisis particularly in Swaziland. This requires Administrators to think like marketers, to view the institution and its purpose using a new lens. This includes branding and co-branding in educational organisations. These processes provide an organisation or a place with a new outlook. An organisation or a place name is important for its survival therefore it needs to be clear and understood by all relevant clients. A place or an organisation's name work as a symbolic texts within the organisation and is imbedded in meaning and ideology that are read, interpreted and acted upon by different clients (Pinchevski at al. 2002). This notes that through branding and co-branding an organisation might be clearly visualised and marketed to its internal and external audiences (Aaker, 2004).

Branding is a form of educational organisation marketing. Organisation branding means turning the organisation into a brand not just branding the products the organisation provides but also its practices (Morsing, 2002; Fombrum,1990). Organisation branding goes deeper than marketing, because it is about communicating the values of and identity of the organisation in a strategic manner. It takes into account what the organisation stands for and how those ideals, norms and values are shared with existing clients and potential ones. It caters for both internal and external constituencies (Aaker, 2004).

Co-branding is a brand alliance strategy in which two or more brand is simultaneously presented to clients (Inman and Geylani, 2008). It is used by companies and no-business organisations to reinforce their image. It is done for different reasons such as to gain access to new clients and to signal unobservable quality in the organisation (Rao et al. 1999).

### **Renaming of Institutions and Institutional developments.**

More often than not institutions changed names to reflect major institutional developments and local geographical location (Tight, 2000). For example, in the United Kingdom some institutions changed their names to indicate or reflect their geographical location, to

emphasise their University status and retain a designation in its title so as to reflect the difference of its focus from existing Universities across the land (Tight, 2013). Some changed their names to reflect their granting of University status, for example the Royal Agricultural University in Cirencester in the United Kingdom. The post 1992 and post 2000 Universities in the United Kingdom created from former Polytechnics and Colleges changed their names to suit their new status (Tight, 2000). This notes that institutional change is not confined to Swaziland higher education as other developing and developed nations have experienced or seen their higher education systems moving from elite to mass participation and other institutional changes (Tight, 2013). Institutions of higher education are in a continuous change process of re-inventing themselves in many different ways to align themselves with contemporary societal challenges, so as to better survive and thrive in their own changing environment (Tight, 2013).

### **Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences**

This Faculty is located 20km from the Kwaluseni main Campus and 27km from the Manzini city centre along the Bhunya road. In 2014 the Faculty changed from being a Faculty of Agriculture to a Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences because of different educational related reasons to be discussed later in the paper.

The debate of co-branding processes within the Faculty of Agriculture at Luyengo campus started back in 1995, in an Educational Seminar at the Malkerns Research Station, where it was noted that the campus needs two faculties: Faculty of Agriculture and Faculty of Home Economics. In the 1990's the first Strategic Plan was crafted and it was documented that the Faculty of Agriculture should be split into two Faculties. The Faculty of Agriculture should look for land to house the new Faculty: Home Economics. In 2002/2003 academic year a document from the Faculty of Agriculture was submitted to Senate for establishment of the Faculty of Home Economics, separate from the Faculty of Agriculture but was not approved.

In 2012, the issue of changing the Faculty of Agriculture resurfaced and the Faculty Professor was given the responsibility to research on how Faculties, Centres, Institutes and Schools in higher institutions are established and specifically how they could be created in the University of Swaziland. The absence of guidelines which guides the establishment of new Faculties and Schools helped the advocators of new Faculties at Luyengo campus to re-focus their attention on renaming the Faculty and makes it more reflective of what was happening on ground, they believe that there is much on a name. Much of the social forces which led to co-branding are discussed later in the paper.

The Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences has seven academic departments offering different degree programmes. Including Agricultural Biosystems Engineering, Agricultural Economics and Management, Agricultural Education, Agronomy, Animal Science, Consumer Science, Consumer Science Education, Food Science, Nutrition and Technology, Horticulture and Textile and Apparel Design and Management. The faculty also offers Masters and PhD programmes. It is one of the progressive Faculties in the University and it the first Faculty to introduce a PhD programme. Its main challenge and the key challenge for the whole

University is gender imbalance among its professionals (Report of the Vice Chancellor 2012-2013).

