

BRANDING INITIATIVES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A STUDY ON SOME SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN BANGLADESH



Thesis Submitted for the Award of the Degree of Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) in
Marketing, Dhaka University, Bangladesh

Researcher Md. Maksodul Haque Sawrov, M.Phil Fellow Registration No: 187, Session: 2018-2019 Department of Marketing Dhaka University, Bangladesh	Supervisor Professor Dr. Serajul Hoque Department of Marketing Dhaka University, Bangladesh
---	---

Submission Date: February, 2024

Declaration

I attest that the study titled "Branding Initiatives in Higher Education: A Study on Some Selected Universities in Bangladesh" reflects my own research, conducted under the guide of Professor Dr. Serajul Hoque from the Department of Marketing at Dhaka University, Bangladesh.

Furthermore, I confirm that this thesis is entirely original and has not been previously submitted to any other university or institution for any degree or purpose, either in part or in its entirety.

.....

Md. Maksodul Haque Sawrov

M.Phil. Research Fellow

Reg.No: 187, Session: 2018-2019

Department of Marketing

University of Dhaka

Certificate of the Supervisor

I confirm that Md. Maksodul Haque Sawrov submitted the thesis titled "Branding Initiatives in Higher Education: A Study on Some Selected Universities in Bangladesh" to Dhaka University to obtain the degree of Masters of Philosophy in Marketing. I attest that:

- i. I directly supervised and guided the research work.
- ii. The research work is the sole accomplishment of the researcher and not a joint effort.

I have reviewed the final draft of the thesis and granted my approval for submission to the controller of examination for assessment.

.....

Professor Dr. Serajul Hoque

Department Of Marketing

University of Dhaka

**DEDICATED
TO
MY
MOTHER**

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Allah, the Almighty, who has granted me the opportunity to undertake this thesis. His divine guidance and blessings have enabled me to embark on this academic journey.

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to the individuals who have played essential role in the formation of this study. First and foremost, I would like to honor and thank my esteemed supervisor, Professor Dr. Serajul Hoque. His unwavering support and dedication, as well as his meticulous guidance, have been invaluable throughout this thesis's development. His patience in reviewing and advising on all stages of my work will forever remembered with deep gratitude.

I express my gratefulness to Rashel Sheikh, an Associate Professor in the Department of Business Administration at Sheikh Fazilatunnesa Mujib University, and Saifullah Saif, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics at Sheikh Fazilatunnesa Mujib University, Jamalpur. Their valuable expertise and support in conducting statistical analysis played a essential role in the successful completion of this thesis. Without their valuable time and guidance, this journey would have been considerably more challenging. I would also like to thanks to my fellow colleagues, who provided important documents and unwavering support that greatly contributed to the preparation of this report. I apologize to anyone whose name may have been unintentionally omitted, as every contribution was significant in its own right.

I acknowledge with gratitude the work of authors both in Bangladesh and abroad, whose research findings have enriched this study. Moreover, I express my deep gratefulness to the students, teachers, and staff of various universities in Bangladesh who contributed in my field study and shared their insights.

Last but certainly not least, I am immensely grateful to my dear mother, Kohinoor Begum. Her unwavering support and encouragement have been a driving force behind my research efforts. I will forever cherish her sacrifices and dedication to seeing her son complete this research endeavor.

Table of Contents

SL. No.	Contents	Page No:
	Declaration	ii
	Certificate of the Supervisor	iii
	Dedication	iv
	Acknowledgement	v
	Table of Contents	vi- viii
	List of Tables	ix
	Glossary/Abbreviations	x
	Executive Summery/Abstract	xi

CHAPTER - 1 INTRODUCTOTY PART		
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	Statement of the Problem	2-3
1.3	Research Question	3
1.4	Objectives of the Study	3
1.5	Rationale of the Study	3-4
1.6	Limitation of the study	4
1.7	Chapterization of the Report	4

CHAPTER - 2 LETERATURE REVIEW		
2.1	Literature Review	6-11

CHAPTER - 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		
3.1	Population of the Study	13
3.2	Nature of the Study	13
3.3	Study Area Selection	13
3.4	Sampling	13-14
3.5	Source of Collection of Data	15
3.6	Factor Analysis	15-19
3.7	Processing and Analysis the Data	19-22

CHAPTER - 4 OVERVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN BANGLADESH		
4.1	Definition of Brand	24
4.2	Definition of Branding	24-25
4.3	The Concept of Branding In Higher Education	25
4.4	Higher Education in Bangladesh	25-35
4.5	Branding and Marketing Initiatives in Higher Education	36-37
4.6	How to Develop the University Education and Becoming Brand	37-38

CHAPTER - 5 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS		
5.1	Demographic Data Analysis	40-41
5.1.1	Gender Group of the Respondents	41
5.1.2	Occupation of the Respondents	41

5.1.3	Faculty of the Respondents	42
5.1.4	Education of the Respondents	42
5.1.5	University Branding Influence for Admission	42
5.2	Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Quality Education (PBQE)	42-44
5.3	Factor Analysis for Perceived Strong Brand Image (PSBI)	44-46
5.4	Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Learning Environment (PBLE)	46-48
5.5	Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Students Facilities (PBSF)	48-49
5.6	Factor Analysis for Perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)	49-51
5.7	Relationship between University Branding Influence and Gender	51-52
5.8	University Branding Influences with Education	52-53
5.9	University Branding Influences with Faculty	54
5.10	University Branding Influences with Occupation	55
5.11	University Branding Influences with Universities	56-61
5.12	Multiple Regression Model Results	61-62

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION		
6.1	Findings	64
6.1.1	Findings Regarding Branding Quality Education	64-66
6.1.2	Findings Regarding Strong Brand Image	66-67
6.1.3	Findings Regarding Branding Learning Environment	67-68
6.1.4	Findings Regarding Branding Students Facilities	68-69
6.1.5	Factors Regarding Branding Students Facilities	69-71
6.1.6	Research Implication	71
6.2	Recommendation	71-72
6.3	Conclusion	72-73

LIST OF TABLE		
Table-3.1	Factors of Branding Quality Education	16
Table-3.2	Factors of Strong Brand Image	16
Table-3.3	Factors of Branding Learning Environment	17
Table-3.4	Factors of Branding Students Facilities	17
Table-3.5	Factors of Branding Activities.	18
Table-4.1	Public Universities List in Bangladesh	27-28
Table-4.2	Private Universities List in Bangladesh	30-33
Table-4.3	List of International Universities in Bangladesh	35
Table-4.4	Data Statistics of Public and Private Universities in Bangladesh	35-36
Table-4.5	Elements of University Education Branding	37-38
Table-5.1	Demographic Summary Statistics	40-41
Table-5.2	Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Quality Education	43
Table-5.3	Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Strong Brand Image	45
Table-5.4	Percentage Distributions and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Learning Environment	46
Table-5.5	Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Students Facilities	48
Table-5.6	Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)	50
Table-5.7	Tabulation of University Branding Influences Gender	51-52
Table-5.8	Tabulation of University Branding Influences Education	52-53
Table-5.9	Tabulation of University Branding Influences Faculty	54
Table-5.10	Tabulation of University Branding Influences Occupation	55
Table-5.11	Tabulation of University Branding Influences with Universities	56-57
Table-5.12	Multiple regression on Perceived University Branding Influences for Admission	62

Abbreviations

University Name:

1. **NSU:** North South University
2. **AIUB:** American International University Bangladesh
3. **BRAC** University
4. **EWU:** East West University
5. **IUBAT:** International University of Business Agriculture and Technology
6. **DIU:** Daffodil International University
7. **DIU:** Dhaka International University
8. **SFMU:** Sheikh Fazilatunnesa Mujib University
9. **BU:** Bangladesh University
10. **MIU:** Manarat International University
11. **BAUST:** Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology
12. **AIB:** Asian University of Bangladesh
13. **UITS:** University of Information Technology and Sciences
14. **DU:** Dhaka University
15. **CU:** Chittagong University
16. **JNU:** Jagannath University
17. **MBSTU:** Mawlana Vasani Science and Technology University
18. **HSTU:** Hazi Danesh Science and Technology University
19. **JKKNIU:** Jatiyo Kabi Kanzi Nazrul Islam university
20. **BUP:** Bangladesh University of Professionals.

Executive Summary

The study aims to examine the branding initiatives and strategies employed by higher education institutions in Bangladesh. This study has considered twenty renowned universities as the study area. The data collection process involved surveying 385, including current university students, besides gathering input from teachers and university officials. In this study quantitative analysis is used to identify the impact of branding initiatives on higher education. Exploratory factor analysis is utilized to identify pertinent branding factors with statistical significance. Subsequently, multiple regression models are applied to establish the connections between these branding factors and their impact on university admission. The findings of the study reveal five major variables: branding quality education, strong brand image, branding learning environment, branding student's facilities, and university branding tools. The results from the multiple regression analysis highlight the major impact of four key variables on student admission decisions. Specifically, branding quality education, strong brand image, branding learning environment and university branding activities all demonstrate a positive influence on student admissions. This highlights the role of university branding in attracting potential students and increasing the possibility of their enrollment. Based on these findings, this study recommends cumulative efforts from both public and private universities to leverage branding strategies aimed at influencing prospective students' enrollment decisions. Such efforts include emphasizing the delivery of quality education, recruiting high-caliber faculty, adhering to international curriculum standards, establishing affiliations with other universities, achieving international rankings with a strong reputation, ensuring adequate media exposure, and more. Both new and established universities can benefit from implementing comprehensive university branding initiatives that positively impact student enrollment.

CHAPTER - 1 INTRODUCTOTY PART		
1.1	Introduction	
1.2	Statement of the Problem	
1.3	Research Question	
1.4	Objectives of the Study	
1.5	Rationale of the Study	
1.6	Limitation of the study	
1.7	Chapterization of the Report	

CHAPTER - 1

INTRODUCTOTY PART

1.1 Introduction

In recent times, there has been a significant shift in higher education policies, structures, and conditions worldwide, including in Bangladesh. This has resulted in changes like privatization, differentiation, decentralization, globalization, and highly competition, which are affecting how higher education institutions run. In reply to these changes, higher education institutions are feeling the pressure to appeal new students, offer scholarships, and enhance their status and reputation locally, nationally, and globally. To stay competitive field, higher education institutions are using marketing tactics to gain a competitive advantage and ensure student satisfaction. Marketing is becoming increasingly important in higher education due to increased competition. Higher education institutions should take initiatives like adopt a marketing framework to gain a sustainable competitive advantage. Students' motivations for choosing a university have also changed, and marketing plays a crucial role in student recruitment. With the intensifying competition, both public and private universities see students as customers and market their institutions intensively. The brand of a higher education institution represents its unique characteristics, ability to meet student needs, build confidence, and help employers make informed decisions. Recently, there has been a growing emphasis on higher education institution branding to attract and enroll more students, increase tuition fees, expand course offerings, and internationalize education. In this section discusses the contextual background of branding initiatives in higher education, branding of higher education institutions, and advertising. The problem statement helps as the basis for the research objectives and questions.

1.2 Statement of the Problem:

In the last few years, Bangladesh has made extraordinary progress in higher education. Development of any nation is not possible without higher education. There are 55 government and 114 private universities in Bangladesh for higher education. Not all universities here have the same standards. Some universities have high competition and some universities do not get the expected students. The increase in the number of universities has created competition and there are enough vacancies. Higher education requires branding for this scenario, which can give varsity a unique place in the education market and help it gain a competitive advantage. What the

students expect in terms of the brand's reputation needs to be addressed. Academically, higher institutions do not invest sufficient resources in communication. For this reason, lose their perceived competitive advantage. Some educational institutions focus solely on brand building, the widespread use of media, which leads to heavy costs and revenue expansion. Does branding really play an important role? This thesis is intended to find out if branding influences students or not

1.3 Research Question

- a. Which branding strategies have an impact on students' choices when selecting a university?
- b. What branding initiatives do universities use to influence potential students?
- c. Is branding necessary in higher education to attract both domestic and international students?
- d. To what extent does branding impact students' choice when they are deciding on a university for their higher education?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Broad Objective: The primary aim of this research is to investigate branding initiatives in higher education and identify which branding efforts have an impact on students' decision to pursue higher education at a university.

Specific Objectives

- a. To know how branding initiatives can work in higher education.
- b. To identify the branding initiatives really works on selected universities or not.
- c. To identify the university branding tools and methods
- d. To make a guideline for policy maker for branding the university.

1.5 Rationale of the Study

Branding initiatives are essential in higher education to establish a favorable image with potential students. Despite providing quality education, very few university in Bangladesh has been listed among the world's top-ranking universities where branding and marketing are considered crucial. Because of growing number of universities in the country, there is highly competition and available vacancies. As a result, higher educational institutions need appropriate branding strategy to differentiate themselves from competitors and secure competitive advantage

within the market. Branding holds particular significant for universities, as a student's selection of a university essentially signifies their choice of career path, with the university playing a vital role in shaping their career journey.

Limitation of the Study:

There are some limitations in the study. Although adequate precautionary measures have been taken in collecting, processing and analyzing of the data, some limitations have been remained. A few of those limitations are furnished below.

- a. Difficulties to collect data
- b. Lack of information
- c. Unequal respondents
- d. Lack of willful cooperation
- e. Lack of secondary data
- f. Sampling design
- g. Few statistical techniques

1.7 Chapterization of the Report

Chapter#01: Introductory Part

This chapter deals with statements of the problems research questions, objective of the study, rationale of the study, limitation of the study and Chapterization of the study.

Chapter#02: Review the Literature

This chapter presents review of related literature relating to the topic of the study.

Chapter#03: Methodology of the Study

In this chapter population of the study, sampling technique, determination of sample size, preparation of interview schedules, source of data, reliability and validity test, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis and data presentation have been discussed.

Chapter#04: Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

In this chapter brand, branding, education branding, higher education in Bangladesh, how to build strong brand of a university have been discussed.

