Towards a Branding Oriented Higher Education Sector:

An Overview of the Four Perspectives on University Marketing Studies

Narissara Sujchaphong

Mahasarakham University

Mahasarakham Business School

Khamriang Sub-District, Kantarawichai District

Maha Sarakham, 44150, Thailand

Email: narissara.s@acc.msu.ac.th

Bang Nguyen

East China University of Science and Technology

School of Business

Shanghai 200237, P.R. China

Email: bang.london@gmail.com

T C Melewar

Professor of Marketing and Strategy,

The Business School,

Middlesex University, London, United Kingdom

Email: t.c.melewar@mdx.ac.uk

Towards a Branding Oriented Higher Education Sector:

An Overview of the Four Perspectives on University Marketing Studies

Abstract

The paper provides a background to the discussion of the evolution and influence of marketing and brand management within UK universities. Four perspectives are considered, namely, marketing management in universities, branding in universities, corporate branding in universities and internal branding. The discussion suggests that higher education institutions are encouraged on all sides to become more market oriented. Private universities, which may be more dependent upon tuition fees (since they receive less funding from the government), appear to be ahead of public universities in using the initiatives in internal brand communication. Employees need to understand the brand values, in order to align their attitudes and behaviour in support of the corporate brand. Although internal branding has become important for universities in increasingly competitive markets, it is still recognised as a new phenomenon and therefore more research is encouraged in this area.

Introduction

The increased competition in the UK education market has been seen as the key driver of higher education marketisation across the world (Maringe, 2005a, 2010). However, even though universities are forced in some senses to become more independent, at present the most influential market is state-regulated (Henkel, 1997; Adcroft, Teckman & Willis, 2010). In addition, the emergence of branding in higher education also seems to be a consequence of system level policies in the higher education sector (Stensaker, 2005), where the government supplies the organisation with critical resources (contributions) and in exchange the government expects its interests to be satisfied (Hill & Jones, 1992). The influence of government is felt more strongly by colleges and universities than by business and industry (Karol & Ginsburg, 1980; Adcroft et al., 2010). Governments control universities through legislation, administrative regulations (Gledhill, 1996), court decisions and the actions of the executive branch of government.

When the government encourages market approaches to education policies[1], it allows universities to have more control over their staff, budget and internal organisation (Tooley, Dixon & Stanfield, 2003; Adcroft et al., 2010). This encourages universities to develop efficient systems, for example, of internal communication (Judson et al., 2006) to support academics in developing their performance (Tooley et al., 2003), which in turn, increases the quality and efficiency of their service (Tooley et al., 2003). Market approaches to education policies tend to highly influence the initiation of marketing and branding programmes in universities (Stensaker, 2005). First, during the last twenty

---

[1] The market approaches in university can be classified into three ideal types: 1) alternative funding; 2) alternative schools; 3) alternative providers (Tooley et al., 2003).

years, governments throughout the world have built their strategies around keywords such as transparency, comparability and consumerism (Stensaker, 2005). Governments have decentralised the provision of universities in order to stimulate improvements in the educational attainment of students (Walford, 1996; Marginson, 1996; de Boer, Jürgen & Liudvika, 2007). Devolving authority to the organisational level forms an integral part of new public management approaches which have inspired higher education institutions to reform and encouraged market approaches to higher education administration (Marginson, 1996; de Boer et al., 2007; Adcroft et al., 2010).

Second, higher education institutions are dependent upon three sources of income to support their operations: 1) endowments; 2) funding from government; and 3) tuition (Hobbs, 1978). Although public institutions receive more funding from government than private institutions do (Hobbs, 1978), both private and public universities are now facing a decline in governmental funding (Ivy, 2001; Brookes, 2003). A new public management approach (e.g., the introduction of variable tuition fees) has been introduced in order to inspire and encourage educational institutions to be more market-oriented, resulting in lower government grants to higher education (Brookes, 2003; de Boer et al., 2007; Adcroft et al., 2010). The decline of funding from governments is one of the main reasons for institutions to begin applying a marketing strategy (Ivy, 2001), since they need to find alternative revenue streams; inevitably they have become more marketing-aware (Brookes, 2003; Adcroft et al., 2010).

Third, the practices discussed above could also bear witness to the emergence of quasi-market policies for governing the higher educational sector (Brookes, 2003; Stensaker

2005). The term 'quasi-market' is used to describe a type of market-like institutional structure in which competition mechanisms are encouraged in order to improve the performance of public institutions (their quality and efficiency) (Lapsley, 1992). However, to defeat negative aspects of the market and to ensure educational equality, state involvement has been strengthened (Walford, 1996). According to the 'Oxford studies in comparative education' of 1996, it is agreed that the purpose of the quasi-market policies used by all governments has been to encourage educational institutions to think more in terms of the market (Walford, 1996).

Furthermore, in parallel with the emergence of quasi-market policies for governing the higher educational sector, ranking systems have emerged in a number of countries (Stensaker, 2005; Salmi & Saroyan, 2007) in order to guide students when making decisions about their choice of institution for a first degree. These systems also serve as background information for funding decisions (Dill & Soo, 2003 cited in Stensaker 2005, p.4) and are used as policy instruments for measuring and comparing university performances (Salmi & Saroyan, 2007). The league tables and ranking systems impact greatly on higher education decision-making by helping universities to set goals for their strategic planning and assess their performance, as well as to support their representation (Hazelkorn, 2007).

League tables and ranking systems lead to good opportunities for higher education institutions to position themselves within the higher education market. The ranking table is likely to influence the way in which institutions encourage employees to deliver the service, which the institution brand promises to customers, in order to offer a

positive image (Salmi & Saroyan, 2007; Hazelkorn, 2007). In addition, the increasing competition between institutions, not to mention the growing concern for effective management, have resulted in the need for higher educational institutions to be managed in the same way as any other enterprise in the private sector and the need to promote their services through various marketing activities (e.g., Kotler & Levy, 1969; Litten, 1980; Kotler & Fox, 1985; Gray, 1991; Klayton, 1993; Naude & Ivy, 1999; Maringe, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Hammond, Harmon, Webster & Rayburn, 2004, 2007)**.**

Overall, the discussion above suggests that UK higher education institutions are encouraged on all sides to become more market oriented. When educational institutions are led by governments into a market system, they are forced to fund themselves more independently (Marginson, 1996). The institutions begin to treat students and parents as consumers, responsible in the end for the policies of the institution, including staff policies (Marginson, 1996). A decline in funding influences the way in which institutions treat their staff (Brookes, 2003). Private universities, which may be more dependent upon tuition fees (since they receive less funding from the government), appear to be ahead of public universities in using the initiatives in internal brand communication (Judson et al., 2006). Given these developments, it seems appropriate to review the extant literature on marketing management and branding practices in higher education. The present article provides an overview of the four key areas, characteristics and perspectives on university marketing studies, including, marketing management in universities, branding in universities, corporate branding in universities, and internal branding. Prior to this presentation, the study first introduces two

background topics, namely, the general meaning of university and universities as organisations.

Literature Review

The general meaning of university

The debate over what constitutes a 'university' is a fairly longstanding and extensive one and it is still ongoing (Dopson & McNay, 1996). A university seems to be known as a place of higher learning where people continue their education after school (Gill & Lashine, 2003). In other words, a university is an institution of higher education, which grants academic degrees at all levels (bachelors' and masters' degrees and doctorates) in a variety of subjects. According to Pelikan (1992), much more discussion about the university has been elicited since 1852, when John Henry Cardinal Newman[2] delivered a series of lectures and essays seeking support from influential Catholics for the university, which were later published as 'The idea of a university'. Pelikan (1992) defines the "business of the university" as:

> "The advancement of knowledge through undergraduate and graduate teaching; training that involves both knowledge and professional skill in the professional programs or schools of the university; preservation of knowledge in libraries, galleries and museums; and diffusion of knowledge through scholarly publication" (Pelikan, 1992, p.76).

---

2 John Henry Cardinal Newman had major positions at Oxford University and in the Anglican Church; he was asked in 1851 to become rector of a proposed new Catholic University in Ireland.

As such, a university provides both tertiary and post-graduate education where the courses of study on offer help prepare people for professions and careers. Gill & Lashine (2003) explains the educational system as a multi-stage input-output system, referring to universities as in the fourth stage of the educational system, where the input is from secondary schools while the output is to the job market. In order to prepare students sufficiently for the job market, universities are advised to arrange the capabilities of their educational system to meet the requirements of the job market (Gill & Lashine, 2003). Basic career skills are developed at the pre-university (secondary school) stage. However, those skills are later concentrated and improved at university level (Gill & Lashine, 2003).

