

The Relationship between Branding and Organisational Change*

by

Bjørn Stensaker
NIFU STEP, Norway

Increased national and international competition within higher education has triggered an interest in branding within the sector. Higher education institutions are, as a consequence, currently re-examining their profile and image. This article addresses the problems higher education institutions face in this process, and points to the benefits and dangers of branding as a strategy for survival in the higher education market. The aim of the article is to investigate the potential relationship between branding and organisational change. Drawing on recent insight into organisational theory, we discuss how branding, a process of linking organisational identity and the external image of a given organisation, can enhance institutional development and stimulate organisational change. We conclude that while a branding process with these characteristics is necessarily incremental and on-going, it can also maintain the social responsibility of higher education even in a period when the sector is becoming an industry.

* An earlier version of this article was presented in a lecture in the City Higher Education Seminar Series (CHESS) at City University, London, 7 December 2005. The author is indebted to Professor Vaneeta D'Andrea for comments helping to improve the article.

Introduction

The increased competition in higher education – both at the national and international level – has led to an emerging interest in how higher education institutions profile themselves. The image or brand a given higher education institution has in its surrounding seems to be considered as more important than before, and, to an increasing extent, a strategic and managerial issue. The reason is the possible impact a positive image or brand is expected to have concerning recruitment of students and academic staff, for attracting resources and to create goodwill (Belanger *et al.*, 2002, p. 217). As a consequence, new images have been proposed for higher education institutions. The service-university (Cummings, 1996), the corporate university (Bleiklie, 1998) and the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 1998) are only some of the new organisational ideals stimulating new and dynamic branding efforts.

Image and branding issues are interesting phenomena that we need to better understand, not only due to the money being spent on branding efforts, but also as a development that may shed some light on the future of higher education. An obvious question is, for example, whether the interest in branding is yet another sign that higher education institutions are being transformed from social institutions to a standardised industry (Gumport, 2000). One may argue that this is perhaps the most dangerous effect of engaging in the branding game. If universities become more similar in their attributes and characteristics, they remove themselves from the one element that it is most difficult to copy: their uniqueness and distinctiveness. Sceptics may, on the other hand, argue that the tendency towards emphasising image and branding is merely an indication of higher education's ability to create convincing symbolic responses to new demands in its surroundings while protecting the core values of the sector (Mintzberg, 1983). The decoupling, or at least, loose coupling between structure and action, has been a major factor characterising higher education in the past (Weick, 1976), and is perhaps one of the keys for understanding the long-term adaptability and survival of higher education (Clark, 1983).

However, success in the past is not a guarantee for success in the future, and the stronger emphasis given to image and branding may create new challenges for higher education institutions. A fundamental problem is, of course, that images and brands nowadays are increasingly tested and contested (Power, 1997). The audit society also influences higher education, and various

forms of national and/or independent evaluations and media investigations may to an increasing degree hold institutions accountable for images not rooted in reality. The effects of being “caught” may be damaging, not only concerning the ethical and legal dimensions (Belanger *et al.*, 2002), but also concerning student drop-out (Levitz *et al.*, 1999). One may therefore argue that it is strategically important to create images that match the organisational identity of a given institution, and that the challenge for higher education institutions is to balance the need for adjusting to a changing world while maintaining their organisational identities and the inherent characteristics of higher education.

Given that branding can be an important process when trying to link the institutional identity and the external image of higher education institutions, this article first addresses how recent contributions from the field of organisational theory may assist institutions in positioning themselves in a more competitive higher education market. Second, we discuss in detail the pros and cons of branding as a strategy for survival of and change in higher education institutions.

Organisational identity and image as drivers for organisational change

If branding is understood as a process that aims to link organisational identity and image, one can still question whether this has any relationship with organisational change. The answer is found in recent studies within the field of organisational theory which indicate that organisational identity is a more dynamic concept than traditionally perceived, and that organisations often change when trying to preserve their identity. However, to better understand how this process actually takes place, we should first understand how organisational identity and image are usually portrayed.

Traditional concepts of organisational identity and image

Organisational identity can be regarded as one of several possible cultural artefacts in an organisation (Hatch and Schultz, 1997), and has in recent years attracted renewed interest both within organisational studies in general (Weick, 1995; Whetten and Godfrey, 1998; Gioia *et al.*, 2000) and in higher education studies more particularly (Välilmaa, 1998; Henkel, 2000).