Chapter#05: Analysis and Findings

Chapter#06: Recommendation and Conclusion

CHAPTER - 2 LITERATURE REVIEW		
--	--	--

2.1	Literature Review	
-----	-------------------	--

CHAPTER - 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Literature Review

The brand image is a crucial aspect of any organization that establishes credibility and trust with consumers. The brand image is often associated with fear and power, as seen in the example of the lion, which has created a strong brand image. The views and ideas about a brand are shaped by its performance and reputation in the market, as noted by (Sahin & Singh, 2017). To establish a distinct identity in the minds of people, educational institutions can employ various branding strategies. In marketing, branding serves as a potent tool to promote products or services. Branding enables customers to differentiate between different product offerings. In the present day, marketing has become synonymous with branding, which sets apart a company's products from its competitors. Branding refers to "a name, word, symbol, or design, or a combination of these items, intended to identify the products and services of a seller or a group of sellers and to distinguish them from the competition" (Keller, 2003). If we consider higher education as a service, it becomes apparent that branding has helped many prestigious universities establish a strong global presence. The aim of branding is to provide clients with a clear idea of the unique identity of the products or services offered, which can influence their economic decisions. However, branding in higher education is not a neutral instrument for institutional uniqueness and information. Instead, it is used to influence the preferences of consumers by presenting content that aligns with the concept of university education, which is structured according to social stratification (Mendiola & Ledesma, 2019). Numerous educational institutions worldwide adopt certain methods or approaches, referred to as branding, to attract students. Initially, branding served as a choice for consumers and involved organizations representing their values and benefits. Branding has allowed many prestigious educational institutions to establish their identities using trademarks. In the perspective of higher education's growing competition, branding has become increasingly significant in bolstering an institute's status (Lamboy, 2011). The process of branding shapes the perception of the audience by highlighting the values associated with a university's education, which may contribute to social inequality by promoting the belief that a privileged social status and professional success can only be achieved through attending certain universities. This idea is discussed in the work of Alvarez and Gonzalez (2019).

The concept of branding is multifaceted and serves various purposes in product/service design, customer relations, and marketing communication. Individuals' perspectives on branding can differ. Similarly, each student may have a distinct perception of branding a university. However, if a higher education institution implements all the branding elements, then most people should have a similar opinion. Branding has become a significant concern for higher education institutions, similar to other for-profit organizations, in recent years. However, the branding process for these institutions is complex due to multiple reasons, as observed by Alam et al. (2019) when addressing the current branding challenges and issues. To enrich the effectiveness of the consumer choice process, branding is used, and this is one reason why branding education is becoming more important. Consumers tend to trust a brand that is expected to fulfill certain promises, which makes branding even more significant in the present day, as consumers are concerned about the brand. The selection and preference of a university are influenced by its brand image, especially for the new generation of students who have easy access to information about universities worldwide (Doyle, 1989; Omor, 2013). A brand represents a promise, an idea, and an expectation that resides in the mind of every consumer about a product, service or company. The purpose of branding is to create an emotional bond. Educational institutions aim to differentiate themselves from others and reflect their strengths, values, and mission as a place of learning through their brand identity. To avoid vague or misleading messages, the marketing team and other key stakeholders need to first clearly define the positive aspects of their institution and how they align with their target audience's motivations, challenges, concerns, and educational preferences. Consistency in the use of logos, images, video quality, "about" descriptions, and even slogans is a significant branding challenge for many educational institutions (Hem Education, 2021). Modern marketing relies heavily on branding, as every organization employs branding as a marketing tool to lure customers. Branding in contemporary times goes beyond the mere use of logos or graphic elements. Robust branding assists companies in acquiring loyal customers. It makes hope, fosters appreciation, and increases popularity for companies amongst people. A university that has established a reputable brand enjoys various advantages. It can simply appeal students based on the quality of education, faculty, campus environment, and tuition fees (Afrin, 2020). The aim of education is to promote the mental, physical, environmental, economic, social, political, and cultural development of individuals. Education plays a crucial role in shaping people's behavior and social interactions, and it is a

wise investment for people. Due to the regular growth of demand and inadequate facilities, as well as the lack of a supportive environment on campus, government educational institutions are facing significant challenges. Consequently, a large number of students from neighboring countries and elsewhere are leaving each year. Those who can afford it go abroad, while others leave their future prospects to fate. In this discouraging situation, the establishment of private universities under the Private University Act-1992 has provided considerable release to students and their parents (Islam and Salma, 2016). Improving the quality of higher education services in the 21st century is a pressing issue for all those involved in education. Modern universities are constantly evolving to effectively address the various challenges of the world. There is a global demand for quality services, which is prompting academic institutions around the world to make significant changes (Amoako and Gyimah, 2020). The way educators teach can be viewed as a gauge of the quality of a program and has a notable impact on student contentment, according to Osman and Saputra (2019). The connection between the quality of education provided by lecturers, student satisfaction, and university administration is significant. Several studies have demonstrated that the quality of teaching, learning facilities, and good governance by the institution of higher education have a constructive and noteworthy impression on student satisfaction (Muhsin et al., 2020). Private universities recognize the importance of having a contemporary campus, and developing one requires a significant amount of capital. The conditions of charity enjoyed by all universities make it even more challenging for new institutions (Ahmed et al., 2016). Higher education has significant economic importance, both domestically and globally, and its reputation in the competitive global market depends solely on exceptional quality. Companies have the option to adopt a strategic approach to increase their market share by enhancing quality, productivity, or marketing efforts (Kotler & Fox, 1995). Ruben (2004) suggests that students' perception of their educational experience is influenced by numerous issues, with the learning and teaching environment, such as facilities, accommodation, physical surroundings, policies, interpersonal relationships, and communication. The perceived prestige or quality of an institution's specialty is often more important than its actual quality because potential students and scholars base their decision on the university's reputation. A university's strong image can attract students and help build a relationship with the community (Kotler & Fox, 1995). In the present time, consumers place greater emphasis on branding as a decent brand meets all the challenging measures and satisfies customers in every possible way.

The new generation of students has access to information about universities worldwide and a university's brand image makes it easier for them to make their selection and preference (Sahin & Singh, 2017). The caliber of instruction in the classroom is an essential aspect of educational excellence. Quality education relies on well-defined objectives, qualified instructors, suitable pedagogical approaches, significant educational outcomes, effective presentation of academic knowledge, and teacher self-evaluation (Ronnie & Rashid, 2009). The growing demand for higher education and the increasing competition among universities due to globalization has led higher education institutions to view their virtual presence as a possible competitive advantage. This shift is in response to the changing landscape of the job market and the need for higher education throughout people's lives. As a result, universities and colleges are focusing on internet marketing and branding, including social media, to increase their visibility and reputation (Maresova et al, 2020). In light of globalization, both public and private universities are required to enter for native and international students by improving their international standing and ranking. As a result, universities must adopt advanced and creative marketing strategies, as well as tactical skills. While corporate social responsibility (CSR) has been viewed as a marketing instrument, its effectiveness in the higher education industry has yet to be demonstrated (Othman et al., 2014). Knight (2011) suggests that in the current climate of advanced education, where the emphasis is on competition, universal branding, and ranking, it is unclear whether the strategy of establishing a country as an education hub is merely a trend or a genuine investment that should be taken seriously. However, he emphasizes that education centers are more than just a brand and require careful planning to achieve their goals and become sustainable. This planning includes developing policies, human resources, infrastructure, and financial investment. Despite the lack of extensive research on branding within the framework of higher education, the idea gained popularity in the 1980s. This led many universities to adopt the practice of creating their own distinct "brand," a term borrowed from the consumer world, in an effort to establish their identity and reputation. This trend can be observed among many ambitious universities worldwide, as noted by Rothblatt in 2008. While there has been a rise in research on branding in higher education, there is still a lack of emphasis on internal branding within this industry. A crucial factor in a university's inner branding is the support it receives from mid-level administrative staff and deans. In several countries, the higher education division is becoming more market-driven, and many universities are adopting branding as a means to distinguish

themselves from their rivals. Nevertheless, due to the complexities and unique features of higher education, the practice of branding is tougher than in the traditional marketable context, as highlighted (KT & Manjunath, 2020). A current study by Sujchaphong et al. in 2014 has emphasized the consequence of member of staff brand support in the successful implementation of inner branding within a university. Branding helps to establish an institutional uniqueness and distinguish it from its challengers. A strong brand also enhances a university's capacity to participate for the best students, appeal alumni membership, and take financial support from contributors. From the perspective of students, branding assists as a promise to meet their opportunities and make simpler the decision-making process when selecting an institution to attend, as highlighted by Kmath in 2015. Educational services are intangible products that are created to meet the needs of customers seeking education. While they cannot be touched or felt, promotion is an essential and beneficial activity for these services. Marketing plays a crucial role in educational institutions since it is the primary means of distributing their services to consumers. To achieve the desired outcomes in terms of sales, institutions must develop an effective marketing strategy that focuses on the promotional mix. This involves utilizing a range of marketing variables such as personal sales, sales promotion, community relations, and other tools to achieve the objectives of the sales program, as noted (Rahim, 2019). Higher education institutions have the capability and flexibility to shift towards the education market, and this has led to their widespread popularity. As a result, the quality of the educational services offered by these institutions has naturally improved, as stated by Rubtsov in 1996.

For universities to operate effectively in the modern world, it is imperative that they devise marketing strategies that can actively support the implementation of their overall objectives. This is vital to keep and enhance their position in the education market while ensuring the delivery of high-quality education that satisfies the needs of both graduates and staff members, as highlighted (Biaton, 2015). In order to develop an effective branding strategy, it is important for universities to include the "community" aspect in their messaging. This is because students expect up-to-date information that is relevant to the job market. One effective strategy that universities can use is to update their curriculum. When developing a branding strategy, universities should focus on emotions rather than numbers as this is more memorable for potential students (Solis, 2020). Over the last decade, universities have recognized the need to create perceptions that differentiate them from their competitors. While some universities are

considered to have great brands, this is not the case for most universities. This may be because higher education is unique and cannot be reduced to a simple color, mascot or slogan. Instead, great brands are created through a sum of total commitments and fulfilled that add meaningful and lasting relationships (Pasternak, 2017). The brand is a crucial factor that contributes to the increased competition of higher education institutions. This is due to a range of factors such as boundary openness, participation in the Bologna process, financial and economic crises, sharpening of the population situation, and changes in the economic conditions of university activities, as highlighted by Valitov in 2014.

Over the past few years, Bangladesh has observed remarkable advancement in the field of higher education, which is essential for any country's development. There are 53 government and 109 private universities in Bangladesh, but not all universities have the same standards, with some facing stiff competition while others struggle to attract students. The growth in the number of institution of higher education has resulted in a highly competitive market, with many vacancies available. Therefore, higher education institutions in Bangladesh need to emphasis on branding to distinguish them and gain a competitive advantage. It is important to address students' expectations regarding the reputation of a university's brand. However, many educational institutions do not allocate sufficient resources to communicate their brand's value, resulting in a loss of perceived competitive advantage. Some institutions focus solely on brand building, which can lead to high costs and revenue expansion. The significance of branding in influencing students' decisions is the subject of this thesis.

The available literature on branding in education is limited, but there have been several research works that discussed this topic. The significance of university branding in education is considerable. However, there is no clear understanding of which components of a university can be branded or what motivates students or potential students to choose a particular university. There is a lack of quantitative studies on this topic from the Bangladeshi perspective, although some qualitative studies have been conducted. Therefore, research has been conducted to fill this gap.

CHAPTER - 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		
---	--	--

3.1	Population of the Study	
3.2	Nature of the Study	
3.3	Study Area Selection	
3.4	Sampling	
3.5	Source of Collection of Data	
3.6	Factor Analysis	
3.7	Processing and Analysis the Data	

CHAPTER - 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section covers the methodology used in the research, outlining the researcher approach to data collection. The study focuses on understanding the factors that influence students' decisions to enroll in a particular university for higher education. Both qualitative and quantitative data were used for the research, and the methodology was designed to address the research questions and objectives.

3.1 Population of the Study:

The population of this study includes all the students, as well as teachers and officials, of the universities in Bangladesh.

3.2 Nature of the Study

This research is exploratory because there isn't much prior research on branding in higher education in Bangladesh. While there are some existing studies, they don't concentrate on branding efforts in higher education. So, this study's purpose is to bridge this research gap and investigate different aspects of branding in higher education in Bangladesh. The researcher plans to explore several areas in this study

3.3 Study Area Selection

The study is concerned about branding initiatives in higher education. Twenty universities have been selected, where thirteen are private and seven are public universities in Bangladesh. Researcher has selected purposively all the universities from Bangladesh to collect the data from the students and others.

3.4 Sampling

3.4.1 Determination of Sample: In this study, convenience sampling have used. Researcher chose a total 20 universities for the study. Purposively convenience sampling has used to collect the data.

3.4.2 Determination of Sample Size: What will be the sample size for this research? Sample size means how many samples are to be taken for the research work. Sample size is an important factor to get a good result from the research. If sample size is large, time and cost of research will be more and accuracy will also be more. To get a standard result from the study, too little sampling should be avoided. To determine the appropriate sample size can be challenging without information of exact population information. Generally, it's suggested that a minimum of

around 30 cases is needed for studies involving statistical data analysis (Bailey, 1994). However, some researchers consider 50 cases, and others argue for a minimum of 100 (Fisher et al., 1991). To ascertain the ideal sample size, the following factors should be taken into account (Smith, 2013).

Margin of Error (Confidence Interval) - The confidence interval establishes the range within which the researcher is comfortable with allowing their sample mean to deviate from the population mean. For this study, let's assume a margin of error of plus or minus 5%.

Confidence Level or Risk - How certain the researcher wishes to be that the true mean falls within their confidence interval is a crucial consideration. Typically, researcher opts for common confidence levels like 90%, 95%, or 99%. For this study, a 95% confidence interval is chosen. Each confidence level corresponds to a specific Z-score, which is a constant value used in this equation. Below are the Z-scores commonly associated with these confidence levels (Smith, 2013):

- 90% – Z score = 1.645
- 95% – Z score = 1.96
- 99% – Z score = 2.326

Standard of Deviation - What level of variability does the researcher anticipate in their responses? Using a value of 0.5 for variance is the most conservative approach and guarantees an adequately large sample size. The determination of the sample size is essential to establish the minimum number of participants for the study. Given the numerous indicators, the sample size is calculated based on a 50% indicator percentage for the survey, which results in the maximum sample size. Here's how the calculation works assuming a 95% confidence level, a Standard Deviation of 0.5, and a margin of error (confidence interval) of $\pm 5\%$ (Smith, 2013):

The sample size: Sample size was calculated using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Necessary Sample Size} &= \frac{(Z\text{-score})^2 \times \text{Std Dev} (1 - \text{Std Dev})}{(\text{Margin of error})^2} \\ &= \frac{(1.96)^2 \times (0.5)(1-0.5)}{(0.05)^2} \\ &= 385 \text{ units (Approximately)} \end{aligned}$$

3.5 Sources and Collection of Data

Primary Data

The main concentration of this research is the analysis of primary data, which has been collected freshly, making it original. The data has been collected through interviews and a questionnaire. The interview schedules were designed to address the primary research questions. The schedules are divided into two parts: Part I includes demographic information such as gender, education, occupation, etc. while Part II contains branding education related questions. The questionnaire makes use of a five-point Likert scale.

