

Interpretation and implementation of reputation/brand management by UK university leaders.

Received 4th August 2003

Abstract

Reputation and brand management are topical issues in UK higher education but previous research has often focused on marketing practitioners within higher education (HE) institutions rather than the senior, strategic leaders. This paper, however, examines university Chief Executives' understanding, attitudes and interpretation of reputation and brand management.

Current literature on defining reputation and brand, research on branding in higher education, and the role of leaders in brand management, are examined to give context to the work. Research was conducted through interviews with Vice-Chancellors, Principals and Rectors from a selection of fourteen universities representing three different 'generations' (the 1992 universities, those formed in the mid-20th century, and older institutions)

Whilst the work is exploratory in nature it does highlight this as a rapidly evolving area of perceived importance and discusses conclusions on some of the external and internal issues related to reputation and brand management in this sector.

Keywords

Branding, brands, reputation, chief executives, universities, higher education

Introduction

The whole discipline of brand management has been described as “a cacophony of simultaneously competing and overlapping approaches”¹ and although the discipline of brand management is still evidently evolving, there appears to be increased recognition by both managers and academics of the significance of brands as sources of sustained competitive advantage². Investigation of brand management approaches and the application of these to the increasingly commercially orientated UK higher education sector would seem, therefore, to be both relevant and significant

This research builds on earlier work on branding in higher education carried out in 2001. That research explored the opinions of key members of university marketing departments on branding in UK universities and is summarised in the article *Is Branding in UK Universities Real?*³ and a subsequent paper in the Case Journal⁴

An appropriate progression was to apply similar research to the senior management of universities; those who have control for strategic direction of institutions but who may not be formally involved in marketing and are less likely to be trained in marketing. The particular audience concerned was Vice Chancellors (VCs), Rectors and Principals.

The objectives of this research were;

- To identify the level of understanding of the role and importance of 'reputation/ brand management' among leaders of UK universities
- To identify examples of existing practice relating to managing reputations/ brands in UK universities
- To open up further opportunities for debate and discussion on the issues and importance of reputation/ brand management in universities

Terms of reference

The term *Chief Executives* is used to denote leaders of UK universities. Their specific titles vary to include Vice Chancellor, Rector and Principal but this was considered an appropriate term to

encompass the modern nature of the role of head of a university.

The research commences by exploring whether UK University Chief Executives perceive a distinction between *reputation* and *brand*. Through the remaining questions, however, respondents did not necessarily draw a distinction between reputation and brand in their answers. For this reason in these questions the term *brand* may be used to denote *reputation/ brand* (based on the assumption that *brand* is wider and includes *reputation*).

Literature review

Interpretation of reputation and brand;

The concepts surrounding brands are unusual in that, despite wide discussion in academic and practitioner journals, there is still a good deal of subjectivity and therefore limited agreed common models or practice. There is some evidence of historically differing academic approaches between Europe and the U.S., typified by the writings of Aaker 5 and Kapferer 6 which differ in content and form, in the value systems which underpin the mental frameworks, and interpretation of the term 'brand'.

The terms reputation and brand are, however, often used interchangeably in general discussion, but require closer examination in order to assess university Chief Executive's interpretation of the concepts. Brand and brand image are often examined and differing definitions are proposed by such writers as Ellwood 7, Kapferer 8, and Hankinson and Cowking 9. Patterson 10 considers the concept of brand image and suggests that "there continues to be a large degree of confusion about what brand image actually means" and goes on to suggest a model of the 'brand image system'. Few writers discuss and compare brand and reputation distinctly, however, an exception being Frost and Cooke 11 who explore the area of corporate brand v reputation in some detail, suggesting that 'corporate brand' is a more established concept than 'corporate reputation'. They find "no commonly agreed definition" for either term, but especially for 'corporate reputation'. They ultimately suggest, however, that there are similarities between the two terms and that they represent two approaches to the same objective: a strong and sustainable brand and reputation, and that many in their study "feel that they are actually aspects of the same thing". In discussing these terms in this paper, the assumption has been made that precise definition is a sub issue and the two terms may be used interchangeably, although the term 'brand' may be used to *include* 'reputation' in some circumstances.

Trends in the concept of branding in higher education

The concept of brands and brand management in the wider non-profit sector has been a focus of academic research for some years, with writers such as Hankinson and Cowking 12, De Chernatony 13 and Kapferer 14 exploring these areas.

