Chapter 1.

Reputation management, social embeddedness and rationalization of universities

Tom Christensen, Åse Gornitzka and Francisco O. Ramirez

Introduction

Reputation management or branding, imitated from private organizations, has become increasingly important for public organizations the last decades (Wæraas & Maor, 2015). The world has become more globalized, more complex and insecure than it used to be, making it more difficult for public leaderships to know what measures with what effects to take to fulfill public instrumental goals. This leads to more ‘talk’, either as a substitute for action or to supplement action (Brunsson, 1989). This balance between talk and action is meant to increase support and legitimacy from other public organizations, from stakeholders in the environment or from citizens at large.

In recent decades, European universities, most of them public, have changed more quickly than ever before, reflecting, with a certain time-lag, the role models derived from American universities. In a broader perspective, this development reflects the global formalization and rationalization of the universities, leading them to develop more generic or general organizational features and detracting from their unique status/special character (de Boer et al., 2007; Ramirez, 2006a). Current university developments have entailed a shift in the balance and blend of the different visions of the European university (Olsen, 2007), as a community of scholars, a representative democracy, an instrument serving the public interest or a service enterprise embedded in a competitive market. In this mix the latter two has gained strengths, in particular the last one, which may be seen as reflecting that so-called New Public Management reforms have increased their influence in universities (Christensen, 2014).

There are some major aspects of this change of universities (Aberbach & Christensen, 2017; Ramirez & Christensen, 2013). First of all, the internal decision-making system, which used to be totally dominated by professors in European higher education systems, has changed in two contradictory ways. Decision-making bodies now comprise a decreasing number of professors, but more administrative actors, temporary academic staff and external societal representatives, often seen as democratization (Christensen, 2011). But at the same time one also experiences a rehierarchization with more power to the top leaders and more close and

exclusive decision-making processes. Second, university administrations have become relatively larger, more professional and more influential compared with the academic staff, and it's a closer coupling of the academic and administrative hierarchies (Bleiklie & Michelsen, 2013; Enders, de Boer & Meyer, 2013; Gornitzka & Larsen, 2004; Ginsberg, 2014). Third, universities are generally more catering to students' needs than before, ranging from new teaching methods and more feedback to providing more and better services and facilities (Ramirez, Meyer & Lerch, 2016; Ramirez & Christensen, 2013). Overall, this creates more influence from non-academic decision makers in daily university life.

Fourth, universities are more 'socially embedded' than before, i.e. they reach out more to stakeholders in the environment and those actors have more influence (Ramirez, Meyer & Lerch, 2016; Ramirez & Christensen, 2013). This is partly a result from a more proactive university policy of the central authorities, but also because universities now have to find extra resources from public or private actors, for they are considered part of the knowledge economy and regarded as actors in international markets of students, researchers and research projects (Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006). This is facilitated by an increasingly professional university administration, but has also resulted in external actors becoming more integrated in universities and hence exerting more influence. Bleiklie (2013) argues that today's universities are characterized both by more centralization and professional hierarchies and by more social embeddedness,

Furthermore, the socially embedded university is often imagined to be normatively good. The socially embedded university is either linked to progress, as in Clark's (1998) vision of the entrepreneurial university and its role in fostering local and national development or to equity, as in current discussions of the more democratic university and its role in promoting greater accessibility and valorizing diversity (Maher & Tereault, 2009). Some of these virtues, of course, can also be seen as shortcomings. There are critics of entrepreneurial universities as sites of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). There are also those who critique an overall decline in the distinctive focus of and intellectual standards in the university (Readings, 1996; Bloom, 1987).

We study two aspects of this development. First, the reputation or reputation management of a selection of Nordic, American and Chinese universities, or how the universities present themselves to internal and external stakeholders through different channels. We focus here on how they present themselves on their websites. Second, we study in American universities how the increasing social embeddedness is leading to institutionalization of new organizational features connected to development units, diversity and legal elements.

Accordingly, the following research questions are posed in this book:

- What is typical for the reputation management of the universities, as reflected by their websites? What are the core symbols - related to their performance record, professional qualities, moral features and procedural features – balanced and changing over time?
- How is social embeddedness reflected in the institutionalization in universities over time of diverse organizational features, exemplified by the emergence of development offices, diversity units and legal units?
- What explains differences between universities with respect to reputation management and the institutionalization of new organizational units?

Reputation and reputation management

Carpenter (2010, p.33) defines organizational reputation as ‘a set of beliefs about an organization’s capacities, intentions, history, and mission that are embedded in a network of multiple audiences’. This implies that leaders of an organization, in our universities, have to use symbols to reach and appeal to diverse audiences to build a reputation (Wæraas & Maor, 2015). Doing this in an organized and systematic way is what is called reputation management. Aside from their own organization and the superior ministry, the stakeholders for universities would be regional/local authorities, private funding actors, and national and international communities of universities, scholars, research councils/funding agencies, students, etc. Effects of reputation management could be general support, building goodwill and slack in general (Cyert & March, 1963), but also more specific support leading to the provision of more resources (cf. Easton, 1965). Hence, the standing of a public organization is important for organizational well-being, position in a political-administrative system and their ability to act effectively (Carpenter, 2010).

Reputation management for a university involves stating its core mission, reflecting its historical path, main resources and competences, and its outputs and outcomes. The aim of reputation management is to build, maintain and protect and we use the concept broadly in all these aspects in this book (Wæraas & Maor, 2015). Building means to establish a reputation or an image. Maintain implies gradually to nurture and develop what is build of reputation, and protect means to fend off attacks from diverse stake-holders on the reputation. Reputation management not only facilitates navigation for members of the organization but also helps external constituencies to understand its activities (Morpheus & Harley, 2006, p.457). Success in ‘the presentation of self in everyday life’ (Goffman, 1959) depends, however, not just on the

agency's ability to present itself, but also on how this presentation is perceived by the 'networks of multiple audiences', the balance between internal and external actors, in other words.

The goal of reputation management is to strike a balance between being 'excessively vague or unrealistically aspirational or both' (Morphew & Harley, 2006, p.457). This is very challenging, because the message or image may be unclear and open to interpretation, or the stake-holders may see and define it differently. We see reputation from the perspective of the universities, since we do not have data on how a university's image is received by the outside world. Reputation management may involve visual design or market differentiation (Drori et al 2013, p.142). Other possibilities include mission statements, core values or other symbols related to core activities. The latter is what we focused on in the first part of the book when we looked at the websites of the universities we chose to study. Website analysis of organizations is increasingly undertaken in social science research (Powell, Horvath & Brandtner, 2016).

An organization's reputation can be managed in different ways. One way is to develop a rather narrow, integrated and specific profile, which has the advantage that internal and external stakeholders know what the organization stands for (van Riel & Fombrun, 2007). The disadvantage is that presenting an integrated set of norms and values does not reflect the complexity and heterogeneity of the organization (Wæraas & Solbakk 2009, p.459), which often may lead to conflicts especially if, for example, academic staff are required to actively represent or 'live the brand' (Ind, 2004). Another way is to have a rather broad identity profile, directed at a range of internal and external stakeholders, having what Røvik (2002) calls a 'bridging effect'. In this way different messages can be sent to different stakeholders in what metaphorically can be called 'polyphony' (Christensen et al., 2005). Multiple different messages create flexibility for the leadership. The disadvantage is that trying to please everybody results in a profile that is an ambiguous isomorphic set of symbols that may not say anything to anyone. Or as Morphew and Harley (2006, p.456) formulate it, symbols related to a shared purpose can be seen as 'rhetorical pyrotechnics – pretty to look at but of little structural consequence'.