Secondary Data

Secondary sources refer to data that have been collected and used previously. In this research, the researcher has collected secondary data from various sources such as previous research works, reports, books, journals, periodicals, newspapers, seminar papers, and other publications. Additionally, the researcher has used various resources such as seminar papers, summaries of discussions, national and international journals, newspapers, magazines, and other relevant materials to gather secondary data for the study.

3.6. Factor Analysis.

Factor analysis is a statistical technique employed to reveal fundamental factors that could account for the observed variations among interrelated variables. By identifying latent factors, researcher can better understand the interdependence between observed variables and potentially reduce the set of variables in a dataset. Factor analysis is widely used in various fields such as biology, psychology, marketing, finance, and more. It is a commonly used technique to identify systematic interdependence between a relevant set of variables and find latent factors that contribute to a commonality. A distinction exists between factor analysis and principal component analysis, with principal component analysis serving as the foundational form of exploratory factor analysis. In this study, the researcher has used factor analysis to identify the latent factors that influence branding in higher education, and several tables are provided to illustrate the factors considered for the analysis.

Table 3.1: Factors of Branding Quality Education

Name of Factors	Measurement Unit
Branding Quality Education:	1 to 5 scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree)
Enriched Faculty Members	
Modern teaching Method	
Global Guest Teacher	
International Standard Curriculum	
Assessing Creativity	
Credit Transfer Facility	
No Session Jam	
Offering Ph.D. Degree	
Foreign University Affiliation	
Admission Test	

Source: Author's Compilation, 2022

Table 3.2: Factors of Strong Brand Image

Name of Factors	Measurement Unit
Strong Brand Image:	1 to 5 scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree)
University Reputation	
Corporate Relation	
University Ranking	
Alumni Employment Position	
Media Connection	
University Age	

Source: Author's Compilation, 2022

Table 3.3: Factors of Branding Learning Environment

Name of Factors	Measurement Unit
Branding Learning Environment	1 to 5 scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree)
Permanent Campus	
Part-Time Job	
Existing Foreign Students	
University Location	
University Learning Environment	
Digital Campus	
Dress & Behavioral Code	
University Playground	
University Common Language	
Green Campus	

Source: Author's Compilation, 2022

Table 3.4: Factors of Branding Students Facilities

Name of Factors	Measurement Unit
Branding Students Facilities:	1 to 5 scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree)
Residential Facilities	
Transportation Facilities	
Job Fair	
Industrial Visit	
Scholarship Facility	
Scholarship for Global Students	
Affordable Tuition Fee	
Health Insurance	
Canteen Subsidy	
Extracurricular Activities	

Source: Author's Compilation, 2022

Table 3.5: Factors of Branding Activities.

Name of Factors	Measurement Unit
University Branding Activities:	1 to 5 scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree)
Digital Advertising	
Acronyms of University	
Lucrative Website	
All Media Social Media	
Beauty of Campus	
Cultural Club	
University Conference	
Students Ambassador	
Logo-Slogan	
University Research	

Source: Author's Compilation, 2022

To derive a perceived value for each of the primary variables using factor analysis, the researcher must undertake three additional assessments. These assessments consist of the Cronbach Alpha test, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, and the Bartlett test. These evaluations aid in establishing a perceived value for each main variable, and their influence on the level of satisfaction will be elucidated through ordered logistic regression analysis.

3.6.1 Cronbach's Alpha Test

Cronbach's Alpha is a valuable tool for gauging the internal consistency of a group of items, indicating how closely they are interrelated. This test yields values within the range of 0 to 1 and is widely regarded as a measure of the scale's reliability. Typically, a Cronbach's Alpha score exceeding 0.70 is deemed acceptable, while scores below this threshold are considered questionable or indicative of poor reliability (Islam, 2016).

3.6.2 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test is a tool employed to assess the appropriateness of data for factor analysis. It measures the sampling adequacy of each variable within the model. The KMO test is a statistical technique that assists in quantifying the extent of shared variance

among variables. When this proportion is lower, the data becomes more suitable for factor analysis. KMO values range from 0 to 1, with a globally accepted threshold of over 0.6 for the KMO test

3.6.3 Bartlett Test

Bartlett's Test is linked to the study's significance and indicates the validity and appropriateness of the collected responses for addressing the study's focal issue. When Bartlett's Test yields a value below 0.05, it suggests the suitability of factor analysis and is thus recommended.

3.6.4 Ordered Logistic Regression

In this study, a multiple linear regression model was employed to evaluate the influence of different aspects of University Branding Initiatives on university admissions. The model's econometric representation is depicted as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 X_{3i} + \beta_4 X_{4i} + \beta_5 X_{5i} + \mu_i$$

Here, Y = UBIA (university branding influence for admission), X_1 = Branding Quality Education, X_2 = Strong Brand Image, X_3 = Branding Learning Environment, X_4 = Branding Student Facilities and X_5 = University Branding Activities.

Thus, the overall perception on university branding influence for admission has been predicted by the five dimensions of University Branding Initiatives' covariates. Variable details used in the regression model are shown in table 3.1 to 3.7.

3.7 Processing and Analyzing Data

The collected data have been processed and analyzed, adhering to the established research plan. Processing encompassed tasks such as data editing, coding, categorization, and the creation of data tables. STATA statistical analysis tool has been used in the study. Collected data are coded and the coded data are put into STATA for analysis. The present study used different types of statistical tools and techniques like simple mean, mode, Standard Deviation (SD), Coefficient of Variance (CV), Percentage, tabular presentation, frequency table and Chi-square Test etc. The

data was presented in the form of tables, figures and graphs. Different clustered charts and different line charts are used for the presentation of the data.

There are different statistical tools which have used throughout the analysis in the study. Here is an example how to calculate different statistical value using a sample table:

3.7.1 Calculation of Mean

Mean is the simplest and relatively stable measure of central tendency. It shows the central tendency of frequency distribution. The following formula is to calculate Mean ($\bar{X}$) (Gupta & Gupta, 2012):

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

Where,

X = Opinion Categories (1, 2, 3, 4 & 5)

f = Number of frequency

N = Total Number of frequency

Σ = Sigma (Summation)

3.7.2 Calculation of Standard Deviation

The Standard Deviation is a commonly utilized metric for assessing variation. It quantifies the degree of "spread" within the sample. If we square the standard deviation, we get what is called the 'variance'. Greek small letter sigma, σ denotes standard deviation. The following formula has been used (Gupta & Gupta, 2012):

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum f(X - \bar{X})^2}{N}}$$

Where,

$\bar{X}$ = Mean

X = Level of feelings (1, 2, 3, 4 & 5)

f = Number of frequency

N = Total Number of frequency

Σ = Sigma (Summation)

3.7.3 Calculation of Coefficient of Variance (C. V.)

The Standard Deviation serves as an absolute measure of variation, while its relative counterpart is referred to as the coefficient of variation. This coefficient is employed to compare the variability among two or more series. To compare variability of feelings of bank client and bank employee, C.V. is used. Coefficient of variance is calculated as follows (Gupta & Gupta, 2012):

$$\text{C.V.} = \frac{\sigma}{\bar{X}} \times 100$$

Where,

$\bar{X}$ = Mean

σ = Standard Deviation

Calculating Coefficient of Variance (C. V.) from sample table:

Coefficient of Variance for Bank Clients

$$\begin{aligned}\text{C.V.} &= \frac{\sigma}{\bar{X}} \times 100 \\ &= \frac{0.853}{2.97} \times 100 \\ &= 28.74\%\end{aligned}$$

Coefficient of Variance for Bank Employees

$$\begin{aligned}\text{C.V.} &= \frac{\sigma}{\bar{X}} \times 100 \\ &= \frac{0.691}{2.94} \times 100 \\ &= 23.49\%\end{aligned}$$

3.7.4 Calculation of Chi-square (χ^2)

The χ^2 test is one of the simplest and most widely used non-parametric tests in statistical work.

The quantity χ^2 describes the magnitude of discrepancy between theory and observation, i.e., with the help of χ^2 test we can know whether a given discrepancy between theory and observation can be attributed to chance. The Degree of Freedom (d. f.) can be calculated as follows (Gupta & Gupta, 2012):

$$(\text{Total columns} - 1) \times (\text{Total rows} - 1)$$

Thus, in a 2×2 table, the degree of freedom would be $(2 - 1) (2 - 1) = 1$ and in a 3×3 table, the degree of freedom would be $(3 - 1) (3 - 1) = 4$. The formula for calculating χ^2 test is (Gupta & Gupta, 2012, p. 543):

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where,

O = Observed frequency

E = Expected frequency

Σ = Sigma (Summation)

CHAPTER - 4		
OVERVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN BANGLADESH		
4.1	Definition of Brand	
4.2	Definition of Branding	
4.3	The Concept of Branding In Higher Education	
4.4	Higher Education in Bangladesh	
4.5	Branding and Marketing Initiatives in Higher Education	
4.6	How to Develop the University Education and Becoming Brand	

CHAPTER – 4

OVERVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN BANGLADESH

4.1 Definition of Brand

A brand is a term used to refer to a product or service that has a distinct identity of its own. With an ever-growing market, brands are essential in setting a product or service apart from others and attracting attention. A brand can represent loyalty, trust, confidence, or other qualities, depending on how it is promoted and marketed. It distinguishes a product or service from others, making it easily communicated and marketed. A brand is the image and personality that a business provides, such as a logo or slogan, which makes it unique. AMA states a brand as a characteristic that sets apart one seller's product or service from another's. Legally, a brand is known as a trademark, and it can be used to identify all items sold by a seller or just a particular item. Donna Antonucci defines a brand as a recognizable identity of a company, not only for the products and services it offers but also for the essence of what the company stands for. Branding is a form of communication that describes what a company stands for, such as superior service or environmental responsibility, using both subtle and overt statements that intentionally evoke emotions in the receiver. According to Philip Kotler, a brand is a designation that can take the form of a name, word, symbol, sign, design, or a combination thereof. Its purpose is to uniquely identify a seller's products and services, setting them apart from those offered by competitors.

4.2 Definition of Branding:

Branding refers to the overall image or identity of a company that is linked to its product and defines it in the eyes of consumers. This includes the company's name, logo, design, and any other distinctive features that reflect the company's personality and distinguish its product from others on the market. The process of branding involves giving meaning to an organization, company, product or service by creating a specific brand in the minds of consumers. This strategy helps consumers to quickly identify and recognize the brand, and provides a reason for them to choose the company's products over those of competitors by clarifying what the brand is and what it is not. In the past, branding was a passive activity that involved designing and

naming products based on the company's preferences. However, in recent years, branding has become a crucial part of the marketing process, involving various strategies designed to create relevance for the product. A good brand should convey a clear message, inspire trust, connect emotionally with customers, motivate buyers, and build user loyalty. Kotler and Keller (2015) describe a product as something that fulfills a market need or demand, encompassing physical goods, services, experiences, events, individuals, locations, properties, organizations, information, and concepts. On the other hand, as defined by the American Marketing Association (AMA), a brand refers to a designation, which can be a name, word, symbol, design, or a combination thereof, with the purpose of recognizing and setting apart the offerings of one seller or group of sellers from those of others.

4.3 The Concept of Branding in Higher Education:

The idea of branding is not a new concept, and has been utilized for centuries. According to Keller (1993), customers tend to prefer services that they are familiar with and can trust. With the increasing commercialization of higher education due to globalization, universities have started employing marketing strategies to position themselves in the global market by identifying their strengths and weaknesses, and focusing on building their brand value. There are varying opinions on the branding of higher education, with some authors viewing branding as a means to enhance competitiveness and reputation. Mellewar and Akeel (2006:41) advocate that universities, recognized as service providers, must adopt strategies to maintain and improve competitiveness. They should focus on developing a competitive edge based on their unique attributes and communicate this effectively to all stakeholders. At its essence, branding involves developing a clear and coherent representation of a product, service or organization. This also applies to higher education branding. Establishing a strong brand for a university ensures consistency in messaging across all platforms, which is crucial in helping potential students take informed decisions about the university they wish to attend.

4.4 Higher Education in Bangladesh:

The progress of a modern society heavily hinges on the nature and quality of the higher education it offers. Higher education's primary aim is to produce capable, informed, and forward-thinking individuals. The significance of knowledge in today's world, particularly within an intensely competitive global landscape, cannot be overemphasized. In developing nations,

especially, higher education carries the potential to drive progress. In the past, getting a higher education in Bangladesh was seen as something only a few people could afford, especially because many people couldn't read or write. But now, as the demand for skilled professionals in areas like education and research has gone up, the value of higher education is becoming clearer. Skilled individuals who get higher education become teachers, trainers, researchers, and scholars, helping society grow and develop. They work in schools, colleges, technical institutes, and universities to make a positive impact. They also spearhead technological advancements in areas like agriculture, industry, commerce, medicine, engineering, transportation, and communication. Higher education institutions in Bangladesh fall into five main categories: general education, science and technology, engineering education, medicine, agricultural education, and distance education. Currently, Bangladesh boasts 169 universities, consisting of 55 public institutions and 114 private ones. Public universities provide a wide range of programs, covering general studies, engineering, agriculture, science and technology, arts and culture, and even distance learning. These public universities are strategically distributed across the country to ensure that students from various regions have access to higher education. Higher education in Bangladesh awards two types of degrees: a three-year pass course or a four-year honors course leading to a bachelor's degree. This is followed by a two-year master's course for pass graduates and a one-year master's course for honors graduates.

4.4.1 Public Universities in Bangladesh

The establishment of the first teaching-cum-residential university in Dhaka can be traced back to 1921, followed by the second university in Rajshahi in 1953. Prior to 1971, Bangladesh had only six public universities. However, in the 35 years since Bangladesh gained independence in 1971, the higher education landscape has undergone significant transformations. Public universities have emerged as the preferred choice for the majority of students pursuing higher education for several compelling reasons.

Firstly, public universities offer a diverse array of academic disciplines, including science, commerce, liberal arts, humanities, engineering and technology, law, education, and medicine. Secondly, despite comparatively modest financial compensation, public universities manage to attract highly qualified teachers and researchers. Thirdly, public universities boast superior library, laboratory, internet, and research facilities compared to other educational institutions in the country. Fourthly, these institutions frequently host a wide range of events such as seminars,

symposiums, workshops, debates, exhibitions, and visiting faculty lecture series, providing promising young students with opportunities for both national and international exposure. Lastly, public universities provide residential and boarding facilities at affordable or subsidized rates.

