

# PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

## STUDENTS PERCEPTION TOWARDS BRAND PREFERENCE OF HIGHER LEVEL EDUCATION: STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELLING

*Dr.Madhur Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Dr .D. Prabha<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup>Dean-Academics, St Xavier's College, Bangalore

<sup>2</sup>Research Coordinator & Associate Professor, St Xavier's College, Bangalore

Email: [Prabhavathy4131@gmail.com](mailto:Prabhavathy4131@gmail.com)

**Dr.Madhur Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Dr .D. Prabha<sup>2</sup>, Students Perception Towards Brand Preference Of Higher Level Education: Structural Equation Modelling– Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(7) (2020). ISSN 1567-214X.**

**KEY WORDS: Brand preference, Perceived quality, Promotion, Higher Level education, Information**

### **ABSTRACT**

Important contest in building higher level education brands is the transformation in the perceptions of proprietors and Students. The proprietor of the institution looks at those challengers who may not see whatever is really or equally significant to the students or viewers (Belanger, 2002). Investment in a tertiary institute focuses on construction, infrastructure, restaurants, sports facilities etc. These investments can be risky compared to similar investments in the FMCG market since in the education sector belief and relationships can yield a long time to grow and can be short-lived (Twitchell, 2002), in the FMCG market which is completely opposite. These studies are discussed in terms of different types of Brand preferences in HLEs and the results are based on the Structural Equation Model used to look at the structure of the material in order to determine the observed variables. These questionnaires, although confined to the environment, provide important insights, which go on to create effective promotional activities.

### **I INTRODUCTION**

This red sea takes the limits of the distinction between public and private organizations and universities, supported by appropriate marketing and Brand management practices. This practice works at a level of financial rewards but there is a negative side to it and it affects universities of real quality providers and their lack of Brand management marks them less aware of the community and

professionmarket than many cruelly promoted institutions. Also, there were few informal but informative discussions that were led by a senior organization of various universities in Bangalore, in order to get a clear picture of their vision and beliefs regarding the HLEs brand. Empirical research in relation to the HLE mark (Higher Education) has been reduced, which is why the subject of HLE's international marketing in comprehensive terms has become a major factor in Empirical and theoretical research (Mazzarol 1998; Binsardi & Ekwulugo, 2003; Gray et al., 2003),

## **II RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. To study the importance of branding, especially in the field of education in highly competitive educational markets.
2. To Introducing marketing activities / marketing approaches for the understanding of a higher education institute / University.

### **a. BRAND MANAGEMENT**

Therefore, the main purpose of building a Brand significance is to arise with products that former for eras (Aaker, 1996). From a customer point of view, a brand is well-defined as a symbol that distinguishes the trademark distinctiveness from others, which may be a symbol, a motto, a marker, a tag line, a particular composition, a vibrant design or the best blend of all of these (Schiffman et al., 2005). As a result the capability to remember the brand name is "Brand awareness" (Einwiller, 2001), and the extent towards which a product is valued by the customers is entitled brand equity combined by brand trust and brand loyalty. This Brand rating can be achieved with quality, Brand value of the product and its features.

### **b. PERCEIVED QUALITY**

Ali Zareei and Peyman Ghafari Ashtiami (2015) find that showing quality is a factor that determines the most important factor, following Value and Prestige is one of the most significant factors in the popularity of Brand of Home Appliances. Distinguished by assessing the general quality or superior of a good item by the consumer compared to options (Zeithaml, 1998; Aaker, 1994) variables related to perceived quality were based on reviews (Bernues, Olai and Corcoran, 2003).

### **c. BRAND PREFERENCE**

In their research, Kalamani and Shanmuga vadivelu (2009) found that an effort to be able to analyze customer satisfaction levels in relation to Brand butterfly house hold products. The customer was the king of the market. Consumer behavior has been a determining factor in product purchases

### **d. PROMOTION**

In marketing, promotions refer to some type of marketing communiqué that is used to enlighten or convince targeted audiences of a product-related relevance, convenience service, product type or release. It helps marketers to make a unique space in the minds of consumers. The main purpose of the promotion is towards increase brand awareness, make interest, generate sales or generate brand loyalty. It is one of the main elements of the marketing mix, which comprises four Ps,

namely, product, price, place, and promotion. The promotion incorporates the means of communication used by the market to deliver information about its product. Details be able to be oral and visual.