To say that organisational identity is one of several possible cultural artefacts in an organisation suggests that it is a narrower concept than, for example, organisational culture. While conventional definitions of the latter often highlight that organisational culture can be managed and manipulated, resulting in changes in the collective behaviour of the members of the organisation (Alvesson and Berg, 1992), a provisional definition of organisational

identity would emphasise the symbolic, mythological and cognitive sides of the organisation. Important here is the construction of organisational reality through the use of symbols and myths that blur the distinction between truth and lies (Strati, 1998, p. 1380). In other words, organisational identity should be understood as a socially constructed concept of what the organisation is. Hence, organisational identity may be a social construction, but one that people inside the institutions recognise as meaningful and real (Bauman, 1996).

But if organisational identity describes what the organisation is, then it should be understood as something “real” and “deep” and as an expression of the true “self” of a given organisation. This tradition can be said to belong to a Durkheimian perspective where individual behaviour aggregates into a holistic and institutionalised organisational entity. As such it links the organisational identity concept to more conventional understandings of organisational culture emphasising values, norms and behaviour. In higher education, Burton Clark can be regarded as a consistent representative of this perspective (Clark, 1972, 1998).

In a similar line of thinking, Albert and Whetten (1985) have suggested that this uniqueness consisted of three aspects: *a)* central character, *b)* temporal continuity and *c)* distinctiveness. The first notion, central character, distinguishes the organisation on the basis of something important and essential. Temporal continuity means that the identification includes features that exhibit some degree of sameness or continuity over time, and distinctiveness implies a classification that identifies the organisation as recognisably different from others.

This characterisation of organisational identity rings familiar for students in organisational theory. One of the founders of the institutional school in sociology, Philip Selznick (1957) used the identity concept in the same way – as a label to describe how organisations over time become transformed into institutions with distinctive characteristics (an identity). In this “old” institutional perspective, organisational identity was perceived to be a “real” stabilising element in organisational life, and a holistic expression of the organisation.

This holistic view on organisations can also be found in later versions of organisational theory, not least within the new institutional school of thought (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). A “new” element in the new institutionalism is, however, the way in which organisational identity is interpreted and defined. Organisational identity is a social institution the organisation adapts to. The organisation then becomes a metaphor – a “super-person” who “exposes” an identity (Czarniawska and Sevón, 1996). Thus, in order to obtain legitimacy from the environment, organisations compose themselves into a whole (Czarniawska, 2000, p. 273). Thus, in the new institutionalism, organisational identity is subordinated to popular ideas in the environment of how the

organisation should look. Instead of a conception of identity emerging from deep inside the organisation, identity is located in the formal structure and becomes a “chameleon-like imitation of images prevailing in the post-modern marketplace” (Gioia *et al.*, 2000, p. 72). The assumption is that organisational identity is transformed from a stable, distinct and enduring characteristic to a fluent entity and an easily changeable organisational fashion.

Even if these interpretations provide some clarity regarding the properties of the organisational identity concept, there still appears to be a gap between an understanding of organisational identity as “real”, “deep” and distinctive, and one that emphasises organisational identity as a metaphor, a symbolic and more fluent entity, an interpretation that relates more to how organisational image usually is conceived.

The emergence of a dynamic organisational identity

The ambiguity over whether organisational identity is real, deep and enduring or whether it is a fluent and easily exchangeable construct can also be found in studies of organisational identity (Gioia *et al.*, 2000). However, recent research on organisational identity suggests that this ambiguity may stem from a failure to distinguish between identity labels on one side and the on-going interpretation of these labels on the other (Gioia *et al.*, 2000). The argument rests on the assumption that organisational identity is found in the labels we use when we talk about, describe and analyse an organisation, and that it is the labels that usually are institutionalised and communicated to the outside.

