The Marketisation of Higher Education

Concepts, Cases, and Criticisms

Edited by
John D. Branch · Bryan Christiansen

Marketing and Communication in Higher Education

This series seeks to critically address marketing and communication related issues in higher education. The series aims to be broad in scope (any aspect of higher education that broadly connects with markets, marketization, marketing and communication) and specific in its rationale to provide critical perspectives on higher education with the aim of improving higher education's emancipatory potential.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15431

John D. Branch · Bryan Christiansen
Editors

The Marketisation of Higher Education

Concepts, Cases, and Criticisms

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
John D. Branch
Ross School of Business
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Bryan Christiansen
Global Research Society, LLC
Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Contents

List of Figures

Chapter 7

Chapter 9

Chapter 10

Chapter 12

Chapter 14

Chapter 15

List of Tables

Chapter 12

Chapter 13

Chapter 17

Introduction

Kai Peters

1 The Introduction of Higher Education

> *No better text for a History of Entrepreneurship could be found than the creation and development of the modern university, and especially the modern American university.*
>
> Peter Drucker

The business origin of universities can still be seen in academic dress today. Indeed, professors' gowns originate in the robes of the mendicant medieval monks who taught in early European universities. Their sewn-up under-sleeves with an opening above, still prominent in most universities, were used to collect the alms and donations from the students who attended professors' classes. Medieval student satisfaction was measured in terms of immediate performance-based compensation (Rossano, 1999). It is fair to say, therefore, that professors and universities more generally have been in business since the beginning of universities.

K. Peters (✉)
Coventry University, Coventry, England, UK
e-mail: ac5701@coventry.ac.uk

1

What has changed significantly, however, is that the full force of the market has come to bear on all aspects of the institution: intense marketing, commissions for student acquisition, strong centralised financial control, complex group structures to maximise income, minimisation of costs, tax avoidance, and work-force flexibility through hourly paid lecturers and the related precariat.

Much has been written about the marketisation of higher education, with various authors pointing to related originating causes. Most of the highly referenced articles such as Jongbloed (2003) whose case explored the marketisation of higher in the Netherlands, point to the role of the state, and suggest that in creating a market for higher education, social engineering and additional control were the driving factors. Writing about the United Kingdom, Furedi (2010) and Brown (2011) come to a similar conclusion. A related body of literature including Tomlinson (2017), Bunce (2017), and Nixon et al. (2018) point out that marketisation has led to students seeing themselves as 'consumers' of education. Most recently, McClure et al. (2020), Sporn (2020), and Brown (2020) reluctantly acknowledge that marketisation has occurred, and competition and privatisation is the new normal. While government policy has played a significant role in the shift to marketisation, one is left with a feeling that 'it has been done to us' by the state. There is, however, another perspective which is under-represented in the literature. In this introductory chapter, therefore, I should like to focus on three non-state areas which I believe deserve further attention when considering marketisation: the role of rankings, the advent of mergers and acquisitions, and the need to professionalise management.

2   Rankings

The shift from markets to marketisation, I contend, occurred with the 1988 advent of business school rankings in the American magazine *Business Week*. While not the first ranking of business schools or universities—everyone loves a list, after all—the *Business Week* rankings set off a chain of events which have altered the higher educational landscape for good in some ways, but for bad in many others.

Writing in 2005, Andy Policano, Dean Emeritus of both the business school at the University of Wisconsin in Madison and the business school at the University of California, Irvine stated that:

[f]ew people can remember what it was like before 1988—what I call the year before the storm (of *Business Week* rankings). It was a time when business school deans could actually focus on improving the quality of their schools' educational offerings. Discussions about strategic marketing were confined mostly to the marketing curriculum. PR firms were hired by businesses, not business schools. Many business schools had sufficient facilities, but few buildings had marble floors, soaring atriums, or plush carpeting. Public university tuition was affordable for most students, and even top MBA programs were accessible to students with high potential but low GMAT scores.

Since the 1988 launch, business school deans have had to come to terms with the myriad issues which are led by the MBA rankings. As noted, John Byrne launched them in 1988, when he was at *Businessweek*. They were followed closely by *U.S. News & World Report* in 1990, and latterly by the *Financial Times* in 1999. In addition to these 'big MBA rankings', many other national and international rankings are also influential.