Carpenter (2010) argues that a public organization's reputation may be divided into four dimensions: First, the performative dimension focuses on whether leaders manage to create the impression among the various stakeholders that their own organization is delivering instrumentally on outputs and outcomes closely related to core mission and goals (Chapleo et al. 2011, p.27). Depending on how many and what types of tasks and functions a public organization has, effectiveness and efficiency may vary concerning how easy they are to assess. Some organizations have tasks that are rather easy to connect to output and outcome, while for

other either output and/or outcome are not that visible, intertwined with other tasks or are rather ‘unsolvable’ (Wilson, 1989). If very difficult, then the persuasiveness of the symbols is particularly important, i.e. to create the perception of rationality, modernity and success (March, 1994). The rationalization of the university may indeed have become its “bottom line” (Ramirez, 2006a, p.243). Related to this dimension, we have the movement of evidence-based policy in different sectors. One can argue that a policy is based on ‘objective facts’, which will give a lot of weight to performance indicators and collections of hard data, while critics will stress that such data and their interpretations is based on political processes and are biased. In a world in which metrics are often invoked to explain or justify rank or policy (Espeland & Sauder, 2007), accounting for excellence is increasingly expected of universities. And indeed, universities and sub-units within universities increasingly engage in accounting for excellence exercises (Ramirez, 2010; Shavelson, 2008). These processes reflect both the intensification of processes rationalizing the university and also the sense that universities are competing in local, national, and even global markets (Marginson, 2006; Portnoi, Bagley & Rust, 2010)

Second, the moral dimension, related to whether a public organization is emotionally appealing and a carrier of moral values, i.e. whether it’s perceived as ‘compassionate, flexible and honest’ (Carpenter & Krause 2012, p.27). Giving the impression that one is following high ethical standards is always an advantage, as is creating the feeling of integrating or protecting different stakeholders or the public at large. One challenge regarding this dimension is to creating the feeling that everyone is included, i.e. the bridging effect as Røvik (2002) labels it. Rather often public organizations, For different reasons, will flag that it’s caring about special groups, related to gender, religion, cultural background, etc., something that easily can create conflicts between special groups or towards between majority and minority groups. Another challenge is of course that ethical standards are relative and difficult to define and agree on, both in theory and practice. Still it is evident that universities are expected to be more welcoming of diverse groups of students and professors as well as diverse perspectives reflected in curricula. (Smelser & Alexander, 1999). University discourse and organization highlighting the importance of diversity further demonstrates the normative value of diversity. Student testimonials displaying how much the university cares about diversity may be found in the oxford undergraduate prospectus, 1998-99. Even a venerable medieval university with a world class reputation symbolically adapts to more recent global standards. (See Kwak, Gavrilă & Ramirez in this volume)

Third, the technical/professional dimension focuses on creating an image of a public organization that scores high on professional capacity, knowledge and competence that are

required to deal with complex tasks and environments, which is often seen as the backbone for public decisions and activities (Wæraas & Byrkjeflot, 2012). Creating a sense of competence will make it overall easier to get stakeholders support the organization. This could also be related to recruiting new groups or reconfirming an existing competence profile. One of the challenges with this dimension is the potential tension between political control and professional autonomy. How much should it be left to the internal peer-related processes in a profession to define what is professional capacity and quality. Another is potential conflicts among professions or towards semi-professions. This seems to be especially likely as a greater number of occupations, including university administrators and managers, become professionalized. This dynamic is foreshadowed in Wilensky's (1964) "professionalization of everyone?" analysis.

Fourth, the procedural dimension deals with whether a public organization creates the impression that it adheres to appropriate procedural and legal requirements in decision-making. This applies internally to rule-of-law and users'/citizens' rights, but externally to whether it attends to the legal framework, including laws and rules regulating its activities, in an appropriate way. One challenge with this dimension is whether an organization should stress loyalty or autonomy towards superior authorities, and an example of this is security-related police forces (Christensen & Lodge, 2016). Another is the relative weight of procedural and legal focus relative to other considerations. While much attention has been paid to the managerial university (Ginsberg, 2014) not enough has been expended to the legalized university (Furuta and Ramirez in this volume). The rise of more formal and legal discourse and organization in universities is evident in American universities but may also be emerging in universities around the world.

Three different perspectives on the forces that drive reputation management can be formulated, based in organization theory (Christensen et. al., 2007). The first is a rational process whereby, as often outlined in political science-related branding studies, central leaders in an organization, or their communication experts, will use systematic strategies to position their organization vis-à-vis internal and external stakeholders to fulfill their basic needs and interests (Wæraas & Maor 2015, p.5). This process, which may include structural or policy-oriented reforms or changes, is mostly instrumental, in the sense that an organization wants to achieve specific goals and be effective and efficient by using reputation in a systematic and planned way. So reputation symbols may be a special type of means to instrumental ends. A rational interpretation of reputation management contains either an economic or a more bounded rationality perspective (Rindova & Martins 2012, Simon, 1957). According to such a

perspective, leaders will dominate processes of reputation management, either in a straight hierarchical way or through processes of negotiation among elite actors with diverse views (cf. March & Olsen, 1983). Connecting this perspective to Carpenter's dimensions, two are in particular relevant, namely the performative and procedural dimensions, but there are also professional aspects that are evident.

Second, the reputation image may mainly reflect the traditional cultural values and norms of the organization, i.e. its core institutional features. In this way, the leaders carry and further the 'necessities of history' in their branding (Selznick, 1957). Reputation symbols are used primarily to reflect path-dependency, i.e. they represent the essence of the value 'roots', which heavily determine the 'routes' or trajectories followed. This way of looking at reputation management perceives leaders as far less instrumental. The cultural path reflected in the symbols may be linked either to a micro-institutional context, to systemic cultural features or else to the macro-cultural context of a country (Fombrun, 2012). But to base reputation management ON historical traditions and path-dependency may lead to at least to potential conflicts. One is how to interpret the history, which could be difficult (March & Olsen, 1976). Clark's (1972) discussion of "organizational sagas" in promoting distinctiveness in some American liberal arts colleges illustrates the development and use of history in projecting who one is. Another is how to use the cultural preconditions and constraints currently, in what March (1994) calls 'matching situations'. This means that a decision-maker must ask what is his/her cultural identity, what is the situation and what decision rules should be used to connect situation and identity. But reputation management could also be used to mark a break with the past, to start on a new cultural path (Kingdon 1984, Baumgartner & Jones, 1993). This perspective has a lot to do with the moral dimension of Carpenter and also part of the professional dimension.

Third, reputation may be related to institutional environments features (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), or wider global or national cultural and social contexts (Christensen, 2014). Intermediary actors in organizational fields – for example, international organizations, global consulting firms, monitoring and certification organizations, the media and non-governmental organizations – provide 'objective' information (for example rankings) that influence reputation management (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). In such a neo-institutional or constructivist perspective organizations may either be heavily influenced by the macro-environment or else be able to utilize this context. Accordingly, reputation management is really all about the creation and utilization of symbolic goals and strategies often unrelated to organizational everyday practices. This has been discussed as a case of 'hypocrisy' or 'double-talk' (Brunsson,

1989). It can combine maximal institutional flexibility and legitimacy (Morphew & Hartley 2006, p.458). Organizations can use certain symbols to brag about themselves and their achievements or else to increase legitimacy by emphasizing how caring and open they are, but the coupling to reality may be rather loose (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This may indirectly benefit their instrumental goals or support a cultural path, but they have no guarantee that they can control their message if environmental pressures are strong and deliver on instrumental goals. This perspective may have connections to all Carpenter's dimensions.

Looking at the dynamics of reputation management, at one extreme, successful branding leaders may be able to anchor an organization's reputation firmly in its cultural trajectories and combine instrumental effects and positive symbolic effects for both internal and external stakeholders. At the opposite extreme, leaders' attempts to manage reputation will be undermined by lack of instrumental planning, cultural resistance, bad handling of symbols or even the emergence of 'counter-symbols' (March & Olsen, 1976).

Reputation management in universities – key expectations

What are some of the core organizational features, institutional characteristics and tasks/functions of universities that may be important for reputation and reputation management? First, the overall structure or formal organization of universities is rather loose or decoupled, both vertically and horizontally (Cohen & March, 1974; March & Olsen, 1976). The central decision-making level struggles to establish any strong control of the lower levels, even though a more modern professional university bureaucracy has striven to do this. In modern university life, strategic plans and steering has emerged as a result of this, which again is often coupled to reputation management, but has not necessarily led to more actual coupling.

