

Measuring the Brand Image Association with Personal and Social Factors for Private Universities

Osman Sahin^{1*}, Dr. Uma Shankar Singh²

¹Department of Business and Administration, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq Correspondence: Osman Sahin, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq

²Department of Business and Administration, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq Correspondence: Osman Sahin, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq

*Corresponding author

Osman Sahin

Article History

Received: 12.04.2018

Accepted: 30.04.2018

Published: 30.05.2018



Abstract: This study investigates the university's brand image with the aim of explaining the components of the image and effects of the image on students' university selection and also the study examines the relationships between the different components of the university image. The main objective was to clarify how different private university constructs their image. This research is aimed at finding the importance of brand image for the persuasion of students in the selection of university for the higher education. An exploratory method of research is assumed to explore a new dimension. The geographic scope is selected as Kurdistan region of Iraq where the higher education is one of the most important needs for the population to grow intellectually. The study measures the effectiveness of universities stake holders' personal factors as well as social ones in brand image building of an academic institution through a conceptual model. The study is a deductive research where different concepts are taken to constitute the independent and dependent construct leading to building a new concept. The study is descriptive in nature and for this purpose both the sources of data was used i.e. primary source of data and secondary source of data. Firstly the secondary data was used as literature review to understand the existing theories in North Iraq and around the globe. The purpose solved by the visit of different online libraries, published articles available with different online databases and the printed published journals, magazines, newspapers and books. Secondly the primary data was collected using structured survey questionnaires. The survey was carried out with a sample of 481 full-time undergraduate students in 3 private universities in Kurdistan Region. Stratified sampling method of probability sampling was used to select the respondent from the whole population, a stratum selected based on cluster of students, out of which respondents selected randomly. In the questionnaire different scales of measurement were used such as nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio scales. For collecting interval scale data, a five-point Likert scale from 1 to 5 was used, where "1" accounted for the minimum possible value and "5" for the maximum possible value. Qualitative data interpreted and descriptively presented while quantitative data analyzed using statistical multivariate data analysis techniques, such as T-test, Anova and regressions. SPSS software package was used to analyze the data. Here the study has the evidence that the university brand image get affected by all the aforesaid variables in the case of private university.

Key words: Brand image, brand image of university, social factors, personal factors.

INTRODUCTION

A brand is a sign that remains in the minds and hearts of consumers who create a certain sense of meaning and feeling about the product. For that reason, the brand is not just a logo, name, symbol, trademark or label attached to a product [1]. It has been argued that a university brand should be created in such a way that it evokes associations, emotions and images these impressions differentiate the university from other competitors [2]. Brand image is a type of picture that contains collected information about a particular

product that exists in the mind of the consumers. A handful of studies examine the factors that affect the image of the universities and therefore the demands of the students. Brand image plays a significant role in the development of a brand since the brand image will combine the brand's reputation and its credibility to create a specific experience for testing and using a product or service for the consumer mass and will determine whether the consumer is a brand loyal or just an opportunist [1]. Brand image is a multidimensional structure triggered by consumers' cognition, emotion,

symbol, values and attitudes and it is an integral element of brand equity because it conveys the value of the brand to consumers [3]. Kotler [4] describes the image as the set of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person holds about an object. For this reason, while talking about the brand image, it concerns the mental representation of the brand based on individual consumer beliefs, ideas and impressions. As Aaker [5] states that the brand image is called as a set of associations organized in a meaningful way and in the same context Keller [6] calls it brand perceptions in consumer memory. Both of these definitions lead to the existence of various abstract features that may be objective or subjective in the mind of the consumer. Aaker [7] points out that brand identity is a unique set of brand associations that brand strategist wants to create or maintain, while brand image is perceived by consumers as a brand. Its origin is in the mind of the consumers. Images are the interpretation of their beliefs and values [3]. As we reach the year 2018, three things are clear that university branding is no longer a choice but a necessity, it no longer conceived as a function to be performed individually by the university, if done effectively, university branding can provide 'soft power'. University branding is relevant because some students rely heavily on university images to make their future decisions [8]. This research is aimed at finding the importance of brand image for the persuasion of students in the selection of university for the higher education. An exploratory method of research is assumed to explore a new dimension. The geographical scope is chosen as the Kurdistan region of Iraq where the higher education is one of the most important needs of intellectual growth of the population.