Universities as organisations

As said by Etzioni (1964, p.3), "Organisations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals", that is, organisations are official groups of people who work together for the same purposes. Universities are similar to business organisations in having mission statements, employees and management systems (Karol & Ginsburg, 1980). According to Morgan (2006), different metaphors can be used to describe the nature of organisations and they give rise to different theories of organisation and management. In line with de Boer et al. (2007), the characteristics of the university as an organisation are explained through many models, which can be divided into two groups: traditional and modern. De Boer et al. (2007) note that traditional models for universities, which stress the peculiarities of universities as organisations are, for example, that of organised anarchy (Cohen, March

& Olsen, 1972), the organisational saga (Clark, 1972) and the loosely coupled organisation (Weick, 1976). These models are seen as 'bottom-heavy' with a low potential for collective action (Clark, 1983). Since the 1980s, alternative models for universities as organisations, which contrast strongly with traditional models, appear in policy-making and in the study of higher education organisations (de Boer et al., 2007), for instance, the service model (Tjeldvoll, 1997; Tjeldvoll & Holtet, 1998; Cummings, 1998a, 1998b) and the entrepreneurial model (Clark, 1998).

Although it is agreed that state regulation has a strong influence on universities, universities have been forced in some ways to become more autonomous (Henkel, 1997). Modern models of universities suggest that academic work can be administered in the same way as any work in any service-providing company (de Boer et al., 2007). In addition, a study undertaken by Henkel (1997) shows that universities are steadily being transformed into corporate enterprises. This study finds that many institutions nowadays demonstrate a movement towards the university as a corporate enterprise (Henkel, 1997). Karol and Ginsburg (1980) also support the idea of entrepreneurship in universities. They note that competition among institutions, as well as an increasing concern about effective management in educational institutions, is part of the main drive to consider universities as enterprises (Karol & Ginsburg, 1980). Managing the university enterprise means managing universities in the same way as managing any other enterprise in the private sector, including both financial factors (income and expenses) and market factors (supply and demand) (Karol & Ginsburg, 1980). With regard to the discipline of the market when applied to the education market, it is said

that only high quality institutions will survive in the market, thus increasing competition for universities, among other things (Walford, 1996).

The increased competition in the education market has been seen as one of the key drivers of higher education marketisation across the world (Maringe, 2010), including the USA (Kwong, 2000; Dill, 2003); Europe (Gibbs, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Binsardi & Ekwulugo, 2003; Jongbloed, 2003); Africa (Ivy, 2001; Maringe, 2005a, 2005b); Asia (Mok, 1999, 2000; Oplatka, 2002; Gray, Fam & Llanes, 2003); Australia (Baldwin & James, 2000); New Zealand (Ford, Joseph & Joseph, 1999); and Russia (Hare & Lugachev, 1999). In this situation, new institutions and different academic programmes have been created in order to meet the growing demand, thus widening the choice for students (Maringe, 2005a). For this reason, it is becoming more challenging for higher education institutions to attract students when the environment is so competitive. Therefore, in order to be chosen by potential students, institutions make known their services through a range of promotional activities, which in a business context are called 'Marketing' (Litten, 1980). In the next sections, the literature on marketing and brand management in universities is presented and discussed in more detail.

Marketing management in universities

During the last twenty years, governments throughout the world have built their strategies "around keywords such as transparency, comparability and consumerism" (Pollitt, 1993 cited in Stensaker, 2005, p.4). At present, state regulation is still the greatest influence on the higher education market (Henkel, 1997). The competition in

the higher education market tends to be encouraged by government policies, for example, marketisation policies (Jongbloed, 2003; Tooley et al., 2003), new public management policies (Stensaker, 2005), reformation policies (Hare & Lugachev, 1999), the decline in government funding (Ivy, 2001; Brookes, 2003), the promotion of colleges to become a part of higher education institutions (Ivy, 2001; Oplatka, 2002) and the introduction of variable tuition fees (Adcroft et al., 2010). As a result of the high competition in the higher education market, marketing management is increasingly implemented in them (Kotler & Fox, 1985).

Universities in the UK have been facing several changes, for example, the decrease in the number of students (Naude & Ivy, 1999), the intense increase of competition (Jongbloed, 2003; Adcroft et al., 2010), the greater choice of universities (Jongbloed, 2003), with an expansion and diversification of the degree courses offered by other competitors (Naude & Ivy, 1999). The highly competitive environment of higher education is likely to encourage universities to embrace the idea of marketing (Kotler & Fox, 1985; Smith, Scott & Lynch, 1995) in order to differentiate themselves from other competitors (Litten, 1980; Maringe, 2005a). In addition, Caruana, Ramaseshan and Ewing (1998) reveal that the implementation of the marketing concept has positive impacts on the overall performance of departments in universities and the ability of departments to obtain non-government funding.

According to Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka (2006), researchers pay increasing attention to the application and implementation of marketing principles and practices in universities. The applicability of marketing to higher education has been discussed and

demonstrated in the higher education marketing literature (e.g., Kotler & Levy, 1969; Jongbloed, 2003; Maringe, 2010) and the non-profit marketing literature (e.g., Kotler & Andreasen, 1991; Lovelock & Weinberg, 1989; Hannagan, 1992). Several authors describe marketing ideas and evaluate their benefits for managing educational institutions. Kotler and Levy (1969), for example, stress that the concept of marketing can be applied to non-profit organisations, including universities. Kotler and Fox (1985) point further to the importance of strategic marketing in higher education institutions. They define marketing in educational institutions as follows:

> "Marketing is the analysis, planning, implementation and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets to achieve institutional objectives. Marketing involves designing the institution's offerings to meet the target markets' needs and desires and using effective pricing, communication and distribution to inform, motivate and service the markets" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p.7).

As such, marketing is perceived by universities as a process of selling or informing the public about their services (Maringe, 2005b, 2010). Litten (1980) supports the applicability of marketing in a university. Litten (1980) notes that universities can promote their services and interest through the use of marketing activities, for example, public relations, student recruiting and fund-raising. In addition, a study of marketing in business schools conducted by Hammond et al. (2004) shows that marketing practices tend to be effective in increasing the performance of the school. Furthermore, due to the changes in government policies noted above, marketing can benefit

universities in searching of alternative sources of funding (Brookes, 2003). Government persuades the university system to be more market oriented because this allows the quality of the services offered by the universities to be assessed by their customers, which consequently increases the efficiency and effectiveness of the service (Jongbloed, 2003). In addition, through the use of marketing research, universities gain a better understanding of the environment of the institution (Klayton, 1993), both internally and externally (Kotler & Fox, 1985), which therefore improves the institution's capacity to deliver quality educational service, which meet customer expectations (Litten, 1980). The market-oriented institution, according to Caruana et al. (1998, p.57), is an institution that "successfully applies the marketing concept". To ensure the success of such applications, Maringe (2005a) suggests that universities should base their marketing on a model called the curriculum centred marketing model (CORD), which recommends universities to identify their core business and develop their curriculum on the basis of the core business itself.

Although it has been suggested that marketing frameworks and procedures should be implemented in educational institutions (e.g., Gray, 1991; Trim, 2003), marketing in educational institutions tends to be unsystematically implemented (Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2004). A study conducted by Naude and Ivy (1999) has found that marketing strategies are indeed used in universities. However, the marketing strategies of old universities are not as aggressive as those of new universities (Naude & Ivy, 1999). This is because the old universities are able to rely on "their traditional strengths of faculty, teaching, and research standing" (Naude & Ivy, 1999, p.132), whereas the new universities attempt to reach out to prospective students earlier in their decision-making

process through the use of marketing activities (Naude & Ivy, 1999). This, therefore, helps the new universities to provide tangible details about their institutions at an earlier point in the process and influencing prospective students by so doing.

The discussions above reveal to the universities the ideas and benefits of marketing in a highly competitive environment. This environment has led to an emerging interest in the self-profiling of higher education (Stensaker, 2005). Because achieving differentiation has become more and more difficult (Davis & Dunn, 2002), most people in marketing have agreed that success depends crucially on building the brand of an organisation (Davis & Dunn, 2002; King, 2005; Keller, 2007).

Branding in universities

As discussed in the previous section, most educational institutions employ marketing of some kind, albeit unsystematically (Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2004). In addition, it is likely that branding programmes are also increasingly implemented in the whole public sector (Tschirhart, 2008), which includes universities (Chapleo, 2010). The interest in image and branding issues in higher education institutions seems to be a sign that they are being transformed from social institutions into an industry (Gumport, 2000; Stensaker, 2005). The modern model of a university is seen as a new organisation ideal that stimulates the effort to brand (Stensaker, 2005). However, according to Bunzel (2007, p.152), the motivation for applying branding strategy in universities is "to enhance the university's reputation and to have a positive influence on university ranking". In addition, Belanger et al. (2002) note that universities are pushed into

branding themselves by the decline in government funding and the increase of competition in the higher education market.

With a successful brand, customers and all stakeholders are likely to have a positive attitude towards the image of the organisation (Kay, 2006). According to Ind (1997), an organisation conveys its image by transmitting messages about itself to its customers, employees and all its internal and external audiences. Therefore, the image of an organisation is "the picture that an audience has of an organisation through the accumulation of all received messages" (Ind, 1997, p.48). Belanger et al. (2002) state that the brand and image of a university have great power to affect the number of students and promising staff, as well as to attract money from research clients and donors.