However, research suggests that not every identity label is perceived as valid and carries the right legitimacy in its environment (Schultz *et al.*, 2000). Not least is it usually emphasised that images should be trustworthy. If this is the case, then a close relationship exists between organisational identity and the organisational image (*cf.* Gioia *et al.*, 2000, p. 67) – a relationship that may lead to various outcomes: An organisational image that provides a “good match” with the organisational identity will result in stability and only incremental change (*cf.* March and Olsen, 1989). However, it is possible to claim that due to increasingly complex environments, and more rapidly shifting external demands, such situations are becoming more exceptional in higher education. Thus, not only are there reasons to believe that many higher education institutions experience a gap between image and identity, but this gap could also represent a potential threat to the survival of the organisation. Specifically, a given identity may be problematic when the organisational environment signals a change in the relationship between the organisation and the outside world. When too huge a gap emerges between the identity of an organisation and its environment, an identity crisis may occur. A huge gap between image and identity could indicate an organisation that is “faking its

identity” or one that is unable to respond to the expectations of its environment (Schultz et al., 2000, p. 1). On the other hand a constant shift in identity labels would not be judged as trustworthy in the environments (Gioia et al. 2000, p. 73).

So how does identity change occur? Traditionally organisational identity change has been portrayed as the outcome of intra-organisational dynamics (Clark, 1972). Influence, coalitions and competing values were seen as ingredients in a power struggle that could, dependent on active institutional leadership, lead to radical organisational change. More recently, change has been conceived as passive, involving constant reproduction and a reinforcement of existing modes of thought. In this perspective change is convergent – leading to more similar organisations through processes of imitation (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996, p. 1022, p. 1027).

However, it can be argued that imitation is an important concept also for developing a more distinguishable organisational identity (Røvik, 1998). The argument launched to support this statement is that imitation should not be seen only as a passive process. Imitation should rather be perceived as an active process (Czarniawska and Joerges, 1996; Sahlin-Andersson, 1996; Sevón, 1996). Since organisational identity is a relational phenomenon, it must always be defined according to something or someone. However, copying is not necessarily the result. There will always be organisations or organisational identities that a given university does not want to be associated with. Thus, imitation may include both adaptation and differentiation processes (Røvik, 1998, p. 139). In some instances, adaptation and differentiation may also occur in an integrated process as when one organisation imitates a specific aspect of another. For example a university may “imitate” the computer science programme of another institution, while choosing to distance itself from other elements of that institution (Labianca et al., 2001, p. 314). Such decisions indicate a rather reflective and thoughtful process of adaptation, and not unconscious and passive imitation.

Thus, imitation is perhaps not the best term when trying to describe adaptation processes in more realistic terms. Czarniawska and Joerges (1996) have suggested that transformation is a better description, suggesting that imitation is not necessarily the opposite of innovation. Imitation could be viewed as a process in which something is also created (Sevón, 1996, p. 51). Furthermore, recent research suggests that the mechanisms through which transformation takes place involve matching not only structures, as suggested in the new institutionalism, but also organisational identities. In a study of university emulation in the United States, Labianca et al. (2001, p. 325) found that universities considered other institutions’ identity-attributes as crucial for their own emulation choices. For example, a university may carry the label “entrepreneurial” without attaching a specific organisational structure to that

label, and without pretending to be entrepreneurial. Organisational change occurs due to different and on-going interpretations, by organisational members and stakeholders, of what the labels mean or signal but without questioning the labels as such (Gioia *et al.*, 2000, p. 54). The result is that stability is found in the labels, but the meanings attached to the labels change over time creating more dynamic and adapting organisations.

This line of thinking is supported by studies of organisational identity change in universities established during the 1960s and 1970s in Scandinavia and the Netherlands (Stensaker and Norgård, 2001; Huisman *et al.*, 2002). These studies show that all these universities had quite unique organisational identities at the time of their establishment, and that they, over the years, have been forced to adjust to a changing environment. This has in some instances led to quite dramatic internal structural changes, reallocations of resources and even extensive academic reorientations. But regardless of such changes, these universities did manage to preserve a number of their unique characteristics (Huisman *et al.*, 2002, p. 329). It can be argued that they have managed to do so by constantly “editing” and translating their identity labels to attach meaning to and providing coherence when facing external pressure for change (Stensaker and Norgard, 2001, p. 489). Even if these universities may seem far from taking part in the branding game currently found in the United Kingdom and in the United States, the knowledge of how change has taken place at these institutions is also relevant in this setting. These studies indeed show that a given university may have room to manoeuvre even when experiencing external pressure for change. A recent study on how a number of higher education institutions in Norway have adapted to policies concerning the quality of teaching and learning illustrates that, even in the age of New Public Management, there are a number of organisational images to choose from and adapt to, and that institutions can maintain their profile and identity even when adjusting to new demands in their environment (Stensaker, 2006).