Horizontally, universities are not only structurally fragmented, in what are often seen as separate 'kingdoms', but also score low on what Krasner (1988) characterizes as cultural horizontal width, meaning academic staff do not really care what is going on in other faculties/schools, since their status within their disciplines and professions does not mainly depend on the standing of their colleagues. The cohesion culturally is often connected to rather abstract terms like academic freedom (Aberbach & Christensen, 2017). Following Carpenter and Krause's argument (2011, 28) we might expect organizations that are highly differentiated and loosely coupled to effectively deal with complexity by presenting a symbolic, abstract and simplified self-image to cover up complicated university realities. Moreover, we would expect organizations with a specialized orientation to highlight the fact that they are professionals catering to a more specialized audience at a lower level of abstraction and thus resort less to

moral symbols. On the other hand, we can expect reputation management to vary according to organizational age and history (Stinchcombe, 1965). A unique history and/or identity may be reflected in the use of moral symbols irrespective of the formal organizational properties of the institution in question.

Universities basically have three main tasks; research, teaching and knowledge dissemination. Universities are thus differentiated organizations, even though main tasks are connected, and hence we would expect reputation management to differ between the various activities or tasks. The output of all these activities is measurable; this is done in modern universities via incentive systems. Research is also special in that the research process is not easy to explain or measure, outcomes definitely less easy to measure (cf. Wilson, 1989), and the basic value of academic freedom has a prominent role to play. One would therefore assume that universities would most readily apply their reputational symbols to their research activities and less to their teaching/learning that is a relatively more typical instrumental activity.

We can also expect features of organizational environments to shape and create variation in reputation management. First, variation in the overall governance arrangement between universities and central government is likely to affect organizational behavior (Gornitzka & Maassen, 2011) producing cross-national variation. European/Nordic universities have historically in practice been rather independent of central ministries of education. The formal affiliation has, however, changed in European universities in the last decade towards more formal autonomy, meaning that universities in theory will experience less direct regulation and intervention from central government than, for example, ordinary public agencies (Fumasoli et al., 2014). Hence it is unlikely that universities will be very attentive to accountability relationships vis-à-vis central government.

One may, however, question whether more formal autonomy in fact implies more real autonomy for universities (Christensen, 2011; Weldin & Pallas, 2017). If steering at a distance in terms of formal status of the universities implies more auditing and other forms of performance-based regulation, then reputation management for universities can be expected to reflect the formal reporting requirements of central government or regulatory agencies (Gornitzka & Stensaker, 2014) in the same way that mission statements are also shaped by government (see Kosmutzky, 2012 for the case of Germany). If more formal autonomy is curbed by more resources having to be obtained from external public and private stakeholders, this can also be seen as part of a trend towards social embeddedness (Christensen, 2011). Or, if societal representatives are part of formal decision-making bodies at the universities, that may change decisions and orientations (Aberbach & Christensen, 2017). This could all mean

that the focus of reputation management will become both more intense and more diverse and attend to multiple audiences in the environment.

Second, in line with Veloutso et al. (2004), we can also see reputation as reflecting diverse kinds of environmental pressure for information, such as the reputation of the university and its programs more generally, the institutional infrastructure, the location of the university, the cost of studying, career prospects, quality of life during study, etc. The external face of universities will in this respect reflect university provision of key ‘market information’, allowing students to make an informed choice in competitive higher education markets. If that is the case we would expect the use of especially professional and performative symbols in reputation management to become more competitive, but moral symbols could also attract special groups.

Finally, the larger pressures from the institutional environments of universities should be considered as a shaper of reputation management. One can say with Chapleo et al. (2011) that branding reflects new university trends towards growing international cooperation, more mobility, globalization, new steering and management systems, and moving towards a knowledge society and new media. Reputation management would then comply with universal pressures to be identified, classified and certified as ‘world class’ according to a global script (Gornitzka & Maassen, 2011; Ramirez, 2010). This brings us to the core question of whether we will find convergence or divergence in reputation management when we compare the use of reputation symbols among universities, both when comparing between and inside countries.

Arguments for convergence would generally be that reputation management as such may be a global fashion which will make the self-presentation of universities more similar, i.e. they become isomorphic. Drori et al. (2013, p.143) use this argument in focusing on disembedded icons in the field of higher education. Kosmützky (2012, p.60) sees mission statements as a well-established organizational tool and an idea that has travelled from a business context to higher education (cf. Cziarnawska & Sevon, 1996). The question will further of course be convergence around which profiles or reputation types. Will universities be more similar regarding all types or some? Are we talking about convergence in types or content?

Arguments for divergence would be that different tasks and functions of universities give them different reputational profiles, as found by Morphew and Harley (2006, p.467) in their study of mission statements of American universities and colleges. Kosmützky (2012, p. 70–71) also found large variety in the mission statements of German universities and demonstrated a connection between organizational features and image. Delmestri et al. (2015,

p.122, 130) also find a lot of variation between countries in what they call abstract branding (university icons).

A third position would be a combination of convergence and divergence in reputation management. Bleiklie et al. (2011) argue, for example, that national profiles may both reflect and filter global trends (cf. Olsen, 1992). Delmestri et al. (2015, p.130) point to two arguments for a mixed pattern of convergence and divergence, namely a world society approach whereby the influence of corporate and market logic is uneven; likewise, organizational actorhood and institutional logics. Ramirez (2006b) makes a similar argument in reflecting on growing commonalities and persistent differences in higher education systems.

Since the book also contains some data on the development of reputation profiles over time, an added question would be how they will converge or diverge over time? Again, the argument for more convergence over time will be globalization mechanisms that lead to institutional isomorphism. In his book on time, policy and management, Pollitt (2008, p.16-17) relates time in public administration studies to two aspects. First, change processes – be it generational change, cultural change, organizational restructuring, training professional staff or making new political coalitions - take a long time. Second, contextual events in temporal sequences are important for the outcome, like internal leadership change or external crises. Overall, the change processes, like the ones stressed above, will lead us to expect convergence, while contextual events will lead to divergence.

Social embeddedness and the rationalization of the university.

Universities throughout the world are subjected to organizational demands that were earlier experienced by American universities. Universities will vary in their responses, embracing, resisting, or translating and editing these demands depending on varying national and local contexts (Sahlin & Wedlin, 2008). But it is clear that universities are under considerable pressure to imagine themselves as organizational actors—bounded entities with goals and strategies for attaining these goals and accountable for their pursuit of these goals (Krucken & Meier, 2008). To be sure, it is not only universities, but a range of organizations that face similar demands (Bromley & Meyer, 2017). Under the flags ‘world class’ and/or “best practices”, all sorts of not for profit institutions, including universities face pressures to deploy organizational discourse and create organizational structures to effectively communicate who they are and what they stand for. (Huang & Powell, 2009) These ‘presentations of self’ take place within a competitive organizational field made up of other organizational actors and a

growing number of stakeholders and consultants. Local and national actors roam this field but they are increasingly joined by consultants without borders and transnational organizations and markets (Marginson, 2006; Slaughter & Cantwell, 2012). This is the broader global context within which we study university reputation management and its professional and organizational correlates in different societies, that is the organizational structures intended as to put these ideas in place.

In what follows we briefly focus on American higher education as an organizational field and American universities as organizational actors. We do so because an idealized American university model appears to guide a lot of higher educational reforms worldwide. Ideas about accessibility, utility, flexibility, transparency, and accountability and their corresponding organizational structures percolated in the American context before they were theorized as best practices and linked to national progress and equity goals. These ideas and their organizational implications are in varying degrees globally and regionally promoted (European Commission, 2003, 2008) but also critiqued (Slaughter & Cantwell, 2012; Baert & Shipman, 2005). The theorization is clearly influenced by the dominance of American universities in world rankings (Altbach & Salmi, 2011) and the centrality of English as a *lingua franca* in academic circles. Understanding some core features of American higher education and their cultural foundations or historical roots is important, given the pressures on other higher educational systems to pursue routes less consistent with their cultural roots. Our discussion is guided by the following interrelated ideas. First, we contend that the American cultural and political matrix gave rise to the socially embedded universities therein earlier. Next, we contend that the more socially embedded universities were more likely to emerge and develop as organizational actors.

Universities have historically varied with respect to how much they are linked to state authorities as opposed to civil society and markets. They have also varied as regards how much authority was vested in professors operating like self regulating guilds versus university presidents leading organizations. In comparison to their European counterparts, American universities emerged as socially embedded entities, not shielded from social movements nor market forces by either the authority of states or by an influential senior professoriate (Ben David and Zlockzower, 1962; Clark, 1978, 1983). Much of the organizational development of the American university stems from its distinctive societal roots. But what was it about the American cultural matrix that gave rise to its once distinctive character, now globalizing as a model of excellence? From a macro political perspective, the starting point is to recognize that nation-building preceded state formation in American society (Huntington, 1968; Lipset, 1959).