Table 4.1: Public Universities List in Bangladesh

SL	List of Public Universities in Bangladesh
1	University of Dhaka
2.	University of Rajshahi
3.	Bangladesh Agricultural University
4.	Bangladesh University of Engineering & Technology
5.	University of Chittagong
6.	Jahangirnagar University
7.	Islamic University, Bangladesh
8.	Shahjalal University of Science & Technology
9.	Khulna University
10.	National University
11.	Bangladesh Open University
12.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University
13.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University
14.	Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science & Technology University
15.	Mawlana Bhashani Science & Technology University
16.	Patuakhali Science And Technology University
17.	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University
18.	Chittagong University of Engineering & Technology
19.	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology
20.	Khulna University of Engineering & Technology
21.	Dhaka University of Engineering & Technology
22.	Noakhali Science & Technology University
23.	Jagannath University
24.	Comilla University

25.	Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University
26.	Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University
27.	Sylhet Agricultural University
28.	Jessore University of Science & Technology
29.	Pabna University of Science and Technology
30.	Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur
31.	Bangladesh University of Professionals
32.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Science & Technology University
33.	Bangladesh University of Textiles
34.	University of Barishal
35.	Rangamati Science and Technology University
36.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Maritime University, Bangladesh
37.	Islamic Arabic University
38.	Chittagong Medical University
39.	Rajshahi Medical University
40.	Rabindra University, Bangladesh
41.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Digital University, Bangladesh
42.	Sheikh Hasina University
43.	Khulna Agricultural University
44.	Bangamata Sheikh Fojilatunnesa Mujib Science and Technology University
45.	Sylhet Medical University
46.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Aviation And Aerospace University
47.	Chandpur Science and Technology University
48.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman University, Kishoreganj
49.	Hobiganj Agricultural University
50.	Sheikh Hasina Medical University, Khulna
51.	Kurigram Agricultural University
52.	Sunamganj Science and Technology University
53.	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Science & Technology University

Source: UGC Website Bangladesh, 2022.

The education commissions established in Bangladesh have emphasized the need to create a pool of highly trained individuals to contribute to national development. Higher education is expected to produce skilled individuals and innovate new knowledge. However, achieving these goals requires ensuring the quality of education, which should be dynamic and strive for excellence. Quality assurance is necessary for institutions to ensure that students can achieve the standards they set. Public universities in Bangladesh deserve more attention to quality assurance as they are established and financed by the government. The quality of education in public universities appears to have declined, as noted in the Public Works Commission report and analysis of employers' views on both public and private sector employment. Internal factors such as poor quality of primary and secondary education, flawed recruitment processes, low faculty salaries, outdated teaching methods, and inadequate infrastructure contribute to the decline. External factors such as political interference, quantitative expansion without adequate infrastructure, and decreasing government budget allocation to university education also pose challenges to quality assurance in public universities.

4.4.2 Private University of Bangladesh

In the 1990s, the Bangladeshi government recognized the inadequacy of public universities in meeting the growing demand for higher education. In response, the government lent support to a group of academics who aimed to establish private universities. This led to the enactment of the Private Universities Act-1992, providing the legal framework for private universities. This marked a significant milestone in Bangladesh's higher education history, breaking the government's monopoly on higher education provision. The inception of the first private university took place in 1992, and several others followed suit. In 1998, amendments were made to the Private Universities Act to address specific concerns and prevent potential misuse of its provisions. Currently, Bangladesh is home to 108 private universities, with the majority located in Dhaka, and they have exceeded the initial expectations in terms of student enrollment. In summary, private universities in Bangladesh play a pivotal role in the country's higher education landscape, offering students a valuable alternative for a more specialized and personalized educational experience.

Table 4.2: Private Universities List in Bangladesh

SL	List of Public Universities in Bangladesh
1	North South University
2.	University of Science & Technology Chittagong
3.	Independent University, Bangladesh
4.	Central Women's University
5.	International University of Business Agriculture & Technology
6.	International Islamic University Chittagong
7.	Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology
8.	American International University-Bangladesh
9.	East West University
10.	University of Asia Pacific
11.	Gono Bishwabidyalay
12.	The People's University of Bangladesh
13.	Asian University of Bangladesh
14.	Dhaka International University
15.	Manarat International University
16.	BRAC University
17.	Bangladesh University
18.	Leading University
19.	BGC Trust University Bangladesh
20.	Sylhet International University
21.	University of Development Alternative
22.	Premier University
23.	Southeast University
24.	Daffodil International University
25.	Stamford University Bangladesh
26.	State University of Bangladesh
27.	City University

28.	Prime University
29.	Northern University Bangladesh
30.	Southern University Bangladesh
31.	Green University of Bangladesh
32.	Pundra University of Science & Technology
33.	World University of Bangladesh
34.	Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology
35.	The Millennium University
36.	Eastern University
37.	Metropolitan University
38.	Uttara University
39.	United International University
40.	University of South Asia
41.	Victoria University of Bangladesh
42.	Bangladesh University of Business & Technology
43.	Presidency University
44.	University of Information Technology & Sciences
45.	Primeasia University
46.	Royal University of Dhaka
47.	University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh
48.	Atish Dipankar University of Science & Technology
49.	Bangladesh Islami University
50.	ASA University Bangladesh
51.	East Delta University
52.	European University of Bangladesh
53.	Varendra University
54.	Hamdard University Bangladesh
55.	BGMEA University of Fashion & Technology(BUFT) (2)
56.	North East University Bangladesh
57.	First Capital University of Bangladesh

58	Ishakha International University, Bangladesh
59	Z.H Sikder University of Science & Technology
60	Exim Bank Agricultural University, Bangladesh
61	North Western University
62	Khwaja Yunus Ali University
63	Sonargaon University
64	Feni University
65	Britannia University
66	Port City International University
67	Bangladesh University of Health Sciences
68	Chittagong Independent University
69	Notre Dame University Bangladesh
70	Times University, Bangladesh
71	North Bengal International University
72	Fareast International University
73	Rajshahi Science & Technology University (RSTU), Natore
74	Sheikh Fazilatunnesa Mujib University
75	Cox's Bazar International University
76	Ranada Prasad Shaha University
77	German University Bangladesh
78	Global University Bangladesh
79	CCN University of Science & Technology
80	Bangladesh Army University of Science and Technology(BAUST), Saidpur
81	Bangladesh Army University of Engineering and Technology (BAUET), Qadirabad
82	Bangladesh Army International University of Science & Technology, Comilla
83	The International University of Scholars
84	Canadian University of Bangladesh
85	N.P.I University of Bangladesh
86	Northern University of Business & Technology, Khulna
87	Rabindra Maitree University, Kushtia

88	University of Creative Technology, Chittagong
89	Central University of Science and Technology
90	Tagore University of Creative Arts, Uttara, Dhaka, Bangladesh
91	University of Global Village
92	Rupayan A.K.M Shamsuzzoha University
93	Anwer Khan Modern University
94	ZNRF University of Management Sciences
95	Ahsania Mission University of Science and Technology
96	Khulna Khan Bahadur Ahsanullah University
97	Bandarban University
98	Shah Makhdum Management University, Rajshahi
99	Trust University, Barishal
100	International Standard University
101	University of Brahmanbaria
102	University of Skill Enrichment and Technology
103	Microland University of Science and Technology
104	R.T.M Al-Kabir Technical University
105	Sheikh Hasina University of Science and Technology
106	IBAIS University
107	The University of Comilla
108	Queens University
109	Chattagram BGMEA University of Fashion and Technology

Source: UGC website in Bangladesh, 2022

4.4.3 Private University Regulations

Private universities are expanding rapidly in Bangladesh, but many of them provide substandard education due to their small size, limited scope, inadequate facilities, and reliance on part-time teachers. The government should strengthen regulations and improve their implementation to ensure that private universities meet certain standards. Although some private universities have the potential for growth and success, the sector as a whole requires reform. The Private

Universities Act of 1992, which is currently being amended, should be enforced more strictly. Private universities should ideally have administrative structures similar to those of public universities, including a vice-chancellor and other statutory bodies. However, in most cases, these structures do not exist and the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor is often influenced by patrons of the university. Private universities face challenges such as non-compliance with regulations, lack of consistent policies for admission and examinations, opaque financial management, insufficient full-time teachers, inadequate infrastructure, laboratories and libraries, lack of extracurricular activities, and commercial bias in decision-making. To address these issues, the government should formulate specific guidelines for good governance, including restructuring governing bodies to include academics and members of civil society and appointing Vice-Chancellors more transparently. A realistic tuition cap can also be introduced to make private universities accessible to poor students.

4.4.4 Funding Private Universities

Private universities derive their funding primarily from their respective Board of Trustees, which is financed through tuition fees and other contributions made by students. However, ensuring the delivery of high-quality education involves more than just offering quality academic programs. While degree requirements and academic curricula may align with national and international standards, the caliber of education hinges on the quality of teachers employed by these universities. Regrettably, the overall faculty situation in private universities is generally suboptimal. When private universities were initially established in 1992, they understandably relied on a handful of expatriate instructors from the United States and part-time local faculty members from Dhaka University. However, the current scenario sees most private universities still depending on part-time instructors from public universities. These part-time teachers often juggle multiple roles, teaching at several private institutions in addition to their full-time positions at the main university to supplement their income. This practice can lead to reduced effectiveness and efficiency among these educators, ultimately impacting the quality of education provided by private universities.

Table 4.3: List of International Universities in Bangladesh

Serial Number	List of International Universities in Bangladesh
1	Islamic University of Technology, Gazipur
2.	Asian University for Women
3.	South Asian University

Source: UGC website in Bangladesh, 2022.

Table: 4.4: Data Statistics of Public and Private Universities in Bangladesh

Data Statistics of Public and Private Universities in Bangladesh				
Serial No	Description	Public Universities	Private Universities	Total
1	Number of Universities approved by UGC as of 2020.	50	107	157
2	Number of foreign funded universities.	-	-	02
3	Number of seats in universities at undergraduate level.	6,34,042	1,86,899	8,20,941
4	Number of seats at postgraduate level.	2,71,906	89,296	3,61,202
5	Number of students admitted in 2020.	10,99,707	99,771	11,99,478
6	Number of students studying in 2020.	43,62,187	3,28,689	46,90,876
7	Male Students.	24,23,418	2,31,185	26,54,603
8	Female Students.	19,38,769	97,504	20,36,273
9	Foreign Male Students.	767	1,322	1,929
10	Foreign Female Students.	160	228	388
11	Residential facility.	1,05,787	10,937	1,16,724
12	Faculty Members of the Universities.	15,426	15,277	30,703
13	Ph.D. Faculty Members.	5,651	2,950	8,601
14	Average Teacher Students Ratio.	1:31	1:22	1:27
15	Total Allocation for Research Sector (In single taka figure).	72,90,62,000	111,72,93,000	18,463.55

Source: UGC annual report, 2020

4.5 Branding and Marketing Initiatives in Higher Education:

Higher education is pursued for a variety of reasons, such as enhancing career prospects, increasing earning potential, expanding one's horizons, and acquiring knowledge. However, seeking higher education demands a significant investment of both time and money, prompting prospective students to be discerning in their choice of educational institution. This is where higher education branding plays a crucial role. In today's landscape, students have a multitude of options for accessing higher education, intensifying the competition among universities. Consequently, educational institutions must actively vie for students' attention. Branding, typically applied to products, services, or organizations, becomes equally vital in higher education. It helps universities distinguish themselves from their rivals and maintain a consistent message. This consistency enables prospective students to anticipate what a university offers, aiding them in their decision-making process. The process of higher education branding revolves around comprehending two fundamental elements: identifying the intangible qualities that set one university apart from others and effectively expressing these qualities through digital and physical mediums. Higher education branding empowers universities to communicate a unified message via a distinctive visual identity. This, in turn, fosters trust by consistently delivering on the promises associated with the brand—whether through printed materials, responsive websites, or various forms of marketing collateral in higher education.

4.5.1 Why is branding important for higher education?

Branding is how a university presents itself to the public, and it is essential to influence people's opinions about the institution. A strong brand helps people know what to expect from the university and unites its different departments and programs under a single, consistent identity. This consistency helps build trust with both current and prospective students, which is crucial for long-term student achievement and retention. Universities need branding and marketing to differentiate themselves from other institutions and gain a competitive advantage. Brand management involves traditional advertising, marketing, and identity development, as well as the use of technology. Universities are using responsive web design, data-driven analytics, social media, and mobile technology to reach their audience and gain a prominent position in search engine results. They are also using content management and customer relationship systems,

especially for admissions professionals, to reach out to prospective students. In recent years, institutions have been focusing more on design and advertising campaigns, as well as using a variety of new platforms for external engagement and communication in the online space, including social media and digital marketing. Website design and interface are also becoming increasingly important in how universities present themselves to prospective students.

Branding is important for higher education because it helps universities differentiate themselves in a highly competitive marketplace. Higher education branding allows universities to create a clear and consistent message that communicates their unique value proposition to students, faculty, alumni, and donors. This can help attract and retain students, increase fundraising efforts, and enhance the university's reputation. By creating a focused brand, universities can unite their various departments and programs under a single, cohesive umbrella, which helps build recognition and trust among current and prospective students. This is especially important since people like to know what to expect from organizations where they may spend years of their lives. Additionally, branding enables universities to communicate their message effectively across different platforms, including print materials, websites, and marketing collateral. In today's digital age, universities need to have a strong online presence, and branding helps ensure that their message is consistent across all online channels.

Furthermore, branding and marketing in higher education are becoming more technology-focused, with universities investing in responsive web design, search engine optimization, data-driven analytics, social media, and mobile technology. By leveraging these tools, universities can reach and engage with their audience in more effective ways, ultimately leading to increased student enrollment, retention, and success.

4.6 How to Develop the University Education and Becoming Brand

In order to improve the quality of university education, it is necessary to implement changes such as reforming the existing student politics, putting an end to the influence of teachers' politics, controlling corruption and nepotism, upgrading the facilities, and addressing session jam issues. Additionally, it is important to increase the responsibilities of teachers, recruit them based on merit, and introduce participatory and research-based educational methods. The medium of instruction should be in English to enhance the quality of education. Other improvements such as increased financial support, reduced residential crisis, and modernization of education should

also be considered.