The benefits of a strong brand are extolled in the literature. In line with McClure, Laibson, Loewenstein and Cohen (2004), consumers' awareness of a brand has a substantial impact on their consumption experience. That is, when customers have a positive attitude towards a brand, their awareness of the brand tends to positively influence their consumption experience. In addition, Hoeffler and Keller (2003) argue that the advantages of a strong brand arise when consumers are purchasing a product/service for the first time. In this case, customers are uncertain of or unfamiliar with the choices of the product/service. Keller (2007) agrees, saying that the main roles of branding strategy are 1) to 'clarify brand-awareness' by improving consumer understanding and communicating similarities and differences between individual products and 2) to 'motivate brand-image' by providing general guidelines to

management about which brand elements to apply across its product. Davis and Dunn (2002) note that brand can drive an organisation's success. They stress, however, that the most effective way to deliver brand to customers and stakeholders is to ensure that all employees should "work in a cohesive and consistent way to support the brand and its promise to guarantee that customers and other stakeholders are always satisfied and even delighted with their brand experience" (Davis & Dunn, 2002, p.4).

Several authors note that branding becomes a strategic managerial decision for higher education because it impacts upon the institution's capacity to recruit students (Stensaker, 2005) and staff (Ivy, 2001; Belanger et al., 2002). According to Mark (2006), strong brands can be created by connecting products/services to activities, which create meaningful associations or representations of the brand. In order to attract students, staff and research clients, a study by Jevons (2006) suggests that universities should employ branding by creating and communicating their meaningful brand, one that differentiates their service from other universities. Kotler and Fox (1985) maintain that the products and services of educational institutions can be branded by a given name, term, sign, symbol, design, or some combination of these, which identifies them with the institution and differentiates them from competitors' offerings. According to a study by Gray et al. (2003), university publications and websites are effective media for a university to communicate brand messages to target students. Nevertheless, for successful branding, Chapleo (2010) suggests that universities should pay more attention to internal brand engagement.

It is likely that when consumers decide to purchase a product/service, the organisation's brand often influences their decision. According to Simoes and Dibb (2001, p.221), "brands allow the consumer to identify the product that best serves his/her physiological and physical needs". A case study conducted by Simoes and Dibb (2001) shows that an organisation (e.g., the LEGO brand) can gain customer loyalty by developing the organisation's brand through the use of communication activities in order to differentiate the organisation's brand from that of competitors and enhance the position of the brand in the market. Moreover, according to Morsing (2006), an organisation which enables employees to coherently deliver the organisation' brand tends to maintain customer satisfaction, in particular when the organisation introduces moral issues and ethics into the brand. Schultz and de Chernatony (2002) assert that if the brand of an organisation is developed on the basis of aligning organisational cultures across functional and geographic boundaries, the brand can benefit the organisation for global recognition. Moreover, the organisation's brand not only influences consumers in deciding to purchase a product/service, but also seems to have a positive impact when new products/services are introduced (Keller & Aaker, 1992). A university's brand is, therefore, very important to the university when new courses are introduced.

With regard to the benefits of an organisation's brand, Hatch and Schultz (2003) note that organisations tend to reprioritise their efforts from product/service brands to corporate branding. As in the private sector, studies on corporate branding have increasingly been conducted in universities (e.g., Balmer & Liao, 2007; Atakan & Eker, 2007; Celly & Knepper, 2010). This can be seen as a sign of the increasing interest in corporate branding from universities.

Corporate branding in universities

In parallel with an increasing number of companies discussing corporate branding as an important management strategy, there is also a growing field of research on corporate branding (Morsing, 2006). Studies on corporate branding and the way in which higher education institutions create their corporate identity have recently been conducted (e.g., Melewar & Akel, 2005; Balmer & Liao, 2007; Celly & Knepper, 2010). Originally, corporate branding emerged from the notion of 'trademarks', which facilitate brand awareness and recognition, leading consumers to have particular expectations of a brand, such as a special quality, unique experience, or personal identity (Schultz, Antorini & Csaba, 2005). Morsing (2006, p.99) notes that the idea of corporate branding is "to make the entire corporation the subject of the branding effort rather than the individual product". Van Riel (2001 cited in Einwiller & Will, 2002, p.101) defines corporate branding as:

> "A systematically planned and implemented process of creating and maintaining a favourable reputation of a company with its constituent elements, by sending signals to stakeholders using the corporate brand".

According to de Chernatony (2002), corporate branding seeks to incorporate an organisation's activities into a consistent strategic framework, which presents the company's values, both emotional and functional. The movement towards corporate branding can be described as a shift from classic branding. There are a number of stages in the continuum between classic branding (product/service branding) and

corporate branding (Schultz et al., 2005) which are summarised in Table 1. One of the key issues when moving towards corporate branding is to build the relationship between strategic vision, organisation culture and stakeholder image. However, the difficulty is to align the internal and external stakeholders and to involve different subcultures (Schultz et al., 2005).

< Insert Table 1 About Here >

The current models of corporate branding have been identified by Balmer (2001). He divides them into two distinct types – macro and micro. The macro models of the 1980s and early 1990s noted by Abratt (1989) and Dowling (1993) incorporate into their models various constructs, such as corporate personality, identity and image, while the more recent micro models (from the organisation and marketing fields) are likely to capture more readily the challenges faced by organisations in managing and aligning multiple identities across different stakeholder groups (Knox & Bickerton, 2003). For instance, Hatch and Schultz (1997, 2001) point to the need for managers to build the relationship between strategic vision, organisation culture and stakeholder image, and to check on the alignment of these three key aspects of corporate branding.

The increasing number of writers on corporate branding reflects the growing interest in elements of the corporate marketing mix. Corporate brand management, according to Balmer (2008), is part of the corporate marketing mix that consists of: corporate identity (character); corporate communications (communications); marketing and stakeholder management (constituencies); corporate reputation (conceptualisation); organisational

identity (culture) and corporate brand management (covenant). Punjaisri and Wilson (2011) also register the importance of corporate brand management, where the activities take into account the other elements in the corporate marketing mix, internal stakeholders in particular.

Corporate branding may be perceived as the means by which a company communicates its identity (Kay, 2006). A strong identity is crucial for conveying a consistent image to stakeholders (Simoes & Dibb, 2001). Although the terms 'corporate brand' and 'corporate identity' are used interchangeably in the literature, Balmer (2008, p.44) argue that corporate identity tends to provide "the platform upon which the corporate brand emerges". In other words, corporate brand is characterised by corporate identity, which is generally shaped by, for example, organisation structure and business activities as well as the range and quality of produces/services offered (Balmer & Greyser, 2002).

University corporate branding

In a university context, studies on corporate branding and the way in which universities create their corporate identity have also been conducted (e.g., Melewar & Akel, 2005; Balmer & Liao, 2007; Celly & Knepper, 2010). An empirical study by Atakan and Eker (2007) indicates that one of the motives, which have led universities to manage their corporate identities, is the intention to differentiate themselves from other universities. Melewar and Akel (2005) suggest that the management of corporate identity in universities should be designed to take hold of the multidisciplinary character of corporate identity in order to control the institution's identity. Furthermore, Kay

(2006) suggests that a corporate brand should be directly related to a common corporate identity. However, Celly and Knepper (2010) note from their study that the challenge faced by a multi-campus university to build its brand is the lack of common identity between the university's main campus and the other campuses. As a result, when students from the small campus go to study in the larger campus (or a main campus), they do not feel that they are really part of the university's larger system (Celly & Knepper, 2010).

In order to encourage students to feel that they are a part of the institution's prestige, reputation and history, effective corporate brand management is needed (Balmer & Liao, 2007). A study on student brand identification conducted by Balmer and Liao (2007) suggests that a communications management approach and a brand values/promise management approach are more likely to result in high brand identification. According to Lawlor (1998 cited in Judson et al., 2006, p.57), brand identity for universities is "the essence of how you would like alumni, prospective students, legislators and the public to perceive your institution". Therefore, corporate brand identification can be seen as a process that generates distinctiveness and represents what a university stands for.

Studies (e.g., Baker & Balmer, 1997; Celly & Knepper, 2010) support the view that a university can build its brand through the use of corporate visual identities, for example, logos, symbols and websites. Baker and Balmer (1997) also value the consistent use and design of the institution's visual identities. However, for a multi-campus university, as stated earlier, it can be a challenge to avoid the inconsistency of the

institution's visual identity (Celly & Knepper, 2010). According to Celly and Knepper (2010, p.53), a university should therefore be concerned about "negotiating, persuading, and informing groups of how much better it is for them to participate in the larger branding effort, so they [the campuses] can take advantage of the equity we have built in the brand and become a part of the larger system".