The benefits and dangers of branding, and a new understanding

Traditionally, branding is not understood as a process closely related to organisational change, but rather as a (unwanted) consequence of system level policies in the sector. During the last 20 years governments throughout the world, influenced by New Public Management philosophies, have built their governing strategies around keywords such as transparency, comparability and consumerism (*cf.* Pollitt, 1993). The effects are recognisable in a number of countries. The massive build-up of various forms of evaluation of higher education, performance indicators and report cards have created a sector that in many ways is more transparent than ever before (Stensaker, 2003).

By looking into the sheer number of reports, statistics and evidence available, we now know more about higher education. This massive amount of information is in turn systematised, and used as input for comparisons between higher education institutions. Ranking systems have emerged in a number of countries intended to guide student choice as to which institution and study programme they should attend, or as background information for funding decisions (Dill and Soo 2003). Treating students as customers may, however, have the effect that they actually start to behave as such, which probably is one of the major factors behind the tendency to look upon higher education as an industry (Gumpert, 2000), and to transform stakeholders more and more into consumers of higher education. Hence, there is a close relationship between the emergence of what we might term the “branding game” and the emergence of market or quasi-market strategies for governing the sector.

However, attempts to create market behaviour do not imply that the emerging market will function accordingly. As Dill and Soo (Dill, 2003; Dill and Soo, 2003, 2004) have shown in a number of studies, there are some serious side-effects that should be considered carefully when arguing for more “market” in higher education.

The benefits of branding

The problem is that while branding may be a relevant strategy for survival for the individual institution, evidence shows that branding may yield unwanted effects at the system level (Dill and Soo, 2003, 2004). Most relevant for the current study are indications that the major vehicle triggering university branding efforts – ranking lists provided by newspapers and other third party actors to higher education – produces institutional behaviour that provides little added value for the society at large. Even though there are indications that rankings may produce a more mobile student population, data still suggest that most students are affected by factors other than reputation and image when making university choices. Hence, even the US data suggest that approximately two-thirds of the students at the baccalaureate level study in their home state (Hoxby, 1997). The fact that it is high ability students or students from high income families who most often use rankings to inform their choices is still a strong indication that such rankings have an important signalling function for the most attractive segment of the student market (Dill, 2003). For the individual institution, attracting such students through various branding efforts is therefore a rather obvious and potentially benefiting strategy.

Branding is also a phenomenon that allows the individual institution to provide information and images that combine neutral information with information intended to create emotional ties with various stakeholders. The long-term success of developing good alumni relations is more than anything

an emotional process intended to build a personal relationship between the individual and the institution. Studies have shown that emotional satisfaction is far more important than cognitive satisfaction (Clarke, 2005), and that focusing on the former may be very beneficial for universities. For example, if we look at the amount of private money being given to universities in the United States, evidence suggests that this is a quite effective strategy. In the United States in 2004, private donors including alumni gave USD 24.4 billion to universities (Wooldridge, 2005).

Branding may also be a promising strategy for improving institutional co-operation. As institutions are exposed to an increasing competition, one institutional response may be to join other institutions in some co-operative effort (Huisman and van der Wende, 2004). The number of new university networks created in the last decade is just one of the effects of such considerations. Hence, while most student behaviour is more or less unaffected by rankings, evidence suggests that rankings and similar efforts affect higher education institutions to a much larger extent. In the race for prestige, selecting the right institutional partner must be done carefully, and studies show that finding a “peer” institution through benchmark information provided by ranking lists is a rather common solution (Labianca *et al.*, 2001).

Branding efforts may also be a promising way to instigate internal change at a given institution. The strong disciplinary focus held by many academics and the emergence of more matrix structures inside higher education institutions are factors that do not necessarily support strategies and objectives at the institutional level (Belanger *et al.*, 2002). Providing internal support and interest for institutional strategies and the institutional mission may therefore appear as a rational reason to engage in branding efforts in higher education. This may be of special interest in situations where institutions are experiencing a rising level of tension internally as a result of the reallocation of resources or the closing down of certain study programmes or units (*cf.* Dill, 1997).

Last but not least, branding efforts may help higher education institutions to rediscover what they are, and their basic purposes. In an age with new stakeholders entering higher education, new demands being directed at universities, and an increasing amount of tasks to handle, higher education institutions may face a situation of capacity overload (Clark, 1998). Branding may assist in the process of prioritising all the tasks and objectives on the agenda, and help remind institutions of their core activities.