### **III COMMENTS ON THE ARENA OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

The recognized part of a higher education brand is the situation stand-alone statement that sets its brand apart from the agitated competition (Chapleo, 2004). Therefore, the use of high-quality marking qualifications in educational branding requires careful practice (Temple & Shattock 2007), in order to adopt the best and most complete branding policy. In this province the brand of the institution should lead to the development of those marketing strategies that allow it to last longer (Apte 2014). At the same time, the effective Brand management of higher level education institutes is based on this(Five Ms &Strategic Moves), including

1. Mission-communiquéapproach is in line with the extensive standing goals of the institution
2. Media-Will the media used be directly relevant to a particular branding policy?
3. Message-Which message would best match the desired result?
4. Money-What means will be needed intended for effective in addition efficient implementation?
5. Measurement- How will the effectiveness of branding products be measured?

The branding of educational services may face many challenges that the average commercial service provider cannot because non-commercial institutions must be very careful in their promotion and branding efforts (Vijender, 2007) since types of education are used for lasting commercial drives. With regard to the diversity and strengths of students taking into account learning aspirations, purpose and association can differ from a segment of society to a certain extent, and most students may dislike these contributions (Warwick, 2004) making institutional markings very difficult. The aspect of similarity can be overlooked regardless of the fact that applications are regularly submitted by various institutions as "advanced", "high quality providers" etc., which eventually makes them identical at the same time (Belanger, 2002). Advancing opportunities to leave track on this branding strategy cannot be ruled out as focusing on shifting new offers and growing market share could affect the teaching and knowledge capacity of these institutions.

### **IV MATERIALS AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Quantifiable techniques are best suited aimed at arithmetic, measurement and arithmetical data and these purposes are inherent (Dezin and Lincoln, 2005). Most of the enquiry in this study is done as follows. Close ended questionnaire, the final closed-ended questions stand designed to examine students' replies to the research question i.e. the influence of Brand management on their decision-making. "Also, the targeted survey questions will contribute us an in-depth look at their views, thoughts and opinions on advertising for higher education institutions. This questionnaire has been conducted for the students' sample of 521 to know about their perception and expectations regarding brand management of HEI, which is the

core objective of this study. Independent variables are perceived quality, price, convenient service and Information. Brand preference is one mediating variable and purchase decision is the Dependent variable. The questionnaire along with results and Structural Equation path model Analysis. The five-point Likert scale, estimated ideal in presence and simpler to assess than the seven-point scale, was predominantly all of the variables (Malhotra & Birks, 2003). The SPSS 21 and AMOS 22 were used to perform the required statistical analysis

## V STRUCTURAL EQUATION PATH MODEL ANALYSIS

The correlation among the external variable and the endogenous variable in the postulated model is shown in Fig. The postulated model is verified by a Maximum likelihood method. Thereafter, a structural equation model was conducted on a model developed by the researcher. The result was initiated that the model simply identified structurally and empirically.

**Table 1 Regression Weights**

*Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)*

			Measure	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
BP	<---	PQ	.295	.041	7.237	***	
BP	<---	CS	.245	.047	5.255	***	
BP	<---	P	.129	.043	2.995	.003	
BP	<---	I	-.028	.023	-1.226	.220	
PD	<---	BP	.235	.043	5.483	***	
PD	<---	I	.163	.024	6.829	***	
PD	<---	P	.133	.043	3.129	.002	
PD	<---	CS	.158	.047	3.331	***	

Source: Primary data.