As stated earlier, the move towards corporate branding is driven by various factors. Kay (2006), for example, notes that strong corporate brands attract more loyal and less price-sensitive customers. In addition, Keller and Aaker (1992) also highlight the positive impact of the corporate brand on new product introductions and product brand extensions. Therefore, if a university has a strong corporate brand, it has more advantage when it introduces new faculties and academic programmes. However, in order to build a strong corporate brand, an organisation should connect stakeholders to the representation of the organisation in its actions, concerns and symbols, showing what the organisation stands for (Mark, 2006) and the organisation's central idea (Schultz et al., 2005).

Moreover, when corporate brands are successful, their customers and stakeholders usually tend to have a positive attitude towards the image of the company (Kay, 2006). An issue of corporate branding which should be considered is whether representations of the organisation are connected to the people in the organisation (Kay, 2006; Cornelissen, 2007). Moving from branding towards corporate branding requires the behaviour of corporate members to be aligned to the brand values (Schultz et al., 2005), regarding which van Rekom (1997) notes that employees may oppose or dissociate

themselves from corporate branding activities, for example, advertising campaigns. In addition, corporate branding may operate in opposition to employee values, but this eventually causes conflict (Kay, 2006). To defuse such conflict, the entire organisation should perform in harmony with the desired brand identity (Harris & de Chernatony, 2001). Furthermore, employees and other stakeholders should be seen as the first audience of corporate branding activities, in order to represent what the brand has promised to give its customers (Kay, 2006). In organisations, which have highly explicit codes of behaviour, such as educational institutions, it may be risky for employees to try to adapt their idea of self to their day-to-day operations (Ind 2007). Stensaker (2005) notes that the university brand will not be trustworthy if the employees do not display brand characteristics. This can be seen as a sign of the increasing interest in internal branding from universities.

Internal branding

According to definitions by Urde (2003), Ind (2007) and Karmark (2005), internal branding is a way to enable employees to understand the values inherent in brands and organisations so that they can spontaneously deliver the brand promises to consumers in their day-to-day operations. However, as Ind (2007) claims, values are not created but already exist in organisations; thus the important question is how well they are embedded and expressed. Therefore, it is important that there is more attention to understanding the effects of the tools that universities use to communicate, express and embed brand values to their employees in order to ensure that these people will behave in alignment with the desired brand.

From this perspective, employees are seen as target audiences for the company's brand communication (Karmark, 2005). The perspective is described by Karmark (2005) as follows:

> "Employees should first and foremost understand the brand values as … defined by the brand organisation. The primary means for attaining this understanding is internal communications, branding, training and development. Here the role of employees is to deliver the brand's values to key stakeholders primarily by following brand guidelines which are often presented in the form of a brand book or other types of manuals that specify the meaning of the brand values to the employees" (Karmark, 2005, p.108).

Since internal branding from this perspective values direct control, the brand values need to be communicated to employees carefully and efficiently, because leaving brand values open to interpretation by employees tends to be detrimental to the brand (Kunde, 2000; Karmark, 2005). As Kunde (2000) states:

> "If employees in the front-line are left to themselves to find the best way of doing things, the results will be highly variable. Some do fantastically well, others less well. It's not so surprising – a brand's values contain many possibilities, like so many different facets around the brand itself. But for a brand to become a success, its values must be communicated identically" (Kunde, 2000, p.166).

From the marketing and communication based perspective, the task of management is to formulate the brand values and communicate them to the employees (Karmark, 2005). The mechanism of these perspectives is designed to communicate brand values through 1) brand-centred training and development activities and 2) internal communications (Karmark, 2005; see also Burmann & Zeplin, 2005; Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007, 2011).

Brand-centred training and development activities

Training is "a planned and systematic effort to modify or develop knowledge/skill/attitudes through learning experience, to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities" (Pinnington & Edwards, 2005, p.185). Miles and Mangold (2004, p.72-73) stress a crucial rule of training and development activities that:

> "Training and development are … important in terms of the messages employees receive. Training helps employees to master skills and glean knowledge required for their immediate job, while development is geared toward increasing employees' skills, knowledge, or behaviours, with the goal of improving their ability to meet changing job requirements … For example, training and development activities that focus on developing the organisation's brand image as it relates to customer orientation may send various messages about the customer service behaviour the organisation expects employees to exhibit."

Therefore, brand-centred training is a good opportunity to build understanding about brand values and to align employees to its principles (Aurand et al., 2005; Ind, 2007).

As brand values can help the organisation achieve its overall objectives, brand-centred training processes should focus on creating such programmes as are defined by the values (Aurand et al., 2005; Papasolomou & Vrontis, 2006; Ind, 2007). According to a study conducted by Punjaisri and Wilson (2011), training activities make employees appreciate the value brand and know how to deliver the brand. Miles and Mangold (2004, p.72) stress that "during the recruiting and staffing phases, employees start to gather information about the organisation and job in which they are interested". Furthermore, in order to ensure that employees understand the brand's values from the first moment they start working in the organisation, brand-centred training and development programmes should be operated (Wilson, 2001; Karmark, 2005; Ind, 2007). Ind (2007) further explains why employees need a predisposition towards that brand:

"People can sometimes uncover suppressed aspects of their character on these occasions but it is likely that if they possess contradictory beliefs, the whole experience will be uncomfortable" (Ind, 2007, p.118).

In addition, training and development activities are prone to be incorporated in HR activities (Miles & Mangold, 2004). It is generally agreed that employees' brand support behaviour may vary as a result of HR activities (e.g., Gotsi & Wilson 2001; Aurand et al., 2005). Empirical studies by several authors show that HR activities, for example, performance evaluation (Aurand et al., 2005); training (Gotsi & Wilson 2001); development courses (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011) and orientation programmes (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011), can develop employees' behaviour so that it reflects brand values, so

long as these activities are aligned with brand values. It has been noted that HR professionals have developed HR activities, which support internal branding efforts (Aurand et al., 2005). According to the empirical research by Aurand et al. (2005, p.163), "employees seem to have a more positive attitude toward the brand and [are] more likely to incorporate this image into their work activities when there is some degree of HR involvement in the internal branding process". Aurand et al. (2005, p.163) show that "there is a strong relationship between HR involvement in internal branding and the incorporation of the brand into work activities".

Moreover, according to Gotsi and Wilson (2001), it is agreed that communicating brand values internally can encourage staff behaviour in support of the brand organisation. However, the study shows that organisations should consider aligning human resource management activities with brand values in order to reinforce the staff's behaviour in support of the brand. They further explain that "if recruitment policies, performance appraisal, training and remuneration structures are not aligned with the brand values, conflicting messages will be sent about which behaviour is really important for the organisation" (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001, p.102). Ind (2007) also argues that the behaviour of employees to support the brand in different organisations can vary, depending on the way in which the organisation's brand values are related to human resource activities. Miles and Mangold (2004, p.73) comment that "compensation is another powerful tool for aligning employee interests with organisational goals. Pay influences employee attitudes and behaviours, and it influences the kinds of individuals who are attracted to and remain with an organisation". However, an empirical study conducted by Punjaisri and Wilson (2007) shows that training activities were the only activity, which was

mentioned by managers and employees as likely to develop and reinforce employees' behaviour to conform to the organisational brand (other HR activities, e.g., the recruitment and reward system, were not mentioned).

Apart from conveying brand messages through orientation programmes and development courses (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011), e-learning can also be used as a brand-centred training tool to develop employees' understanding of the brand vision and value (Ind, 2007). E-learning, as a wide set of applications and processes (e.g., web-based learning, computer-based learning, virtual classrooms and digital collaboration), conveys information through, for example, graphics, videos, audios, animations, models, simulations and visualisations (Federico, 1999; de Rouin, Fritzsche & Salas, 2004). De Rouin, Fritzsche and Salas (2005) also support the view that e-learning should be leveraged within organisations. The benefits of e-learning are, for example, consistency of delivery standard (Ind, 2007), preparation for main training (Ind, 2007) and less cost than formalised classroom-based training (Goodridge, 2001). However, e-learning programmes can have limitations in terms of low completion rates and lack of interactivity (Ind, 2007).

In summary, from the marketing and communication based perspective, the brand messages sent through training and development activities inform employees what the organisation's brand values are and how important these values are. These activities help employees to understand how the organisation expects them to behave.

Internal communications

In order to ensure that employees deliver brand values to key stakeholders, these values should also be communicated to employees' internal communication activities (Karmark, 2005). Conveying the benefit of the brand idea and encouraging involvement is the role of internal communications in building employees' commitment to the brand (Ind, 2007). Internal communication tools are used for internal branding in many organisations, such as hotels (Punjaisri & Wilson, 2007, 2011), call centres (Burmann & König, 2011) and universities (Judson et al., 2006). The example of such tools are: internal publications; e-mail messages; memos; group meetings; daily briefings; direct contract; e-mail; newsletters; brand books and intranet (Judson et al., 2006; Punjaisri & Wilson, 2011). An organisation can use these communication media to influence its brand targeting not only to customers but also to employees (Miles & Mangold, 2004). Miles and Mangold (2004) suggest that "internal public relations efforts can also be enhanced when organisations target employees with their advertising. Advertising messages can enable employees to better understand the product brand image and increase their emotional connection to that image" (p.74).