The dangers of branding

However, the potential advantages of branding cannot hide the fact that branding is also a risky business for higher education institutions. Dill (2003), by referring to a US study by Brewer *et al.* (2002), has shown, for example, that

prestige-seeking higher education institutions tend to invest in areas such as admission selectivity, student consumption benefits (dormitories, eating facilities, etc.) or other measures intended to improve their positions in the publicised rankings (see also Twitchell, 2002). These are relatively costly investments, especially since it is not known how much such investments actually matter for student choice. A study from Norway re-analysing data on student satisfaction indicates that for Norwegian students, it is factors relating to teaching and learning that cause high student satisfaction, not buildings, computer facilities, etc. (Wiers-Jenssen *et al.*, 2002). Since institutions involved in the branding game tend to spend money in the same areas, and since competing for prestige is a zero-sum game (Brewer *et al.*, 2002), this means that the investments are high-risk and have potentially little impact on student choice.

Investing in dormitories and similar things is also a sign that branding efforts may easily put students in the role of the customer. As noted in the introduction, a risk is involved if reality is perceived as different from the image sought and created. Trust may take a long time to build but a short time to destroy. Students who are turned into customers may also be a demanding and unstable group, there is the danger that these “students are leaving universities almost as fast as new students are enrolled” (Schertzer and Schertzer, 2004, p. 79). A related issue is, of course, that higher education institutions may change their own values and norms during this process even if that was not an intended outcome.

Another potential risk involved in creating a strong university brand is related to the massification of higher education and its increasingly diverse student population. This diverse student population means that student objectives, study ambitions and involvement may vary considerably. In line with this, a recent study shows that the criteria students and parents use when selecting a higher education institution differ significantly (Warwick and Mansfield, 2003). Establishing a strong brand consequently may attract some students while it may not appeal to others. A university may want such selectivity, but this can also turn away potentially interested students.

Those studying branding efforts in higher education can also note the tendency of institutions to highlight standard elements in this process. Profiling themselves as “the best”, “world-class”, “leading”, or similar attempts is rather common (Belanger *et al.*, 2002). The paradox that might appear as a consequence of this strategy is that while trying to be unique and distinguishable from the rest, a university risks becoming more similar, removing the true unique characteristics it might have. Twitchell (2002), a professor of advertising at the University of Florida argues, for example, that in the branding game, universities behave like sheep trying to emulate those perceived as successful. One explanation for this result is that higher

education institutions engaged in the branding game may look more at what their competitors are doing than what students, parents or other stakeholders consider important. Hence, the branding game itself carries the potential of becoming more important than the purpose of the game.

Towards a new understanding of branding

So what is the purpose of the game? Is it just to create an attractive image of the organisation in the age of “marketisation”, or is it to develop and deliver the educational services students and the society require? On the one hand, it is easy to find those that argue that branding is only about “reputation management” indicating that the concept is all about self presentation (Temple 2006, p. 18). On the other hand, one can also identify those that see branding as an integrated part of the marketing of and the strategic decisions in a given institution (Litten, 1980, p. 43). This understanding implies that branding may be a deeper process, closely linked to institutional development and the deliverance of high quality educational services. As Spais (2005, p. 62) has pointed out, the word “marketing” actually stems from the Greek word meaning “deliver”, indicating an intention to put action behind promotion.

Empirically, we have seen evidence supporting both views. Still, in a long-term perspective evidence suggests that it is the deeper approach that pays off. As Temple (2006) argues, a central factor contributing to institutional development is the strategic choices institutions manage to take over a longer period, and the consistency of the actions taken. According to Temple (2006, p. 18), the reason why some universities succeed is that they have a “realizable strategic vision for the institution, and [are] managing it as a totality to achieve that vision...”.

One can interpret from this statement that organisational change is more or less solely determined by and dependent on the organisation itself, and a result of tough decisions taken by the institutional leadership. While evidence supports the importance of strategic visions and visionary leadership (Shattock, 2003), an outside observer would still wonder how these strategies actually are developed, and how they emerge as strategies? Are they just visions suddenly appearing in the mind of the extraordinary and gifted leader?