Branding in the context of higher education is an area which has been on the agenda of practitioners for some time. It still, however, receives limited discussion in academic papers, especially in a UK context. Recent articles by Bodoh and Mighall, suggest that "branding is emerging as a hot topic for those who want to consolidate their positions or save their skins" but suggest that "brands will present some real challenges in a sector that has been slow to embrace the basic principles of branding" 15. Whilst the branding issue has become more topical in very recent years, writings in 2000-2001 could imply that addressing the issues is a faltering process; Johnston sums up the consensus from practice journals when he states, "the higher education system certainly has a long way to go in terms of understanding and incorporating the branding concept". He adds, "there has never been a more appropriate time for institutions to consider the role and purpose that branding may play within the sector" 16. Bean suggested that "ironically, as an industry sector education has the least sophisticated brands with which to relate to its target groups" 17.

In academic journals higher education marketing in its wider context is discussed by papers such as Brookes 18, but there is little discussion of branding as a specific area.

The USA appears to be ahead of the UK in the acceptance and implementation of branding as a concept in higher education. Work by writers such as Sevier 19 and Kotler 20 demonstrate this, suggesting that branding in HE has become accepted practice. One suggested reason for this is that the U.S. has gone through the clash of cultures between the traditional academic values and market focused values ten years earlier 21.

Senior management attitudes and influence on brand

It is widely accepted that leaders have a fundamental part to play in shaping the brands of their organisations, both internally and externally. Writers such as Free suggest that “there is hardly a self respecting chief executive that has not become more acquainted, and, often familiar with the subject matter “(of branding) 22. Whilst the relationship between external and internal branding is complex and too wide to explore here, it is generally acknowledged that external branding should be built on internal branding. The Chief Executive has a key role in driving this internal brand and the best companies are, it is suggested, driven by a chief executive who understands that markets are internal as well as external 23. It is suggested that, particularly in services, “the Chief Executive, in whom brand ownership lies, must rely on what staff do and how they behave.....because that is the basis on which customers will experience the brand” 24. Studies on the non-profit sector, such as that by Hankinson 25, focus on the internal brand by exploring senior management attitudes. The increasing relevance of internal branding as a concept, and the crucial role of the chief executive in that, would therefore suggest that the focus of this research, in exploring their acceptance and interpretation of branding in UK universities, is a relevant one.

Methodology

Qualitative research was appropriate as it seeks a deeper understanding of factors 26, in particular in-depth interviews, which enable a more accurate picture of respondents’ true feelings on an issue to be deduced.

The approach of conducting interviews with opinion makers and decision takers is one adapted from a ‘delphi technique’ which focuses on future trends, using trendsetters in any market as a barometer 27

The UK university sector can be segmented into three sub groups based on incorporation dates;

- ‘Newer’ Universities - 1992 and post ’92 institutions
- Middle Group Universities created by Royal Charter in the mid 20th Century
- ‘Older’ Universities incorporated before 1950

Therefore qualitative research via structured interviews with 14 universities was broken down as follows;

4 Newer Universities

6 Middle Group Universities

4 Older Universities

14 interviews constituted a sample of a little over 10% of the total population of 128 UK institutions with university in their title as listed by UCAS, and was considered an adequate response group size, as samples of less than 1% of a population can often give reliable information provided that the sampling procedure is creditable 28

Findings

Do Chief Executives consider that their university has a reputation?

All Chief Executives considered that their university had a reputation, with the partial exception of one merged institution who considered that, whilst the two constituent institutions had reputations, it was perhaps too early for the new institution to have a meaningful reputation.

Do Chief Executives consider that their university has a *brand*?

There was less of a resounding 'yes' to this question; although most Chief Executives considered that they did have a brand, many considered that this was more diffuse than the reputation and the opinion was expressed by at least two interviewees that there really was no institutional brand, more a series of niche brands in subject areas.

An interesting point made directly or alluded to by a number of Chief Executives was whether brand as they interpreted it was a constraining set of values and therefore fundamental to the institution, or whether it was something more superficial in nature and 'wheeled out' when convenient

What do Chief Executives consider to be the difference between the two terms' meanings?