In addition, organisations communicate values through their corporate visual identity, for example, by invoking the organisation's name, slogan and symbol (Melewar & Akel, 2005; Whisman, 2009). Ind (2007) agrees that internal communications are available if organisations wish to keep repeating the importance of the brand. An interesting example was a company which Vallaster and de Chernatony (2006) found:

"There is no salary statement distributed without a company letter that states the brand claim or some brand-related information. The reappraisal of a company's history, the continuous use of the same pictures, the same logo or the same claim not only allows employees to acknowledge and recognise the brand promise, but also to internalise its values and identity" (Vallaster & de Chernatony, 2006, p.769).

It is noted that the company intranet can be used in the process of maintaining interest in the brand among employees, because it enables the brand to become a focus for discussion, rather than something employees merely hear about (Davis & Dunn, 2002; Ind, 2007). The study by Davis and Dunn (2002) supports the finding that, in order to maintain healthy brand-employee relationships in the internal branding of many successful companies, companies' intranets are used to help employees to talk about the brand. The intranet sites contain best practices as guidelines for trademarking, naming, communication elements, brand valuation and tool kits (Davis & Dunn, 2002; Tschirhart, 2008), which not only effectively help employees to talk about the brand, but also help employees to apply it in business decision-making as well as in their day-to-day operations (Davis & Dunn, 2002). In addition, brand books and manuals are included in internal communications. Brand books and other types of manual (e.g., games and videos) can specify the meaning of the brand values to the employees (Karmark, 2005). According to Ind (2007), the purpose of a brand book is to present the brand and its context in order to strengthen brand values and the brand's relationship to other activities and strategies within the organisation, with the expected benefits. Similarly, from a corporate design perspective (e.g., Napoles, 1988; Wheeler, 2006), by

containing the vision of a company and the meaning of a brand, the brand book will inspire, teach and build brand awareness. However, what should be noted is that a brand book is a guide to attitudes and behaviour, not a rule book (Ind, 2007). In addition, although organisations can communicate values through their corporate visual identity (Simoes & Dibb, 2008) – for example slogan, symbol, logo and organisation name (Melewar & Akel, 2005) – a brand book should be something more than a visual identity manual which provides detailed instructions on the use of the logo or typography, because this may persuade people that brands are only about logos and not behaviour (Ind, 2007).

The problem with this perspective is that the brand values which are communicated through a brand book are unlikely to be related to employees' everyday work (Karmark, 2005) and are hard to memorise in full (Burmann & Zeplin, 2005). In order to be a more practical and effective mechanism, it is suggested that a brand book can be published on the intranet in the form of an online brand centre (Ind, 2007; Tschirhart, 2008). Wheeler (2006, p.164) notes that "intranet and online brand sites are beginning to juxtapose the fundamental, i.e., 'Who we are' and 'What our brand stands for' in addition to standards, templates and guidelines". Moreover, an online brand book would create the capacity to update brand details (Wheeler, 2006). Ind (2007, p.110) further comments that "the updating element is partly connected to the opportunity to allow the words themselves to evolve but, more importantly, it provides the means of sharing best practice and keeping the brand in people's minds". However, a brand book may become only a reference source, something that employees may consult rather than engage with. It is suggested that there are other manuals and media available in the

form of brand-based games, performances and videos to teach and prepare employees to engage with brand values in their day-to-day operations (Kunde, 2000; Ind, 2007). This kind of internal brand communication tool provides an opportunity for repetition, which can take employees to a deeper level of understanding and shapes employees' minds to follow certain desired ways of working (Ind, 2007).

In conclusion, from the marketing and communication based perspective, it seems that organisations can encourage employees' behaviour to match with their desired image by communicating their brand values to their employees (through internal brand communications media as well as brand-centred training and development), in order to ensure that the employees will understand the brand and be able to deliver the brand values to external stakeholders. From this perspective, organisations should seriously consider employees as an audience to communicate with; hence, Ind (2007) suggests that organisations should get their employees involved in the research process and construct the campaign idea consciously, not waiting to show the campaigns after they have been created, as a way of informing employees. This is to ensure that advertising and marketing campaigns can be supported by employees who understand and are involved in the intended message (Mitchell, 2002; Ind, 2007; Tschirhart, 2008).

Conclusion

The studies on marketing and branding in universities discussed above have shown that marketing activities in higher education have increasingly recognised the value of a strong corporate brand and the importance of stakeholder and employee (corporate)

brand identification. Table 2 shows the four perspectives on university marketing studies. Although state regulation is a strong influence on universities, universities are also encouraged to become more autonomous (Henkel, 1997). Moreover, from the modern models of a university (e.g., Tjeldvoll, 1997; Clark, 1998), it seems that academic work can be administered in the same way as any work in any service-providing company (de Boer et al., 2007). In addition, significant moves have been made towards conceiving the university as a corporate enterprise (Henkel, 1997).

< Insert Table 2 About Here >

Drawing on a similar review of the previous studies, researchers have been paying attention to the application and implementation of market-oriented principles and practices. As discussed in the previous section, branding has become a strategic managerial decision for higher education, because it impacts upon the institution's capacity to recruit university staff and students and to introduce new facilities and programmes. Stensaker (2005) views branding as an activity that is increasingly undertaken by institutions of higher education. However, Stensaker (2005, p.9) further notes that "when entering the branding game, there should be a good match between the image exposed and the organisational identity of a given institution". Therefore, a question, which has been raised, is how this can be done in practice (Stensaker, 2005).

In order to build and deliver a strong corporate brand, internal stakeholders must play an important role (Hatch & Schultz, 2003). Within the branding field, the delivery of the brand promise to the employees of an organisation is, as noted above, as important as

the brand promise delivered to customers (Judson et al., 2006; Boone, 2000). The connection between employees' commitment and performance and the customers' perceptions of the service brand is also related to service marketing and branding (Karmark, 2005). Schultz (2006) notes that the employees become key actors in delivering the brand promise in corporate branding.

In a university context, the internal stakeholders are: (1) students, (2) academics and (3) non-academics (Melewar & Akel, 2005). According to the Jarrett Report (1985 cited in Barry et al., 2001, p.89), "academic staff should be seen as the primary resource of a university, [needing] to be managed and accounted for with appropriate care and skill". Therefore, academic staff is also considered to be an important key to building an institution brand. Melewar and Akel (2005, p.50) note that "academic staff has different motives for working in a university from administrative staff, who use a different value system from their own".

Employees may not support or represent their company's branding effectively (Mitchell, 2004; Melewar & Karaosmanoglu, 2006; Ind, 2007). For this reason, employees need to understand the brand values, in order to align their attitudes and behaviour in support of the corporate brand (Karmark, 2005). This is noted by Judson et al. (2006) as the task of internal branding in universities. Hence, the internal branding concept seems to be important in this situation; Collins and Porras (1995 cited in Mosley, 2007) also claim that:

"The companies with consistent, distinctive and deeply held values tended to outperform those companies with a less clear and articulated ethos" (p.128).

Although internal branding has become important for universities in increasingly competitive markets, it is still recognised as a new phenomenon (Judson et al., 2006; Whisman, 2009). Therefore, the concept of internal branding requires more research in future studies.

References

Abratt, R. (1989). A new approach to the corporate image management process. *Journal of Marketing Management, 5* (1), 63-76.

Adcroft, A., Teckman, J. and Willis, R. (2010). Is higher education in the UK becoming more competitive?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *23* (6), 578-588.

Atakan, M. and Eker, T. (2007). Corporate identity of a socially responsible university: a case from the Turkish higher education sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *76* (1), 55-68.

Aurand, T.W., Gorchels, L. and Bishop, T.R. (2005). Human resource management's role in internal branding: an opportunity for cross-functional brand message synergy. *Journal of Product and Brand Management, 14* (3), 163-169.

Baker, M.J. and Balmer, J.M.T. (1997). Visual identity: trappings or substance?. *European Journal of Marketing*, *31* (5/6), 366-382.

Baldwin, G. and James, R. (2000). The market in Australian higher education and the concept of student as informed consumer. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *22* (2), 139-148.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2001). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate marketing: seeing through the fog. *European Journal of Marketing, 35* (3/4), 248-291.

Balmer, J.M.T. (2008). An epiphany of three: corporate identity, corporate brand management, and corporate marketing. In: Melewar, T.C. (ed) *Facets of corporate identity, communication and reputation*. UK: Routledge, 35-54.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Greyser, S. (2002). Managing the multiple identities of the organization. *California Management Review*, *44* (3), 72–86.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Liao, M.N. (2007). Student corporate brand identification: an exploratory case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 12* (4), 356-375.