Statement of the Problem

Brand image of university is a dimension that has not got elevated by researchers yet. The main research problem observed in this study is "measuring the private university as a brand for the selection of higher education by students, since brand image plays an important role in other sectors, so the education sector also needs to grow with other sectors exploring this dimension as brand image that can make the universities more powerful with recognition and strengthen the ability to serve more students". Further to make the process more clear and to get the clear solution for the research problem formulated a set of questions are needed. Based on the extensive literature review and existing models of the study, it is observed that the brand image concept has been studied in different industry differently for different aspects. Different independent and mediating variables have been considered for the brand image measurement for the business. This specific study views the research problem as "to draw the idea and conceptualize the new relationships between independent variable (Personal factors and Social factors) and the dependent variable (Brand Image) to measure the role of independent variables in the brand image building of universities".

LITERATURE REVIEW

Brand image represents the emotional aspects that identify the brand of a company or its products, and has a powerful impact on consumer buying behavior [9]. Consumers select a product not only for its usefulness but also for the image associated with the product and for the identification of the brand with other users. The definition of the brand image is not stable and differs from one author to another [10]. Kotler [4] describes the image as the set of beliefs, ideas and impression that a person holds about an object. As Aaker [7] states that the brand image is called as a set of associations organized in a meaningful way and in the same context Keller [6] calls it brand perceptions in consumer memory. Both of these definitions lead to the existence of various abstract features that may be objective or subjective in the mind of the consumer. Aaker [5] points out that brand identity is a unique set of brand associations that brand strategist wants to create or maintain, while brand image is perceived by consumers as a brand. Branding starts as a sign, a way of expressing what an object is and what it is then called. A unique brand image schools need to transfer to students. Educational brand image affects the choice of students, families and society. Brand image established by schools is an important factor when students choose a school, with a positive brand image of a school students can recognize the differences among schools and improve their intention to choose [11].

University Brand Image

Competition in the higher education sector forces higher education institutions to develop more competitive marketing strategies. For marketing strategies of developing universities, higher education institutions must understand the student selection process of a university. It is not easy to understand the university selection process, which involves a complicated decision affecting the lives of students [12]. For marketers, regardless of the marketing strategies of their companies, the main purpose of marketing activities is to influence consumers' perceptions and attitudes to creating the brand image in the consumers mind, and promoting the consumer's actual purchasing behavior, thereby increasing sales, maximizing market share and enhancing brand equity. The brand image is a multidimensional structure triggered by consumers' cognition, emotions, symbols, values and attitudes [3]. Brand image of universities and satisfaction of universities can influence the sharing of satisfying experiences and recommendations to other students [11]. The importance of university selection criteria varies among participants public and private institutions. While public university students evaluate programs, athletics, reputation, cost, housing, and places, private university students support different interpretations of common finding factors, while evaluating fame, selectivity, personal interaction, facilities and cost. Both of these students are looking for a modern university experience with the latest

technology, community involvement, and an attractive campus environment, although the university branding initiatives need to be customized according to the institution [13]. While the process of building a successful university branding continues to evolve, there can be many benefits of branding a college or university. The effects of a well-branded university are to attract more and better student to attend, richer students, better faculty and staff, more media attention, more money for research, more strategic partners respectively [14] increased admission application [15], increased retention rates for professors and students and to increase their graduation rates [16].

Independent Factors

In this conceptual model there are two independent factors; personal factors and social factors. Personal factors consist of age and way of life, purchasing power and revenue, lifestyle, and personality and self-concept. Personal factors mean that each learner is completely independent of his / her state set. It is considered like age, sex, family history or ethnicity [17]. The features of each customer obviously affect decisions and buying behavior. Customers generally purchase different goods or services at different ages, such as a costumer will not buy the same goods or services in 25 or 65 years. Customers' behaviors, interests, surroundings, the way of life, values, environments, and actions progress during his/her life. Factors that affecting the buying decision process may also change university selection process, allow students to explore various alternatives. Obviously, purchasing will have a significant impact on behavior and purchasing decisions based on power, income and capital. This can clearly reflect the level of price prejudice in the perspective of his money and purchasing decisions. Purchasing decision is the decision process and the physical activities of the individual during the evaluation, purchase, use or reject of the consumer, goods and services [18]. A person's way of life includes all his activities, interests, values and opinions. A customer's way of life influences their lifestyle, behavior and purchasing decisions. The health and well-being of the students is an important concern of the university community. The student lifestyle influences the behavior, perceptions, and experiences of undergraduate students [19]. Personality, that is the product of the interaction of the individual's psychological and physiological characteristics and causes continuous behavior, is a set of characteristics and properties of each individual. The concept of self resembles the image that the individual has - or desires to possess - and conveys it to its surroundings. Individuals' purchasing behavior is often unconsciously affected by some factors. One of these factors is social factors. Social factors play an important role in product purchase decision [20]. Groups that have a direct impact on an individual are called membership groups. The groups that have an indirect effect are called non-membership groups. Many of us belong to various