The functions and operations of the Faculty are guided by its key objectives. The key objectives of the Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences are as follows:

- Adopt teaching strategies that are responsive to the needs and aspirations of the internal and external environment of the faculty of Agriculture in favour of proper balance of teaching, research and community enterprise development;
- Produce human resources at tertiary levels that are well equipped for the job market and self-employment;
- Collaborate and partnership with relevant stakeholders in the department and dissemination of Agricultural technology information;
- Develop and operate the library that provides an excellent information service to the academic community of the faculty and to serve as a reference centre for the public;
- Conduct demand-driven research and relevant student research training aimed at increased production, poverty alleviation and environmental conservation;
- Disseminate research-driven information in the usable form to all stakeholders;
- Develop and operate commercial enterprises to generate funds for the University;
- Provide consultancy services; and
- Address environmental concerns.

Source: Report of the Vice Chancellor 2012-2013; 2013-2014.

These Faculty objectives are important because educational changes including change of names are usually guided and responsive to organisational objectives and socio-political environment and the national goals. This suggests that name change and organisational change has an influence on marketing strategies and subject content and programmes objectives.

### **Excitements and questions on name change**

The change of name of the Faculty of Agriculture at Luyengo Campus has raised different questions to some individuals and excitement and promises to others. As Haytko, et al. (2008) noted that there is nothing exciting for an educational organisation than taking a new name that is more reflective of what the institution has become or stands for. They further stated that an educational organisation may change its name when it grows and expands and it may change to reflect what it has evolved into. In addition, naming can be an act of intervention, a way of organising and giving meaning to an institution (Pettet, 2005). Karpoff and Rankines (1987) stated that the mere act of a name change and implicit promise of future changes may lead to a sense of an improved productivity.

### **Question remains over co-branding**

In all these educational developments at Luyengo Campus in the past few years, very few individuals understood why the Faculty has to change its name, how long has the faculty

trying to change its name, how the University decision making organs dealt with this task ? What needed to be changed? How was the name change transition process managed? These are important questions because an organisation's name is infused or pregnant with different agendas, meanings and reputation. It sometimes help the organisation to identifies itself to its internal and external audiences; an organisation's name reveals organisational identity-what the organisational members consider to be central and distinctive about the organisation, the image and the manner organisational members believes others see the organisation (Karpoff and Rankines, 1987). Sometimes renaming places is usually characterised by opposition and chaotic behaviours from different societies because of different political persuasions and racial backgrounds (Starosta, 1988) and this may spark conflict. For example, the suggestions to rename Boulevard street in America as Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard sparked some controversy among Black Americans and White Americans particularly politicians and business people (Porpke et al. 2007).

There is need to investigate the Luyengo Agriculture campus co-branding to understand the complexities surrounding the process. Currently there is no systematic documentation in Swaziland on deeper understanding of co-branding in higher educational organisations. Hence a gap in the literature existed, and this study represented an important piece of work that adds to the knowledge and expertise of those managing educational establishments in Swaziland. An addition of knowledge and expertise is important because name changes have different policy implications (Gioia-Sehltz and Corley, 2000; Karpoff and Rankines, 1987). For example, altering the old name may have direct attention on the implementation of new programmes and some changes on programmes offered.

### **The Methodology**

The study design was descriptive, employing qualitative procedures. In this design, data collection procedures involved interviews and content analysis of relevant documents (University's Annual Reports; University Strategic Plans). Ten of the key members of the academic staff from various departments and Deans and Directors were interviewed. These facilitated the process of responding to the research question. The paper examines the rationale for co-branding the Luyengo Agriculture Campus: how the co-branding aims at boosting the Faculty's academic diversity. Most people working in the University asked the question: why co-branding the Faculty of Agriculture? They did not understand the needs of those affiliated with the Faculty who made the name to reflect what the Faculty had become since its inception in 1972. The key question was addressed through these research questions:

- What were the pushing and pulling factors which initiated the co-branding process?
- How the faculty officials attacked the task of co-branding?
- How the co-branding of the faculty was expected to boost its academic diverse activities?

## **Content analysis**

According to Krippendorff (1989) content analysis is a research method that uses different procedures to make inferences from text. Content analysis remains an ideal data collection procedure in this study, where the documents containing information about the co-branding and interview scripts can be compared objectively and inferences drawn.

The purpose of content analysis is to provide insights, facts and guide to actions (Krippendorff, 1989; Tesch, 1990; and Holsti, 1969). This suggests that inferences drawn from the relevant documents and interview scripts can be used to develop insights on how the co-branding was initiated, conducted, managed and concluded by the key participants. This is important because naming or re-naming public institutions are not innocent spatial reference or passive matters; they are embedded in social power dynamic relations and struggles (Ber and Vuolteehaho, 2009). These struggles usually involve defending the identities of places and people. More often than not political elites within countries are engaged in the naming process to erase signs of earlier political and ideological regimes and to advance new memory (Light, 2004). This notes that re-writing names is an uneven negotiated process of constant mediations as participants of different groups of different ideologists and power question, re-interpret and challenge the form of change process and meaning of place names (Yeoh, 1996 p 304). Rose-redwood (2011) noted that the right name of a place, including schools is increasingly controlled and exclusionary in nature in most today's societies.