Table 4.5: Elements of University Education Branding

Reforming the existing students politics
To stop the teachers politics
Recruitment of teachers by merit
To be more responsible of the teachers
To control the corruption, nepotism and
weakness to the party politics
To increase modern facilities
To introduce participatory education
To orient research based teaching method
To introduce medium of instruction in English
To increase financial support
To reduce residential crisis
To remove session jam
To make the education modern and time

CHAPTER - 5		
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS, ANALYSIS AND RESULT		
	Analysis and Findings	
	Recommendation	
	Conclusion	

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In this chapter, the data collected from the participants is presented and analyzed in order to determine their opinions based on the interview schedule and the objectives of the study. The interview schedule is divided into two parts: Part-1 collects descriptive information while Part-11 collects data on the influence of students on branding in higher education as perceived by current students and others. The analysis also includes demographic and descriptive data.

5.1: Demographic Data Analysis

Various demographic factors, such as the gender, occupation, and educational background of the respondents, have been addressed.

Table 5.1: Demographic Summary Statistics

Variables	Scales	Freq.	Percent
Education	1 st Year	154	40.00
	2 nd Year	77	20.00
	3 rd Year	60	15.58
	4 th Year	36	9.35
	Masters	55	14.29
	Others	3	0.78
Total		385	100.00
Age	19-25	332	86.23
	26-32	27	7.01
	33-39	17	4.42
	40-45	5	1.30
	46 above	4	1.04
Total		385	100.00
Faculty	Business	176	45.71
	Social Science	62	16.10
	Arts	60	15.58
	Science & Engineering	87	22.60
Total		385	100.00
Location	Rural	18	4.68
	Semi- Urban	69	17.92
	Urban	298	77.40
Total		385	100.00
Occupation	Students	344	89.35
	Teachers	24	6.23
	Officials	17	4.42

Total		385	100.00
Gender	Male	245	63.64
	Female	140	36.36
Total		385	100.00
Dependent Variable: University Brand Influence for Admission			
UBIA	Strongly Disagree	8	2.08
	Disagree	19	4.94
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	7	1.82
	Agree	183	47.53
	Strongly Agree	168	43.64
Total		385	100.00
Independent Variables			
BQE	Branding Quality Education		
SBI	Strong Brand Image		
BLE	Branding Learning Environment		
BSF	Branding Students Facilities		
BA	Branding Activities		

Source: Calculated on the basis of the field survey.

5.1.1: Gender Group of the Respondents

This study has included both male and female participants; however, a larger number of the respondents are male. As indicated in Table 5.1, out of the 385 participants in the study, 245 are male and 140 are female. This means that approximately 64% of the participants are male, while approximately 36% are female.

5.1.2: Occupation of the Respondents

The respondents have been categorized into three groups based on their occupation, namely students, teachers, and officials. The data presented in table 5.1 indicates that a majority of the respondents in this study are full-time students. Specifically, out of the 385 total samples, 344 respondents are students, 24 are teachers, and 17 are officials or fall under other categories. This means that approximately 90% of the respondents are students, while approximately 6% are teachers and 4% are officials.

5.1.3: Faculty of the Respondents

The respondents are categorized into four faculty groups based on their field of study, namely business, social science, arts, and science & engineering. Table 5.1 reveals that out of the total

385 respondents, 176 are from the business faculty, accounting for 45.71% of the total sample. 62 respondents are from the social science faculty, representing 16.10% of the total sample, while 60 respondents are from the arts faculty, representing 15.56% of the total sample. Finally, 87 respondents are from the science & engineering faculty, accounting for 22.60% of the total sample.

5.1.4: Education of the Respondents

Education is divided into six parts on the basis of the respondents like 1st year, 2nd year, 3rd year, 4th year, masters and others respondents. According to the table 5.1 it is found that out of total 385 respondents, 154 respondents are from 1st year and percentage is 40%, 77 respondents are from 2nd year and the percentage is 20%, 60 respondents are from 3rd and the percentage is 15.58%, 36 respondents are from 4th year the percentage is 9.35%. Similarly 55 respondents are from master's degree and the percentage is 14.29%. Finally 3 of the respondents has others degree like foreign degree, M.Phil. Or Ph.D. and the percentage is 0.78%.

5.1.5: University Branding Influence for Admission

The dependent variable is 'does brand influence the students to take higher education. On the basis of the statement out of 385 respondents 168 respondents are strongly agree that they influenced by brand and percentage is 43.64%. Similarly 183 respondents are agree that they also influenced by brand and the percentage is 47.53%. On the other hand 7 respondents are neutral and the percentage is 1.82%. 19 respondents disagree that they didn't influence by brand and the percentage is 4.94%. Similarly 8 respondents strongly disagree and the percentage is 2.04%.

5.2 Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Quality Education (PBQE)

Student's perception on branding quality education to choose a university for higher study have been captured through enriched faculty members, modern teaching methods, global guest teachers, international standard curriculum assessing creativity, credit transfer facility, no session jam, offering Ph.D. Course, foreign university affiliation and admission test. . These ten factors collectively represent the branding quality education in this study. Each factor includes several items to measure student's perceptions and each of these items has been tested individually to make ten determinant of quality education.

Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Quality Education (PBQE)

Table.5.2 Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Quality Education

Items	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Alpha Value	KMO Value	Mean (R)	Mean (A)	Mean (K)
EFM	38.44	44.16	12.21	5.19	-	0.8477	0.9040	0.3883	0.8639	0.9093
MTM	40.52	40.26	15.32	3.64	0.26	0.8539	0.9233			
GGT	29.09	48.05	18.44	2.86	1.56	0.8495	0.9060			
ISC	39.74	44.42	9.35	5.19	1.30	0.8431	0.9191			
AC	20.52	53.51	21.04	4.16	0.76	0.8531	0.9341			
CTF	29.09	47.01	15.84	7.53	0.52	0.8529	0.8850			
NSJ	37.66	41.30	12.73	5.71	2.60	0.8571	0.9097			
OPD	34.55	44.68	13.77	5.97	1.04	0.8502	0.9233			
FUA	56.62	31.17	4.94	5.71	1.56	0.8460	0.8946			
AT	23.64	44.16	20.52	10.65	1.04	0.8561	0.8983			

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Table 5.2 shows the percentage distribution of response for each item representing perceived branding quality education. Here,

EFM = Enriched Faculty Members

MTM = Modern Teaching Methods

GGT = Global Guest Teachers

ISC = International Standard Curriculum

AC= Assessing Creativity

CTF= Credit Transfer Facility

NSJ= No Session Jam

OPD= Offering Ph.D. Degree

FUA= Foreign University Affiliation

AT = Admission Test

The participants completed a survey using a five-point rating scale, where SD stands for Strongly Disagree, D for Disagree, N for Neutral, A for Agree, and SA for Strongly Agree. The table above indicates that for the first item, EFM, the highest response was on the 'Agree (A)' scale and it accounts for around 44.16% of the responses. For the second item, MTM, the highest

response was on the 'Strongly Agree (SA) and Agree (A)' scales with percentages of 40.52 and 40.26 respectively. The third item, GGT, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of 48.05%. The fourth item, ISC, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of 44.42%. Similarly, the fifth item, AC, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of 53.51%. The sixth item, CTF, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of 47.01%. For the seventh item, NSJ, the highest response was on the 'Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA)' scales with percentages of 37.66 and 41.30 respectively. The eighth item, OPD, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of 44.68%. For the ninth item, FUA, the highest response was on the 'Strongly Agree (SA)' scale with a percentage of 56.62%. Lastly, for the tenth item, AT, the highest response was on the 'Agree (A)' scale with a percentage of approximately 44%. All ten items were combined under the name PBQE, which stands for perceived branding quality education.

The factor PBQE, perceived branding quality education, underwent several specification tests such as Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), Alpha, and Average inter-item correlation range (R). A value greater than 0.60 is considered acceptable for the KMO test, and in this case, the value was 0.90, indicating that the correlation was not excessive. The Alpha test, which measures factor reliability, was 0.86, where a value greater than 0.70 is acceptable, indicating that PBQE is a reliable factor. The average inter-item correlation range from 0.15 to 0.50 is regarded as an acceptable level of consistency, and in the above table, the R value was 0.38.

5.3 Factor Analysis for Perceived Strong Brand Image (PSBI)

Student's perception on strong brand image to choose a university for higher study have been captured through university reputation, corporate relationship, university ranking, alumni employment position, media connection and university age . These six factors collectively represent the strong brand image in this study. Each factor includes several items to measure student's perceptions and each of these items has been tested individually to make six determinant of strong brand image.

Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Strong Brand Image (PSBI)

Table 5.3 Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Strong Brand Image

Items	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Alpha Value	KMO Value	Mean (R)	Mean (A)	Mean (K)
UR	49.09	40.52	7.53	2.60	0.26	0.8205	0.8773	0.4756	0.8448	0.8738
CR	68.57	22.26	5.45	3.38	-	0.8046	0.8447			
UR	61.30	25.97	5.45	6.49	0.78	0.8094	0.8731			
AEP	15.32	59.74	10.39	12.21	2.34	0.8394	0.8849			
MC	13.25	57.66	21.04	6.75	1.30	0.8158	0.8853			
UA	23.38	56.10	10.39	7.79	2.34	0.8245	0.8896			

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Table 5.3 shows the percentage distribution of response for each item representing perceived strong brand image. Here,

UR = University Reputation

CR = Corporate Relation

UR = University Ranking

AEP = Alumni Employment Position

MC= Media Connection

UA= University Age

The survey participants used a five-point scale consisting of SD (Strongly Disagree), D (Disagree), N (Neutral), A (Agree), and SA (Strongly Agree) to respond to the items. The table above displays the responses for six items that collectively make up the PSBI factor, which stands for perceived strong brand image. The item UR received the highest percentage of responses in the SA category, with 49.09%, while the highest response for CR was in the SA category at 68.57%. UR also had the highest response in the SA category at 61.30%. The AEP item received the highest percentage of responses in the A category at 59.74%, while MC and UA had the highest response in the A category at 57.66% and 56.10%, respectively.

To assess the PSBI factor, various specification tests were conducted, including Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), Alpha, and Average inter-item correlation range (R). A KMO value greater than 0.60 is considered acceptable and the PSBI factor had a value of 0.87, indicating moderate to

high correlation. An Alpha value greater than 0.70 indicates good factor reliability, and the PSBI factor had a value of 0.84. The R value, which measures the consistency of responses, ranged from 0.15 to 0.50, and the PSBI factor had an R value of 0.47, indicating moderate consistency.

5.4 Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Learning Environment (PBLE)

Student's perception on branding learning environment to choose a university for higher study have been captured through permanent campus, part-time job, existing foreign students, university location, university learning environment, digital campus, dress and behavioral code, university playground, common language and green campus. These ten factors collectively represent the branding learning environment in this study. Each factor includes several items to measure student's perceptions and each of these items has been tested individually to make ten determinant of branding learning environment.

Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Learning environment (PBLE)

Table 5.4 Percentage Distributions and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Learning Environment

Items	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Alpha Value	KMO Value	Mean (R)	Mean (A)	Mean (K)
PA	38.44	51.17	6.49	3.12	0.78	0.7504	0.8646	0.2628	0.7809	0.8538
PJ	14.55	24.42	30.13	29.87	1.04	0.7942	0.8356			
EFS	33.77	36.62	18.70	9.87	1.04	0.7627	0.8288			
UL	30.91	52.73	10.39	4.42	1.56	0.7404	0.8643			
ULE	38.70	46.23	8.05	5.97	1.04	0.7510	0.8879			
DC	16.36	57.92	19.48	4.94	1.30	0.7424	0.8802			
DBC	14.29	31.43	36.10	16.10	1.30	0.7730	0.8822			
UP	12.99	23.12	24.16	32.99	6.75	0.7863	0.7800			
UCL	12.73	44.16	29.35	13.25	0.52	0.7600	0.8231			
GC	26.49	53.51	10.39	8.83	0.78	0.7549	0.8432			

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Table.5.4 shows the percentage distribution of response for each item representing perceived branding learning environment. Here,

PA= Permanent Campus

PJ = Part-Time Job

EFS = Existing Foreign Students

UL = University Location

ULE= University Learning Environment

DC= Digital Campus

DBC= Dress and Behavioral Code

UP= University Playground

UCL= University Common Language

GC = Green Campus

The participants responded using a five-level scale, which includes the options SD = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, and SD = Strongly Disagree. The table above displays the results for ten items that collectively form the PBLE, or perceived branding learning environment, factor. The first item, PA, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale, covering around 51.17% of the responses. For PJ, the highest response was on the 'Neutral (N)' scale, at approximately 30.13%. The third item, EFS, scored highest on the 'Agree (A)' scale, with a percentage of 36.62%. Similarly, the fourth, fifth, and sixth items, UL, ULE, and DC, respectively, scored highest on the 'Agree (A)' scale, at percentages of 52.73%, 46.23%, and 57.92%, respectively. For DBC, the highest response was on the 'Neutral (N)' scale, with a percentage of 36.10%, while UP had the highest response on the 'Disagree (DA)' scale, at 32.99%. The eighth item, UCL, had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale, at 44.16%. Finally, GC had the highest response on the 'Agree (A)' scale, at approximately 53%.

To assess the PBLE factor, various specification tests were conducted, including the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, Alpha test, and Average inter-item correlation range (R). For the KMO test, a value greater than 0.60 is deemed acceptable, and here it was 0.85, suggesting that the correlation is not excessive. The Alpha test, which indicates factor reliability, yielded a value of 0.78, greater than the acceptable value of 0.70, indicating that the PBLE factor is reliable. Averaging the inter-item correlation ranging from 0.15 to 0.50 is considered an acceptable level of consistency. In the presented table, the R value was 0.26.

5.5 Factor Analysis for Perceived Branding Students Facilities (PBSF)

Student's perception on branding students facilities to choose a university for higher study have been captured through residential facility, transportation facility, job fair, industrial visit, scholarship facility, scholarship for global students, affordable tuition fees, health insurance,

canteen subsidy and extracurricular activities. These ten factors collectively represent the branding student's facilities in this study. Each factor includes several items to measure student's perceptions and each of these items has been tested individually to make ten determinant of branding students facilities.

Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Students Facilities (PBSF)

Table 5.5 Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived Branding Students Facilities

Items	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Alpha Value	KMO Value	Mean (R)	Mean (A)	Mean (K)
RF	20.00	48.83	23.64	5.97	1.56	0.8794	0.8603	0.4128	0.8755	0.8993
TF	26.75	57.14	9.09	7.01	-	0.8569	0.9299			
JF	31.17	34.81	25.97	7.79	0.26	0.8651	0.8601			
IV	57.92	31.95	3.90	5.19	1.04	0.8569	0.9068			
SF	47.79	35.84	9.61	5.19	1.56	0.8613	0.9259			
SFGS	22.08	56.10	14.29	6.23	1.30	0.8620	0.9216			
ATF	22.34	40.00	29.09	7.01	1.56	0.8617	0.8857			
HI	22.86	40.26	25.71	8.83	2.34	0.8659	0.8790			
CS	31.95	36.88	17.14	9.35	4.68	0.8683	0.9122			
ECA	47.53	41.82	3.38	4.94	2.34	0.8561	0.8881			

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Table 5.5 shows the percentage distribution of response for each item representing perceived branding students facilities. Here,

RF = Residential Facility

TF = Transportation Facility

JF = Job Fair

IV= Industrial Visit

SF= Scholarship Facility

SFGS= Scholarship Facilities for Global Students

ATF= Affordable Tuition Fees

HI= Health Insurance

CS = Canteen Subsidy

ECA= Extracurricular Activities

The participants used a five-level scale with the following abbreviations: SD (Strongly Disagree), D (Disagree), N (Neutral), A (Agree), and SA (Strongly Agree) to respond to the survey questions. Based on the table above, for the first item (RF), the highest percentage of responses fell under the 'Agree (A)' category, covering around 48.83% of the total responses. The second item (TF) had the highest response percentage on the 'Agree (A)' scale, which was around 57.14%. The third item (JF) had the highest percentage of 'Agree (A)' responses at 34.81%, while the fourth item (IV) had the highest percentage of 'Strongly Agree (SA)' responses at 57.92%. The fifth item (SF) had the highest percentage of 'Strongly Agree (SA)' responses at 47.79%. Similarly, for the sixth item (SFGS), the highest percentage of responses fell under the 'Agree (A)' category, which was 56.10%. The seventh item (ATF) had the highest percentage of 'Agree (A)' responses at 40.00%. The eighth item (HI) had the highest percentage of 'Agree (A)' responses at 40.26%. The ninth item (CS) had the highest percentage of 'Agree (A)' responses at 36.88%. Finally, the last item (ECA) had the highest percentage of 'Strongly Agree (SA)' responses at approximately 47%. Together, these ten items were referred to as PBSF, which stands for perceived branding students facilities.

The PBSF factor underwent some important specification tests, including the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), Alpha, and average inter-item correlation range (R) tests. An acceptable value for the KMO test is above 0.60, and in this case, it was 0.90, indicating that the correlation was not excessive. The Alpha test, which indicates factor reliability, was 0.88, which is acceptable since a value greater than 0.70 is considered acceptable. This suggests that the PBSF factor is reliable. An average inter-item correlation range of 0.15 to 0.50 is considered an acceptable level of consistency. In the table, the R value was 0.41.

5.6 Factor Analysis for Perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)

Student's perception on perceived university branding activities to choose a university for higher study have been captured through digital advertising, acronyms of university, lucrative website, social media, beauty of campus, cultural club, conference, students ambassador, logo slogan, university research. These ten factors collectively represent the university branding activities in this study. Each factor includes several items to measure student's perceptions and each of these items has been tested individually to make ten determinant of university branding activities.

Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)

Table 5.6 Percentage Distribution and Factor Test for Perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)

Items	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Alpha Value	KMO Value	Mean (R)	Mean (A)	Mean (K)
DA	39.48	41.04	15.06	3.90	0.52	0.8835	0.9411	0.4474	0.8901	0.9259
AU	49.61	39.48	6.75	3.90	0.26	0.8769	0.9275			
LW	27.79	54.81	10.65	5.71	1.04	0.8750	0.9224			
AMS	46.75	35.06	10.91	5.97	1.30	0.8802	0.9175			
BC	48.31	41.30	4.42	4.68	1.30	0.8748	0.9048			
CC	59.22	31.69	2.60	5.71	0.78	0.8725	0.9308			
UC	36.10	37.66	16.10	3.35	0.78	0.8885	0.9266			
SA	7.27	55.32	20.00	17.14	0.26	0.8865	0.9508			
LS	30.39	48.31	12.21	6.75	2.34	0.8820	0.9205			
UR	43.90	45.19	4.16	5.45	1.30	0.8720	0.9299			

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of response for each item representing perceived University Branding Activities (PUBA)

Here,

DA = Digital Advertising

AU = Acronyms of University

LW = Lucrative Website

AMS = All Social Media

BC= Beauty of Campus

CC= Cultural Club

UC= University Conference

SA= Students Ambassador

LS= Logo-Slogan

UR = University Research

The participants responded to a five-point scale with Strongly Agree (SD) and Strongly Disagree (SD) at opposite ends. The table shows the distribution of responses for each item. For item DA, 41.04% of participants selected the Agree (A) option. The highest percentage of Strongly Agree (SA) responses (49.61%) was recorded for item AU. Item LW had the highest percentage of

Agree (A) responses (54.81%), while item AMS had the highest percentage of SA responses (46.75%). Both items BC and CC received the highest percentage of SA responses, with 48.31% and 59.22%, respectively. For item UC, the majority of participants (37.66%) chose the Agree (A) option. Item SA had the highest percentage of Agree (A) responses (55.32%). The highest percentage of Agree (A) responses for items LS and UR were 48.31% and 45%, respectively. These ten items were combined and referred to as PUBA (perceived university branding activities). PUBA underwent several specification tests, including the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), Alpha, and Average inter-item correlation range (R) tests. The KMO test produced a score of 0.93, indicating acceptable correlation levels. The Alpha test yielded a score of 0.89, indicating that PUBA is a reliable factor. The acceptable range for Average inter-item correlation is from 0.15 to 0.50, and the R value obtained was 0.44.

5.7 Relationship between University Branding Influence and Gender

Table 5.7 Tabulation of University Branding Influences Gender

Gender	University Branding Influence for Admission (UBIA)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Male	3	14	6	116	106	245
	1.22	5.71	2.45	47.35	43.27	100.00
Female	5	5	1	67	62	140
	3.57	3.57	0.71	47.86	44.29	100.00
Total	8	19	7	183	168	385
	2.08	4.94	1.82	47.53	43.64	100.00
Pearson Chi2 = 4.69 Prob = 0.3205						
Cramér's V = 0.1104						

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

From the 5.7 table, the researcher found that the table of tabulation of university branding influences gender. Here, the dependent variable is UBIA- University branding Influences for Admission with Gender. From, the table 106 male respondents and 62 female respondents are strongly agree that branding influence them to select the University for taking higher education and the percentage 43.27% and 44.29% respectively. Similarly 116 male respondents and 67 female respondents are agreed on the dependent variable (UBIA) where percentages are 47.35% and 47.86% respectively. But 6 male and 1 female respondents are neither agree nor disagree on

(UBIA) and the percentages are 2.45% and 0.71% respectively. 14 male and 5 female respondents disagree on (UBIA) and the percentages are 5.71% and 3.75% respectively. 3 male and 5 female are strongly disagree with this statement where the percentages are 1.22% and 3.57% respectively. According to the gender variable, the author find that in total 245 male respondents and 140 respondents female out of 385 respondents. Author mentioned that 43. 64% and 47.53% both male and female are strongly agree and agree respectively out of 385 respondents. According to the table 5.7, the value of p is 0.3205 which is statistically insignificant as the accepted range is below 0.05. This indicates that the independent variable gender is not associated with the dependent variable University Branding Influence for Admission.

5.8 University Branding Influences with Education

Table 5.8 Tabulation of University Branding Influences Education

Education:	University Branding Influence for Admission					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
1st Year	3	7	1	84	59	154
	1.95	4.55	0.65	54.55	38.31	100.00
2nd Year	2	5	1	20	49	77
	2.60	6.49	1.30	25.97	63.64	100.00
3rd Year	3	2	0	34	21	60
	5.00	3.33	0.00	56.67	35.00	100.00
4th Year	0	2	3	22	9	36
	0.00	5.56	8.33	61.11	25.00	100.00
Masters	0	3	1	22	29	55
	0.00	5.45	1.82	40.00	52.73	100.00
Others	0	0	1	1	1	3
	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33	100.00
Total	8	19	7	183	168	385
	2.08	4.94	1.82	47.53	43.64	100.00
Pearson Chi2 = 58.05 Prob = 0.0000						
Cramér's V = 0.1942						

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

From the 5.8 table, the researcher found that the table of tabulation of university branding influences on education. Here, the dependent variable is UBIA- University branding Influences for Admission with Education. There are six levels of respondents like 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, masters' students, and others. Total respondent of the 1st year is 154 where 59 respondents are strongly

agree and the percentage is 38.31%, 84 respondents are agree and the percentage is 54.55%, 1 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0.65%, 7 respondents are disagree and 3 respondents are strongly disagree and the percentages are 4.55% and 1.95% respectively. Similarly, the total respondents of 2nd year students are 77 where 49 respondents are strongly agree and percentage is 63.64%, 20 respondents are agree and percentage is 25.97%, 1 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 1.30%, 5 respondents are disagree and 2 respondents are strongly disagree and the percentage are 6.49% and 2.60% respectively. The total respondents of 3rd year students are 60 where 21 respondents are strongly agree and the percentage is 35.00%, 34 respondents are agree and percentage is 56.57%, 0 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0.00%, 2 respondents are disagree and 3 respondents are strongly disagree and the percentages are 3.33% and 5.00% respectively. The total respondents of 4th year students are 36 where 9 respondents are strongly agree and the percentage is 25%, 22 respondents agreed, and the percentage is 66.11%, 3 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 8.33%, 2 respondents are disagree and 0 respondents are strongly disagree and the percentages are 5.56% and 0.00% respectively. The total respondents of masters, the students are 55, where 29 respondents are strongly agree and the percentage is 52.72%, 22 respondents agreed, and the percentage is 40.00%, 1 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 1.82%, 3 respondents are disagree and 0 respondents are strongly disagree and the percentages are 5.45% and 0.00% respectively. Similarly, the total respondents of others are 03 and the percentages is 33.33% where 01 respondent is strongly agree, 01 respondent agreed, 01 respondent is neither agree nor disagree and the percentages are 33.33% respectively, 0 respondent is disagree and 0 respondent is strongly disagree. 43. 64% and 47.53% respondents are strongly agree and agree respectively out of 385 respondent. According to the table 5.8, the value of p is 0.0000 which is statistically significant as the accepted range is below 0.05. This indicates that the independent variable education is associated with the dependent variable University Branding Influence for Admission.

5.9 University Branding Influences with Faculty

Table 5.9 Tabulation of University Branding Influences Faculty

Faculty	University Branding Influence for Admission					Total
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Business	5	10	3	77	81	176
	2.84	5.68	1.70	43.75	46.02	100.00
Social Science	1	3	0	32	26	62
	1.61	4.84	0.00	51.61	41.94	100.00
Arts	0	2	1	24	33	60
	0.00	3.33	1.67	40.00	55.00	100.00
Science & Engineering	2	4	3	50	28	87
	2.30	4.60	3.45	57.47	32.18	100.00
Total	8	19	7	183	168	385
	2.08	4.94	1.82	47.53	43.64	100.00
Pearson Chi2 = 12.71 Prob = 0.3906 Cramér's V = 0.1049						

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

The researcher of the study analyzed the 5.9 table and found that it represents the tabulation of university branding influences with faculty. In this table, the dependent variable is UBIA (University branding influences for admission) with faculty as the independent variable. The table presents the responses of the participants from different faculties. Out of the total 176 respondents from the business faculty, 81 strongly agree with the university branding influences for admission with faculty, and the percentage is 46.02%. 77 respondents agree with the statement, and the percentage is 43.75%. The remaining respondents are either neutral or disagree with the statement. Similarly, 62 respondents are from social science faculty where 26 respondents strongly agree with the university branding influences for admission with faculty, and the percentage is 41.94%. 32 respondents agree, and the percentage is 51.61%.

The table also shows the responses from respondents from the arts faculty and science and engineering faculty. After analyzing the table, the author found that the value of p is 0.3906, which is statistically insignificant, as the accepted range is below 0.05. This indicates that the independent variable faculty is not associated with the dependent variable University Branding Influence for Admission.

5.10 University Branding Influences with Occupation

Table 5.10 Tabulation of University Branding Influences Occupation

Occupation	University Branding Influence for Admission					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Students	7	17	5	163	152	344
	2.03	4.94	1.45	47.38	44.19	100.00
Teachers	0	1	1	12	10	24
	0.00	4.17	4.17	50.00	41.67	100.00
Officials	1	1	1	8	6	17
	5.88	5.88	5.88	47.06	35.29	100.00
Total	8	19	7	183	168	385
	2.08	4.94	1.82	47.53	43.64	100.00
Pearson Chi2 = 4.62 Prob = 0.7974 Cramér's V = 0.0775						

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

Based on the tabulated data in Table 5.10, the author observed that the table presents the relationship between universities branding influence for admission with respect to occupation. The UBIA (University Branding Influences for Admission) is the dependent variable, and it has been analyzed based on the different occupations. The total number of student respondents is 344, out of which 152 respondents strongly agree, constituting 44.19%, 163 respondents agree, making up 47.38%, 5 respondents are neutral with "neither agree nor disagree," while 17 respondents disagree and 7 respondents strongly disagree, with percentages of 4.94% and 2.03%, respectively. In the case of teachers, 24 respondents are there, among which 10 respondents strongly agree, making up 41.67%, 12 respondents agree, making up 50.00%, 1 respondent is neutral, and 1 respondent disagrees, with the percentages of 4.17%, respectively. For officials, 17 respondents are there, out of which 6 respondents strongly agree, representing 35.29%, 8 respondents agree, representing 47.06%, 1 respondent is neutral, and 1 respondent disagrees, with the percentages of 5.88%, respectively. The table shows that the value of p is 0.7974, which is statistically insignificant because it is above the accepted range of below 0.05. This indicates that the independent variable occupation is not associated with the dependent variable University Branding Influence for Admission.