groups and perhaps want to belong to others [21]. Consumer behaviors not only allow us to understand and estimate what consumer buys in the market, but also explain why they are buying certain products or services [22]. No doubt, the family is one of the most influential factors on the individual. It creates an environment of socialization in which an individual develops shapes and acquires values. Family members, aspirations, expectations, level of parental education, and family social backgrounds are factors that can be taken into consideration. Researchers are considering that parents are a key element in encouraging their children to continue their higher education [12].

A social role is a sequence of attitudes and activities that an individual is expected to make based on his / her occupation and position in the workplace, position in the family and gender. Social role and status deeply affect costumer behavior and buying decisions. Wiese *et al.* [23] state that according to social life, universities should put effort on these factors; events organized by student representatives, student associations / organizations, clubs and student groups, religious life, traditional events (annual festivals for students, special events, class traditions), the availability of a wide range of sports programs within the institution, and leisure opportunities.

Dependent Factor

In this conceptual model brand image and its three subcomponents (mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) serve as the dependent factor. In this study, brand image is considered as an important concept in consumer behavior because brand and product selection by consumers is based on the evaluation of the brand image [10]. A consumer has shaped his/her perception and feelings for a brand through direct/indirect brand experiences that capture cognitive, sensory, and emotional aspects. These are reflected in three dimensions of mystery, sensuality, and intimacy, respectively [24]. The mystery is defined by stories, metaphors, dreams and symbols. The mystery is about not giving all information away, but providing consumers with surprises in order to keep them awake and interested [25]. The majority of companies have similar data, similar marketing methods, and almost no differentiated products. As a result, companies that want to be successful are looking for inspiring customers and looking to be unique. Mystery is the rising factor at that point [26]. Sensuality is about sight, sound, scent, touch and taste that have the function of determining to feel. When sense branding is done correctly, the results are unforgettable while the brand is stored in consumers' minds [25]. The fact is that senses play an important role in decision-making and persuasion, but many companies struggle with the exact use of senses in the right place, and they have problems with relationship management [27]. Five senses: vision, hearing, smell, touch and taste play an important role in consumers' persuasion and decision-making processes because they

help consumers to remember memories and previous experiences [24]. Intimacy is about being close to family, customers, consumers, partners [27]. The intimacy is a factor that can make a personal sense of the mass experience because it has the ability to bring the brand closer to the consumer. It is significant for emotional relationships, but more intangible than mystery and sensuality, and it requires both listening and speaking [26]. Since listening and speaking are directly related to personal aspirations because of a two-way process, intimacy is much more contentious than mystery and sensuality [27].

Research Objectives

The study is based on specific research objective formulated to reach the research goals and formulated as:

- To know the importance of brand image for private universities in selection of higher education by students.
- To know the brand image building process and effect of different variables on this.


Research Hypothesis

A research hypothesis is an expectation or prediction statement that will be tested by research. Hypotheses of the study are:

Hypothesis 1: Personal factors affect brand image.

Hypothesis 2: Social factors have effect on brand image.

Conceptual Model



METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

The study is descriptive in nature and for this purpose both the sources of data were used i.e. primary source of data and secondary source of data. Firstly the secondary data was used as literature review to understand the existing theories in North Iraq and around the globe. Secondly the primary data collected using structured survey questionnaire. A self-prepared structured survey questionnaire about demography and all the specified variables in the model tested for credibility. Stratified sampling method of probability sampling used to select the respondent from the whole population, a stratum selected based on cluster of students, out of which respondents selected randomly. The survey questionnaire is prepared in three languages as English, Arabic and Kurdish for the clear understanding of the items presented in the survey questionnaire. In this study the sample size considered as 481 for three private universities and they were used based on Cohen [28]'s table for effective sample size. In the questionnaire different scales of measurement

were used such as nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio scales. For collecting interval scale data, a five-point Likert scale from 1 to 5 was used, where "1" accounted for the minimum possible value and "5" for the maximum possible value. Qualitative data was interpreted and descriptively presented while quantitative data analyzed using statistical multivariate data analysis techniques, such as T-test, ANOVA, and regressions. All these quantitative methods were used keeping in mind the research objectives. SPSS software package was used to analyze the data.