National citizenship institutions flourished before the national state consolidated its authority. More concretely, the franchise was extended to white men earlier than similar developments in Western Europe whereas national bureaucracies emerged earlier in the latter (Huntington, 1968). In educational terms it is important to emphasize that throughout much of its history the United States did not have a national ministry of education. There was no national plan nor state steering that accounted for its rise and expansion as well as its organizational character. Its helter skelter development was not planned and involved an extraordinary degree of hustling for resources and legitimacy (Labaree, 2017). It is not surprising that in a very politically decentralized system one also found a very decentralized educational system. Political and educational decentralization facilitated the rise of a competitive market oriented system in which private higher education grew alongside public higher education. Indeed, much of its earlier growth has been attributed to its decentralized and competitive character, an environment within which social classes and status groups competed for access to universities and influence within them (Collins, 1979; Geiger, 2004).

But simply because a system is easily accessible does not explain why there was such a high demand for entry. True, there was an expanded supply of higher educational entities because state regulation was weak, thereby making it easier to create these entities. However, to make better sense of the high demand one needs to recognize that the wider culture did not only emphasize the centrality of individuals and their associations but also bred an overall optimism linking societal progress to individual development (Schudson, 1988). Today's education for all mantra (and increasingly that means higher education as well) was first an American emphasis. So, while European states constructed welfare programs to avoid class conflicts, easier access to post compulsory schooling was the American way, In lieu of emphasizing security for the working class, opportunity for all was the favored perspective in the United States (Heidenheimer, 1981). Easier access to higher education became the vehicle for opportunity in the United States. Easier access is now very much a global standard, as illustrated by higher educational expansion worldwide in the last half century (Schofer & Meyer, 2005).

But how did this affect the organization of higher education in the American context? First, it allowed for enormous experimentation in what could be thought of as knowledge worthy of higher education, that is flexibility and diversity as regards curricula. The Morrill Land Grant Acts created universities that would emphasize applied science to advance agriculture and manufacturing (Gelber, 2011). These curricular innovations as well as business studies would diffuse across public and private universities. The idea that not everyone was

suited for higher education lost track via the Morrill Acts, the GI bill after World War II, and lastly, through the civil rights movements in the sixties and seventies. More recently, ethnic, race, and gender studies also emerged and diffused (Rojas, 2007; Olzak & Kagan, 2008). The idea of the university in canonical terms fades as does a more homogenous profile of the university student and professor. This facilitates the emergence of diversity and inclusion discourse and organization in universities.

What yesterday's and today's curricular innovations have in common is the sense that universities ought to be empowering a greater number of different individuals via more flexible and relevant curricula. Yesterdays' poor rural white folks are today's women and people of color. The populists of the late nineteenth century protested against elitist higher education and argued for greater flexibility regarding admissions and curricula (Gerber, 2011). The contemporary critics point to universities as bastions of white male privilege and make similar demands regarding accessibility and diversity (Maher & Terrault, 2009).

Armed with utilitarian rationales but also with a growing logic of inclusion, the field of higher education was attuned to and influenced by developments in the wider society. That is, they were more socially embedded. Absent a national educational ministry or an dominant professoriate, universities were more able to respond to changing demands. Of course, it is precisely this lack of commitment to a cannon that is the object of critiques of American higher education, from Flexner (1930) to Bloom (1987). As Labaree (2017) repeatedly emphasizes, the point is not that the national climate fostered high quality higher education but rather that it facilitated the rise of a field of higher education deeply connected to its environment, that is the field of socially embedded universities.

Secondly, absent a steady source of national funding higher education entities, first the privates and later the publics as well, learned to engage in resource mobilization. In a competitive and optimistic environment, to survive and endure, universities had to rely on multiple sources of funding and legitimating constituencies, today called stakeholders. In addition to local government officials, universities were attuned to the interests and needs of local business and civic leaders as well as to the students of the universities and their parents. To survive universities were more likely to become organizational actors, entities with goals and strategies for attaining these goals and university leaders who could articulate the aims of their universities in ways that attracted support from multiple sources. Contemporary debates regarding entrepreneurial universities and the administrative or management logics within them mostly ignore the links between the historical roots of socially embedded universities and their more recent development and intensification. The latter clearly involves accelerated

efforts to pursue funds from multiple sources, leading to the establishment of university development or advancement offices (Skinner & Ramirez in this volume). But the quest for funding and the establishment of endowments starts in the late 18th century; the role Harvard played in becoming a leader and trend setter is well documented (Kimball & Johnson, 2012a and b). Consider, for example, the following exhortation from Harvard President Charles Elliott in 1906:

“In the competitions between American universities and between American and foreign universities, those universities will inevitably win which have the largest amount of free money....How is free money to be obtained?...The only way to increase the amount of such funds is to emphasize the urgent need of them, and to treat them with such steady consideration that they will have...an assured permanence as funds.” (p. 224 in Kimball & Johnson, 2012a; see also Kimball & Johnson, 2012b)

In this brief passage, Elliot imagines a field of higher education that is competitive and international. It is also one in which funding will be crucial to excellence. To be sure, universities have throughout their history depended on patronage, from popes and monarchs and ultimately stabilized in national state budgetary allocations. But the Elliot vision is about creating and expanding permanent funding as a university goal that is not time nor project specific sensitive. This is a vision about the university always fundraising motivated by the pursuit of excellence. Elliot went further and emphasized the importance of maintaining records of who donated and how their gifts were utilized. These are practices designed to display accountability, transparency, relevance, and impact, university identity displays in vogue throughout much of the world.

‘This early 20th century vision was an innovation but unlike most innovations that fail, it is now very much institutionalized in the US. Its institutionalization is reflected both in organizational discourse (e.g. job descriptions of university presidents often refer to fundraising expertise) and as organizational structure, e.g. formation of offices dedicated to fund raising.¹ Chief development or advancement offices are a feature of universities as organizational actors and are an increasingly professionalized presence in the organizational field of higher education’ (Croteau and Smith, 2011)

Lastly, the more socially embedded university and the more empowered individual within the university trigger legalization as unintended consequence. The latter arises in part to deal with conflict of interest issues that grow as universities interact with more stakeholders. These issues

¹ See Skinner & Ramirez in this volume

range from doctors in pharmaceutical boards or lawyers consulting with different interest groups to scientists with ideas that lead to innovations that have commercial value. How to manage conflicts of interest that do not harm university reputations call for effective communications often underpinned by legal advice. Whether the conflicts stem from increased ties with Wall Street, Silicon Valley, or political parties, these pose reputational risks and their management entails legalization. The latter is also driven by the expansion of entities with rights that may conflict with one another, professorial rights pitted against student rights or both sets of rights versus those of administrators.

To summarize, the American political and cultural matrix gave rise to a decentralized organizational field of higher education within which socially embedded universities competed for resources and sought to empower individuals with more flexible admission standards and more relevant curricula. Both of these developments indicate how much universities responded to their changing environments. This was not a context in which the identity or reputation of any one university could be taken for granted. Instead what this competitive context called for was more organization than was the case in the less competitive fields of higher education in Europe. This context led to the earlier expansion of higher education in the United States (Collins, 1979) but also to the earlier emergence of universities as organizational actors. The latter is illustrated in developments such as the university president as organizational leader, the emergence of new university subjects to attract different students, and greater organizational differentiation and formalization to cope with the challenges of empowering individuals and mobilizing resources. In the American context, this has led to the ascendancy of legal frameworks to deal with conflicts of interest that arise with greater links between universities and other stakeholders in industry and civil society. The rational legalization of the university is also a response to the empowerment of individuals and the clashes of rights that these generate.