The consensus was that reputation was principally external in focus; the external perception of the quality of the institution, or the "perceived aggregate quality". It was also described as 'what peers think of us'.

The brand was less clearly defined than reputation, as is perhaps to be expected. There was a common opinion however, that brand is created or manufactured (whereas reputation evolves) and that brand is particularly relevant for undergraduate audiences as it has a more commercial slant and connotations.

It was apparent that most Chief Executives did clearly perceive a wider meaning of the term brand to include such elements as values and quality as well as the specific visual elements of logo, strap line, font styles etc. This was not universally the case, however, with at least two Chief Executives only citing the visual elements of what constitutes a brand.

A number of key words run through the interviews and are summarised in Table 1.

An area of difficulty was that of the relationship between reputation and brand; whilst most Chief Executives suggested reputation being part of and informing / underpinning the brand, two Chief Executives considered that brand was a part of reputation or that brand was derived from reputation.

Which term is considered more appropriate?

Chief Executives suggested that either term was acceptable, although most recognised a subtle distinction in meanings. There were exceptions to this, however, perhaps reflecting more traditional academic attitudes; one Chief Executive stated that the term brand would not be acceptable to an internal audience.

Do the reputation/ brand accurately reflect the institution?

In summary, the Chief Executives considered that reputation better reflected the reality of the institution than did brand, although this was by no means always the case.

Reputation was considered by most institutions in all three sub-groups to be a fair reflection of reality. The exceptions to this were among the middle group, two of whom felt that their reputation was no longer a reflection of reality.

Brand was considered generally to approximate reality but responses here were disparate; among new universities the consensus was that brand was a good reflection of reality, although two tempered this by suggesting that only certain audiences perceived the correct message. Middle group universities were split, with half suggesting that the brand was correct among the 'informed publics' or 'approaching correct' whilst half thought that the current brand simply did not reflect current reality except in niches. The older group had a general view that reputation more closely reflected reality than did brand.

Throughout the sample there was a feeling of moving, albeit slowly and incrementally, in the right direction to building a brand that reflected reality. The disparate nature of the audiences, complex nature of the brand and in some cases lack of a clear brand vision and model were considered to make this difficult.

Answers to this question also related to the understanding of definitions of reputation and brand; there was a

perception that reputation, being historically derived, is more likely to be accurate and difficult to change. Brand, however, being seen as disparate and artificially constructed, is perceived to be movable and able to be deconstructed and rebuilt.

Do the reputation/ brand differentiate the institution?

All institutions endorsed the need to differentiate UK universities. Almost all the Chief Executives considered that their institution was distinctive, but this suggestion was often qualified by limitations including;

- ... differentiated within our local region
- ... differentiated from direct peers
- ... differentiated with certain audiences

When considering the three university sub groups it was apparent that there were differences;

Newer universities - all considered that they were distinctive and points of differentiation suggested included; -

Vocational

Regional focus

Business and professional links

Middle group universities - this group contained institutions that felt that they were not, or were only partially differentiated. Points of differentiation suggested included;

Employability

Research profile

These points of differentiation, in particular the latter one, were often in subject areas rather than institution wide however. It was in this group that the greatest proportion of Chief Executives expressed concern that their institution would have difficulty with genuine overall differentiation (with notable exceptions)

Older universities interviewed felt strongly that they were differentiated, and suggested points were;

Employability

Position relative to immediate competitor set

City (Location)

Research

How many of these are genuine points of differentiation and how many could apply to many institutions is open to debate, but undoubtedly overall reputation is also seen as a differentiator among older universities.

Who is responsible for managing reputation/ brand?

Interestingly, most Chief Executives again dealt with reputation and brand synonymously in this answer. The responses were fairly easily summarised as all but one Chief Executive suggested that they had a key role to play in managing the brand of their institution. The other principal response to this question was that the inclusive suggestion that 'everybody' had a role to play in managing brand. One interesting point here was a variance in suggesting whether brand management was filtered down from the top or built from the bottom up; for example, one Chief Executive suggested that "presenting it and delivering it is the concern of 'University Management Team'" whereas others talked clearly of "development of common visiondecided by all staff".