Quantitative Tools and Techniques Used

This part of chapter 3 aims to analyze the results of empirical findings. Descriptive statistics were calculated after the reliability of the constructions was measured by Cronbach's alpha test. Descriptive statistics performed for this thesis included T-test, Anova and Regressions. One way to measure reliability is to perform the Cronbach's alpha test [29].

Table-1: Reliability TEST for Private Universities

Dimensions	Number of items	Sample	Cronbach's Alpha
Private University Personal Factor (PRUPF)	9	481	0.605
Private University Social Factor (PRUSF)	12	481	0.734
Private University Brand Image (PRUBI)	22	481	0.824
ALL	91	481	0.860

The table no 1 shows that the values of Cronbach's alpha for each factor. All the factors for private universities are reliable since their values of Cronbach's alpha are higher than 0.70.

The personal factor for the private university is that all items have a very important consequence. For this reason, the study was accepted for further analysis (Table-2).

Table-2: T-Test: Private University Personal Factor (PRUPF)

One-Sample Test						
	Test Value = 4					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Age is important in selection of university	-14.436	480	.000	-.514	-.58	-.44
Family requirement makes me to select the university	-20.842	480	.000	-.701	-.77	-.63
Family status makes me to select the university	-17.510	480	.000	-.740	-.82	-.66
University can support me in my work	-19.645	480	.000	-.775	-.85	-.70
My work will be improved being with university	-18.153	480	.000	-.657	-.73	-.59
Based on my work university is best for me	-14.950	480	.000	-.597	-.68	-.52
Financial structure of the university attracts me	-10.493	480	.000	-.372	-.44	-.30
Financial aids by university is supportive	-15.071	480	.000	-.640	-.72	-.56
Family financial situation made me chose the university	-13.386	480	.000	-.547	-.63	-.47

Table-3: T-Test: Private University Social Factor (PUUSF)

One-Sample Test						
	Test Value = 4					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Proximity of the university matters me in its selection	-13.834	480	.000	-.586	-.67	-.50
Intimacy with the university is important for me in its selection	-18.962	480	.000	-.767	-.85	-.69
My level of personal relationship with the university is a criteria for selection	-17.422	480	.000	-.667	-.74	-.59
Geographical location of the university matters me in its selection	-17.617	480	.000	-.653	-.73	-.58
University exposure to digital devices is important for me	-18.299	480	.000	-.692	-.77	-.62
My emotional attachment with the university brand is a criteria to select it	-15.432	480	.000	-.617	-.70	-.54
My choice and my family choice is different for university	-15.645	480	.000	-.617	-.70	-.54
My choice and my family choice for university is same	-16.232	480	.000	-.615	-.69	-.54
My family financial condition affects the university choice	-23.370	480	.000	-.794	-.86	-.73
My family social status affects the university choice	-14.151	480	.000	-.574	-.65	-.49
My family size affects the university choice	-15.639	480	.000	-.603	-.68	-.53
Society opinion affects my university selection	-14.621	480	.000	-.555	-.63	-.48

The personal factor for the private university is that all items have a very important consequence. For this reason, the study was accepted for further analysis (Table-3).

For the private university, the Brand Image is that all items have a very important consequence. Thus, the study was accepted for further analysis (Table-4).