Many of these developments have intensified in recent decades but they are grounded in the historical roots of American higher education. However, there have been global educational changes creating new “rules of the game” that need to be considered. It is now evident that higher educational expansion is compatible with political and educational regimes different from those that prevail in the United States. This finding is consistent with the neo-institutional idea that while differences are often important in accounting for first movers as regards the emergence of some policies or practices, once these become taken for granted virtues, diffusion follows regardless of the initial differences. So, once higher education is seen as a virtue for both individual mobility and national development, not surprisingly nation-states

commit themselves to the massification of higher education agenda. We also know that some curricular innovations earlier found in the United States have diffused. Wotipka and Ramirez (2008), for example show that women's studies have spread across many different national contexts. More broadly, Frank and Gabler (2006) in their cross-national study of faculty composition and curricular content in universities, reveal changes in the direction of more student centered and empowering content. Moreover, Oertel (2016) finds that diversity management offices and officers emerge in German universities, especially in the newer ones that presumably are more receptive of contemporary valorizations of diversity in higher education ideas. There is also evidence that European universities are today more engaged in reputation management (Christensen & Gornitzka in this volume) and more linked to consultants without borders eager to teach them how to secure additional funding. This is part of the overall professionalization of the university (Christensen & Klemsdal in this volume).

To conclude, the main thrust of our argument is that universities increasingly engage in reputation management discourse and organization, as they increasingly function more like organizational actors. That is, as universities set forth goals and plans to attain these, the more they are inclined to seek to communicate who they are, that is, to build and maintain reputations or identities. These university presentations of selves involve discursive accounts and sagas but also organizational structures that more formally anchor university reputations. We further contend that as universities become more socially embedded, more linked to and more responsive to multiple constituencies, universities begin to look like organizational actors in both discursive and structural terms. Universities face global, regional, and national pressures to become more socially embedded organizational actors and their responses reflect both their historical roots and the rules of the game fostered by their broader environments.

We do not propose to test this broader argument in this book. Instead we seek to examine its implications by first comparing reputation management in Nordic, Chinese, and American higher education. We then examine related organizational developments—development or advancement, diversity, and legal offices—in mass and elite American universities.

Method.

Web-census related to reputation management of universities in China, Norway and US.

We will describe the data and method related to the two different parts of the book. The first part is covering reputation management in a comparative perspective, while the other one

contains data from American universities. The more general aspect of the method will be presented both in a general way and related to each country/chapter.

The first part of the book is mainly covering different studies that are based on a comparison of self-presentations of universities in China, the Nordic region and U.S, using a web census as the main methodological approach. Although previously largely neglected in the literature, organizational websites are becoming a key data source in the study of branding and reputation management (Chapleo et al., 2011). Key studies of branding/reputation management in the Nordic countries have used website information in a structured way, of which Sataøen's (2014) study of Norwegian and Swedish higher education institutions' visions and core values is a prominent example. He uses university websites as one of three data sources.

In contrast to Sataøen's methodological approach, which consisted of collecting a broad range of statements categorized into 200 types of values, we have zoomed in on four sets of predefined categories or dimensions of reputation symbols as defined by Carpenter (2010) – performative, moral, professional and procedural. For all dimension, a score of 3 (high) meant not only mentioning the different kinds of symbols, but strongly emphasize them; a score of 2 (medium) meant mentioning them briefly or partly, while a score of 1 (low) meant there was little or mention. The following six specific headings on the websites of the universities were then selected: 1) history; 2) strategies, goals, vision, values; 3) research, including prioritized areas; 4) teaching/education; 5) other internal features (academic freedom, ethical guidelines, work environment); and 6) environmental features. We did this in order to tap differences in reputation management according to type of activities. The three chapters using this approach have these categories as a core, but vary somewhat in whether all reputation types are covered or concerning the labeling of the pragmatic categories of activities.

University websites are multilayered and reflect the central position that the WWW has for the internal and external activities of a university. Our data are drawn from the outer layers of the institutions' websites – i.e. the front pages of the university at the central level where the six headings we have selected are addressed. Given that the university as an organization is our unit of analysis, we do not cover how individual units, faculties/ schools/ departments, manage their reputation. Nor do we claim to cover the whole process of reputation management – how changes take place over time, how universities respond to threats to their reputations, how an organization constructs its presentation or how internal and external stake-holders are reacting to the reputation profiles.

In order to improve future replicability of this study, we must note some of the intricacies of collecting data through the web census method, a method which has been gaining

popularity in recent years since were officially accepted as a ‘primary point of access and communication between consumers and organizations’ (Powell et. al.,2016). That being said, all websites are different, and with university websites, the overall layout, web hierarchy and number of tabs does matter, for instance, just because of a tab with the same name (e.g. History) exists on two websites, it does not necessarily mean those have the same visibility or impact. Having to resort to the search function on these websites is not ideal, but occasionally necessary to get additional insight into certain dimension (for example the Strategic Planning dimension since those pages are rearranged by webmasters quite frequently). In general, however, our data was drawn from the outer layers of the universities’ websites (i.e. home pages), and the normal procedure was to allow for up to three clicks maximum in order to reach the desired section. The rational for doing that instead of using the search function for everything is that universities are making strategic decisions in terms of online reputation based on what information they make most visible to users, and we wanted to follow that organically.

China. The data from China were collected in the fall of 2016. We compare three categories of universities – high-, medium- and low-ranked, to have a look at their differences (see Table 1.1). We focus first on the 108 Chinese universities enlisted by the co-called Project 211 (aim is to develop about 100 universities to be world-class universities) for three reasons. These universities are representative in terms of academic focus, reputation, and geographic location. Second, the sampled universities are comparable. Last, the data on these universities are comprehensive and suitable for analyses reported in this study. The data are mainly from two sources. The reputation variables are manually coded by browsing universities’ official websites, like described above. Other variables about universities’ basic facts are from open data sources.

The size of universities is measured by two variables, one is the total number of students and staffs (highly correlated, $r=0.70$, $p<0.05$). The other is the total budgetary revenue and spending of the latest year (highly correlated, $r=0.96$, $p<0.05$). The two categories of size measures are also moderately correlated (r ranges from 0.40 to 0.60). We classify universities into three types by their prioritized disciplines or areas, including general or comprehensive (balanced in every discipline), science and engineering (natural and medical sciences), and others (including humanities and arts, social sciences). In our sample, the shares of the three types are 37, 35, and 28 percent respectively.

The ranking of universities is gauged by mainstream international and domestic university rankings. We divide universities into two categories by their relative standing in the rankings,

including (1) high-ranked, (0) medium-and-low-ranked. As a rule of thumb, we treat universities of the Project 985 as high-ranked (i.e., elite universities) and otherwise medium-and-low-ranked. In the sample, the portions of the two categories are 34 and 66 percent respectively.

The age of universities is measured by the number of years since their founding. For universities with a history of merging, splitting, and other reorganizing, we use their original founding year as the starting point. The earliest modern universities in China were founded in the 1890s (e.g., Wuhan University, Tianjin University, Jiaotong University), the late Qing Dynasty, while many were restructured after PRC's founding in 1949. As such we split the universities into old and young by the watershed of 1949, with 59 percent old and 41 percent young (founded in or after 1949).

Generally speaking, high-ranked universities were founded earlier (Mean=1926), recruiting more students (Mean=35769) and faculty members (Mean=3010), and earning (Mean=6.19 billion RMB) and spending more (Mean=5.01 billion RMB) than medium- and low-ranked universities. In terms of type, half of high-ranked universities are general or comprehensive (53.9%), and one third are science and engineering, with 12.8% of others.

Table 1.1 The sample of Chinese universities included, based on ranking

Variable	High	Medium	Low	Total
<i>N</i>	39	77	30	146
Percent (%)	26.7	52.7	20.6	100
The Project 985	Yes	No	No	
The Project 211	Yes	Yes	No	
Average age	91.3	80.1	80.8	83.2
Average founding year	1926	1937	1936	1934
Average students	35769	29081	23619	29712
Average faculty	3010	1763	1287	2005
Average revenue (100 million RMB)	61.9	19.5	7.9	29.5
Average spending (100 million RMB)	50.1	17.7	7.9	24.9
<i>Type:</i>				
General (%)	53.9	28.6	30.0	35.6
Engineering (%)	33.3	36.4	13.3	30.8
Others (%)	12.8	35.1	56.7	33.6

Nordic/Scandinavian countries. For the analysis in chapter 2 by Christensen and Gornitzka, , data from the websites of the sampled institutions in the four countries were gathered. The sample consists of five institutions per country (see table 1.2). To address the main research questions and expectations concerning what factors might affect reputation management in these kinds of organizations, we sampled organizations that vary in age and academic breadth/specialization, in addition to nationality. The data were collected for the periods April 2005 and 2015.²

Table 1.2 Sample of universities in the Nordic countries

Country	Type of institution				
	Old General	General	Specialized	'68-/post-war' universities	Young
Denmark	Copenhagen University (KU)	Aarhus University (AaU)	Technical University of Denmark (DTU)	Roskilde University (RUC)	Aalborg University (AaU)
Finland	University of Helsinki (UH)	University of Tampere (UTAM)	Aalto University (Aalto)	(University of Oulu (UOulu))*	University of Eastern Finland (UEF)
Norway	University of Oslo (UiO)	University of Bergen (UiB)	NTNU	University of Tromsø (UiTø)	University of Nordland (UoN)
Sweden	University of Gothenburg (GU)	University of Stockholm (SU)	Royal Technical College (KTH)	University of Umeå (UMU)	Linée University (LNU)

* This university does not really fit the '68-university' club, but belongs definitely to the post-war expansion category.