A group cited by Chief Executives as important in managing brand were the marketing department (or external relations and PR). An interesting distinction can be drawn here, however, in terms of whether marketing should be fundamentally involved in construction of the brand or whether it should simply be responsible for communicating the brand decided upon by the Chief Executive (and senior management). Whilst the new university Chief Executives who mentioned marketing specifically all suggested that marketing should 'guide in brand construction', the middle group university and older group university Heads who mentioned marketing alluded more to "implementation" and one talked of "leaving it to marketing not being enough". Whether there is significance in this split is debatable, but clearly the role and relationship of marketing in brand management has yet to be clearly defined.

In summary, the subtext of most interviews seemed to suggest that the Chief Executives perceived a need to gain internal acceptance for brand and then to decide upon presentation and communication in conjunction with senior

colleagues (and generally, but not always marketing or external relations). All then become important in communicating the brand although the Chief Executives themselves (supported by senior colleagues and marketing) perceived a pivotal role for themselves.

What should the role of the Chief Executive be in managing reputation/ brand?

In common with the previous question responses largely drew no distinction between reputation and brand. All Chief Executives saw managing reputation/ brand as part of their role. Almost all went further, suggesting that it was a 'core concern/ key role'.

A number went further to suggest how their 'key role in managing the brand/ reputation' translated to responsibilities. Approximately half of Chief Executives suggested that their role was to oversee professionals (marketing, PR and external relations) in managing the brand. Also cited as important by almost all Chief Executives, across all three sub groups, was their personal PR and lobbying role with peers, policy makers and media.

In summary, Chief Executives of UK universities across all three sub groups show a fair degree of consensus that reputation/ brand management is central/ key to their role

Who are the key target audiences with which to establish reputation/ brand?

See Table 2 for a summary of responses.

The most noticeable trend from the results to this question was a lack of commonality between target audiences cited as being important. There were exceptions, however, and a number of other noteworthy results;

Industry/ professions were cited as a target audience with which to establish brand/ reputation by all but one Chief Executive, with employers mentioned as a distinct sub group within this sector.

Government/ civil service were mentioned by only three Chief Executives, perhaps slightly surprisingly.

Bodies such as HEFCE, TTA, research councils, heads of careers, RDAs etc. were alluded to by a number of heads but specifically cited by only three Chief Executives. Only two Chief Executives specifically mentioned 'the media' as a target audience.

It should be noted, however, that a number of Chief Executives used rather nebulous phrases to explore the target audiences such as "those we are likely to do business with" and "those that have control over us". For this reason the audiences which were specifically suggested by surprisingly few Chief Executives (such as 'media') may in fact be alluded to as part of these wider groups.

Overall, there was limited correlation between the target audience that Chief Executives suggested were important in establishing the reputation/ brand. In particular the various sub groups within the student audience, many of which have differing motivations, need consideration, and a perhaps a common model of understanding of other audiences could lead to greater correlation. Amongst the Chief Executives there appears to be recognition of the need to address these disparate groups but only partial common definition of exactly who these are and how to prioritise them.

What helps and hinders the institution in building a reputation/ brand?

For the purpose of this question the terms reputation and brand were dealt with synonymously by Chief Executives except where indicated. In responding to this question it was apparent that Chief Executives were more easily able to identify and explore hindrances to building a reputation/ brand than they were aids. The answers are explored under the 'helps' and 'hinders' headings respectively.

Aids to building an institutional reputation/ brand.

The responses here showed only limited commonality and therefore it is difficult to suggest themes becoming apparent. A number of factors were suggested by only one Chief Executive; history, location, links with Further Education (FE), 'word of mouth', 'communicators - web site, publications', 'inclusive structure', 'seen as 20 places higher than actual position', 'staff have helped build brand', 'strong overall brand - sub branding not an issue'. Perhaps the most enlightening factor, and the only one mentioned by more than one Chief Executive, was 'the institution wishing to move forward to occupy a clear place in the market'.

Hinders building a clear institutional reputation/ brand?

Responses to this aspect showed greater commonality and therefore can be summarised with greater clarity;

1. Institutional resistance to change. Interestingly, this was explored to include such factors as the institutional culture and cultural legacy. This seems a little at odds when considered in relation to some positive factors suggested such as 'staff have helped build brand' and 'inclusive structure' but may need further exploration. It may in fact simply be indicative of the complex issues facing Chief Executives when trying to build a clear reputation/ brand for a diverse and not traditionally commercial organisation.