Table above refers to the effect of AMOS manuscript for the testing of uncertain maximum likelihood Criteria for value measurement (CR), which shows the constraints estimation divided by its standard error. The constraints estimation is very important at  $p \leq 0.05$  without the CR test being  $> 1.96$ . Seven major structural path between exogenous and endogenous latent variables are intended to be significant. The probability of receiving a critical ratio such as 7.237, 6.829, 5.483, 5.255, 5.483, 3.129 and 2.995 incomplete value is  $< 0.005$ . In added words, the regression weight for the perceived quality, convenient service and promotion is very important in Brand popularity. Brand preferences, convenient service, promotions, and information are critical to the decision of students' Brand preference in relation to the decision to opt for a higher education. It differs significantly from zero at 0.005 level (with two tailed). Brand preference and decision making is one of the key mediating factors that lead to a positive effect on students' Brand preference in choosing a higher education. The Information

factor have a negative influence on the popularity of the Brand. Perceived quality has a great impact on brand preference.

**Table: 2 Standardized regression weights** *Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)*

			Measure
Brand Preference	<---	Perceived Quality	.330
Brand Preference	<---	Convenient Services	.240
Brand preference	<---	Price	.139
Brand preference	<---	Information	-.045
Purchase decision	<---	BP	.237
Purchase decision	<---	Information	.259
Purchase decision	<---	Price	.144
Purchase decision	<---	Convenient Services	.156

Source: Primary data.

Examining the table above is an inter-correlation for the two relationships between the latent constructs of student Brand selection to higher education except the variable information is not > 1.

**Table: 3 Standardized residual covariance**

*Standardized Residual Covariance (Group number 1 - Default model)*

	Information	Price	Convenient services	Perceived quality	Brand preference	Purchase decision
<b>Information</b>	.000					
<b>Price</b>	.000	.000				
<b>Convenient services</b>	.000	.000	.000			
<b>Perceived quality</b>	.000	.000	.000	.000		
<b>Brand</b>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

	Information	Price	Convenient services	Perceived quality	Brand preference	Purchase decision
<b>preference Purchase decision</b>	.000	.000	.000	.005	.000	.000

Source: Primarydata.

Table above estimates that all other variables are important and it has been perfectly fit.

**Table: 4 Model Fit Summary**

**CMIN**

Model	NPAR	CMIN	DF	P	CMIN/DF
Default	20	3.342	1	.068	3.342
Saturated	21	.000	0		
Independence	6	918.901	15	.000	61.260

Source: Primarydata.

From the table it is estimated that the calculated P value is 0.068 which is > 0.05 which shows the absolute correlation.

**Table: 5 RMR, GFI**

Model	RMR	GFI	AGFI	PGFI
Default	.001	.998	.955	.048
Saturated	.000	1.000		
Independence	.035	.538	.353	.384

Source: Primarydata.

From the table above Here the GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) and AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) is > 0.9 which indicates that it is good fit.

**Table: 6 RMSEA**

Model	RMSEA	LO 90	HI 90	PCLOSE
Default	.067	.000	.152	.247
Independence	.340	.322	.359	.000

Source: Primarydata.

From the table above 4.9.7 (Root Mean Square Residuals) and RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error), the value is .067 which is  $<0.10$  which means completely perfect.

## VI FINDINGS BASED ON SEM

The relationship among the external factor and the endogenous factor in the hypothesized model. The hypothesized model is confirmed by a maximum likelihood method. Thereafter, a structural modeling was conducted on a model developed by the researcher. It was started that the model simply pointed out fundamentally and empirically. The regression weight for decision of brand quality, convenient service and promotion is very important on Brand preference. Brand preferences, convenient service, promotions, and information are important in determining student brand preference to a higher level of education.

Brand selection and decision-making are important aspects of mediation that point to the positive outcome of continuing student brand preference towards higher education. Variable information have a negative impact on Brand preference. Perceived quality has far-reaching effects on brand preferences and is perfectly fine.