Barry, J., Chandler, J. and Clark, H. (2001). Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line. *Journal of Management Study*, *38* (1), 87-101.

Belanger, C., Mount, J. and Wilson, M. (2002). Institutional image and retention. *Tertiary Education and Management, 8* (3), 217-230.

Binsardi, A. and Ekwulugo, F. (2003). International marketing of British education: research on the students' perception and the UK market penetration. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 21* (5), 318-327.

Boone, M. (2000). The importance of internal branding. *Sales & Marketing Management, 152* (9), 36-38.

Brookes, M. (2003). Higher education: marketing in a quasi-commercial service industry. *International Journal of Nonprofits and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *8* (2), 134-142.

Bunzel, L.D. (2007). Universities sell their brands. *Journal of Product & Brand management, 16* (2), 152–153.

Burmann, C. and König, V. (2011). Does internal brand management really drive brand commitment in shared-service call centers ?. *Journal of Brand Management, 18* (6), 374–393.

Burmann, C. and Zeplin, S. (2005). Building brand commitment: a behavioural approach to internal brand building. *Journal of Brand Management, 12* (4), 279-300.

Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B. and Ewing, M.T. (1998). Do universities that are more market orientated perform better?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 11* (1), 55-70.

Celly, K. S. and Knepper, B. (2010). The California State University: a case on branding the largest public university system in the US.. *International Journal of Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *15* (2), 137-156.

Chapleo, C. (2010). What defines "successful" university brands?, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *23* (2), 169 – 183.

Clark, B.R. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17* (2), 178-184.

Clark, B.R. (1983), *The higher education system: academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B.R. (1998), *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17* (1), 1-25.

Collins, J.C. and Porras, J.I. (1995). Built to last'. UK: Random House.

Cornelissen, J. (2007), *Corporate communications: theory and practice*. London: Sage.

Cummings, W.K. (1998a). The service university in comparative perspective. *Higher Education*, *35* (1), 1-8.

Cummings, W.K. (1998b). The service university movement in the US: searching for momentum. *Higher Education*, *35* (1), 69-90.

Davis, S.M. and Dunn, M. (2002), *Building the brand-driven business: operationalize your brand to drive profitable growth*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

de Boer, H.F., Jürgen, E. and Liudvika, L. (2007). Public sector reform in Dutch higher education: the organizational transformation of the university. *Public Administration, 85* (1), 27-46.

de Chernatony, L. (2002). Would a brand smell any sweeter by a corporate name?. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *5* (2/3), 114-132.

de Rouin, R.E., Fritzsche, B.A. and Salas, E. (2004). Optimizing e-learning: research-based guidelines for learner-controlled training. *Human Resource Management*, *43* (2/3), 147–162.

de Rouin, R.E., Fritzsche, B.A. and Salas, E. (2005). E-learning in organizations. *Journal of Management*, *31* (6), 920-940.

Dill, D.D. and Soo, M. (2003). A league table of league tables: a cross-national analysis of university ranking systems. *Paper presented to the INQAAHE conference*, Dublin, 17 April.

Dopson, S. and McNay, I. (1996). Organisational culture. in: Warner, D. and Palfreyman, D. (eds) *Higher education management.* Buckingham: Open University Press, 16-32.

Dowling, G. (1993). Developing your company image into a corporate asset. *Long Range Planning, 26* (2), 102-109.

Einwiller, S., Will, M. (2002). Towards an integrated approach to corporate branding: findings from an empirical study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *7* (2), 100-109.

Etzioni, A. (1964), *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Federico, P. (1999). Hypermedia environments and adaptive instruction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *15* (6), 653–692.

Ford, J.B., Joseph, M. and Joseph, B. (1999). Importance performance analysis as a strategic tool for service marketers: the case of service quality perceptions of business students in New Zealand and the USA. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, *13* (2), 171-186.

Gibbs, P. (2001). Higher education as a market: a problem or a solution?. *Studies in Higher Education*, *26* (1), 85-94.

Gill, A. and Lashine, S. (2003). Business education: a strategic market-oriented focus. *Journal of educational management*, *17* (5), 188-194.

Gledhill, J. (1996). Student management. in: Warner, D. and Palfreymen, D. (eds) *Higher education management: the key elements.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Goodridge, E. (2001). Online training lets companies provide more employee instructions for less money'. Learning Circuits, v2 n2 (2001, Nov.). ASTD Publishing: Alexandria, V.A.

Gotsi, M. and Wilson, A. (2001). Corporate reputation management: living the brand. *Management Decision*, *39* (2), 99-104.

Gray, L. (1991), *Education Marketing*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gray, B.J., Fam, K.S. and Llanes, V.A. (2003). Branding universities in Asian markets. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *12* (2), 108-120.

Gumport, P. (2000). Academic restructuring: organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, *39* (1), 67-91.

Hammond, K., Harmon, H., Webster, R. and Rayburn, M. (2004). University strategic marketing activities and business school performance. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *22* (7), 732-741.

Hammond, K., Harmon, H., Webster, R. and Rayburn, M. (2007). University performance and strategic marketing: an extended study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *25* (5), 436-459.

Hannagan, T.J. (1992), *Marketing for the Non-Profit Sector*, Macmillan Press, London.

Hare, P. and Lugachev, M. (1999). Higher education in transition to a market economy: two case studies. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *51* (1), 101-122.

Harris, F. and de Chernatony, L. (2001). Corporate Branding and Corporate Brand Performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35* (3/4), 441-456.

Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organisational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, *31* (5-6), 356-365.

Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (2001). Are the strategic stars aligned for your corporate brand?. *Harvard business review*, *79* (2), 128-134.

Hatch, M.J. and Schultz, M. (2003). Bringing the corporation into corporate branding. *European Journal of Marketing*, *37* (7/8), 1041–1064.

Hazelkorn, E. (2007). The impact of league tables and ranking systems on higher education decision making. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *19* (2), 87-110.

Hemsley-Brown, J. and Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19* (4), 316-388.

Henkel, M. (1997). Academic values and the university as corporate enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *51* (2), 134-143.

Hill, C.W.L. and Jones, T.M. (1992). Stakeholder-agency theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, *29* (2), 131–154.

Hobbs, W.C. (1978), *Government Regulation of Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Hoeffler, S. and Keller, K.L. (2003). The marketing advantages of strong brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, *10* (6), 421-445.

Ind, N. (1997), *The corporate brand*. New York: New York University Press.

Ind, N. (2007), *Living the brand*. 3rd edn. London: Kogan Page.

Ivy, J. (2001). Higher education institution image: a correspondence analysis approach. *The International of Journal Education Management, 15* (6), 276-282.

Jarrett Report (1985), *Report of the steering committee for efficiency studies in universities*. London: CVCP.

Jevons, C. (2006). Universities: a prime example of branding going wrong. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *15* (7), 466-467.

Jongbloed, B. (2003). Marketisation in higher education, clarke's triangle and the essential ingredients of markets. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *57* (2), 110-135.

Judson, K.M., Gorchels, L. and Aurand, T.W. (2006). Building a university brand from within: a comparison of coaches' perspectives of internal branding. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 16* (1), 97-114.

Karmark, E. (2005), Living the brand, in: Schultz, M., Antorini, Y.M. and Csaba, F.F. (eds) *Corporate branding: purpose/people/process*. Copenhagen: CBS press, 103-124.

Karol, N.H. and Ginsburg, S.G. (1980), *Managing the higher education enterprise*. New York: John Wiley.

Kay, M.J. (2006). Strong brands and corporate brands. *European Journal of Marketing*, *40* (7/8), 742-760.

Keller, K.L. (2007), *Strategic brand management: building, measuring, and managing brand equity*. 3rd edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Keller, K.L. and Aaker, D.A. (1992). The effects of sequential introduction of brand extensions. *Journal of Marketing Research, 29* (1), 35-50.

King, S. (2005). Brand-building in 1990s. in: Balmer, J.M.T. and Greyser, S. (eds) *Revealing the corporation: perspective on identity, corporate branding, corporate communications, corporate image and corporate reputation*. New York: Routledge. Originally published in *Journal of Marketing Management*, *7* (1), 3-13, (1991).

Klayton, M.A. (1993). Using marketing research to improve university programs. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 9* (1), 105-114.

Knox, S. and Bickerton, D. (2003). The six conventions of corporate branding. *European Journal of Marketing, 37* (7/8), 998-1016.

Kotler, P. and Andreasen, A.R. (1991), *Strategic marketing for non-profit organisation*. 4th edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. and Fox, K.A. (1985), *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. and Levy, S.J. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *33* (1), 10-15.

Kunde, J. (2000), *Corporate religion*. London: Prentice Hall.

Kwong, J. (2000). Introduction: marketisation and privatisation in education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *20* (2), 87-92.

Lapsley I. (1992). Public services in transition: the introduction of quasi-markets. *Financial Accountabilities and Management*, *8* (2), 75–76.

Lawlor, J. (1998). Brand identity. *CASE Currents*, 24 (9)23-16 ,.