One middle group Chief Executive made an interesting comment in suggesting that internal building of a brand was hindered by the feeling that some "staff work *at* the university, but not *for* it"

2. Difficult to construct a real overall convincing brand that captures ethos and diversity. Two newer university Chief Executives suggested this. This point follows closely from the previous one in that it alludes to the difficulty of branding an institution such as a university. Indeed, the third factor builds from this.

3. Nature of brand model; lack of clear model to construct a brand. It was suggested that there is no evidence of a clear model for constructing a brand in institutions such as universities. One Chief Executive asked, "do we build one strong overall brand which encompasses everything we do and all our services (are we a 'Virgin' type brand) or do we have a series of strong sub brands which have a higher profile than the overall institutional brand (are we are 'Unilever' type brand)?"

4. Sub branding - schools/ faculties who want a distinct reputation. This is clearly the articulation of the fundamental question in the previous 'lack of branding model' issue. Several Chief Executives cited this as a hindrance to building a reputation/ brand, although this was tempered by others who identified it as an issue but not necessarily negative (Business Schools were cited as an example of where it is necessary). Two interviewees were aware of this issue but felt that it did not affect their institutions, as the overall institutional brand was strong enough. This appears to be another area where there is no simple model or answer to suggest whether it is a positive or a negative and what the best practice should be?

An interesting difference between the USA and UK was explored by one middle group Chief Executive who suggested a partial cause of the UK trend to sub brands pulling away from the overall institution; In US higher education cross checking of quality is carried out by other departments within the same institution, whereas in the UK this cross checking is carried out by a similar external department from another institution. Whilst there are doubtless arguments supporting this, it was suggested that this could lead to schools/ faculties not relating as strongly to their parent institution as in the USA?

5. Other factors that hinder building reputation/ brand but were suggested by only one institution Chief Executive and included league tables, slowness to change, history and myth, and Government policy changes

6. Government bodies such the RAE, TQA etc. were suggested as a 'big driver of brand' but neither help nor a

hindrance.

Conclusions

These have been grouped into three areas;

1. Definition of reputation/ brand and scope/relationship?

The term *reputation* was, in general, clearly understood and embraced by Chief Executives. A consensus of interpretation can be summarised as 'external perception of the quality of the institution'

The term *brand* showed more variable understanding and interpretation. Whilst it was, in general, embraced as a concept, this was not absolute throughout the sample.

Brand was interpreted with some degree of variability and terms suggested included 'perceived aggregate quality' with mention of 'visual communicators'. In general reputation was understood to be part of brand, but there were exceptions to this understanding. Reputation was considered to be particularly relevant for peers and brand for undergraduate audiences.

There were varying views about the scope and role of brand; is brand fundamental and constrains all the organisation does, or is it superficial and purely presentational when required. Most Chief Executives views tended more towards the former statement though suggesting that the brand 'informs' rather than 'constrains'. In essence, is a university brand *fundamental* or *superficial* (visual), or put another way, is branding a *philosophy* or a *function*?

The evolution of the discipline and subsequent modelling of branding concepts to the HE environment should lead to clearer conceptualisation and definition of brands and their relationship to reputation.

2. Barriers to building a brand

The majority of Chief Executives suggested a lack of *real differentiation* in the sector. This appeared to be especially an issue for the genuinely diverse institutions who find it hard to encapsulate this in a few key points. There is no succinct answer to this complex issue, but there appears to be an opportunity to clearly understand current perceptions of institutions and therefore clearly articulate a desired brand positioning, rather than arrive at one by default

It was suggested that internal acceptance is one of the key issues which can hinder building a university brand. Research pointed to the middle group institutions having greatest difficulty in this area, thought to be due to a) internal resistance resulting from organisational culture and b) genuinely diverse educational provision. Any model clearly needs to encompass internal marketing but it may be suggested that over time funding imperatives will lead to cultural shifts which more easily facilitate internal acceptance.

The lack of a clear model to facilitate building a brand in a large and diverse NPO such as a university was seen as a limitation to constructing a clear brand. Most models derive from commercial sources are therefore may have only partial applicability.

3. Models of practical implementation

One of the key wider conclusions to become apparent from this research was that there appears to be little in the way of best practice or workable models for understanding, constructing, communicating and maintaining a brand in a large, complex and diverse non-profit organisation such as a university. This is particularly applicable to a number of areas;

Internal brand management - roles and relationships of leader, senior management, marketing dept and 'everybody in institution' in brand management.