² The English versions of the websites are basically translations of the national languages.

The study in chapter 6 by Wæraas and Sataøen is based on an analysis of core values and core value statements from higher education institutions in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The core values were collected from the institutions' web pages from October to December 2017. All public and officially accredited universities and university colleges in Denmark, Norway and Sweden were included in the sample, except for educational institutions internal to specific departments or agencies (e.g. defense university colleges and police university colleges) or universities and university colleges not categorized as "scientific". In total, we included 81 higher education institutions in our sample, of which 32 are Swedish, 25 are Danish, and 24 are Norwegian.

From the total of 81 higher education institutions in Scandinavia, 36 universities and university colleges were found to have core values or core value statements, of which 14 are Swedish, 9 are Danish, and 13 are Norwegian (Table 1.3). This is less than half of the total number of institutions, but should be seen in connection with our strict selection criteria. For example, during the data collection, we noted a tendency for some universities to refer to a core value statement in their annual reports or web pages, but without actually showing it.³ These core value statements are not included here because they required more work than simply clicking on a few links; they were therefore not sufficiently visible. The average number of clicks necessary to access the core value statements was 2.89, with some cross-country variation (Table 1.3).

Table 1.3 Sample descriptives of Scandinavian universities

	Sweden	Denmark	Norway	Total
Institutions displaying core values	14	9	13	36
- Ordinary universities	5	6	4	15
- University colleges and professional colleges	9	3	9	21
Average clicks to access core value statements	3.14	2.44	2.92	2.89

US. The data for the American exploratory study in chapter 3, written by Gavriela and Ramirez, and was collected in the summer of 2017 (August to September) by building on ongoing

³ An example is Karolinska Institute, which stands for "responsibility, compassion, and holistic vision". These values could only be retrieved through the university's search engine and are not included in our data set.

research within the Stanford Comparative Higher Education Research Group. Methodology-wise it followed the same scheme as described above. To understand how online management works in US higher education context, we relied on two samples: (1) a randomly selected, nationally representative sample of 124 universities stratified by region (Northeast, Midwest, South and West) and institutional type (public, private); (2) and a non-representative sample of 28 elite universities commonly known as the ‘Ivy Plus’ institutions.

The random example was drawn from an extensive IPEDS-based dataset comprising over 1400 American universities and colleges to which we applied a two-stage random stratified sampling process, excluding institutions with less than 1000 students and dropping some additional 33 cases because of missing data on key institutional variables. The resulting sample size of 124 institutions reported below represents approximately 10% of the total population of US universities.

Table 1.4 Summary of institutions included in the two American samples (by region and institutional type)

Region	National sample		Elite sample	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
Northeast	10	23	2	15
Midwest	12	21	0	3
South	19	22	2	1
West	9	8	3	2
Total	124		28	

Social Embeddedness and Organizational Differentiation.

For the database that is used in the three chapters in this second section, universities have been selected from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), a quantitative survey conducted annually through the National Center for Education Statistics. The final sample is restricted to public and private four-year colleges and universities in the United States as defined by the Carnegie Classification (CC) system. This came to a set of 1444 universities and colleges in 2014.

To develop a manageable sample of universities for further study, we selected a random 20% sample of universities. To exclude very small universities, we dropped all universities with less than 1,000 full-time and part-time students in 2014. This excluded 161 universities

(~11%), which brought our total cases from 1444 to 1283. We also dropped 33 universities that were missing information regarding the institutional type variable. This brought the total cases to 1250. We then sorted the 1250 remaining universities into four regions, based on the U.S. Census regions (Northeast, Midwest, South, West). Once sorted, we further stratified the sample by whether the universities were public or private institutions in that region. We then took a representative sample of each region by institution type (Northeast Public, Northeast Private, Midwest Public, Midwest Private, South Public, South Private, West Public, West Private). One randomly selected university was dropped because it merged in 2014 with another university outside of the sample. This led to a selection of 238 universities, or a sample of 19%.

In addition to randomly selected stratified sample, we wanted to understand the role of the professionalization of the development office in elite universities, as these universities experienced this process early and to a very high level. To better understand this group, we

Table 1.5 Stratified sample of American universities by region and institution type.

Region	Public		Private		Total	
	Total	Sample	Total	Sample	Total	Sample
Northeast	103	19	226	44	329	63
Midwest	121	23	214	40	335	63
South	197	38	220	42	417	80
West	86	17	83	15	169	32
Total	507	97	743	141	1250	238

purposefully selected an assortment of “Ivy+” universities. The term “Ivy+” can have differing definitions, but often refers to the eight Ivy league schools and an assortment of other schools that are associated with the Ivy league due to affiliations, alumni, and endowments. The boundaries of which this classification varies, therefore we selected 28 schools⁴ most often listed to be as inclusive and broad in the definition as possible. Every university selected is a

⁴ Universities included under the Ivy+ designation are: Air Force Academy, Amherst College, University of California, Berkeley, Brown University, California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Duke University, Georgetown University, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Naval Academy, Northwestern University, Williams College, Princeton University, Smith College, Stanford University, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, University of Washington, Washington University in St. Louis, Wellesley College, West Point, College of William & Mary, and Yale University.

member of the Ivy+ Alumni Association. Out of the 28 schools, one was already in the random sample.

The outline of the book.

Part 1 is the introduction containing chapter 1 by T.Christensen, Å.Gornitzka and F.O.Ramirez, presenting first the major research questions of the project/book: What is typical for the reputation management of the universities, as reflected by their websites? What are the core symbols - related to their performance record, professional qualities, moral features and procedural features – balanced and changing over time? How is social embeddedness reflected in the institutionalization in universities over time of diverse organizational features, exemplified by the emergence of development offices, diversity units and legal units? What explains differences between universities with respect to reputation management and the institutionalization of new organizational units? Then the chapter systematically lines out the major analytical thoughts under the headings ‘reputation and reputation management’, ‘reputation management in universities – key expectations’ and ‘social embeddedness and the rationalization of the university’, followed by a method section covering the two main empirical parts and a chapter overview.

Part 2 - Reputation Management - is based on the same method – web census – and covers data from China, the Nordic countries and US. Chapter 2 by T.Christensen and Å.Gornitzka describes and analyzes the core symbols and how they are balanced in the reputation profiles of 20 universities in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden over time. The focus is on three sets of symbols related to their performance record, moral symbols and professional qualities. The analysis is based on differentiating the following categories of universities: old general, general, specialized, 68/post-war and young.

Chapter 3 by S.G.Gavrila and F.O.Ramirez examines the extent to which contemporary American universities make use of reputation management tools and symbols on their websites. The underlying assumption is that universities operating in an intense competitive market make strategic decisions about which aspects of their institutional identity or core activities to emphasize and will develop certain adaptations in order to maintain legitimacy (‘survive’) or gain competitive advantage (‘thrive’). In-depth analyses are made of six dimensions of reputation management are made – history, strategic planning, academics, internal and external environment. The data consist of a nationally representative sample of 124 universities and a subset of 28 highly-selected universities (the ‘Ivy Plus’ group).

Chapter 4 by Ma Liang and T.Christensen examines reputation management profiles of universities in China, and compare their strategies with other countries. A content analysis of 117 universities, 39 of whom are the top elite universities, and a subsample of 30 low-ranked universities, reveals that performative and professional symbols are much more presented in official websites than moral ones, suggesting reputation profiles different from the Western ones. Further, there are not much variety in reputation profiles among Chinese universities, which also is different from Western universities.