In line with the recent insights into how organisational change might occur (see section “Organisational identity and image as drivers for organisational change”), Weick (1995) has argued that a central factor involved in the process of developing ideas is the concept of enactment. For Weick (1995, p. 30), enactment is the process of constructing the organisation through interpretations of how others think of us, and how we see ourselves. The key point here is not that external and internal information is important to arrive

at certain ideas, which are commonplace in standard books about developing organisational strategies, but that developing ideas involves a process of “construction” and “selection of ideas”. The ideas stem from past achievements and future aspirations, the blurring of organisational boundaries, and both soft and hard information. “Other’s” perceptions, how we think about others and how we think others think of us are also of vital importance.

The latter insight is of importance if we define branding, not as a process starting from scratch, but as an on-going and quite fundamental process, not only determined by the institution itself, but strongly conditioned by established beliefs and perceptions “others” may have of the institution. Hence, if the “brand” associated with a certain institution is conditioned by the image and experiences already established in the surroundings, the consequence is that branding then becomes a process of “negotiation”, deliberation, translation and creation of a room to maneuver between external limitations and institutional ambitions.

Towards a more sustainable branding process

When reviewing the prospects for change in higher education, one is often struck by the tendency to embrace rather deterministic perspectives. One such perspective is to portray universities as ivory towers with organisational identities almost unchangeable – and that as a consequence they will not survive (Drucker, 1997). Another perspective, equally deterministic, is to portray the current marketisation of the higher education sector as something every institution must adapt to, and that the university as we know it will be radically changed (Wooldridge, 2005). The position of this paper is that there is plenty of room to manoeuvre between these two extremes. Research in higher education has shown for decades that universities were never the ivory towers they have been accused of, and that change in the sector is the normal situation rather than the exception (Clark, 1972, 1998; Henkel, 2000; Huisman *et al.*, 2002; Stensaker, 2006) – even though not in the tempo governments and other stakeholders would perhaps always appreciate.

The current branding game in higher education can be seen as a process where higher education institutions try to re-invent themselves as organisations. This article has shown that there may be benefits but also dangers associated with this process. The argument launched is that institutions can take part in branding efforts without necessarily losing their organisational identity or inherent characteristics, while they also continue to change. The reasons are twofold: First, the process of imitation, a rather common element in a branding exercise, can be interpreted as an active process, closer to that of innovation than of imitation. Second, stable organisational identities expressed in well-known and agreed upon identity labels are a good starting point for instigating change

through reinterpretations of the labels, and consequently provide new meaning to activities conducted.

What does this mean in practice? A starting point is the rather obvious fact that a brand is not built through creative logos or other symbolic features, it is built through the experience people have with a certain product (Belanger *et al.*, 2002) and the way the individual institution deals with external perceptions. This means that building a brand is a process of translation between external constituencies and internal ambitions, and not a process managed only by marketing or advertising experts. It also means that branding is very much a strategic process with a potentially deep impact on culture and identity, and a process in which fundamental questions, such as “Who are we?” or “Who do we want to be?”, are addressed. Thus, building a brand involves far broader processes than developing a good marketing plan (Hatch *et al.*, 2000).

Branding should be viewed as a process of mobilising the best marketers there are – the staff and students of the institution – not least because they represent central links between the outside and the inside, sometimes associated with the organisational identity, while at other times visualising the image of the institution. For them to buy into the branding process, the image sought must be rooted in the distinctive institutional characteristics staff and students think are important, and that they feel comfortable exposing to others outside the institution. If they do not feel part of this process, even the most creative branding effort will not be trustworthy (Dutton *et al.*, 1994; Albert *et al.*, 2000). Studies in the field of organisation theory tell us that this process will not be a reproduction of the past organisational identity, but a process where identity labels people may have taken for granted are brought to life, discussed, and often transformed as new meanings and interpretations are attached to them (*cf.* also Dill, 1982; Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991; Gioia and Thomas, 1996; Stensaker, 2006). This is an incremental and on-going process, but also one in which the university as a social institution may be maintained, even in an age where higher education is becoming an industry.