Writing in the *Journal of Management Development* in 2007, I showed why rankings matter. I calculated a 'rankings vs tuition' line of best fit MBA programmes. It clearly demonstrated that a significant price premium existed for the top schools, as did a tremendous increase in enquiries and applications for the top 20 schools. It was absolutely clear that excellent rankings led to increased demand, and an ability to increase prices. Because the rankings are not only theatre, but also big business, schools dissect each criterion, and try to optimise each one.

Consequently, 'working the rankings' in this way is now common. Students get admitted because their pre- and post-MBA salaries will maximise economic value-added, advisory boards are designed specifically to maximise internationalism and gender diversity, and professors are rewarded massively for publishing in the journals which count towards rankings. Perhaps some of these factors really do add value to a business school. Alas, it does not always stop there, and schools have also been caught by auditors from the Big 4 'gaming the rankings', which unfortunately have become a feature of the rankings world.

MBA rankings are largely international, whereas undergraduate rankings, or 'league-tables' as they are called in the United Kingdom, are more nationally oriented, because the largest numbers of undergraduate students are recruited nationally. In the United Kingdom, these rankings really began in earnest some years after the MBA rankings theatre

began. The *Times* ranking began in 1992, the *Guardian* in 1999, and the *Complete Universities Guide* in 2007. As with the MBA rankings, there are many more publications which have been in the rankings business over the years.

Given that rankings not only move markets but also shift publications, it is surprising that overall university rankings only began in the early 2000s. The Academic Ranking of World Universities by Shanghai Jiao Tong University began in 2003, and was quickly followed in 2004 by the ever-enterprising duo of Nunzio Quacquarelli and Matt Symonds—the Q and S of *QS*. The *QS* ranking originally appeared in the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, but its managers soon thought that they could do things better themselves, and went their separate way. *QS* remains in business, and claims 50 different ranking variants in its portfolio. The *Times Higher Education* launched its own set of rankings in 2010, and has repositioned itself from a news magazine about higher education to a data metrics business about higher education. It has increased its market value logarithmically by doing so.

University Presidents/Vice-Chancellors obsess as much about the *THE* and *QS* global university rankings as business school Deans worry about *Bloomberg*, *Businessweek*, and the *Financial Times*. Indeed, rankings have now been a core feature in the world of higher education in general for the past 30 years. There are lists for pretty much everything an institution does, from undergraduate through postgraduate research, and from research through to student experience, which ranks institutions on, among other things, the price of a pint of beer, and how good the parties are.

The introduction of the broader rankings game has altered the business school and university context extensively. Over the past few decades, university groups have become more complex and complicated—with multiple faculties and schools, multiple locations, and multiple audiences, all of which are developed in order to cope with marketisation.

Even at the more mundane level of individual universities, complexity is increasing. Many institutions work across multiple sites, bridging urban and suburban campuses. Add to this feeder foundation year activities, online education, international campuses, partnerships, and validation activities. And for another layer of complexity, consider the different products and services ranging from 'business to consumer products' like undergraduate and post-graduate pre-experience degrees, through post-experience programmes, and part-time programmes for working

professionals ('business-to-business consumer products'), right along to business-to-business executive education where corporate learning and development managers purchase education on behalf of their staff members.

Within each of these product-market combinations, universities are faced with a plethora of make or buy decisions. The market can provide a stream of foundation year students and student housing via companies like INTO and Study Group; new students via the global network of agents; online solutions via Pearson, Keypath, or Future Learn among others; and even a steady supply of hourly paid lecturers.

Lastly, scale these elements up to a global level. At last count, there are close to 200 countries in the world. Many of these countries are involved in international student mobility either as exporters or importers of students. In some countries, direct student recruitment is possible. In most countries, however, educational agents intermediate between the university and the school. To note here also is that the 'arkets'in the various countries are not homogenous. Indeed, it is in a smaller selection of countries where online education or adult executive education market opportunities exist.

Consequently, one can view the managerial challenges of the more complex institutions as a three-dimensional Rubik's cube with one axis representing products, another locations, and a third markets. Defining the suitable strategies and structures for institutional success, alas, is neither simple nor well developed in, it is my contention, most universities in the world.