Institutional brand v school/ faculty sub brands - some Chief Executives saw this as 'a problem', others as 'necessary'. The fundamental question appears to be; which is better; a 'Virgin type' structure where the strong

overall university brand acts as an umbrella for all that the institution does, or a 'Unilever type' structure where the overall university brand is often subverted to sub brands and acts simply as a framework?

Reputation/ brand research - is there a suggested best practice for evaluating and understanding this? Currently there is great diversity in how and whether institutions undertake this internally or externally, and which audiences they consider need addressing? It appears that older and middle group universities are particularly likely to undertake internal, student based research only, whereas newer universities tend towards external wider based brand research as well. Does this reflect a differing approach to brand, or is it purely coincidental or financial priorities?

There was some variation in the target audiences whom Chief Executives perceived as being important to communicate reputation and brand to. Particularly notable here was the fact that some Chief Executives dealt with students as one category, whilst others broke to sub categories of overseas and home students, undergraduate and postgraduate students. There does not seem to be a high degree of consensus regarding key audiences for brand building and priorities within these audiences. One of the principal actions proposed from this initial exploratory research is the research and eventual proposal of a model of brand management applicable to HE institutions.

Overall conclusions

Importance of the issue; there was consensus that reputation/ branding in UK higher education was an issue of great importance and likely to remain so. This was suggested to be particularly driven by tuition fees and funding issues, changing attitudes of students as consumers, Government push to differentiation and mergers and alliances.

It was considered that universities, whilst not often possessing natural brands, will be forced to occupy positions of distinctiveness. Whether those positions of distinctiveness will be genuine or have artificial construction is debatable. Six key factors were suggested, as the core criteria on a matrix to plot the positions that universities will have to occupy; *Teaching v Research Led, Science v Arts based, Basic Teaching v Higher Level Teaching*. Others factors may be apparent but were not suggested from this sample.

In general UK University Chief Executives are well informed and embrace reputation and brand management. There is, as is perhaps expected, less consistency in definition of branding as a concept than reputation, in particular whether it is a function or a philosophy.

University Chief Executives have to embrace an agenda that they see as important, but that has little in the way of best practice models to support them. United States higher education (whilst being subject to different funding imperatives) may offer positive role models in this respect. Closer liaison between UK and US management and marketing roles at all levels from strategic to functional may be appropriate to share best practice.

Overall, it is evident that clearer understanding of HE brands and brand management are necessary and further work is needed to identify branding issues and to propose workable models applicable to the UK sector.

Further Research

This was an exploratory study to consider the understanding, attitudes and interpretation of UK University Chief Executives to reputation and brand, and as such the limited sample, whilst over 10% of the total population, can only lead to indicative answers. There are, however, further research questions suggested;

1. What are the constituent elements of university brands perceived as 'successful'?
2. Can a model for university brand analysis and management be developed?
3. Can internal marketing models be applied to the higher education sector?

Implications for Practice

It is apparent that there are difficulties facing UK universities in terms of reputation and brand management, but there are a number of positive steps that university leaders and marketing practitioners may consider;

- One positive factor is Chief Executives' apparent acceptance of the importance of the issue of reputation and brand management. This readiness to embrace the concepts is likely to lead to a proactive rather than reactive approach to the challenge.
- There is an opportunity, therefore, to clearly understand current perceptions of the institution (through research?) and thereafter clearly articulate a desired brand positioning, rather than arrive at one by default.
- Many UK universities have strong historical and cultural legacies, which, once understood, may offer a clear foundation for future brand design and communication.
- Internal acceptance; this appears to be critical for a real and sustainable brand and consideration should be given to how to win acceptance of staff at all levels. A clear starting point is to call for the importance of the concept of branding itself.
- Loyalty is a starting point for internal acceptance. The attitude of working 'at the university' and not 'for the university' appears to be widespread and addressing the cultural issues which have fostered this attitude, whilst not easy, will be necessary in the long term.