The author:

Dr. Bjørn Stensaker
NIFU STEP
Wergelandsvn. 7
0167 Oslo
Norway
E-mail: bjornstensaker@nifustep.no

References

- Albert, S., B.E. Ashforth and J.E. Dutton (2000), "Organizational Identity and Identification: Charting New Waters and Building New Bridges", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 13-17.
- Albert, S. and D.A. Whetten (1985), "Organizational Identity", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 7, pp. 263-295.
- Alvesson, M. and P.O. Berg (1992), *Corporate Culture and Organisational Symbolism*, Walter de Gruyter, New York.
- Bauman, Z. (1996), "From Pilgrim to Tourist – or a Short History of Identity", in S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, Sage, Londres.
- Belanger, C., J. Mount and M. Wilson (2002), "Institutional Image and Retention", *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 3, pp. 217-230.
- Bleiklie, I. (1998), "Justifying the Evaluative State: New Public Management Ideals in Higher Education", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 33, pp. 299-316.
- Brewer, D., S.M. Gates and C.A. Goldman (2002), *In pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in US Higher Education*, Transaction Press, New Brunswick.
- Clark, B.R. (1972), "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 178-184.
- Clark, B.R. (1983), *The Higher Education System*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Clark, B.R. (1998), *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, International Association of Universities Press/Pergamon-Elsevier Science, New York.
- Clarke, G. (2005), "An Examination of Self-monitoring and the Influence of Others as Determinants of Attitude to the Higher Education Application Service Process in the UK", *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, Vol. 15, pp. 1-22.
- Cummings, W.K. (1996), "The Service University Movement in the US: Searching for Momentum", *Higher Education*, Vol. 35, pp. 69-90.
- Czarniawska, B. (2000), "Identity Lost or Identity Found? Celebration and Lamentation over the Postmodern View of Identity in Social Science and Fiction", in M. Schultz, M.J. Hatch and M. Holten Larsen (2000), *The Expressive Organization Linking Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Czarniawska, B. and B. Joerges (1996), "Travel of Ideas", in B. Czarniawska and G. Sevón (eds.) (1996), *Translating Organizational Change*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Czarniawska, B. and G. Sevón (eds.) (1996), *Translating Organizational Change*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Dill, D.D. (1982), "The Management of Academic Culture: Notes on the Management of Meaning and Social Integration", *Higher Education*, Vol. 11, pp. 303-320.
- Dill, D.D. (1997), "Focusing Institutional Mission to Provide Coherence and Integration", in M.W. Peterson, D.D. Dill and L. Mets (eds.) *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment: A Handbook in Redesigning Post-secondary Institutions*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Dill, D.D. (2003), "Allowing the Market to Rule: The Case of the United States", *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 57, pp. 136-157.

- Dill, D.D. and M. Soo (2003), "A League Table of League Tables: A Cross-national Analysis of University Ranking Systems", paper presented to the INQAAHE conference, Dublin, 17 April.
- Dill, D.D. and M. Soo (2004), "Transparency and Quality in Higher Education Markets", in P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D.D. Dill and A. Amaral (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric and Reality*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- DiMaggio, P. and W.W. Powell (eds.) (1991), *New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Drucker, P.F. (1997), interview in *Forbes*, 10 March.
- Dutten, J.E., J.M. Dukerich and C.V. Harquail (1994), "Organizational Images and Member Identification", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 39, pp. 239-263.
- Gioia, D.A. and K. Chittipeddi (1991), "Sensemaking and Sensegiving in Strategic Change Initiation", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 433-448.
- Gioia, D.A., M. Schultz and K.G. Corley (2000), "Organizational Identity, Image and Adaptive Instability", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 63-81.
- Gioia, D.A. and J.B. Thomas (1996), "Identity, Image and Issue Interpretation: Sensemaking during Strategic Change in Academia", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41, pp. 370-403.
- Greenwood, R. and C.R. Hinings (1996), "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing Together the Old and the New Institutionalism", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 1022-1054.
- Gumport, P. (2000), "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives", *Higher Education*, Vol. 39, pp. 67-91.
- Hatch, M.J. and M.H. Larsen (2000), *The Expressive Organization: Linking Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hatch, M.J. and M. Schultz (1997), "Relations between Organizational Culture, Identity and Image", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31, pp. 356-365.
- Henkel, M. (2000), *Academic Identities and Policy Change in Higher Education*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London.
- Hoxby, C.M. (1997), *The Changing Market Structure of US Higher Education*, Harvard University, Mimeo.
- Huisman, J., J.D. Norgard, J. Gulddahl Rasmussen and B. Stensaker (2002), "'Alternative' Universities Revisited: A Study of the Distinctiveness of Universities Established in the Spirit of 1968", *Tertiary Education and Management*, Vol. 8, pp. 315-332.
- Huisman, J. and M. van der Wende (eds.) (2004), *On Competition and Cooperation: National and European Policies for the Internationalisation of Higher Education*, Lemmens, Bonn.
- Labianca, G., J.F. Fairbank, J.B. Thomas and D. Gioia (2001), "Emulation in Academia: Balancing Structure and Identity", *Organization Science*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 312-330.
- Levitz, R.R., L. Noel and B.J. Richter (1999), "Strategic Moves for Retention Success", *New Directions for Higher Education*, Winter, pp. 31-49.
- Litten, L. (1980), "Marketing Higher Education: Benefits and Risks for the American Academic System", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 51, pp. 40-59.
- March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen (1989), *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, The Free Press, New York.