3   Mergers and Acquisitions

Many roads led to multi-campus, multi-activity universities. In some cases, especially in a number of states in the United States, the whole public university system was created with co-ordination and overall state-wide governance as the goal. In other cases, institutions were brought together through mergers, often specified by policies which were instigated by local, regional, or national governments. In France in particular, funding which had previously been provided to local business schools by local chambers of commerce began to dry up, thereby leading to new constellations of multi-location institutions.

In the aforementioned cases, the mergers were driven from above. In other cases, mergers occurred in more of a 'mergers and acquisitions'

manner to achieve critical mass. Invariably there was the acquirer and the target. Taking place mostly in the private sector and often (but not solely) originating from for-profit educational groups from the United States or the United Kingdom, a 'buy and build' strategy has been pursued. In some cases, the portfolio of schools has become significant, and invariably the institutions which were acquired have covered a wide range of subjects and degree levels. Lastly, many individual institutions have expanded to the point where they have become small groups in and of themselves, having added suburban or urban campuses, international locations, and online activities.

The first mentions of multi-location, multi-activity institutions occurred in 1971 and 1975 (Lee and Bowen). They were concerned with multi-campus state systems in the United States—California and North Carolina, for example. Pineiro and Nordstrand Berg (2016) bring the issue up to date through a survey of subsequent literature. Some of the definitions which are cited are quite amusing. Kerr (2001) defines a multi-campus university as having more than one campus. Nicolson (2004) similarly, notes that campuses must be in different places to be defined as having multiple campuses. Their own interest is in multi-campus universities rather than in multi-campus systems. Here, they note that "little is known, however, regarding the complexities and tensions associated with the rise of multi-campus universities, and the possible mechanisms to handle this" beyond some general goals. Multi-campus universities exist to (1) meet multiple objectives, while (2) optimising management. But there is a whole range of challenges: impersonal relations and inequalities among audiences, little cohesion among alumni, gaps between administration and academic co-ordination, bureaucracy, and poor support services.

Nicolson (2004) lists the co-ordination tasks which are faced by multi-campus managers. Indeed, they must develop common goals among the various campuses, pay attention to the local goals of different groups of students and faculty members, ensure that the curriculum is consistent, ensure that professional support services are consistent, and ensure that geographically disparate staff members can meet each other. That said, Nicolson notes that the key to multi-campus systems lays in the individual campuses themselves, and their ability to respond to local needs.

Johnstone (1999) attempts to itemise the role of central administration in a United States-based multi-campus system, rather than in a multi-campus university… although many of the points are relevant in both.

The core tasks are to define the mission of the system and of the individual entities within the system, hire and dismiss senior managers across the system, allocate financial resources, optimise professional services, ensure quality control in teaching and research, arbitrate disputes across the system, and liaise with stakeholders in government and industry. As Pineiro and Nordstrand Berg (2016) noted, "this means that a core issue within multi-campus universities lies in finding the right balance between *centralisation* (system) and *autonomy* (campuses)".

4 MANAGEMENT

If one turns to the professional service firm literature, one can find some guidance for the management of these ever more complex higher education institutions. Von Nordenflycht (2010) defines a professional service firm as displaying three particular characteristics: knowledge intensity, low capital intensity, and a professionalised workforce.

Greenwood et al. (2010) provide a succinct historical overview of the structural changes which have taken place within professional service firms over the past years. Focusing specifically on accounting firms, the authors defined a number of developmental phases. In phase one, professional service firms served local clients from local offices. Each office was more or less self-contained, and the firm was made up of the various offices in a specific geographical area. Coordination was managed by the 'national firm' which provided broad-based marketing, and covered clients who needed national support. The second phase arose as clients required increasingly international services. National professional service firms merged internationally to follow their clients' dispersion. Given the increasing size and geographic spread, firms instituted global headquarters' to assure coordination across multiple national jurisdictions, and to take responsibility for strategic issues like further internationalisation.

Phase three came into play as the firms realised that a new 'axis of specialisation' along industry lines was required, especially because clients increasingly expected in-depth knowledge about their industries and their markets. Relatedly, the professional service firms noted that requests from clients were no longer just about the 'compliance' issues which were the historical trigger for the accounting firms, but were seeking advisory services for transactions like mergers and acquisitions. Finally, by the mid-1990s, professional service firms had arrived at a multiplex organisational

form which comprised one axis along geographic lines, one along industry specialisations, and the third along lines of service.