## **Findings**

Question one of the study was to examine the pushing and pulling factors which initiated the co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture in 2014.

*Content analysis of the mission, goals and objectives of the University of Swaziland contained in the University Strategic Plans.*

The results of study indicated that the key educational factors which initiated the co-branding were of multifaceted in nature. They include the mission, goals and objectives of the University and those of the Faculty of Agriculture and national development goals-stipulated in national development strategies: National Development Strategy; Poverty Reduction Strategies and Action Programme. Some departmental objectives and educational programmes particularly those from the Department of Consumer Sciences were not clearly reflected on the existing Faculty name (Faculty of Agriculture). The consumer Sciences programmes were subsumed not visible enough to clients. The Faculty of Agriculture name did not capture what was happening at some departments, mainly the Department of Consumer Sciences. This made some programmes invisible to potential clients, yet the Department of Consumer Sciences has grown tremendously for the past years. The Faculty name was expected to reflect the different landscape of programmes offered across the departments. The Department of Consumer Sciences has grown in response to socio-economic challenges of the nation and in response to the University strategic plans which are anchored on national goals. It is noted within the University Strategic plans that the University has key role in producing the necessary human capital and academic leadership to

drive the implementation process of national goals. The co-branding of the Faculty was a way of aligning the Faculty with National Development Strategies.

The University of Swaziland had a culture which encourages change as noted in its strategic plan 2010/2015, but the co-branding process did not change the mission and vision of the University. Yet, more often, organisations' vision and mission are usually modified as a result of a change (Hill and Green, 1998).

Question two of the study was to examine how the faculty officials attacked the task of co-branding the Faculty?

#### *Content analysis of interview scripts*

The study revealed that the co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture was a vigorous process because suggestions and ideas were debated by relevant stakeholders. This process was not a straight line because there were disagreements among the different participants. This was consistent with Yeoh, 1996 p 304 argument: re-writing a name is a negotiated process of constant mediations as participants of different groups with different powers question, re-interpret and challenge the form and meaning of the place names. These following groups were involved in questioning and interpreting the suggested name of the faculty: the Faculty Board members, Deans' Committee and Senate members. Different reasons were given for the re-naming. Some noted that re-naming could assist in increasing opportunities for marketing the institution to both internal and external clients; opportunities for personal collaborative research activities and other academic activities thus attracting scientists to spend their sabbatical leave conducting research. The process of fertilisation of ideas might be promoted. It was debated that the new name should reflect the University and Faculty vision and objectives; diversity of existing programmes, thus helping the faculty to stay competitive in the educational global world. Its visibility might help in attracting the required funding for programmes and projects implementations. Changing name should cater for the envisioned or envisaged faculty growth in terms of new programmes which were in the design stage. These programmes were expected to reflect international, regional, national trends. This finding is in line with Peteet (2005) who noted that naming can be an act of intervention, a way of organising and giving meaning to organisations.

Different names which may reflect all departmental programmes were proposed: Faculty of Agriculture Enterprises Consumer Sciences and Natural Sciences; Faculty of Agriculture, Consumer Sciences and Environment. These names were sent to Dean's Committee for further scrutiny. At this committee, the names were further deliberated and one was chosen for submission to the Senate: Faculty of Agriculture and Consumer Sciences. The Senate members approved this name. Some Faculty members felt that it was inappropriate for the Deans Committee to send the name to the Senate for approval without their comments.

The study also indicated that some members of the faculty was against the name change because they believe that the Consumers Sciences programmes to an extent are related to Agriculture programmes. This indicated the Faculty inclination of the members to their departments' interests. The invisible 'camps' at the Faculty was pronounced when the

leadership of the Faculty was from the Department of Consumer Sciences. This leadership took the matter of co-branding seriously and ensure that it became a finished educational project in 2014. This indicates the Department of Consumer Sciences old ambition of standing alone as a Faculty which was rejected by Senate because of its implementation implications.

Question three of the study was to examine how the renaming of the faculty was expected to boost its academic diverse activities?

#### *Content analysis of interview scripts*

The results of the study revealed that the co-branding of the Faculty was expected to boost the Faculty through the increase of diverse programmes and educational sustainable activities. It was expected to attract external resources and collaborators with different expertise. This aimed at promoting the process of fertilisation of ideas. It was also noted that the diverse programmes to an extent helped to attract an external donor which joined hands with the Faculty on mushroom production and pineapples leaves processing project. This aligns itself with the country's National Development Strategy and the University's strategic plan objectives 2010/2015.