5.11 University Branding Influences with Admission

Table 5.11 Tabulation of University Branding Influences with Admission

Uni- Name:	University Branding Influence for Admission					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
NSU	0	0	2	7	10	19
	0.00	0.00	10.53	36.84	52.63	100.00
AIUB	0	1	0	5	13	19
	0.00	5.26	0.00	26.32	68.42	100.00
BRAC	0	2	0	10	7	19
	0.00	10.53	0.00	52.63	36.84	100.00
EWU	0	0	0	15	4	19
	0.00	0.00	0.00	78.95	21.05	100.00
IUBAT	2	0	0	10	11	23
	8.70	0.00	0.00	43.48	47.83	100.00
DIU	0	1	0	15	4	20
	0.00	5.00	0.00	75.00	20.00	100.00
DIU	0	1	0	12	12	25
	0.00	4.00	0.00	48.00	48.00	100.00
SFMU	1	2	0	13	16	32
	3.13	6.25	0.00	40.63	50.00	100.00
BU	0	1	0	12	11	24
	0.00	4.17	0.00	50.00	45.83	100.00
MIU	1	1	0	12	6	20
	5.00	5.00	0.00	60.00	30.00	100.00
BAUST	1	1	0	9	9	20
	5.00	5.00	0.00	45.00	45.00	100.00
AUB	0	1	0	2	17	20
	0.00	5.00	0.00	10.00	85.00	100.00
UITS	0	1	0	10	4	15
	0.00	6.67	0.00	66.67	26.67	100.00
DU	0	0	0	1	14	15
	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	93.33	100.00
CU	0	1	0	14	0	15
	0.00	6.67	0.00	93.33	0.00	100.00
JNU	1	0	1	11	2	15
	6.67	0.00	6.67	73.33	13.33	100.00
MBSTU	1	1	1	6	6	15
	6.67	6.67	6.67	40.00	40.00	100.00
HSTU	1	0	0	4	10	15
	6.67	0.00	0.00	26.67	66.67	100.00
JKKNIU	0	2	0	9	4	15
	0.00	13.33	0.00	60.00	26.67	100.00
BUP	0	3	3	6	8	20

	0.00	15.00	15.00	30.00	40.00	100.00
Total	8	19	7	183	168	385
	2.08	4.94	1.82	47.53	43.64	100.00
Pearson Chi2 = 140.46 Prob = 0.0000 Cramér's V = 0.3020						

Source: Calculation Based on Field Survey, 2022

From the table, the author found that total respondents from NSU 19 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 10 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 52.63%, 7 respondents agree, and the percentage is 36.84%, 02 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 10.53%. There are no respondents on the statement of disagree and strongly disagree.

From the table, the author found that total respondents from AIUB 19 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 13 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 68.42%, 5 respondents agree, and the percentage is 26.32%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 1 respondents on the statement of disagree and percentage is 5.26% and no respondent on strongly disagree.

From the table, the author found that total respondents from BRAC 19 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 7 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 36.84%, 10 respondents agree, and the percentage is 52.63%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There are 2 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 10.53% and no respondent on strongly disagree.

From the table, the author found that total respondents from EWU 19 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 04 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 21.5%, 15 respondents agree, and the percentage is 78.95%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There are no respondents on the statement of disagree and strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from IUBAT 23 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 11 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 47.83%, 10 respondents agree, and the percentage is 43.48%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 5.00% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from DIU 20 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 04 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 20.00%, 15 respondents agree, and the percentage is 75.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 5.00% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from DIU 25 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 12 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 48.00%, 12 respondents agree, and the percentage is 48.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 4.00% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from SFMU 32 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 16 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 50.00%, 13 respondents agree, and the percentage is 40.63%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 6.25% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from BU 24 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 11 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 45.83%, 12 respondents agree, and the percentage is 50.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 4.17% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from MIU 20 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 06 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 30.00%, 12 respondents agree, and the percentage is 60.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There are 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the strongly disagree and the percentages are 5.00%

From the table, the author found that total respondents from BAUST 20 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 09 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 45.00%, 09 respondents agree, and the percentage is 45.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There are 01 respondent on the statement of disagree and strongly disagree and also the percentage is 5.00%

From the table, the author found that total respondents from AUB 20 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 17 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 85.00%, 2 respondents agree, and the percentage is 10.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 5.00% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from UITS 24 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 4 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 26.67%, 10 respondents agree, and the percentage is 66.67%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 6.67% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from DU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 14 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 99.33%, 1 respondent agree, and the percentage is 6.67%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is no respondents on the statement of disagree and strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from CU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 0 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 0 %, 14

respondents agree, and the percentage is 93.33%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 6.67% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from JNU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 2 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 13.33%, 11 respondents agree, and the percentage is 73.33%, 1 respondents is neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 6.67%. There is 0 respondents on the statement of disagree and 1 respondent on strongly disagree and the percentage is 6.67%

From the table, the author found that total respondents from MBSTU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 6 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 40%, 6 respondents agree, and the percentage is 40.00%, 1 respondents are neither agree nor disagree ,disagree, strongly disagree and the percentage is 6.67%

From the table, the author found that total respondents from HJTU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 10 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 66.67%, 4 respondents agree, and the percentage is 26.67%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and agree and the percentage is 0%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of strongly disagree and the percentage is 6.67.

From the table, the author found that total respondents from JKKNIU 15 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 4 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 26.67%, 9 respondents agree, and the percentage is 60.00%, 0 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 0%. There is 02 respondents on the statement of disagree and the percentage is 13.33% and no respondent on strongly disagree

From the table, the author found that total respondents from BUP 20 out of 385 respondents. For the dependent variable UBIA, 8 respondents strongly agree and the percentage is 40.00%, 6 respondents agree, and the percentage is 30.00%, 3 respondents are neither agree nor disagree and the percentage is 15%. There is 01 respondents on the statement of disagree and the

percentage is 15% and no respondent on strongly disagree. According to the table 5.11, the value of p is 0.0000 which is statistically significant as the accepted range is below 0.05. This indicates that the independent variable university is associated with the dependent variable University Branding Influence for Admission.

5.12 Multiple Regression Model Results

All of the aforementioned factor analyses were conducted to evaluate the influence of different aspects of University Branding Initiatives on induced university admissions. In this study, the variables of interest concerning University Branding Initiatives include 'Branding Quality Education,' 'Strong Brand Image,' 'Branding Learning Environment,' 'Branding Student Facilities,' and 'University Branding Activities' as explanatory factors. Conversely, 'University Branding Influence for Admission' has been regarded as the dependent variable. Summary statistics for all these variables are presented in Table 5.1

5.12 Multiple Regression Results on Perceived University Branding Influence for Admission and University Branding Initiatives

To what extent University Branding Initiative variables can explain the perception of University Branding Influence for Admission (UBIA) has been assessed. Table 5.12 shows the multiple regression results on perceived university branding influence for admission and university branding initiatives.

Table 5.12 reveals that the coefficient for 'Branding Quality Education,' one of the University Branding Initiative variables, is highly significant at the 1% level, indicating a positive relationship with a coefficient value of 1.571. Similarly, 'Strong Brand Image' also exhibits a positive correlation, with a coefficient of 1.354 at the 1% significance level. This suggests that a Strong Brand Image plays an essential role in aiding students in their decision-making process when selecting a university for higher education.

Table 5.12 Multiple Regression on Perceived University Branding Influence for Admission and University Branding Initiative

Variable	Variable Description	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	[95% Conf.	Interval]
BQE	Branding Quality Education	1.571***	.365	4.30	.853	2.29
SBI	Strong Brand Image	1.354***	.356	3.81	.654	2.053
BLE	Branding Learning Environment	1.077***	.392	-2.75	-1.848	-.306
BSF	Branding Student Facilities	.329	.391	0.84	-.44	1.098
BA	University Branding Activities.	1.825***	.421	4.33	.997	2.654
Constant		1.128***	.135	8.37	.863	1.393
Observation		385				
R-squared		0.6321				
Dependent Variable: UBIA (Perceived University Branding Influence for Admission)						

N.B.: Standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

The effect of Perceived Branding Learning Environment on Perceived University Branding Influence for Admission was found to be positive with a significant level of 1%. Interestingly, the study found that Branding Student Facilities did not have a significant effect, possibly due to the fact that most respondents were from private universities in Bangladesh where facilities such as residential opportunities and canteens are not optimal compared to public universities. Private university students are more concerned about the learning environment, educational quality, and tuition fees as they need to pay for these themselves, whereas public university students prioritize extracurricular facilities like job fairs, residential options, canteens, and free transportation.

The study also found that university branding activities have a statistically significant impact on university branding influence for students' admission, with a coefficient of 1.825. This suggests that overall branding initiatives in higher education have a strong association with students' choices to engage in higher studies. The empirical model was able to explain 63% of the variation in Perceived University Branding Influence for Admission by University Branding Initiative, as indicated by the R² value of 0.6321 in Table 5.12.

CHAPTER - 6 RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION		
6.1	Findings of the Study	
6.2	Recommendation	
6.3	Conclusion	

CHAPTER- 6

RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter provides a summary of the study's findings, recommendations and conclusions. The findings are presented in a logical sequence without any bias or interpretation. The researcher has described and defined the data collected, analyzed, and interpreted. The conclusion provides a brief summary of the paper's results and aims to help readers understand the significance of the research. It not only summarizes the main topics covered but also suggests new areas for future research. Based on the findings and conclusion of the report, recommendations are provided to assist future researchers in this field of study.

6.1 Findings

From the study following points are found to disclose.

6.1.1 Findings Regarding Branding Quality Education

- a) Enriched faculty members are key branding elements of university branding. Based on the top 20 branded universities both public and private students have expressed the opinion that they are influenced by the rich faculty members to get admission in these universities. About 83% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant.

- b) Modern teaching methods attract the attention of students to choose universities for higher education. Based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students are impressed by the university's modern teaching methods. About 81% of the respondents strongly agree and agree with these statements and according to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant.

- c) Global guest lecturers play an important role for university branding. Based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students believe this statement. About 77%

of the respondents strongly agree and agree with these statements and according to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant.

- d)** International standard curriculum attracts the attention of students. Respondents responded positively to this statement. About 83% of the respondents feel that they are influenced by the quality of the curriculum and based on the regression results, it is statistically highly significant.
- e)** Assessing students' creativity, respondents responded positively to this statement. For latent knowledge, discovery is imperative. About 73% of the respondents strongly agree and disagree with this statement. However, it is highly statistically significant.
- f)** Credit transfer facility is a mediator of university branding. About 76% of the respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. Apart from this, it is highly statistically significant.
- g)** No session jam is a great branding initiative of a university. Based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students believe that political unrest and other factors do not attract students' attention. About 76% of the respondents strongly agree and disagree with this statement. Moreover, it is highly statistically significant.
- h)** A PhD degree enhances the image of a university. Most of the respondents strongly agree with this statement and agree that PhD degree will enhance the image of the university offering it and it is a branding factor for that university. According to the regression results, this factor is highly significant.
- i)** Affiliation with foreign universities builds a university's image locally and internationally. Based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students are influenced by foreign university affiliations. About 88% of the respondents strongly agree and disagree with this statement. Moreover, it is highly statistically significant.

- j) The admission test is the branding elements of the university. About 67% of the respondents strongly agree and disagree with this statement. Moreover, it is statistically significant.

6.1.2 Findings Regarding strong Brand Image

- a) Students select a university based on its reputation. Based on the selected university respondents, the results show that almost 90% of the respondents agree and strongly agree with this statement. Yet it is highly statistically significant.
- b) Students get preferences to enter the job market based on the corporate relationship. The employer sometimes mentions the name of some universities in job circular. Approximate 81% of the respondents from the selected universities strong agree and agree on this statement. Moreover, it is statistically highly significant.
- c) University rankings influence a student's admission to a university. So the ranking is a great branding initiative, based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students make this statement with around 87% strongly agree and agree. Additionally, it is highly statistically significant.
- d) An alumni employment position focuses strong brand image. Based on the top 20 branded universities, both public and private students make this statement with around 74% strongly agree and agree. Additionally, it is highly statistically significant.
- e) Media connection plays an important role in advertising and branding of universities. Students are influenced by a university's media connections. Approximately 71% of the respondents agreed with the statement that media connectivity maintains potential student mind-set. It is highly statistically significant.
- f) Age of the university is a factor in branding but according to the results of the respondents it shows that 70% of the respondents strongly agree and agree that students

are admitted based on the age of the university. But 30% of students don't think university age is influenced by students. But it is highly statistically significant.

6.1.3 Findings Regarding Branding Learning Environment

- a) A permanent campus is a great branding initiative of a university. Based on the top 20 branded universities both public and private students have expressed the opinion that they are influenced by the permanent campus to get admission in these universities. About 90% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- b) A part-time job facilities draw concentration of students. About 38% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement and majority of respondents are not agree on this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- c) Existing foreign students create an image of a university. About 70% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- d) Students give the priority to choosing a university on the basis of location. About 83% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- e) The university learning environment is very effective for students choosing criteria for study. About 84% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- f) Digital Campus creates the position of the students mind. About 73% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.

- g) Dress and behavioral codes is the key factor of branding. About 45% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement but majority of the respondents don't agree on this statements. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant
- h) Playground attracts the students. About 35% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement but 65% of the respondents don't agree on this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- i) Common Language strengthens the university. About 57% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- j) Green inside and outside of the campus draws attention of the students. About 57% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.

6.1.4 Findings Regarding Branding Students Facilities

- a) Residential facilities draw the student's attention to taking admission. About 68% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, According to the regression result, it is statistically insignificant.
- b) Transportation facilities are the great branding tools of a university. About 83% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- c) Organizing job fair is the great advertisement of a university. About 65% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- d) Industrial visits create the image of the university. About 88% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.

- e) A scholarship facility is the great branding tool of a university. About 82% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- f) Scholarship for global students is the medium of international branding. About 78% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- g) Affordable tuition fees with quality education draw attention from potential students. About 62% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- h) Health insurance during study time draws the attention of students. About 61% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- i) Canteen facility Subsidy. About 68% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.
- j) University extracurricular activities draw attention of many students. About 89% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement According to the regression results, it is statistically significant.

6.1.5 Factors Regarding Branding Students Facilities

- a) Digital advertising is an effective branding tool of university branding. Based on the top 20 branded universities both public and private students have expressed the opinion that they are influenced by the digital advertising to get admission in these universities. About 80% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant

- b)** Acronyms of university names create a quick position by brand. Based on the top 20 branded universities both public and private students have expressed the opinion that they are influenced by short name to get admission in these universities. About 89% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- c)** A lucrative website draws the attention of potential students. About 81% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- d)** Social Media plays a vital role to bring university reputation. About 81% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- e)** Branding works through the beauty of campus effectively. About 89% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant.
- f)** Cultural Club branding create the positions in the students mind. About 90% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- g)** University conference draws the attention of mass people. About 73% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- h)** Student ambassador make the students proud. About 62 % of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically significant

- i) University logo and slogan is great branding tool. About 78% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant
- j) Research is a great branding platform for a university. About 88% of respondents strongly agree and agree with this statement. According to the regression results, it is statistically highly significant

6.1.6 Research Implication

The findings of this study can be of significant value to the decision-makers in private and public universities, as well as government initiatives related to branding. These findings provide insights into the factors that can be utilized for effective university branding. By implementing these factors appropriately, universities can position themselves globally and contribute to the improvement of the education system in the country.