Tensions can immediately be seen. There is the challenge of national versus international orientation, especially given that professionals have their core affiliation with a 'home' office. The second tension is between the normative compliance approach of the traditional core business, and the industry- and market-orientation among the strategic consulting partners. These challenges are manifested in the challenge of creating incentive systems which encourage cooperation and collaboration across business lines and geographies.

To address these challenges, four key principles have been adopted by professional service firms: the creation of multiple axes of expertise; the facilitation of crisscrossing, nascent communities of professionals; the implementation and prioritising of a client management system; and the development of a culture of reciprocity. Much of the creation of these multiplex communities is the result of concerted talent management and organisational development efforts which socialise these values. Concentrated hiring efforts ensure a certain homogeneity of staff members. Extensive training and role-modelling reinforces desired practice. Promotion is dependent on having worked in international cross-functional teams, and reward systems are designed to divide up revenue across the various parties which have contributed to each project. Lastly, where the professional service firms are a partnership, year-end profits are shared across the firm's partners rather than on local office performance.

Skjølsvik et al. (2017) summarised and presented an extensive survey of the professional service firm literature. They analysed 226 articles which were published between 1991 and 2015, noting the theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, industries, and geographical contexts. They point out that any homogenous approach to professional service firm definitions fails when confronted with organisational realities. The only honest academic approach to the field is to reflect on the themes which emerge. The following table summarises their findings.

Von Nordenflycht (2010) summarised professional service firms in a more pithy manner. He noted that there really are two core management challenges in professional service firms. The first is 'cat herding' and the second is 'opaque quality', which surely will be familiar to anyone in higher education.

With the exception of a thorough chapter by Thomas et al. (2013) who compared business schools to professional service firms, there is nothing

else of note which covers this terrain. This is really a pity, because there is much to learn from these adjacent organisations. If one reviews the breadth of institutions in the higher education domain, those which are commercially orientated might leave many things to be desired academically, but they have taken many business lessons to heart. Robertson and Komljenovic (2016) looked specifically at a number of case studies on the making of higher education markets, and noted how organisations including INTO, a provider of foundation year education and housing, and also Laureate, a commercial higher education group which in 2015 had 950,000 students who enrolled across 75 campuses in 29 countries (It has recently been contracting due to financial challenges which have affected many aggressive private higher education groups.) organise themselves. Others, especially the increasing numbers of multi-campus, multi-activity institutions are also grappling with these issues.

5   Concepts, Cases, and Critiques

Higher education institutions, whatever one might wish to think, have always operated in markets. Now they have become marketised through and through. Indeed, all institutions must acquire resources—through tuition, research contracts, or other sources. They are subject to the laws of the market, like any other 'economic actor'. And as such they must operate strategically, choosing when, where, and how to play... and risk going bankrupt if they are not managed well.

As proof of this market logic, the Department of Education's Federal Student Aid database notes that since 1984, more than 12,000 branch campuses and entire institutions have gone bankrupt in the United States alone. The 2008–2009 recession wreaked havoc on higher education systems around the world. And I grimace to think of the many institutions which will doubtless be financial victims of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This anthology, therefore, is a timely and valuable contribution to the literature on the marketisation of higher education. Indeed, it explores the nature, scope, and consequences of the marketisation of higher education, by (1) enumerating various policies for stimulating and regulating the marketisation of higher education, (2) identifying numerous practices which constitute the marketisation of higher education, and (3) discussing different perspectives on the marketisation of higher education. The anthology takes a global perspective, with no single geographic

focus. Similarly, it adopts a holistic approach, examining the marketisation of higher education along multiple dimensions, and subscribing to the notion that the marketisation of higher education both drives, and is driven by, the universities of which the higher education market is comprised.