Chapter 5 by T.Christensen and L.Klemsdal focuses, first, on what is characterizing the historical trajectories of the educational profile and programs of sociology and political science at the University of Oslo related to how the professional aspects have been handled. The second part analyzes what characterizes, during the last two decades, how the two disciplines have presented their professional profile, as seen through their yearly reporting of these activities and the use of reputation and image building through their websites? Third, it's discussed how on can explain these development features related to the professional dimension seen from instrumental, cultural and symbolic perspectives based in organization theory.

Chapter 6. A.Wæraas and H.L. Sataøen examines the contents of reputation platforms used by Scandinavian higher education institutions. More specifically, they focus on core value statements as they are presented on these institutions' websites. Core value statements, which a lot of the institutions have, play a role in providing and maintaining organizational legitimacy, thereby satisfying differentiation and homogeneity requirements at the same time. It's a tendency that the unranked universities use more of core value statements than the ranked ones.

Part 3 - Social Embeddedness and Organizational Differentiation – is based on the same data selection for all universities analyzed. Starting from an extensive IPEDS-based dataset comprising over 1400 American universities a representative random example of 238 universities were selected. In addition a non-representative example of universities commonly known as the 'Ivy Plus' 28 universities were selected, called the 'elite' sample.

Chapter 7 by N.A.Skinner and Francisco O. Ramirez deals with the development office that is now an omnipresent feature of the American universities. U.S. universities employ teams of development professionals, sometimes with departments in the hundreds, to solicit funds from private donors. Recognition of the integration between development, communications, marketing, and the success in a university's entrepreneurial endeavors features frequently in the practitioner literature. Yet, there is a divide between the practitioner literature and philanthropic academic literature. This chapter attempts to breach that divide by examining the relationship between communications and institutional advancement by providing a descriptive

field-level analysis of the development office and leadership in the modern American university.

Chapter 8 by N.Kwak, S.G.Gavrila and Francisco O. Ramirez focuses on rationalization of the university by examining personnel arrangements and formal structures reflected in the appointment of a senior-level diversity/inclusion/equity officer (e.g. the Chief Diversity Officer) and the establishment of the diversity/inclusion/equity office or department. It aims to provide a broad picture of the current status of diversity commitment in the field of higher education and the cultural principles undergird such commitment. In doing so, it's deployed insights from the neo-institutional perspective in organizational theory. Given that the preavailing literature on diversity in higher education mainly focuses on individual experiences and individual-level outcomes, the aim is to fill the gap in the literature by highlighting the changes of institutions themselves that reflect *the organizational actorhood* of the college/university.

Chapter 9 by J.Furuta and Francisco O. Ramirez describes the legal rationalization of American higher education over the past several decades. As an organizational development that parallels other changes in American higher education, it's contended that legal offices and the development of university counsel roles as a professional field emerged and expanded in response to two trends: the development of stronger and more extensive linkages between universities and society for purposes like fundraising and knowledge production, and the rise of empowered individuals in colleges and universities (students, faculty, and staff) who are conscious of their rights as individuals.

Part 4 contains a reflective chapter 10 by B.Stensaker. Based on the different contributions in the book, it reflects upon the relationship between impression management and the internal organization of universities. The chapter acknowledges how universities are adapting to processes of formalization, rationalization and impression management. However, the chapter argues that the same drivers that trigger the development of stronger organizational actor-hood also open up for a possible positioning of the university as a socially responsible and moral institution where the cultural, social and economic purposes of the university are balanced. As such, the chapter identifies several paradoxes related to the current development where some of the inherent characteristics of the university may be re-invented.

References

- Aberbach, J.D., & Christensen, T. (2017). Academic Autonomy and Freedom under Pressure: Severely Limited, or Alive and Kicking? *Public Organization Review*, DOI 10.1007/s11115-017-0394-2.
- Altbach, P.G., & Salmi, J. (2011). *The road to academic excellence: Emerging research universities in developing and transition countries*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Baert, P., & Shipman, A. (2005). University Under Siege? Trust and Accountability in the Contemporary Academy. *European Societies*, 7(1), 157-186.
- Baumgartner, F., & Jones, B. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ben-David, J., & Zloczower, A. (1962). Universities and academic systems in modern societies. *European Journal of Sociology* 3(1): 45–85.
- Bleiklie, I. (2013). Comparing university organizations across boundaries. *Higher Education*, 67, 381-391.
- Bleiklie, I. & Michelsen, S. (2013). Comparing HE policies in European Structures and reform outputs in eight countries', *Higher Education*, 65(1), 113-133.
- Bleiklie, I., Enders, J., Lepori, B., & Musselin, C. (2011). New Public Management, Network Governance and university as a changing professional organization'. In T. Christensen & P. Lægreid (Eds.). *The Ashgate Companion to New Public Management*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bromley, P. & Meyer, J.W. (2015). *Hyper-Organization: Global Organizational Expansion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brunsson, N. (1989) *The Organization of Hypocrisy. Talk, Decisions and Actions in Organizations*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Carpenter, D. (2010). *Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carpenter, D. & Krause, G.A. (2012). Reputation and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 72(1), 26-32.
- Chapleo, C., Durán, M.V.C., & Díaz, A.C. (2011). Do UK universities communicate their brands effectively through their websites? *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 21(1), 25-46.

- Christensen, L.T., Torp, S., & Firat, A.F. (2005). Integrated marketing communications and postmodernity: An odd couple? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 10 (2),156-167.
- Christensen, T. (2011). University governance reforms: potential problems of more autonomy? *Higher Education*, 62(4), 503-517.
- Christensen, T. (2014). Global ideas and modern public sector reforms – a theoretical elaboration and empirical discussion of a neo-institutional theory. *American Review of Public Administration*, 42 (6), 635-653.
- Christensen, T., & Lodge, M. (2016). Accountability, transparency and societal security. In T. Christensen & P. Lægreid (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to accountability and Welfare State Reforms in Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., Roness, P.G., & Røvik, K.A. (2007). *Organization Theory and The Public Sector. Instrument, Culture and Myth*. London and NY: Routledge.
- Clark, B. (1972). The Organizational Sage in Higher Education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 178-84.
- Clark, B. (1978). Academic Differentiation in National Systems of Higher Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 22(2), 242-258.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. UK: Emerald Group.
- Cohen, M.D., & March, J.G. (1974). *Ambiguity and Leadership: The American College President*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society: A Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- Croteau, J., & Smith, Z. (2011). *Making the Case for Leadership: Profiles of Chief Advancement Officers in Higher Education*.
- Cyert, R. M. & March, J.G. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Czarniawska, B., & Sevón, G. (Eds.) (1996). *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- De Boer, H. F., Enders, J., & Leisyte, L. (2007). Public sector reform in Dutch higher education: The organizational transformation of the university. *Public Administration*, 85(1), 27-46.