Table-4: T-Test: Private University Brand Image (PRUBI)

	One-Sample Test					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Test Value = 4	
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper	
University brand adds to the experience of my life	-11.235	480	.000	-.443	-.52	-.37
University brand awakens good memories for me	-9.362	480	.000	-.349	-.42	-.28
University brand captures a sense of my life	-14.166	480	.000	-.601	-.68	-.52
University brand captures the times	-9.648	480	.000	-.416	-.50	-.33
University brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase education	-9.653	480	.000	-.422	-.51	-.34
University brand is a part of my life	-11.032	480	.000	-.435	-.51	-.36
The design of University brand's ads is well done	-12.314	480	.000	-.501	-.58	-.42
The feel of University brand is as pleasing as the education	-12.018	480	.000	-.464	-.54	-.39
The environment of University brand appeals to me	-12.237	480	.000	-.536	-.62	-.45
The website design for University brand is well done	-12.388	480	.000	-.559	-.65	-.47
The well-maintained University environment appeals to me	-13.195	480	.000	-.541	-.62	-.46
University brand has a beautiful color scheme	-12.034	480	.000	-.420	-.49	-.35
University brand has incredible displays	-12.482	480	.000	-.532	-.62	-.45
I can rely on University brand	-13.101	480	.000	-.565	-.65	-.48
I feel connected to University brand	-13.494	480	.000	-.559	-.64	-.48
I feel happy when I wear University brand	-16.183	480	.000	-.644	-.72	-.57
I feel satisfied with University brand	-14.438	480	.000	-.565	-.64	-.49
I have fun with University brand	-14.500	480	.000	-.603	-.68	-.52
I have solid support for University brand	-13.625	480	.000	-.588	-.67	-.50
I like looking at the products of University brand	-15.215	480	.000	-.599	-.68	-.52
I really enjoy wearing University brand	-15.088	480	.000	-.547	-.62	-.48
I would stay with University brand	-8.339	480	.000	-.326	-.40	-.25

Table-5: ONEWAY ANOVA: Private University Personal Factor (PRUPF) with University Name

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age is important in selection of university	Between Groups	.055	2	.027	.045	.956
	Within Groups	292.107	478	.611		
	Total	292.162	480			
Family requirement makes me to select the university	Between Groups	4.818	2	2.409	4.497	.012
	Within Groups	256.072	478	.536		
	Total	260.890	480			
Family status makes me to select the university	Between Groups	.422	2	.211	.245	.783
	Within Groups	412.094	478	.862		
	Total	412.516	480			
University can support me in my work	Between Groups	.334	2	.167	.222	.801
	Within Groups	359.417	478	.752		
	Total	359.751	480			
My work will be improved being with university	Between Groups	4.780	2	2.390	3.838	.022
	Within Groups	297.619	478	.623		
	Total	302.399	480			
Based on my work university is best for me	Between Groups	2.501	2	1.251	1.637	.196
	Within Groups	365.254	478	.764		
	Total	367.755	480			
Financial structure of the university attracts me	Between Groups	11.397	2	5.698	9.763	.000
	Within Groups	278.990	478	.584		
	Total	290.387	480			
Financial aids by university is supportive	Between Groups	4.219	2	2.109	2.444	.088
	Within Groups	412.559	478	.863		
	Total	416.778	480			
Family financial situation made me chose the university	Between Groups	1.631	2	.815	1.016	.363
	Within Groups	383.567	478	.802		
	Total	385.198	480			

In the analysis of variance above, 3 items have significant results despite 6 items. Thus, 3 more items can get preceded further for analysis and 6 insignificant items should get removed.

In the analysis of variance above, 4 items have significant results despite 7 items. So, 4 more items can get preceded further for analysis and 7 insignificant items should get removed (Table-6).

Table-6: ONEWAY ANOVA: Private University Social Factor (PRUSF) with University Name