The call for chapters which was posted in early 2019 yielded almost 30 submissions from around the world. The subsequent review and re-submission process resulted in the 16 chapters which follow. As I know from experience, however, a significant challenge when editing an anthology is developing a device for structuring its chapters, even when they all share a common theme. The editors teased out different characteristics of the 16 chapters, and considered matrices, triangular models, and even a framework which was inspired by Adam Smith, the father of market-based economics. In the end, however, they settled on a relatively simple and unit-dimensional categorisation scheme which classifies the 16 chapters according to three themes: concepts, cases, and critiques. Specifically, Chapters 2–6 conceptualise the marketisation of higher education. Chapters 7–13 present cases of the marketisation of higher education. And Chapters 14–18 critique the marketisation of higher education.

Chapter 2 explores the ideological antecedents, processes, and outcomes of the marketisation of higher education, with an emphasis on business schools in particular. The chapter begins with a discussion of the theory of Scandinavian New Institutionalism in the context of higher education, explaining how ideologies spread across nations and fields through adoption and adaptation. It then elaborates the ideologies of neoliberalism and managerialism, and their relation to New Public Management. The chapter continues by elucidating the processes which are related to marketisation—namely commodification, corporatisation, and de-professionalisation. It then enumerates the various outcomes of the marketisation of higher education. Finally, the chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

Chapter 3 examines how higher education systems are currently being influenced by the ideas of new public management. With the aid of a systematic literature review, it maps the use of post-new public management governance concepts in the higher education context, including network governance and the neo-Weberian state.

Chapter 4 discusses e-learning, the branding and marketing of higher education institutions, and disruptive innovation in higher education. It provides university leaders a guide to decision-making, especially with

respect to the acquisition of new students, and the implementation of an e-learning platform via a 'build your own' model, a 'buy vendor services' model, or a 'collaborate with a corporate partner' model.

Chapter 5 provides a brief overview of current studies of the concept of university social responsibility. It then addresses the question of how private universities can utilise university social responsibility in their marketing efforts, and to achieve competitiveness in their higher educational markets.

Chapter 6 explores the confluence of economic income and marketisation, likewise drawing on the concept of university social responsibility. It enumerates the characteristics of university social responsibility, and identifies the emerging trends towards a global education with a social focus. And it analyses the way in which universal social responsibility can provide a balance for higher education institutions between their institutional vision, the economic pressures of the market, and the increasingly important environmental, cultural, social, and economic demands.

Chapter 7 investigates the English language version of the Turkish Council of Higher Education's website *Study in* Turkey, as part of the continuing internationalisation process of higher education in Turkey. It attempts to justify the initiative, clarify its objectives, delineate its applicable contexts, and illuminate future directions for its use.

Chapter 8 describes the internationalisation of higher education in Russia, specifically its ongoing efforts to compete for students in the increasingly global market for intellectual talent. It demonstrates that the lack of a comprehensive state policy for internationalisation has resulted in a kind of intuitive exploitation by Russian educational entities, and a prevalence of a quantitative rather than a qualitative to internationalisation.

Chapter 9 discusses attempts to unpack massification, privatisation, internationalisation, and financing in the context of Indian higher education. It illustrates the impact of neoliberal forces on the higher education system in India, and provides Indian administrators and policy-makers with advice on re-orienting higher education institutions in India towards the needs of learners.

Chapter 10 documents the digital transformation of the commercial department of a Peruvian business school. It presents three determining elements for the implementation of change and the improvement of internal processes: organisational culture, change management, and

digital transformation. It describes the commercial area of the business school, and details the six phases which were conducted during the process of its digital transformation. Finally, the chapter ends by presenting a summary of the lessons which were learned as a result of the digital transformation of the commercial department of the business school.

Chapter 11 uses new institutionalism and Foucault's notion of discipline to reframe the well-known story of Northeastern University and its President Richard Freeland. Specifically, it presents the case of Northeastern and its transformation from regional teaching-oriented university to national research university. It argues that Freeland used various marketisation mechanisms, in conjunction with university rankings, to achieve this transformation.

Chapter 12 investigates the gender differences in managerial practices across three Nordic countries: Finland, Norway, and Sweden. It analyses two aspects: (1) perceptions regarding competition, and (2) motivations for undertaking academic work. The chapter is based on an empirical dataset which was compiled from national surveys (conducted in 2015 and 2016) of senior academic staff (professors, associate professors, and academic leaders), which aimed to assess the perceived effects of recent government-led reforms which focused on performance management and managerial practices.