6.2 Recommendations

- a) Universities should prioritize cultivating quality faculty and use them as a branding tool to position the university.
- b) Modern education systems that are in tune with the world should be widely promoted as a branding tool.
- c) Local and foreign guest teachers should be invited to teach at universities, as this helps promote the university both locally and abroad.
- d) Maintaining an international standard curriculum can draw the attention of potential students and should be prioritized for teaching and branding.
- e) Credit transfer facilities should be contracted with all universities in the country and abroad, as this can act as a branding tool.
- f) Affiliation with more foreign universities can increase branding.
- g) Universities should come up with creative ideas to enhance or maintain their reputation, as the reputation of the university is a branding tool.
- h) Maintaining corporate relations can give preference to all university students and contribute to branding.

- i) Universities should focus on maintaining their ranking, as this has a significant influence on student admissions.
- j) Training university students to become effective human resources can help them brand the university themselves.
- k) Publicizing all university programs and news in the media can significantly contribute to branding.
- l) Using short names or acronyms of the university can make them easily remembered by people, which is a useful branding element.
- m) Having a beautiful and informative university website can also help brand the university.
- n) Maintaining the beauty of the university campus and giving permission to shoot movies or drama can help brand the university.
- o) Promoting the university cultural club can also be a great branding tool.
- p) Focusing on the university logo and slogan can make them easily remembered by people, so they should be publicized using different advertising platforms.
- q) Emphasizing research can help universities brand themselves both locally and internationally.

6.3 Conclusion

Many educational institutions worldwide are competing to establish a reputation that will attract students. With increased competition, branding has become more important to enhance an organization's reputation. In Bangladesh, there are numerous universities, but the branding initiatives are inadequate, making it difficult for students to interact positively with universities. This study sheds light on branding initiatives in higher education for the top 20 selected universities, both public and private, in Bangladesh. The research used purposive convenience sampling techniques and collected data from 385 participants, mostly students, officials, and teachers, using the Likert scale. Principal factor analysis was performed using STATA software, and regression analysis was used to identify key branding elements. The study identified five main variables: branding quality education, strong brand image, branding learning environment, branding student facilities, and university branding tools. The study reveals that several factors, such as enriched faculty member branding, modern teaching methods branding, global guest teacher invitation, standard curriculum, credit transfer facility, foreign university affiliation,

admission test, university reputation creation, corporate relationships, university ranking, media connection, permanent campus build, scholarship facilities, top location selection, learning environment, digital advertising, cultural club branding, and an attractive website, influence students' admission decisions. To brand their universities, university authorities should utilize these steps, create awareness among the public through mass media, and organize gatherings for grand events annually. Universities need to focus on public relations, promote their core staff, faculty, and outstanding students in national media, and create a brand promise based on academic offerings, student experience, and institutional prestige. Research and development is a crucial tool for universities to improve their standing nationally and internationally. Therefore, universities should focus on the research and development of their faculty members and associations.

References

- Afrin, S. (2020). Effective Branding and Choice of University: A Thematic Analysis of Bangladeshi Private University Students. *AIUB Journal of Business and Economics*, 17(1), 67-90.
- Ahmed, J. U., Ahmed, K. U., Shimul, M. A., & Zuñiga, R. (2015). Managing strategies for higher education institutions in the UK. *Higher Education for the Future*, 2(1), 32-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631114558189>
- Alam, M. I., Faruq, M. O., Alam, M. Z., & Gani, M. O. (2019). Branding initiatives in higher educational institutions: Current issues and research agenda. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 1, 34-45. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2019.1-03>
- Anam, R. L. (2019). undefined. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 15(2), 125. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v15i2.7560>
- Álvarez-Mendiola, G., & González-Ledesma, M. A. (2017). Marketing context and branding content of private universities in Chile and Mexico. *Competition in Higher Education Branding and Marketing*, 37-62. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58527-7_3
- Bailey, K.D. (1994). *Methods of Social Research (4th Ed.)*. New Work: free Press.
- Biaton, L. (2015). CREATING MARKETING STRATEGIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS. *MINIB*, 18(4), 129-146.
- Branding for Higher Education: How to Create a Unique and Impactful Brand in 5 Steps. (2021, October 8). *HEM Education Marketing Solution*.
- Cherkunova, N. G. (2016). The Formation of Marketing Strategy of the Higher Educational Institutions to Increase their Efficiency. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(2), 37-42.
- Clark, P., Chapleo, C., & Suomi, K. (2019). Branding higher education: An exploration of the role of internal branding on middle management in a university rebrand. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 26(2), 131-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-019-09054-9>

- Drori, G. (2015). Branding universities: Trends and strategies. *International Higher Education*, (71), 3-5. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2013.71.6083>
- Faiz, M. T. (2018). *Higher education marketing in the lenses of 4Cs: A Case Study* [Master's thesis].
- Fisher, A.A., Laing, J. E., Stoeckel, J.E., & Townsend, J.W.(1991). *Handbook for family planning operations research design*. New York: Population Council.
- Gupta, S.P., & Gupta, M.P.(2012). *Business Statistics (15th Ed.)*. New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Gathungu, J.J.W., & Karoki, A.W. (2010, August). *Service branding: From developing service brands to value creation in the hospitality & tourism industry in Kenya*. Paper presented at the International Research Symposium in Service Management. Republic of Mauritius.
- Hanover Research. (2014). Trends in Higher Education Marketing, Recruitment, and Technology. *Hanover Research | Academy Administration Practice*
- Haryanto, T. (2021). University branding: Student perspectives in private University in Indonesia. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 04(07). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v4-i7-19>
- Hass, G. (2021, March 9). The Importance of Modern Higher Education Branding. *Constant Contact*. <https://www.constantcontact.com/blog/the-importance-of-modern-higher-education-branding/>
- Higher education marketing in the lenses of 4Cs: A Case Study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Eastern Finland. (n.d.).
- Judson, K. M., Aurand, T. W., Gorchels, L., & Gordon, G. L. (2008). Building a University brand from within: University administrators' perspectives of internal branding. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 30(1), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332960802467722>
- Keller (1993) *Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer based brand equity*, *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1) (1993), pp. 1-22.
- Keller, K. L., & Swaminathan, V. (2019). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Kamath, M. U., & Seená, D. (2015). Implication of Branding Initiatives in engineering colleges - An empirical study. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 17(11), 4-11.
- Knight, J. (2013). Education hubs: Issues, indicators and reflections. *International Education Hubs*, 207-228. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6_12
- Kotler, P., Kotler, P. T., Fox, K. F., & Fox, K. F. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Prentice Hall.
- KT, C. K., & Manjunath, S. J. (2020). A STUDY ON BRANDING IN THE HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR. *AEGAEUM JOURNAL*, 8(6), 1453-1460.
- Lamboy, J. V. (2011). *Implications of Branding Initiatives in Higher Education Among Trademarked Institutions in California* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of San Francisco.
- M. Anwarul Islam, K. (2016). The role of private universities in higher education of Bangladesh: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Finance and Banking Research*, 2(4), 121. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijfbr.20160204.11>
- Maresova, P., Hruska, J., & Kuca, K. (2020). Social media University branding. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), 74. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030074>
- Maringe, F., & Gibbs, P. (2008). *Marketing higher education: Theory and practice*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Miller, D., Merrilees, B., Yakimova, R. (2014). Corporate rebranding: An intergative review of major enables and barriers to the rebranding process. *International Journal of Management Review*, 16 (3), 265-289
- Monem, M., & Baniamin, H. M. (2010). Higher Education in Bangladesh: Status, Issues and Prospects. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 30(2), 293-305. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229048197_Higher_Education_in_Bangladesh_Status_Issues_and_Prospects

- Muhsin, M., Martono, S., Nurkhin, A., Pramusinto, H., Afsari, N., & Arham, A. F. (2019). The relationship of good University governance and student satisfaction. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p1>
- Omar, C. M. (2013). Rebranding of university in Malaysia. *International journal of business and behavioral sciences*, 1-10.
- Osman, A. R., & Saputra, R. S. (2019). A pragmatic model of student satisfaction: A viewpoint of private higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 27(2), 142-165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qae-05-2017-0019>
- Othman, R., & Othman, R. (2014). Higher Educational Institutions and Social Performance: Evidence From Public and Private Universities. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(1).
- Pasternak, K. (2017, March 29). Five Strategies for Building a Great University Brand. *Inside Higher ED*.
- Rony, M. E., & Rashid, S. M. (2009). Perspective of Teaching-Learning Practices in Private Universities of Bangladesh. *NAEM Journal*, 5(9), 67-77.
- Ruben, B. D. (2004). *Pursuing excellence in higher education : eight fundamental challenges*. San Francisco, Calif. : Jossey-Bass, ©2004.
- Rohim, M. N. (2019). Marketing strategy for educational services. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Education Innovation (ICEI 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icei-19.2019.61>
- Rothblatt, S. (2008). Global branding and the celebrity university. *Liberal Education*, 94(4), 26–33.
- Rubtsov, V.V. (1996), A concept of development of non-state education in Russia. The bases of social genetic psychology: The selected psychological works Moscow: The Institute of Practical Psychology. Voronezh: NPO MODEK. p344-366. Available from: <https://www.psychlib.ru/inc/absid.php?absid=85923>.

- Sahin, O., & Sings, U. S. (2017). A literary excavation of University brand image past to present. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 3(3).
<https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v3i3p174>
- Sawrov, M. H., & Hasan, M. T. (2018). Branding Initiatives in Higher Education: A Study on Some Selected Universities in Bangladesh. *The International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(1), 20-26.
- Shamma, H. M., & Hassan, S. S. (2009). Customer and non-customer perspectives for examining corporate reputation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(5), 326-337.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420910981800>
- Smith, S. (2013, April 8). Determining sample size: how to ensure you get the correct sample size.
- Sujchaphong, N., Nguyen, B., & Melewar, T. C. (2014). Internal branding in universities and the lessons learnt from the past: The significance of employee brand support and transformational leadership. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 25(2), 204–237.
- Solis, E. (2020, August 12). 7 Ways A University Branding Strategy Brings In Students. *Penji*.
- Valitov, S. M. (2014). University brand as a modern way of winning competitive advantage. *ELSEVIER*, 295-299.

(Survey Questionnaire)**Branding Initiatives in Higher Education: A Study on Some Selected Universities in Bangladesh**

Researcher needs some information from you for the successful completion of this research. He wishes your kind cooperation and assistance. He can assure you that any information you provide him will be used solely for research purposes.

Name:

Age: a) 19-25 b) 26-35 c) 36-50 d) 51-65 e) 65 above

Gender: a) Male b) Female

Education: a) 1st Year; b) 2nd Year; c) 3rd Year; d) 4th Year; e) Masters; f) Ph.D.; g) Others

University Name:

Location: a) Rural b) Semi Urban c) Urban

Departments: a) Business Faculty b) Social Science Faculty c) Arts Faculty d) Science & Engineering

Occupation: a) Student b) Teacher c) Officer d) High Official e) Others

Write your opinion. (Students only, I to III).

I. Why did you choose this university for higher study?

.....

II. How did you know about this university?

.....

III. Does the university brand influence you to study here?

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral

- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

Section A: Branding Quality Education

1. **Enriched faculty members are the key branding elements of university branding.**
 - a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
2. **Modern teaching methods draw attention of students to select universities for higher education.**
 - a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
3. **Global guest teachers play a crucial role for university branding.**
 - a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
4. **The international standard curriculum draws the attention of potential students.**
 - a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
5. **Assessing the creativity of students is a tool of quality education.**

- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 6. The credit transfer facility is the mediator of university branding**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 7. No session jam is the great branding initiative of a University**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 8. Offering Ph.D. courses enhances a university's image**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 9. If any university has affiliation with global institute, students give the priority to taking admission there**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree

10. The admission test is the branding elements of university

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

Section B: Strong Brand Image**1. Students select a university on the basis of university's reputation.**

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

2. Students get preferences to enter the job market based on university corporate relationship.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

3. Students select a university on the basis of ranking.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

4. An alumni employment position focuses strong brand image.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral

- d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 5. University reputation plays a vital role in media connections**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 6. A university image developed by age.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree

Section C: Branding Learning Environment.

- 1. A permanent campus is a great branding initiative of a university.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 2. A part-time job facilities draw concentration of students**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 3. Existing foreign students create an image of a university**
- a) Strongly Agree

- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

4. Students give the priority to choosing a university on the basis of location

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

5. The university learning environment is very effective for students choosing criteria for study.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

6. Digital Campus creates the position of the students mind

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

7. Dress and behavioral codes is the key factor of branding

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

8. Playground attract the students

- a) Strongly Agree

- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

9. Common Language strengthens the university.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

10. Green inside and outside of the campus draw the attention of the students.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

Section D: Students Facilities

1. Residential facilities draw the student's attention to taking admission

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

2. Transportation facilities are the great branding tools of a university.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

- 3. Organizing job fair is the great advertisement of a university.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 4. Industrial visits create the image of the university.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 5. A scholarship facility is the great branding tool of a university.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 6. Scholarship for global students is the medium of international branding**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 7. Affordable tuition fees with quality education draw attention from potential students**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral

- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

8. Health insurance during study time draws the attention of students

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

9. Canteen Subsidy attracts the students.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

10. University extracurricular activities draw attention of many students

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

Section E: Branding Activities

1. Digital advertising is an effective branding tool of university branding.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

2. Acronyms of university names create a quick position by brand.

- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 3. A lucrative website draws the attention of potential students.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 4. All types of Media including social media are a great tool of branding.**
- a. Strongly Agree
 - b. Agree
 - c. Neutral
 - d. Disagree
 - e. Strongly Disagree
- 5. Branding works through the beauty of campus effectively**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 6. Cultural Club branding create the positions in the students mind.**
- a) Strongly Agree
 - b) Agree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Disagree
 - e) Strongly Disagree
- 7. University conference draws the attention of mass people.**
- a) Strongly Agree

- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

8. Student ambassadors make the students proud.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

9. University logo and slogan is great branding tool.

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

10. Research is a great branding platform for a university

- a) Strongly Agree
- b) Agree
- c) Neutral
- d) Disagree
- e) Strongly Disagree

Thank You for Your Nice Cooperation