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Proximity of the university matters me in its selection	Between Groups	4.461	2	2.230	2.599	.075
	Within Groups	410.209	478	.858		
	Total	414.669	480			
Intimacy with the university is important for me in its selection	Between Groups	1.221	2	.611	.775	.461
	Within Groups	376.700	478	.788		
	Total	377.921	480			
My level of personal relationship with the university is a criteria for selection	Between Groups	.165	2	.083	.117	.890
	Within Groups	338.612	478	.708		
	Total	338.778	480			
Geographical location of the university matters me in its selection	Between Groups	.091	2	.045	.068	.934
	Within Groups	316.928	478	.663		
	Total	317.019	480			
University exposure to digital devices is important for me	Between Groups	1.829	2	.915	1.330	.265
	Within Groups	328.632	478	.688		
	Total	330.462	480			
My emotional attachment with the university brand is a criteria to select it	Between Groups	.138	2	.069	.090	.914
	Within Groups	369.475	478	.773		
	Total	369.613	480			
My choice and my family choice is different for university	Between Groups	.020	2	.010	.013	.987
	Within Groups	359.593	478	.752		
	Total	359.613	480			
My choice and my family choice for university is same	Between Groups	4.611	2	2.306	3.368	.035
	Within Groups	327.235	478	.685		
	Total	331.846	480			
My family financial condition affects the university choice	Between Groups	5.292	2	2.646	4.840	.008
	Within Groups	261.331	478	.547		
	Total	266.624	480			
My family social status affects the university choice	Between Groups	32.451	2	16.226	22.340	.000
	Within Groups	347.179	478	.726		
	Total	379.630	480			
My family size affects the university choice	Between Groups	3.855	2	1.928	2.716	.067
	Within Groups	339.300	478	.710		
	Total	343.156	480			
Society opinion affects my university selection	Between Groups	26.140	2	13.070	20.373	.000
	Within Groups	306.650	478	.642		
	Total	332.790	480			

Table-7: ONEWAY ANOVA: Private University Brand Image (PUUBI) with University Name

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
University brand adds to the experience of my life	Between Groups	.057	2	.028	.038	.963
	Within Groups	358.621	478	.750		
	Total	358.678	480			
University brand awakens good memories for me	Between Groups	.964	2	.482	.719	.488
	Within Groups	320.358	478	.670		
	Total	321.322	480			
University brand captures a sense of my life	Between Groups	3.575	2	1.788	2.075	.127
	Within Groups	411.785	478	.861		
	Total	415.360	480			
University brand captures the times	Between Groups	17.388	2	8.694	10.100	.000
	Within Groups	411.452	478	.861		
	Total	428.840	480			
University brand comes to mind immediately when I want to purchase education	Between Groups	25.379	2	12.689	14.582	.000
	Within Groups	415.948	478	.870		
	Total	441.326	480			
University brand is a part of my life	Between Groups	4.971	2	2.486	3.364	.035
	Within Groups	353.216	478	.739		
	Total	358.187	480			
The design of University brand's ads is well done	Between Groups	10.500	2	5.250	6.751	.001
	Within Groups	371.749	478	.778		
	Total	382.249	480			
The feel of University brand is as pleasing as the education	Between Groups	.668	2	.334	.466	.628
	Within Groups	342.945	478	.717		
	Total	343.613	480			
The environment of University brand appeals to me	Between Groups	14.820	2	7.410	8.260	.000
	Within Groups	428.793	478	.897		
	Total	443.613	480			
The website design for University brand is well done	Between Groups	5.561	2	2.781	2.858	.058
	Within Groups	465.000	478	.973		
	Total	470.561	480			
The well-maintained University environment appeals to me	Between Groups	.356	2	.178	.220	.803
	Within Groups	387.104	478	.810		
	Total	387.459	480			
University brand has a beautiful color scheme	Between Groups	5.532	2	2.766	4.796	.009
	Within Groups	275.637	478	.577		
	Total	281.168	480			
University brand has incredible displays	Between Groups	1.945	2	.973	1.113	.330
	Within Groups	417.805	478	.874		
	Total	419.751	480			
I can rely on University brand	Between Groups	15.107	2	7.554	8.699	.000
	Within Groups	415.080	478	.868		
	Total	430.187	480			
I feel connected to University brand	Between Groups	.261	2	.131	.158	.854
	Within Groups	396.300	478	.829		
	Total	396.561	480			
I feel happy when I wear University brand	Between Groups	5.653	2	2.826	3.747	.024
	Within Groups	360.555	478	.754		
	Total	366.208	480			
I feel satisfied with University brand	Between Groups	5.916	2	2.958	4.060	.018
	Within Groups	348.271	478	.729		
	Total	354.187	480			
I have fun with	Between Groups	5.963	2	2.981	3.624	.027

University brand	Within Groups	393.193	478	.823		
	Total	399.156	480			
I have solid support for University brand	Between Groups	6.099	2	3.049	3.434	.033
	Within Groups	424.396	478	.888		
	Total	430.495	480			
I like looking at the products of University brand	Between Groups	5.323	2	2.662	3.612	.028
	Within Groups	352.236	478	.737		
	Total	357.559	480			
I really enjoy wearing University brand	Between Groups	4.183	2	2.091	3.343	.036
	Within Groups	299.015	478	.626		
	Total	303.198	480			
I would stay with University brand	Between Groups	1.331	2	.665	.902	.406
	Within Groups	352.424	478	.737		
	Total	353.755	480			

In the above analysis of variance 13 items are having significant result though 9 items are insignificant. So 13 items can get preceded further for analysis and 9 insignificant items should get removed further (Table-7).