Chapter 13 explores the determinants of international student mobility in higher education in the United Kingdom, using a large panel data set at the country level. The empirical results from the model suggest that home country economic wealth and population, relative exchange rate, bilateral trade and historic/linguistic links, and the United Kingdom government policy are the most significant determinants for international student inflows. More importantly, the results reveal that the determinants are heterogeneous for developed and developing home country groups.

Chapter 14 addresses the problems of the universal treatment of English medium instruction, by exploring and illustrating how English medium instruction is used variably by educational institutions in different countries (with a particular focus on Turkey) for marketing their higher education programmes. It analyses the commercialisation of education from the Polianyian perspective, and the emergence of English medium instruction particularly in countries which had no history of colonisation and traditional English-language associations. It presents the specific case of Turkey, where English medium instruction is marketed aggressively.

It concludes with some practical suggestions for increasing the quality of English medium programmes.

Chapter 15 reviews service quality issues in the context of higher education. More specifically, it reviews the progression of the literature on service quality in the higher education sector, thereby leading to the development of a holistic model on this topic. The review focuses on only empirical findings. Based on theses findings and the holistic model, it provides directions for future research which can potentially fill research gaps in the literature.

Chapter 16 questions the prevailing wisdom that higher education is the primary and most important tool in promoting social mobility and reducing income inequality. Indeed, it underlines the emerging evidence that higher education, rather than being a tool of social mobility, now reinforces income and wealth inequality. The chapter points out that the marketisation of higher education, and the corresponding reduction in state funding per-capita, have reduced its value as a discriminant of talent and capability. Similarly, it proposes that assessment by coursework favours students with wealthier and educated parents.

Chapter 17 investigates how recent developments in European higher education resemble the current state of the most popular sport on earth: football. It begins by showing how both football and higher education, as organisational fields, have emerged as deeply embedded entities within national and/or local contexts, with only weak links to the transnational environment. It continues, however, by further showing that with global marketisation processes gradually coming to the fore, both fields have become subject to convergence pressures, including de-contextualisation as a result of the rise of global markets.

Chapter 18 enumerates some of the challenges and drawbacks which are associated with the ongoing worldwide process of marketisation (neoliberalisation) in higher education. It advances the idea that the requirements—particularly the managerial and labour force needs of a new economy—cannot be satisfied adequately under the approaches and methods which are used by a traditional university. The chapter addresses (1) some of the problems and shortcomings in the triple-helix model of university-industry-government collaborations, (2) the transformation of students into customers and professors into entrepreneurial workers, highlighting the many drawbacks of such strategies, (3) the hegemony of

rankings as procedures of surveillance and control, and (4) the many criticisms posed against neoliberalisation in higher education and the possible alternatives looking to the future.

References

Brown, R. (Ed.). (2011). *Higher Education and the Market*. Routledge.

Brown, R. (2020). Markets and Marketization in Higher Education. In N. Teixeira et al. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of international higher education systems and institutions* (pp. 2037–2043). Springer.

Bunce, L., Baird A., Jones, S. E. (2017). The student as consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education, 2*(11), 1958–1978.

Furedi, F. (2010). Introduction to the Marketisation of Higher Education and the Student as Consumer. In M. Molesworth., R. Scullion., & E. Nixon, (Eds.), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 1–7). New York and London: Routledge.

Greenwood, R., et al. (2010). The organizational design of transnational professional service firms. *Organizational Dynamics, 39*(2), 173–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2010.01.003.

Johnstone, D. B. (1999). Management and leadership challenges of multicampus systems. In Gerald H. Gaither (Ed.), *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects* (pp. 3–20). Stylus Press.

Jongbloed, B. (2003). Marketisation in higher education, Clarks triangle and the essential ingredients of markets. *Higher Education Quarterly, 57*(2), 110–135. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2273.00238.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Harvard University Press.

McClure, K. R., Barringer, S. N., & Travis Brown, J. (2020) Privatization as the New Normal in Higher Education. In L. Perna (Ed), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 589–666). Basel: Springer International.

Nicolson, R. (2004). The management of multicampus systems. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 18*(2), 346–358. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v18i2.25474.