Litten, L. (1980). Marketing higher education: benefits and risks for the American academic system. *Journal of Higher Education*, *51* (1), 40-59.

Lovelock, C.H. and Weinberg, C.B. (1989), *Public and nonprofit marketing*. San Francisco, CA: The Scientific Press.

Marginson, S. (1996). Marketisation in Australian school. in: Walford, G. (ed) *School choice and the quasi-market, oxford studies in comparative education*. Wallingdon: Triangle Books, *6,* 111–127.

Maringe, F. (2005a). Interrogating the crisis in higher education marketing: the CORD model. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *19* (7), 564-578.

Maringe, F. (2005b). University marketing: perceptions, practices and prospects in the less developed world. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *15* (2), 129-153.

Maringe, F. (2006). University and course choice: implications for positioning, recruitment and marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *20* (6), 466-479.

Maringe, F. (2010). Vice Chancellors perceptions of university marketing: a view from universities in a developing country. *Higher Education Review*, *36* (2), 53-68.

Mark, J.K. (2006). Strong brands and corporate brands. *European Journal of Marketing, 40* (7/8), 742-760.

McClure, S.M., Laibson, D.I., Loewenstein, G. and Cohen, J.D. (2004). Separate neural systems value immediate and delayed monetary rewards. *Science*, *306* (5695), 503-507.

Melewar, T.C. and Akel, S. (2005). The role of corporate identity in the higher education sector: a case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 10* (1), 41-57.

Melewar, T.C. and Karaosmanoglu, E. (2006). Seven dimensions of corporate identity: a categorisation from the practitioners' perspectives. *European Journal of Marketing, 40* (7/8), 846-869.

Miles, S.J. and Mangold, W.G. (2004). A conceptualization of the employee branding process. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, *3* (2/3), 65-87.

Mitchell, A. (2004). Getting staff to love the brand: work in progress. *Marketing Week,* 2nd September, 30.

Mok, K.H. (1999). Education and the market place in Hong Kong and mainland China. *Higher Education, 37* (2), 133-158.

Mok, K.H. (2000). Marketising higher education in post-Mao China. *International Journal of Educational Development, 20* (2), 109-126.

Morgan, G. (2006), *Image of organisation*. London: Sage.

Morsing, M. (2006). Corporate moral branding: limits to aligning employees. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *11* (2), 97-108.

Mosley, R.W. (2007). Customer experience, organisational culture and the employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, *15* (2), 123-134.

Napoles, V. (1988), *Corporate identity design*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Naude, P. and Ivy, J. (1999). The marketing strategies of universities in the United Kingdom. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, *13* (3), 126-134.

Oplatka, I. (2002). Implicit contradictions in public messages of 'low-stratified' HE institutions: the case of Israeli teacher training colleges. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 16* (5), 248-256.

Oplatka, I. and Hemsley-Brown, J. (2004). The research on school marketing: current issues and future directions. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42* (3), 375-400.

Papasolomou, L. and Vrontis, D. (2006). Using internal marketing to ignite the corporate brand: the case of the UK retail bank industry. *Brand Management, 14* (1/2), 37-47.

Pelikan, J. (1992), *The idea of the university: a reexamination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Pinnington, A. and Edwards, T. (2005), *Introduction to human resource management.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C. (1993), *Managerialism and the public services*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Punjaisri, K. and Wilson, A. (2007). The role of internal branding in the delivery of employee brand promise. *Journals of Brand Management, 15* (1), 57-70.

Punjaisri, K. and Wilson, A. (2011). Internal branding process: key mechanisms, outcomes and moderating factors. *European Journal of Marketing*, *45* (9/10), 1521-1537.

Salmi, J. and Saroyan, A. (2007). League tables as policy instruments: uses and misuses. *Higher Education Management & Policy*, *19* (2), 31-68.

Schultz, M., Antorini, Y.M. and Csaba, F.F. (2005). Corporate branding – an evolving concept. in: Schultz, M., Antorini, Y.M. and Csaba, F.F. (eds) *Corporate branding: purpose/people/process*. Copenhagen: CBS press, 9-21.

Schultz, M. and de Chernatony, L. (2002). Introduction the challenges of corporate branding. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *5* (2/3), 105-112.

Simoes, C. and Dibb, S. (2001). Rethinking the brand concept: new brand orientation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *6* (4), 217-224.

Simoes, C. and Dibb, S. (2008). Illustrations of the internal management of corporate identity. in: Melewar, T.C. (ed) *Facets of corporate identity, communication and reputation*. UK: Routledge, 66-80.

Smith, D., Scott, P. and Lynch, J. (1995). *The role of marketing in the university and college sector*. Leeds, England: Heist Publication.

Stensaker, B. (2005). Strategy, identity and branding – re-inventing higher education institutions. *Paper presented to the city higher education seminar series (CHESS)*, 7 December. London: City University.

Taylor, J. (2003). Institutional diversity in UK higher education: policy and outcomes since the end of the binary divide. *Higher Education Quarterly, 57* (3), 266-293.

Tjeldvoll, A. (1997). The service university in the global marketplace. *European Education*, *30* (4), 5-19.

Tjeldvoll, A. and Holtet, K. (1998). The service university in a service society: the Oslo case. *Higher Education*, *35* (1), 27-48.

Tooley, J., Dixon, P. and Stanfield, J. (2003), *Delivering better education: market solutions for educational improvements*. London: Adam Smith Institute.

Trim, P.R.J. (2003). Strategic marketing of further and higher educational institutions: partnership arrangements and centres of entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Educational Management*; *17* (2), 59-70.

Tschirhart, M. (2008). Evaluation of brand use on city government websites: a search for brand type, repetition, and consistency. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *19* (1), 35-53.

Urde, M. (2003). Core value-based corporate brand building. *European Journal of Marketing, 37* (7/8), 1017-1040.

Vallaster, C. and de Chernatony, L. (2006). Internal brand building and structuration: the role of leadership. *European Journal of Marketing, 40* (7/8), 761-784.

van Rekom, J. (1997). Deriving an operational measure of corporate identity. *European Journal of Marketing*, *31* (5/6), 410-420.

van Riel, C.B.M. (2001). Corporate branding management'. *Thexis*, *18* (4), 12-16.

Walford, G. (ed) (1996), *School choice and the quasi-market, oxford studies in comparative education*. Wallingdon: Triangle Books, *6* (1).

Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21* (1), 1-19.

Wheeler, A. (2006), *Designing brand identity*: *a complete guide to creating, building, and maintaining strong brands.* 2nd edn. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Whisman, R. (2009) 'Internal branding: a university's most valuable intangible asset. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *18* (5), 367-370

Wilson, A.M. (2001). Understanding organisational culture and the implications for corporate marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, *35* (3/4), 353-367.

Table 1: Differences between classic branding and corporate branding

	Classic branding	Corporate branding
Foundation	• Individual products are the foundation for most brands	• Company or organisation is the foundation for the brand
Conceptualisation	• Marketing • Outside-in thinking	• Cross-disciplinary • Combines inside-out with outside-in thinking
Stakeholders	• Consumers and customers	• All stakeholders
Responsible for branding	• Marketing and communication functions	• All functions driven by top management
Time perspective	• Short; product lifecycle	• Long; organisation lifecycle
Core process	• Marketing and communication decide brand promises and marketing/communication mix	• Managerial and organisational processes align the company behind brand identity
Key issues	• Brand architecture • Brand positioning • Brand identity	• Brand as a strategic force • Relationship between strategic vision, organisation culture and stakeholder image • Brand alignment
Difficulties	• Difficult to build and sustain product differentiation • Restricted involvement of employees and use of cultural heritage • Limited involvement of stakeholders in communication efforts	• Difficult to align internal and external stakeholders • Difficult to create credible and authentic identity • Difficult to involve different subcultures and shifting stakeholders

Source: Adapted from Schultz et al. (2005)