- Mintzberg, H. (1983), *Structures in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*, Prentice Hall, Engewood Cliffs.
- Pollit, C. (1993), *Managerialism and the Public Services*, 2nd edition, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Power, M. (1997), *The Audit Society, Rituals of Verification*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Røvik, K.A. (1998), *Moderne organisasjoner*, Fagbokforlaget, Bergen.
- Sahlin-Andersson, K. (1996), "Imitating by Editing Success: The Construction of Organizational Fields", in B. Czarniawska and G. Sevón (eds.) (1996), *Translating Organizational Change*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Schertzer, C.B. and S.M.M. Schertzer (2004), "Student Satisfaction and Retention: A Conceptual Model", *Journal of Marketing in Higher Education*, Vol. 14, pp. 79-91.
- Schultz, M., M.J. Hatch and M. H. Larsen (eds.) (2000), *The Expressive Organization Linking Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Selznick, P. (1957), *Leadership in Administration, A Sociological Interpretation*, Harper et Row, New York.
- Sevón, G. (1996), "Organizational Imitation as Identity Transformation", in B. Czarniawska and G. Sevón (eds.) (1996), *Translating Organizational Change*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Shattock, M. (2003), *Managing Successful Universities*, Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Spais, G.S. (2005), "A Fundamental Formula for Leadership Efficiency: Weighting the Contribution of 'Marketing Paideia'", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 13, pp. 61-77.
- Stensaker, B. (2003), "Trance, Transparency and Transformation: The impact of External Quality Monitoring in Higher Education", *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 151-159.
- Stensaker, B. (2006), "Governmental Policy, Organisational Ideals and Institutional Adaptation in Norwegian Higher Education", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 31, pp. 43-56.
- Stensaker, B. and J.D. Norgard (2001), "Innovation and Isomorphism: A Case-study of University Identity Struggle 1969-1999", *Higher Education*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 473-492.
- Strati, A. (1998), "Organizational Symbolism as a Social Construction: A Perspective from the Sociology of Knowledge", *Human Relations*, Vol. 51, pp. 1379-1402.
- Temple, P. (2006), "Branding in Higher Education: Illusion or Reality?", *Perspectives*, Vol. 10, pp. 15-19.
- Twitchell, J.B. (2002), "Ranking Race Hurts Higher Ed?", *Forbes*, 25 November.
- Välilmaa, J. (1998), "Culture and Identity in Higher Education Research", *Higher Education*, Vol. 36, pp. 119-138.
- Warwick, J. and P.M. Mansfield (2003), "Perceived Risk in College Selection: Differences in Evaluative Criteria Used by Students and Parents", *Journal of Marketing in Higher Education*, Vol. 13, pp. 101-125.
- Weick, K. (1976), "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 21, pp. 1-19.
- Weick, K.E. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organisations*, Sage Publications, London.

- Whetten, D.A. and P.C. Godfrey (eds.) (1998), *Identity in Organisations: Building Theory Through Conversations*, Sage Publications, London.
- Wiers-Jenssen, J., B. Stensaker and J.J. Grogard (2002), "Student Satisfaction – Towards an Empirical Decomposition of the Concept", *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, pp. 183-195.
- Wooldridge, A. (2005), "The Brains Business", *The Economist*, 8 September, London.



From:
Higher Education Management and Policy

Access the journal at:
<https://doi.org/10.1787/17269822>

Please cite this article as:

Stensaker, Bjørn (2007), "The Relationship Between Branding and Organisational Change", *Higher Education Management and Policy*, Vol. 19/1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v19-art1-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org. Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at contact@cfcopies.com.