## VII CONCLUSION

On the conclusion of this detailed, in-depth besides beneficial study, specifically after the revitalization of large-scale documentation on branding, it should come as no surprise that branding is a requirement of higher education institutions. Responses from high institution of higher education students are a clear indication of the fact that modern scholars value branding at a certain level. Student's perception and preference of universities to be stimulated and students wants to know that their institute is well known and popular. Students like predictive promotional techniques such as gorilla marketing, circulation of souvenirs, marketing social media, etc. proves the opinion that making elementary marketing goals can mark a difference and this is what signifies the opinion of readers i.e. students. Therefore, it would not be incorrect to point out that the period has passed when higher education was the merely thing, as to aggressively institution of higher education sell their name is another significant factor that catches the eye of the students. As, some universities fail to make a marking distinction unlike other institutions, the responses of students who raise their voice through the appropriate publicity strategy for such things as periodic advertisements, workshops, campaigns, etc., as issued in question papers, to force the relevant authorities to take marketing action HLEs and the steps to be taken when non-HLEs reach public recognition. Similarly it chiefs us to the common conclusion that marketing has come to be a viable topic / sector and new institutions such as education need it in order to survive. At the very least, graduation in business guarantees to all marketing students that their study is as correspondingly effective and influential as any other ground such as medicine or engineering, and this marks Social Sciences or business studies the most important field. Or, there is also the shady side of it that needs to be deliberated that this continuation of marketing can also lead to downsizing. In a nutshell, HLEs Marketing departments, if any, would keep in mind Mark Twain's quote as "A little something made bigger in the form of an ad" many other historical institutions though give many students a good chance to live 100 years, but through an unusual

motto, with unaware name and brand less well known. Besides this is almost the similar for all other HLE institutions particularly on a populated continent like Asia wherever the transition among demand and supply shows a marked difference in general.

### VIII References

- Aaker, D.A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Aaker, A.D. (1996) *Building Strong Brands* Chatham, Simon & Schuster
- Aaker, J. (1997) Dimensions of brand personality *Journal of marketing research* 34 pp. 347-356
- Aaker, J. & Fournier, S. (1995) A Brand as a Character, A Partner and a Person: Three Perspectives on the question Brand Personality *Advances in Consumer Research* 22 pp. 391-395
- Anctil E.J. (2008) Recommendations for Selling Higher Education *ASHE Higher Education Report* 34(2) pp. 89-98
- Bengtsson, A. (2003) Towards a Critique of Brand Relationships *Advances in consumer research* 30 pp. 154-158
- Binsard A, and Ekwulugo F. International marketing of British education: research on the students' perception and the UK market penetration. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*. 2003; 21: 318-27.
- Bloemer M.M. & Lemmin G.A.M. J. (1992) the importance of customer satisfaction in explaining brand and dealer loyalty *Journal of marketing management* 8 pp. 351-364
- Belanger, C., Mount, J. & Wilson, M. (2002) "Institutional Image and Retention". *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3, pp. 299-316.
- Bryman, A. 2004. *Social Research Methods* 2nd ed., New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kantanen, H. (2007) *Branding in Higher Education, Exploring an emerging phenomenon*, EAIR Series Research, Policy and Practice in Higher Education, pp. 56-69.
- Kapferer, J.-N. (2004), *The New Strategic Brand Management: Creating and Sustaining Brand Equity Long Term*, Kogan Page, London.
- Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57, pp. 1-22.
- Kotler, "Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions", Prentice Hall, 1985
- Patton, M.Q., Patton, M.Q., 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California, 1-37.
- Merriam, S., 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*, San Fran.: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994): "Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook" (2nd edition). Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Schiffman, L., Bednall, D., O' Cass, A., Paladino, A. and Kanuk, L. (2005), *Consumer Behavior*, 3rd ed., Pearson Education Australia, Sydney.
- Temple, P., Shattock, M. "Branding in Higher Education-Exploring an Emerging Phenomenon" EAIR Research Series, Policy and Practice in Higher Education, pp 73-79, 2007.
- Teichler, U. "The Future of Higher Education and Future of Higher Education Research, Tertiary Education and Management" Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp 171-185, 2003.
- Twitchell, "Ranking race hurts higher education?", *Forbes*, Nov-25, 2002.
- Vijander Sharma, "Indian Higher Education: Commodification and Foreign Direct Investment", *THE MARXIST*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, April-June, 2007
- Warwick, "Perceived risk in college selection: Differences in evaluative criteria used by students and parents", *Journal of Marketing in Higher Education*, 13, pp 101-125, 2003.