The results of study has shown that the co-branding of the Faculty has a potential of boosting its diverse activities but unless the university officials took the initiative to market the institution to both external and external audiences, as a means of attaching itself to its environment. This is consistent with Fullan (1993) argument that a learning institution should be attached to its environment if it expects to survive in today's complex world. Institutions of higher learning are learning organisations which cannot solve societal problems alone, therefore expected to view themselves as part of a societal team ready to offer educational solutions.

The study revealed that co-branding the faculty in its self was just an aspect of marketing the faculty to relevant clients. Although this aspect was overlooked during the deliberation of the co-branding, it was revealed that Faculty members have to design strategies to continue marketing the Faculty because the name on its own is not enough as a marketing strategy. Marketing the Faculty should be a continuous process and a revolutionary way to view it and its mandate. This has a potential of improving the Faculty's market-oriented planning which may lead to a better understanding of the needs of different clients; to a launching new educational programmes; to pruning of irrelevant programmes and to designing effective teaching methods.

The study noted that Faculty members have to assess potential organisations' goals and objectives to determine how the Faculty can work with those potentials organisations with similar interests. This is consistent with Kotler (1979) suggestion that marketing is not just a profit organisation function but also a valid function for educational organisations, all organisations have to understand marketing. He further suggested that educational establishments, educational activity is a function of the actions and interactions of a private sector and public sector which is usually promoted through marketing.

## **Conclusions, implications and recommendations**

The conclusion drawn from this study was that the Faculty of Agriculture was co-branded to ensure that the Department of Consumer Sciences was not viewed as a subset of the faculty but to be a more visible entity on its own. The Department of Consumer Sciences was fighting for visibility and recognition mainly because it has since grown rapidly in terms of programmes offered. It has introduced new programmes and some were on the pipe line. It has four Degree programmes: BSc in Consumer Science in Education, BSc in Food Science, BSc in Nutrition and Technology, BSc in Horticulture and Textile and Apparel Design and Management.

The matter of marketing the Faculty to relevant clients came strongly as the driving force for co-branding it. The co-branding process was centred on marketing the institution to clients but without focusing on marketing strategies. The focus was on the need for the Faculty to reflect changing conditions in the environment.

The study concluded that the key factors which facilitated the successful co-branding of the Faculty include the following: valuing the status governing the University; the spirit of working towards the shared institutional values as stated in the University strategic plans; the culture of valuing both the Faculty and University's strategic plans; University mission, goals; valuing the open expression of professional differences in professional discussions; valuing the spirit of willingness to compromise; valuing the University structures: Departments Boards, Faculty Boards, Deans Committee and the Senate. The use of these structures promoted the culture of joint leadership practices and made it easy for the Dean of the Faculty (2012/2014) to push forward the Department of Consumer Science's agenda.

The study concluded that the departmental inclination of the Dean and her commitment and interests in making the Consumer Sciences programmes more visible facilitated the co-branding process. The Dean was more strategically positioned for initiating and galvanising support for a successful co-branding. This notes that a leaders' position has an impact on initiating change.

The study concluded that the co-branding of the Faculty of Agriculture promoted the culture of democratic principles such democratic governance and vibrant professional engagement and participation at Luyengo campus. This suggests that the success of co-branding of institutions requires these processes. Professional engagement and participation needs to be nurtured and promoted in higher institutions because they are key aspects of democratic governance. They have a potential of leading to rational decisions based on professional reasoning which might increase the legitimacy of the end results of educational projects.

The study concluded that the co-branding of the Faculty did not lead to uncertainties because it was not branded which usually introduces uncertainties about the future course of the organisation and other risks associated with change.

It was concluded that University Faculty's programmes and practices should reflect changing conditions in the environment and advances in education. This could enable the University to

enhance its image in order to market itself to clients. Analysing the co-branding of the Faculty was an important entry point to understanding how professionals from the Department of Consumer Sciences struggled to incorporate their achievements into the University collective success.