Nixon, E. et al (2018). Her majesty the student: marketized education and the narcissistic (dis)satisfactions of the student-consumer. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(6), 927–943.

Pineiro, R., & Nordstrand Berg, L. (2016). Categorizing and assessing multicampus universities in contemporary higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management, 23*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1205124.

Robertson, S., & Komljenovic, J. (2016). Unbundling and making higher education markets. In V. Antoni et al. (Ed.), *World yearbook in education: Global education industry* (pp. 211–227). Routledge.

Rossano, C. W. (1999). Reading the Regalia: A guide to deciphering academic dress code. *Harvard Magazine*, Vol. 5. Retrieved from https://harvardmagazine.com/1999/05/ner.reading.html.

Skjølsvik, T., et al. (2017). Strategic management of professional service firms: Reviewing ABS journals and identifying key research themes. *Journal of Professions and Organization, 4*(2), 203–239. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpo/jox005.

Sporn, B. (2020). Competition in Higher Education. In N. Teixeira, et al. (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of higher education systems and institutions* (pp. 224–229). Netherlands: Springer.

Thomas, H., Lorange, P., & Sheth, J. (2013). *The Business School in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 197–239). Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, M. (2017). Students perceptions of themselves as 'consumers' of higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 38*(4), 450–467.

Von Nordenflycht, A. (2010). What is a professional service firm? Toward a theory and taxonomy of knowledge-intensive firms. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(1), 155–174.

The Marketisation of Higher Education: Antecedents, Processes, and Outcomes

Kimmo Alajoutsijärvi, Ilan Alon, and Rómulo Pinheiro

1   INTRODUCTION

Contemporary universities are increasingly market-oriented, and invest heavily in marketing activities, such as branding, advertising, and student satisfaction surveys. This marketisation is accompanied by commercial rhetoric, students as empowered customers, learning experience management, tuition as an investment, and a focus on excellence. Marketisation is closely connected to accountability, which requires institutions and individuals to report on an expanding range of key performance indicators. These are designed to demonstrate value to students and taxpayers alike

K. Alajoutsijärvi (✉) · I. Alon · R. Pinheiro
University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway
e-mail: kimmo.alajoutsijarvi@uia.no

I. Alon
e-mail: ilan.alon@uia.no

R. Pinheiro
e-mail: romulo.m.pinheiro@uia.no

(Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006; Vos & Pages, 2020). Indeed, in an era dominated by marketisation, education leaders believe that they can promote their universities as the very best, most entrepreneurial, most innovative, and world class (Alvesson, 2013; Alvesson & Gabriel, 2016).

This chapter explores the ideological antecedents, processes, and outcomes of the marketisation of higher education (HE), with an emphasis on business schools in particular. Marketisation has justified the emergence of new micro-level routines, taken-for granted rules, and rhetoric, plus macro-level norms, values, and expectations, all of which are shared, cultivated, and sometimes resisted by the members of academic institutions. More specifically, we address the following questions:

- Which kinds of ideologies have enabled the emergence of the marketisation of higher education?
- What are the processes of marketisation of higher education?
- What are the outcomes of the marketisation of higher education?

In this chapter, we argue that the ideological roots of marketisation of higher education are neoliberalism and managerialism. In particular, business schools have been focal actors in spreading these ideologies in their teaching, research, and organisational practices, since they are (unsurprisingly) the most corporate-like actors (Alvesson & Gabriel, 2016) in the academic sphere.

Neoliberalism and managerialism are seemingly compatible ideologies due to similar rhetoric, although their world-views are somewhat different: neoliberalism is focused on economics and politics, while managerialism deals with organisations and management (Klikauer, 2013, p. 5). Neoliberalism has many branches and practices, but at its core it is focused on the promotion of free markets, which are believed to be the best system for societies due to their presumed ability to increase efficiency and responsiveness to consumer choice by enabling competition, and by producing optimal societal welfare (Smith, 2010).

Managerialism emphasises the notion that managers have the right to lead, and consequently that it is crucial to remove barriers to their leadership by tackling, for example, employee resistance (Klikauer, 2013). This ideology assumes a similarity of organisations and industries, wherein global corporations, regional universities, and kindergartens alike are subject to the same universal management practices. These ideologies