The hypothesis got accepted conceptually having the highly significant outcome with the Beta value of 0.112. This shows that there is an effect of personal factors affect brand image (Table-8).

Table-8: Model Summary, Anova and Coefficients for Hypothesis 1 Test

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.122 ^a	.015	.013	.40978		
a. Predictors: (Constant), PRUPF						
According to this model, 1.5% of PRUBI is explained by PRUPF, so 98.5% of PRUBI is explained by other variables.						
ANOVA ^a						
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	1.208	1	1.208	7.192	.008 ^b
	Residual	80.432	479	.168		
	Total	81.639	480			
a. Dependent Variable: PRUBI						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PRUPF						

F- Value in this model is 7.192 and P- Value is 0.008 overall this model is meaningful.

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.081	.154		20.020	.000
	PRUPF	.121	.045	.122	2.682	.008
a. Dependent Variable: PRUBI						

Constant and coefficient of PRUPF are significant since P-Values are 0.000 and 0.008 respectively.

$$PRUBI = a + bPRUPF$$

$$PRUBI = 3.081 + 0.121PRUPF$$

Table-9: Model Summary, Anova and Coefficients for Hypothesis 2 Test

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square		Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.159 ^a	.025	.023		.40756	
a. Predictors: (Constant), PRUSF						
When this model is considered, 2.5% of PRUBI is expressed by PRUSF, therefore 97.5% is explained by other variables.						
ANOVA ^a						
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	2.076	1	2.076	12.500	.000 ^b
	Residual	79.563	479	.166		
	Total	81.639	480			
a. Dependent Variable: PRUBI						
b. Predictors: (Constant), PRUSF						

Table-10: F- Value in this model is 12.500 and P- Value is 0.000 overall this model is meaningful.

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.976	.147	20.307	.000
	PRUSF	.153	.043	.159	3.536
a. Dependent Variable: PRUBI					

Constant and coefficient of PRUPF are significant since P-Values are 0.000 and 0.000 respectively.

$$PRUBI = a + bPRUPF$$

$$PRUBI = 2.976 + 0.153PRUPF$$

The hypothesis got accepted conceptually having the highly significant outcome with the Beta value of 0.159. This shows that there is an effect of social factors affect brand image.

CONCLUSION

This study investigates the university’s brand image with the aim of explaining the components of image and effects of image on students’ university selection and also the study examines the relationships between the different components of the university image. After doing all the necessary tests to find the effects of the different variables, here it has the evidence that the university brand image is affected by all the aforesaid variables in the case of private university. For the private university two lines are accepted with a high level of acceptance shows that the independent variable is having a very important role in brand image building process and the selection of the University for higher education is influenced by all variables. The findings of the T-test for the private university with the test value 4 almost all dimensions are showing highly significant result, so all dimensions have been taken into a consideration for the study and were used to move to the next level in the study. For the One way ANOVA testing for the private university as well we can consider most of the items and dimensions with university name are significant and can get used for further study. The findings are in favor of the next level of study. Furthermore, the analysis of regression

was done to check the relationship and cause-effect of relationship in between independent variable and dependent variable. For the private university, all relationships are showing a better and significant result so accepted in the study for analysis as findings. The first objective stated as to know the importance of brand image for universities as private in selection of higher education by students has come up with the positive outcome for private universities, the regression analysis has well explained and justified it with having very significant result of hypothesis tested using regression analysis meaning the brand image is one of the very important factors in choosing the university for higher education in the case of private universities. The second objective was observed as to know the brand image building process and effect of different variables on this get justified very well with the regression analysis with two hypotheses with both types of universities taking in two different sets. The ANOVA has well represented the brand image building process for private universities and at the same phase the regression test has measured the effect of all variables considered for brand image building process. The theory has the very valuable contribution to the education sector is being one of the highest competitive sectors as the business entity. All around the world the academic sector development specific to higher education is being more challenging to satisfy the consumer by providing all the needful support. Moreover the academic development process is having a high value for the brand image. So it gets very

important to know the different variables affecting the brand image and the process to build brand image.