Table 2: Characteristics of 4 perspectives on university marketing studies

Main characteristic	Author(s)	Author's comments
Marketing in universities This approach generally highlights the fact that marketing can improve the institution's capacity to develop and deliver educational services which meet customer expectations. Studies give consideration to the understanding, application and implementation of marketing principles and practices in order to meet customer expectations. The studies mainly aim to examine marketing ideas in universities; marketing activities in universities; and the advantages and disadvantages of marketing and international marketing in universities.	Kotler and Levy (1969) expand the concept of marketing to non-profit organisations.	Marketing can and should be implemented in non-profit organisations, including higher education institutions (HEIs).
	Litten (1980) comments on the benefits and risks of implementing marketing in higher educational intuitions in the USA, and offers ideas for maximising the benefits and minimising the risks of implementing marketing in educational institutions.	In order to maximise the benefits and minimise the risks of implementing marketing in educational institutions, coordination between the marketing profession, the market research industry and higher education is required for creating appropriate marketing techniques.
	Kotler and Fox (1985) provide an implementation guideline for employing marketing in educational institutions	Strategic marketing is important for education institutions to develop and deliver educational services which meet customers' expectations.
	Klayton (1993) examines the application of marketing research in a HEI.	HEIs can improve their programmes by using marketing research in order to target potential students; to create data bases on current, former, and potential students and to design new programmes.
	Naude and Ivy (1999) examine the implementation of marketing strategies in old and new UK HEIs.	Although marketing activities were found to be implemented in HEIs, the marketing strategies of old HEIs are not as aggressive as new HEIs.
	Ford et al. (1999) examine the use of performance analysis as a marketing strategic tool, using a sample of business students in New Zealand and USA.	Performance analysis can be used as a marketing strategic tool to assess customer-perceived service quality in order for an HEI to differentiate its services from the services of competitors.
	Binsardi and Ekwulugo (2003) examine the applicability of international marketing in UK HEIs.	Pricing, product and promotion play central roles in the international marketing strategy for HEIs.
	Trim (2003) reviews the literature on the partnership arrangements in HEIs and proposes a marketing framework for managing the partnership arrangements.	A marketing framework for HEIs is proposed for the HEIs to audit, evaluate and manage partnership arrangements. An institution should establish a centre of entrepreneurship which makes it easier to link academia and industry in order to gain additional revenue from marketable ideas.
	Brookes, (2003) examines the need for marketing approach in US and UK HEIs in order to satisfy the changes in government policies	Marketing management in HEIs helps the institutions to comply with the changes in government policies by, for example, increasing the opportunities to attract alternative sources of funding and to provide a better quality of services to meet students' expectations.

	Hammond et al. (2004) examine the relationship between business school performance and marketing planning activities in US HEIs. Then, Hammond et al. (2007) extend the previous study of Hammond et al. (2004) in order to further investigate the applicability of marketing planning activities in these HEIs, and to cross-index the results to the organisational characteristics of the responding institutions.	There is a positive impact of marketing planning activities on university business school performance (Hammond et al., 2004, 2007). However, the study of Hammond et al. (2007) shows that too many business schools assume that the initiation of marketing in the institutions would not significantly improve their performance.
	Maringe (2005a) explores the problems of marketing implementation using evidence from HEIs in Zimbabwe and propose a marketing framework for interrogating the problem in higher education marketing.	To avoid the problems of marketing implementation, HEIs should identify their core business, develop their curriculum based on the core business and base their marketing on a curriculum centred marketing (CORD) model because it is a tool for interrogating the problem in higher education marketing.
	Maringe (2005b) examines marketing perceptions and practices of marketing in HEIs in developing world, from the perspectives of students, institutions' marketers and vice chancellors in Zimbabwe HEIs.	From the internal people's point of view, marketing activities are implemented in HEIs. However, from the customers' (students)' point of view, HEIs still communicate inadequate information about product, price, place, promotion, physical evidence and people. In addition, the elements of product, price and people are seen by the students as the most important elements to influence their decision where to study.
	Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka (2006) review the literature on marketing in HEIs in an international context in order to establish the scope of higher education marketing, to identify gaps in the research literature and to make recommendations for further research in this field.	The literature on marketing in HEIs ought to be more coherent. In addition, the theoretical models should reflect the nature of the education services.
Brand and image building in university This approach highlights the view that branding can help institutions to differentiate themselves from competitors' offerings. In addition, branding becomes a strategic managerial decision for universities because it impacts upon the institution's capacity to recruit university staff and	Ivy (2001) investigates how marketing is used by HEIs in UK and South Africa to create and differentiate their image in higher education market	Old HEIs, new HEIs and polytechnic colleges convey their image through the use of marketing tools in different ways in order to create their unique position in the market.
	Belanger et al. (2002) examines the relationships among the image of a HEI (in Canada), students' expectations and students' actual experience after spending	Students' expectations depend on the institution's image as absorbed by students. Moreover, the students' experience which is congruent with that image can increase the likelihood of student retention. Thus, institutions should ensure congruence between the institutional image and the actual

students. The interest in image and branding issues in higher education seems to be a sign that universities are being transformed from social institutions into an industry. Studies aim to examine how higher education institutions profile themselves with a view to differentiation; the advantages and disadvantages of branding in universities and the importance of aligning university identity and the university's desired image	one year on campus	experience of students.
	Gray et al. (2003) investigates the media used by students in Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong to acquire information of overseas HEIs.	University publications and websites are effective media for a HEI to communicate brand messages to their target students.
	Jevons (2006) discusses the HE's situation and stresses on the need for HEIs to develop and communicate their brand.	HEIs should employ branding by creating and communicating a meaningful brand which differentiates their service from other HEIs in order to attract not only potential students, but also potential staff, together with research clients.
	Stensaker (2007) addresses the benefits and dangers of using branding as a strategy for managing HEI and comments on the potential relationship between branding and organisational change.	Institutions should view their staff and the students of the institution as the best marketers. In order for them to buy into the branding process, the brand should be rooted in the distinctive institutional characteristics. Branding can enhance institutional development and stimulate organisational change by linking organisational identity and the external image of the organisation. However, through the institution's development and organisational change, the institution should maintain the social responsibility of HEI.
	Bunzel (2007) discusses the trend of HEIs to engage in marketing and branding programmes, as the activities are expected to enhance the university's reputation and to have a positive influence on university ranking.	Although it is unclear that marketing and branding activities cause significant changes in a university's ranking, rankings still rely on reputation assessment which can be enhanced by marketing and branding activities.
	Chapleo (2010) investigates the factors which define successful university brands in UK	For the success of branding, university should pay more attention to internal brand engagement.
Corporate branding in university This approach concentrates on the way that institutions would like alumni, prospective students, legislators and the public to perceive them through corporate brand and identity. Studies concentrate on the way in which universities create their strong corporate identity, for instance, by corporate visual identification,	Baker and Balmer (1997) describe the development of a corporate identity/visual identity programme, using a major UK university as a case study.	A strong visual identity has a positive impact on leading the university's internal stakeholders to be loyal to the institution. A weak visual identity may occur due to weaknesses in corporate strategy, corporate culture and/or formal corporate communications policies.
	Melewar and Akel (2005) analyse the strategic intent behind a UK university's corporate identity programme based on the four components of the corporate identity model developed by Melewar and Jenkins.	The university's new corporate identity management strategy moves from a decentralised towards a more centralised management style. The management of corporate identity in universities should take hold of the multidisciplinary character of corporate identity in order to control the institution's identity.

student identification and socially responsible identification. * Corporate brand identification is seen as a process which generates distinctiveness and represents what a university stands for. The corporate brand should be directly related to a common corporate identity.	Balmer and Liao (2007) investigate student corporate brand identification towards the brand in a UK HEI, the business school of the institution and the overseas collaborative partner institute of the institution in Asia.	In order to produce high brand identification, senior managers should seek to employ the management of brand values and brand promise by ensuring alignment between brand promise and corporate identity and employing all the elements of the corporate marketing mix.
	Atakan and Eker (2007) analyse a Turkish HEI's corporate social responsibility management using concepts from the Corporate Identity and Corporate Social Responsibility literature.	'Philanthropy' is one of the main elements of the institution's corporate identity programme. The university should be seen to have altruistic motives for its social responsibility initiatives.
	Celly and Knepper (2010) describe the process of developing a corporate visual identity system in a US multi-campus university and analyse the key issues in developing this system in order to build the university brand.	A challenge for a large multi-campus university in building the brand is the lack of common identity between the university's main campus and its small campuses. As a result, when students from the small campus go to study in the larger campus (or a main campus), they do not feel that they are really a part of the larger university's system.
Internal branding in universities This approach emphasises the use of internal brand communications management and brand values management with the purpose of aligning employees' attitudes and behaviour with the university's brand values. Research focuses on the ways in which universities build their brand from their employees and methods for turning employees' attitudes and behaviour into brand supporters. The use of internal communication activities is also investigated.	Judson et al. (2006) investigate the impact of brand communication activities of US HEIs on internal recipients' behaviours from the sport coaches' perspectives.	Internal brand communication activities have a positive impact on employees' understanding and incorporating the brand into their work activities.
	Whisman (2009) examines case studies from businesses and HEIs, as well as reviews of the literature and research, in order to inspect the essential role which internal branding plays in successful university settings.	Internal branding helps an institution overcome internal resistance to branding efforts. It helps the institution take an identity-development strategy beyond traditional approaches (e.g., new logos and advertising campaigns) in order to take an embedded cultural approach which guides the ways in which the institution should run its activities (e.g., communications, fund-raising, marketing, enrolment management and programme development).
	Judson et al. (2009) investigate the internal promotion of the brand within a US higher education industry from the administrators' perspectives.	A university's brand image has a strong impact on leading university administrators to do their job, but less of an impact upon how they manage their staff and how their staff reflect the brand in their everyday work. Moreover, private university administrators are likely to have a greater brand clarity than public university administrators.

Source: Developed by the researchers