Professor Maurice Kogan: In Memoriam
10 April 1930 – 6 January 2007

Professor Maurice Kogan was Editor of Higher Education Management, as this journal was then known, from 1985 to 2000. He was both a colleague and a friend and it was an honour to be asked to succeed him. Maurice died of cancer on 6 January 2007, professionally active to the last. We print below the obituary which was published in The Times on 12 January 2007.

Michael Shattock

The Relationship between Branding and Organisational Change*

by

Bjørn Stensaker
NIFU STEP, Norway

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

* An earlier version of this article was presented in a lecture in the City Higher Education Policy Series (CHESS) at City University, London, 7 December 2005. The author is indebted to Professor Vaneeta D’Andrea for comments helping to improve the article.
This paper explores the relationship between the diversity within a higher education system and five key factors, namely: the environment, policy intervention, funding, competition and co-operation, and ranking. The exploration is based on the extent to which higher education systems, particularly those of Australia and New Zealand, have accommodated distinctive forms of higher education institutions characterised by the older traditional university at one extreme, and the newer university of technology at the other. Twelve interdependent propositions on diversity are proposed and discussed. These propositions indicate the ways in which each of the five key factors may influence institutional diversity or convergence. In the majority of circumstances, the convergent tendencies of institutions will predominate unless very specific environmental and economic conditions prevail, and/or specific directed policy is implemented.

Globalisation, the “Idea of a University” and its Ethical Regimes

by

Simon Marginson
University of Melbourne, Australia

This paper sketches the impact of globalisation and internationalisation on the terrain of values and ethics in higher education. The first part of the paper discusses values and ethics in higher education in relation to the "Idea of a University", and identifies the ethical regimes essential to the functioning of HEIs as knowledge-forming organisations. The second part draws out implications of globalisation. Globalisation together with the strengthening of executive steering are associated with the partial "dismembering" of higher education institutions from their national governments, along with a pluralisation both of their spheres of operation and the range of private goods and public goods they produce and of the public they serve. This raises new questions about the governance and management of the values and ethical regimes associated with global goods, e.g. the obligations of communicability, mutuality, academic freedom, the protection of persons in higher education suggested by cross-border relationships, and the modes whereby these values and ethics are promoted.

Internationalisation of Higher Education in the Era of Globalisation: What have been its Implications in China and Japan?

by

Futao Huang
Hiroshima University, Japan

This article describes the internationalisation of higher education in the era of globalisation in China and Japan. It presents the following issues: the relationship between internationalisation and globalisation; major characteristics of the
The article concludes that globalisation has led to changes in the internationalisation of higher education in China and Japan, but not changed the most essential part of internationalisation of higher education in either country.

**Market Competition, Public Good and Institutional Governance: Analyses of Portugal’s Experience**

by

Alberto Amaral and António Magalhães
CIPES and University of Porto, Portugal

The emergence of the market as a regulatory tool for the public sector and the promotion of competition among institutions are based upon the idea that they promote institutions’ responsiveness to society and a more efficient use of public funds. However, autonomous institutions forced to compete under market-like conditions may follow strategies aiming at “their own good”, especially when facing stringent financial conditions. This does not guarantee that the institutions’ strategic objectives will coincide or converge with the “public good” or with the government’s objectives. This opens the way for state intervention.

In Portugal, the combined effect of the rapid expansion of the higher education system and the country’s decreasing birth rate has resulted in a situation where institutions compete strongly to attract students. This paper analyses the effect of this competition on the behaviour of both public and private institutions. It focuses on institutional policies for offering new study programmes and promoting the access of new students. It compares the behaviour of the public and private sectors to assess how far strong competition promotes similar attitudes from both sub-sectors, thus resulting in relaxing or even ignoring the pursuit of public good.

**Redefining Competition Constructively:**
**The Challenges of Privatisation, Competition and Market-based State Policy in the United States**

by

Peter D. Eckel
American Council on Education, United States

In the United States, the relationship between state governments and public colleges and universities is being redefined with new notions of autonomy and accountability, and with funding policies that are highly market-driven (often referred to as “privatisation”) as the centrepieces. Situations and institutional strategies unthinkable only a few years
ago are becoming increasingly commonplace. For instance, a few business and law schools at public institutions are moving toward privatisation, distancing themselves from both the states and their parent universities.

While American higher education has traditionally been competitive and market driven, emerging state market-based policies, which will clearly benefit some types of institutions over others, are further intensifying the competition with a variety of effects at the institutional and sector levels. Entrepreneurial or commercial activities may provide the additional resources individual institutions need to fulfil their public purpose. However, when all institutions pursue the same set of competitive strategies, no one gains an advantage. Institutions run harder to stay in place. The cumulative effect of competition may also work against important social objectives such as affordability and access. This paper explores the challenges that the current competitive environment creates for institutional leaders in the United States. It acknowledges that the competitive environment will not abate and suggests that by competing in different ways, over different objectives, with different purposes, US higher education might better meet its social objectives of increased access, lower cost and enhanced quality.

The Entrepreneurial State and Research Universities:
The Nexus of Science and Economic Policy in the United States and a New Wave of State-based Science and Technology Initiatives

by

John Aubrey Douglass
University of California, Berkeley, United States

The convergence of United States federal science and economic policy that began in earnest under the Reagan administration formed the First Stage in an emerging post-Cold War drive toward technological innovation. A frenzy of new state-based initiatives now forms the Second Stage, further promoting universities as decisive tools for economic competitiveness. This paper outlines the characteristics of this Second Stage. Among the author’s conclusions are the following: high tech (HT) economic activity is already relatively widespread among the various states; leading HT states rely heavily on their university sectors and a highly educated workforce, yet are increasingly importing talent and neglecting investment in the education and skills of their native population; the long-term commitment of states to financially support the frenzy of HT initiatives is unclear; and state initiatives are rationalised by lawmakers as filling a need not currently met by the private sector or universities and, in part, by a sense of competition between states, with only a minor concern with global competition, thus far. As this paper explores, the politics of HT, including the focus on university-industry collaboration and neo-conservative religious/moral controversies over stem cell research, are a significant factor for understanding how and why most states are pursuing the Second Stage.
The Commercialisation of University Research and Economic Productivity
by
Paul Clark
University of Oxford, United Kingdom

This article focuses on the relationship between university research (in this case science research) and national economic productivity, particularly in the context of the emerging knowledge economy. It addresses the question of whether university research output should be treated as a public good or a private good, in economic terms, and analyses this question using the tool of game theory. The analysis also draws out the implications both for universities and for governments of treating science as one type of good instead of another.