This research can be a roadmap for the KRG to make the private university more efficient which can lead to successful implementation of academic system and can generate more satisfaction. It will help the universities and KRG government to reduce the migration of students moving for the better brand image and that can be a contributor to social and economic development for Kurdistan.

REFERENCES

1. Wijaya BS. Dimensions of Brand Image: A Conceptual Review from the Perspective of Brand Communication. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 2013;5(31).
2. Bulotaite N. University heritage—an institutional tool for branding and marketing. *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, December 2003. 2003 Dec 1;28(4):449-54.
3. Malik ME, Naeem B, Munawar M. Brand image: Past, present and future. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*. 2012;2(12):13069-75.
4. Kotler P. *Marketing Management*, Pearson Education Canada. 2001 ;(10).
5. Aaker DA. *Building Strong Brands*. New York: Free Press. 1996.
6. Keller KL. Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *the Journal of Marketing*. 1993 Jan 1:1-22.
7. Aaker DA. Measuring brand equity across products and markets. *California management review*. 1996 Apr 1;38(3):102.
8. Coulson AJ. Comparing public, private, and market schools: The international evidence. *Journal of School Choice*. 2009 Mar 25;3(1):31-54.
9. Arora R, Stoner C. A mixed method approach to understanding brand personality. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*. 2009 Jul 17;18(4):272-83.
10. Dobni D, Zinkhan GM. In search of brand image: A foundation analysis. *ACR North American Advances*. 1990.
11. Chen CT. The Investigation on Brand Image of University Education and Students' Word-of-Mouth Behavior. *Higher Education Studies*. 2016;6(4):23-33.
12. Maniu I, Maniu Gc. Educational Marketing: Factors Influencing The Selection Of A University. *SEA: Practical Application of Science*. 2014 Oct 1;2(3).
13. Joseph M, Mullen EW, Spake D. University branding: Understanding students' choice of an educational institution. *Journal of Brand Management*. 2012 Oct 1;20(1):1-2.
14. Sevier CS, Qu H, Heldman N, Gross E, Fass D, Kaiser CA. Modulation of cellular disulfide-bond formation and the ER redox environment by feedback regulation of Ero1. *Cell*. 2007 Apr 20;129(2):333-44.
15. Hearne R. Public private partnerships in Ireland: Failed experiment or the way forward for the state. Manchester University Press; 2011.
16. Lockwood RC & Hadd J. Building a brand in higher education: why business practice—particularly brand strategies – are becoming essential in today's universities, *Gallup Management Journal Online*, 2007;1-6.
17. Aydın OT. University Choice Process: A Literature Review on Models and Factors Affecting the Process. *Journal of Higher Education/Yükseköğretim Dergisi*. 2015 Aug 1;5(2).
18. Loudon, L. D., & Albert, J. Della Bitta (2002). *Consumer Behavior*.
19. Macneela P, Dring Ci, Van Lente Er, Place C, Dring J, Mccaffrey J. Health and Well-Being of NUI Galway Undergraduate Students: The Student Lifestyle Survey.
20. Mirzaei H, Ruzdar M. The impact of social factors affecting consumer behavior on selecting characteristics of purchased cars. 2010.
21. Best RJ, Coney KA. *Consumer behavior: Implications for marketing strategy*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin; 1989.
22. Schiffman LG, Kanuk LL. *Nákupní chování*. Computer press; 2004.
23. Wiese M, Van Heerden CH, Jordaan Y. The role of demographics in students' selection of higher education institutions. *Acta Commercii*. 2010 Jan 1;10(1):150-63.
24. Roberts K. *Lovemarks: The future beyond brands*. PowerHouse Books; 2005 Dec 1.
25. De Boer L, Eti O. *The Greatest Love Stories Between Consumers and Brands-A Study of Brand Love*. 2012.
26. Esmailzadeh E, Meral S, Agilonu HB. *The Secret of Love: A Case of Lovemarks*. 2010.
27. Roberts K. *Lovemarks: The future beyond brands*. PowerHouse Books; 2005 Dec 1.
28. Cohen J. *Statistical power analyses for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1988.
29. Bland JM, Altman DG. *Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha*. *Bmj*. 1997 Feb 22;314(7080):572.