## References

- Aarker, D. A. (2004), 'Leveraging the Corporate Brand', *California Review* V 46 (3) PP 6-18.
- Barron, C.W. (1996), *The Strategy of Selection Excellence: Redesigning Higher Education For Global Competition in a Post Industrial Society*, *Higher Education* 41, PP 447-469.
- Berg S. & Vuolteehaho J. (2009), *The Contested Politics of place naming*. Ashagate Company: Burlington.
- Brennan, J. (2008) *Higher Education and Social Change*, *Higher Education*, V. 56, (3 PP 381-393).
- Fullan M. (1993), *Change Forces Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fombrum, C., Sharley, M. (1990), What's in a name? Reputation building and Corporate Strategy . *Academy of Management Journal* V. 33, PP 233-258.
- Gumport, P.J. (2000), *Academic Restructuring: Organisational Change and Institutional Imperatives*. *Higher Education*, V.39, PP 67-91.
- Gioia, D.A., Schultz, M., Corley K.G. (2000), *Organisations Identity, Image, and Adaptive Instability*. *Academy of Management Review* 25, PP 63-81.
- Hirschey, M., & Bosch, J.C. (1989), *The Valuation Effects of Corporate Name Changes*. *Financial Management*, V 18, (4), PP 64-73.
- Holsti, O.R. (1969), *Continent Analysis For Social Sciences and Humanities*. London: Adison Wesley.
- Imbokodvo National Manifesto (1973), *The Philosophy, Policies and Objectives*. Mbabane: Prime Minister's Office.
- Inman J. & Geylani T. (2008), *Image Reinforcement or Impairment: the Effect of Co-branding on attribute Uncertainty*. *Marketing Science* V 27, (4) PP730-744.
- Karpoff, J.M. & Rankine, G.W. (1987), *The Motives and Wealth Effects of Corporate Name Changes Presented at the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Meetings of the Financial Management Association*, Las Vegas.
- Kingdom of Swaziland, (1999), *National Development Strategy*, Mbabane: Swaziland Government.
- Kotler, P. (1979), *Strategies For Introducing Marketing into Non-profit Organisations*. *Journal of Marketing*. V. 43, (1) PP 37- 44.
- Krippendorff, K. (1989), *Content Analysis*. California: Sage.

Light, D. (2004) Street Names in Bucharest, 1990-1997 Explaining the Modern Historical Geographies of Post-Socialist Change. *Journal of Historical Geography* 30 (2) PP 154-172.

Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, (2006), Poverty Reduction and Action Programme. , Mbabane: Swaziland Government.

Morsing, M. (2002), 'Corporate Branding Basics' Design. DK 1 PP 33-44.

Peteet, J. (2005) Words as Interventions: Naming in the Palestine: Israel Conflict. *Third World Quarterly*, V. 26, (1), PP 153-173.

Pinchevski, S., Amit, J., Efrain, T. & Torgovnik, J. (2002), Signifying Passages: The Signs of Change in Israeli Street Names *Media, Culture and Society* V. 24 (3), PP 365-88.

Popke, E.J., Derek, H. & Mitchelson, M.L. (2007), Branded: The Economic Geographies of Streets Name in Honour of Reverend Dr Martin Luther King Jr. *Social Science Quarterly*, V. 88 (1) PP 120-145.

Roi A.R. & Ruekert, R.W. (1999), Signalling unobservable Product Quality through a brand ally. *Journal of Marketing* V. 36 (2), PP 258-268.

Rudolph E. (1990), *The American College and University: A history* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Starosta, W.J. (1988) A National Holiday For Dr.? Qualitative Content Analysis of Arguments carried in the Washington Post and New York Times. *Journal of Black Studies*, V. 18 (3) PP 358-378.

Stevens R.E., McConkey W.C., Cole, S. & Clow. K. (2008), College Image: Strategic Marketing Dilemmas. *Services Marketing, Quarterly* V. 29, PP 99-113.

Tadeli, S. (1999), What in a name? Reputation as Tradable Asset. *American Economic Review* 98, PP 548-563.

Tesch, R. (1990), *Qualitative research: analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer Press:

Tight, M. (2013), Institutional Churn: Institutional Change in United Kingdom Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* V 35, PP 11-20.

Tight, D. (2009), *The development of Higher Education in the United Kingdom since 1945*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Tredwell, D. (2003) Can your Institutions Name Influence Construct Response? An Initial Assessment of Consumer Response to College Names. *Public Review*, V. 29, 185-137.

University's Strategic Plan 2010/2015, University Corporate Affairs Office: Kwaluseni Campus.

University of Swaziland Report of the Vice Chancellor 2013-2014, University Corporate Affairs Office: Kwaluseni Campus.

University of Swaziland Report of the Vice Chancellor 2012-2013, University Corporate Affairs Office: Kwaluseni Campus.

Yeoh, B.S. (1996) Street Naming and Nation-Building: Toponymic Inscriptions of Nationhood in Singapore Area, 28, PP 298-307.

Yeoh, B.S. (1996) Street Names in Colonial Singapore. Geographical Review V. 8 (3) PP 13-22.