8.0 Bibliography

1. M.J. Louro and P. V. Cunha (2001), "Brand Management Paradigms", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 2001, 17, pp 849-875, Westburn Publishers
2. M.J. Louro and P. V. Cunha (2001), "Brand Management Paradigms", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 2001, 17, pp 849-875, Westburn Publishers
3. C.Chapleo (2002), "Is Branding in UK Universities Real?" *Education Marketing*, Issue 26, June 2002, pp 28 -30, HEIST
4. C.Chapleo (2003), "The real impact of integrated marketing communications on colleges and universities", *Case Journal of Educational Advancement*, International Issue, March 2003, pp240-253, Henry Stewart Publications.
5. D. Aaker (1991), *Managing Brand Equity: capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*, New York: the Free Press.
6. J.N. Kapferer (1992), *Strategic Brand Management: New Approaches to Creating and Evaluating Brand Equity*, Kogan Page, London
7. I. Ellwood (2000) *The Essential Brand Book*, Kogan Page, London

8. J.Kapferer (1997), *Strategic Brand Management*, Kogan Page, London
9. G.Hankinson and P.Cowking (1993), *Branding in action*, McGraw Hill, Maidenhead, UK.
10. M. Patterson (1999), "Re-appraising the concept of brand image", *The Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 6 No.,1999, pp.409-426, Henry Stewart Publications
11. A. Rankin Frost and C. Cooke (1999), "Brand v Reputation : managing an intangible asset", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 7 No.2, 1999, pp. 81-87, Henry Stewart Publications
12. G.Hankinson and P.Cowking (1996), *The Reality of Global Brands*, McGraw Hill, Maidenhead, UK.
13. L. De Chernatony (1998), 2nd Edition, *Creating Powerful Brands*, Butterworth- Heinemann, Oxford, UK.
14. J.Kapferer (1999), 2nd Edition, *Strategic Brand Management*, Kogan Page, London
15. J. Bodoh and R. Mighall (2003), "Study here because you're worth it" *The Times Higher Educational Supplement* March 7 2003 pp.23
16. A. Johnston (2001), "Branding - the key to student recruitment (or maybe not)" *Education Marketing*, HEIST, March 2001, pp.28-29
17. D. Bean (2000), "Is branding a solution to widening participation" *Education Marketing*, HEIST, March 2000, pp.18-20.
18. M. Brookes (2003), "Higher Education : marketing in a quasi- commercial service industry", *International Journal of Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 8 No.2, 2003, pp.132-134, Henry Stewart Publications
19. R. Sevier (2001), "'The future of Branding in Higher Education" - website www.stamats.com
20. P.Kotler and K. Fox (1995), *Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey
21. C.Sanders (1999), "Universities go for a spin" *Times Higher Education Supplement*, Analysis, 10 December 1999, pp.8
22. C.Free (1999), "the Internal Brand" , *The Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 6 No.4, 1999. pp.231-236, Henry Stewart Publications
23. K. Thomson, (2003), "people power", *marketing business*, may 2003, pp.12-14, Chartered Institute of Marketing, Maidenhead, UK.
24. C.Free (1999), "the Internal Brand" , *The Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 6 No.4, 1999. pp.231-236, Henry Stewart Publications
25. P.Hankinson (2003), " the internal brand in leading UK charities" (awaiting publication)
26. Peter M. Chisnall (1992), *Marketing Research*, McGraw Hill, Maidenhead, UK.
27. T. Proctor (2000), *Essentials of Marketing Research*, Pearson, London
28. T. Proctor (2000), *Essentials of Marketing Research*, Pearson, London

Table 1; reputation v brand; key words cited by Chief Executives to differentiate the two terms

Reputation	Brand	
Quality	Consumer	
External	Undergraduate	
Evolves	Created/ managed	
Peer Groups	Logo/Style/ Visual	
Perceived	Persuade	

Table 2: Who are key target audiences with whom to establish the reputation/ brand?

No of responses per category for each sub group of university

Audience	Newer Unis	Middle Unis	Older Unis
Overall current students	two	five	two
Overall potential students	two	five	two
Home UG	two		
Home PG	two		
Overseas UG	two		
Overseas PG	two		
Industry/ Professions	Three	Five	Three
Media	one		one
Local Community			
HEFCE/ TTA	One	One	one
Research Councils	One	two	
Heads of Careers	One		
Heads of FE Colleges	One		
LSKs	One		
RDAs	One	One	
Gov/ Civil Service	One	Two	
Other VCs		One	
Potential Student's Parents	One		
'The Public'	One		