- Delmestri, G., Oberg, A., & Drori, G. (2015). The unbearable lightness of university branding. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 45 (2), 121-136.
- Drori, G., Delmestri, G., & Oberg, A. (2013). Branding the university: relational strategy of identity construction in a competitive field. In P. Scott and L. Engwall (Eds.). *Trust in Higher Education Institutions*. London: Portland Press. (pp. 134-147).
- Easton, D. (1965). *The Political System. An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Knopf.
- Elsbach, K.D. & Kramer, R.M. (1996). Members' Response to Organizational Identity Threats: Encountering and Countering the Business Week Rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3), 442.
- Enders, J., de Boer, H., & Meyer, E. (2013). Regulatory Autonomy and Performance. The reform of higher education revisited. *Higher Education*, 65 (5), 5-23.
- Espeland, W.N., & Sauder, M. (2007). Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113 (1, July), 1-40.
- European Commission (2003). *The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge*. Brussels.
- European Commission (2008). *Fundraising from Philanthropy in European Universities*. Brussels.
- Flexner, A. (1930). *Universities: American, English, German*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fombrun, C.J. (2012). The Building Blocks of Corporate Reputation. In M. Barnett & T.C. Pollock (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Reputation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, D., & Gabler, J. (2006). *Reconstructing the University: Worldwide Changes in Academic Emphases over the 20th Century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Fumasoli, T., Gornitzka, Å., & Maassen, P. (2014). University Autonomy and Organizational Change Dynamics', Arena Working Paper 8: 1-33.
- Geiger, R.L. (2014). *The History of American Higher Education, Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gelber, S. (2011). *The University and The People: Envisioning American Higher Education in an Era of Populist Protest*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ginsburg, L. (2014). *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Gornitzka, Å., & Larsen, I.M. (2004). Towards professionalisation? Restructuring of administrative work force in universities. *Higher Education*, 47(4), 455-471.
- Gornitzka, Å., & Maassen, P. (2011). University governance reforms, global scripts and the "Nordic Model". Accounting for policy change? In J. Schmid, K. Amos, J. Schrader & A. Thiel (Eds), *Welten der Bildung? Vergleichende Analysen von Bildungspolitik und Bildungssystemen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Gornitzka, Å., & Stensaker, B. (2014). The Dynamics of European Regulatory Regimes in Higher Education: Challenged Prerogatives and Evolutionary Change. *Policy & Society: Journal of public, foreign and global policy*, 33(3), 177-188.
- Heidenheimer, A. (1981). Education and Social Security Entitlements in Europe and America. In P. Flora and A. Heidenheimer (Eds). *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America*. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp. 269-306).
- Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19 (4), 316-338.
- Huang, H., & Powell, W.W. (2009). The Rationalization of Charity: The Influences of Professionalism in the Non-Profit Sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(2), 268-98.
- Huntington, S. P. (1968). America versus Europe. In S. Huntington (Ed.). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ind, N. (2004). *Living the brand: How to transform every member of your organization into a brand champion*. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.
- Jungblut, J. (2015). Bringing political parties into the picture: a two-dimensional analytical framework for higher education policy. *Higher Education*, 69(5), 867-882.
- Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kosmützky, A. (2012). Between mission and market position: Empirical findings on mission statements of German higher education institutions. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18(1), 57-77.
- Krasner, S.D. (1988). Sovereignty. An Institutional Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*, 21 (1), 66-94.
- Krücken, G., & Meier, F. (2006). Turning the university into an organizational actor. In G. Drori, J.W. Meyer & H. Hwang (Eds). *Globalization and organization: world society and organizational change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp. 241-257).

- Labaree, D. (2016). *A Perfect Mess: The Unlikely Ascendancy of American Higher Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lipset, S. M. (1963). *The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective*. New York: W.W.Norton and Company.
- Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M.K. (2009). Diversity and Privilege. *Academe*, 95(1, Jan./Feb.): 17-20,3.
- March, J. G. (1994). *A Primer in Decision Making*. New York: Free Press.
- March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. (1976). *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget.
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J.P. (1983). Organizing Political Life. What Administrative Reorganization Tells Us About Government. *American Political Science Review*, 77 (2), 281-297.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of National and Global Competition in Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 52(1), 1–39.
- Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2) (September), 340–363.
- Morphew, C. C., & Hartley, M. (2006). Mission statements: A thematic analysis of rhetoric across institutional type. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77 (3), 456-471.
- Olsen, J. P. (1992). Analyzing Institutional Dynamics. *Staatswissenschaften und Staatspraxis*, 3, 247-271.
- Olsen, J.P. (2007). The Institutional Dynamics of the European University. In P. Maassen & J.P. Olsen (Eds.). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Oertel, S. (2016). Structure Determined by Imprinting: The Diffusion of Diversity Management in German Universities. Paper presented at the European Group of Organizational Studies in Naples.
- Olzak, S., & Kangas, N. 2008. Organizational Innovation: Establishing Racial, Ethnic, and Women's Studies Programs in the U.S. *Sociology of Education*, 81, 163–88.
- Portnoi, L., Bagley, S., & Rust, V. (2010). Mapping the Terrain: The Global Competition Phenomenon in Higher Education.n Rust, V., L. Portnoi, L., & S. Bagley (Eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and the Global Competition Phenomenon*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan. (pp.1-33)
- Powell, W.W., Horvath, A. & Brandtner, C. (2016). Click and Mortar: Organizations on the Web. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36,101-120

- Ramirez, F.O. (2006a). The Rationalization of the University. In M.-L. DeJelic & K. Sahlin-Anderson (Eds.), *Transnational Governance: Institutional Dynamics of Regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ramirez, F. O. (2006b). Growing Commonalities and Persistent Differences in Higher Education: Universities Between Globalization and National Tradition. In H.-D. Meyer & B. Rowan (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Education: Advancing Research and Policy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Ramirez, F. O. (2010). Accounting for Excellence: Transforming Universities Into Organizational Actors. In V.Rust, L. Portnoi & S.Bagely (Eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and The Global Competition Phenomenon*. Palgrave. (pp. 54-75)
- Ramirez, F.O., & Christensen, T. (2013). The formalization of the university: rules, roots, and routes. *Higher Education*, 65(6), 695-708.
- Readings, B. 1996. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ramirez, F., Meyer, J.W., & Lerch, J. (2016). World Society and the Globalization of Educational Policy. In K. Mundy, A.Green, R.Lingard & A.Verger (Eds.), *Handbook on Global Policy and Policy Making in Education*. Wiley Blackwell. (pp. 43-63)
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rindova, V.P., & Martins, L. (2012). Show Me the Money: A Multidimensional Perspective on Reputation as an Intangible Asset. In M. Barnett & T.C. Pollock (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Reputation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rojas, F. (2007). *From Black Power to Black Studies: How a Radical Social Movement Became an Academic Discipline*. Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Røvik, K.A. (2002). The Secrets of the Winners: Management Ideas That Flow. In K. Sahlin-Andersson & L. Engwall (Eds.). *The Expansion of Management Knowledge – Carriers, Flows and Sources*. Stanford. CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sataøen, H.L. (2014). Åpne, mangfoldige og respektfulle? Visjoner og kjerneverdier i norske og svenske høyere utdanningsinstitusjoner' (Open, diverse and respectful? Visions and core values in Norwegian and Swedish higher educational institutions). *Högre utbildning*, 4, 95-108.
- Sahlin, K., & Wedlin, L. (2008). Circulating ideas: Imitation, translation and editing. In R. Greenwood, K. Sahlin-Andersson & R. Suddaby (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. London: Sage. (pp. 218-242).

- Schofer, E. & J. W. Meyer. (2005). The Worldwide Expansion of Higher Education. *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 898-920.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Shavelson, R. (2008). *The Quest to Assess Learning and Hold Higher Education Accountable*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1957) *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Slaughter, S., & Cantwell, B. (2012). Transatlantic moves to the Market: United States and the European Union. *Higher Education*, 63(5), 583-606.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smelser, N., & Alexander, J. (Eds)(1999). *Diversity and Its Discontents: Cultural Conflict and Common Ground*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Stinchcombe, A. (1965). Social Structure and Organizations. In J. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally. (pp.142–193).
- Van Riel, C.B.M., & Fombrun, C. (2007). *Essentials of corporate communications*. London: Routledge.
- Veloutsou, C., Lewis, J.W., & Paton, R. (2004). University selection: information requirements and importance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18 (3), 160 – 171.
- Wedlin, L., & Pallas, J. (2017). Styrning och frihet - en ohelig allians?. In L. Wedlin and J. Pallas (Eds), *Det ostyrda universitetet?* Stockholm/Göteborg: Makadam Förlag. (pp. 9-37).
- Wilensky, H.L. (1964). The Professionalization of Everyone? *American Journal of Sociology* 70 (2, Sep.), 137-158.
- Wilson, J.Q. (1989). *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wotipka, C. M., & Ramirez, F.O. (2008). Women's Studies as a Global Innovation. In D. Baker & A. Wiseman (Eds). *The Worldwide Transformation of Higher Education*. Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI Press. (pp. 89-110).
- Wæraas, A., & Byrkjeflot, H. (2012). Public Sector Organizations and Reputation Management: Five Problems. *International Public Management Journal*, 15(2), 186-206.
- Wæraas, A., & Maor, M. (2015). Understanding Organizational Reputation in a Public Sector Context'. In A. Wæraas & M. Maor (Eds.). *Organizational Reputation in the Public Sector*. New York: Routledge.

Wæraas, A., & Solbakk, M.N. (2009). Defining the essence of university: lessons from higher education branding. *Higher Education*, 57(4), 449-462.