



University of  
**Salford**  
MANCHESTER

# Projecting university brand image via satisfaction and behavioral response : perspectives from UK-based Malaysian students

Alwi, S, Che-Ha, N, Nguyen, B, Ghazali, E, Mutum, D and Kitchen, PJ

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/QMR-12-2017-0191>

<b>Title</b>	Projecting university brand image via satisfaction and behavioral response : perspectives from UK-based Malaysian students
<b>Authors</b>	Alwi, S, Che-Ha, N, Nguyen, B, Ghazali, E, Mutum, D and Kitchen, PJ
<b>Type</b>	Article
<b>URL</b>	This version is available at: <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/56072/">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/56072/</a>
<b>Published Date</b>	2019

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [usir@salford.ac.uk](mailto:usir@salford.ac.uk).





**Projecting University Brand Image via Satisfaction and Behavioral Response: Perspectives from UK-based Malaysian Students**

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Market Research</i>
Manuscript ID	QMR-12-2017-0191.R4
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	brand experience, satisfaction, corporate branding, higher education branding, word-of-mouth, university brand image

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Projection of University Brand Image via Satisfaction and Behavioral Response: Perspectives from UK-based Malaysian Students

## Abstract

This study attempts to ascertain the essential dimensions and components of university corporate brand image, including the cognitive attributes (service/educational quality) and affective attributes (corporate brand image) of the university. It builds on Schmitt's (1999) conceptualization of brand experience. In doing so, this study develops, explores, and presents a student-consumer behavioral response model based on students' experiences at a UK university, exploring the relationship between these attributes with satisfaction and behavioral response (word-of-mouth). Findings reveal that both branding aspects - brand experience and corporate brand image - follow a rational thought process before an affective component is then considered, resulting in brand promise and loyalty. This study identifies several important brand experiences such as social, functional and emotional in higher education that enhance a university corporate brand image and behavioral responses that guide brand positioning of a UK university for the Malaysian market. Based on the findings of this study, a conceptual framework has been presented. Theoretical and managerial implications are discussed with suggestions for future research.

**Keywords** – University brand image, brand experience, satisfaction, word-of-mouth, corporate branding, higher education branding

## 1. Introduction

The increasing demand for higher education has made the sector among the fastest-growing industries worldwide (Hemsley-Brown et al., 2016). Such growth and the need for evaluation by government funding bodies has led to competitive pressure among universities to be perceived as more prestigious and better known than the competition (Nguyen et al., 2019). This has resulted in the growing importance of corporate branding within educational institutions (Hemsley-Brown & Goonawardana, 2007; Melewar & Nguyen, 2015). For example, several researchers have proposed that higher educational institutions (HEI's) can effectively position their corporate or institutional brands by using corporate brand image (Balmer & Liao, 2007; Hemsley-Brown & Goonawardana, 2007; Bennett & Ali-Choudhury, 2009; Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014). By having a reputable image, a university will benefit in many ways, including improvements in various rankings, increased enrolment of excellent students, attracting funding opportunities, recruitment by top employers, and alumni donations (Davies & Chun, 2008; Curtis et al., 2009; Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2015).

However, despite calls for positioning based on corporate brand image, to date, few scholars have focused upon corporate brand image in the higher education sector when modeling consumer-student behavioral response (e.g., Melewar & Akel, 2005; Hemsley-Brown & Oplatka, 2006; Curtis et al., 2009). Here corporate brand image refers to the image associated with the organization's brand and is based on the perceptions of the stakeholders' (Hatch, Schultz & Williamson, 2003; Bravo, Montaner, & Pina, 2012). Simões & Dibb (2001) emphasize the importance of brand orientation and used the terms corporate brand image and brand identity interchangeably. They highlight that each organization has its own personality, uniqueness and individuality. A strong brand image/identity was important for presenting a consistent internal and external image among stakeholders.

1  
2  
3 Most extant works in this context either tend to be theoretical in nature (Hemsley-Brown &  
4  
5 Goonawardana, 2007) focus on the service aspects of HEIs by incorporating singular  
6  
7 components of attitude such as service, product or educational quality (Davies & Chun,  
8  
9 2008). The branding aspects, however, are limited in empirical evidence on how to manage a  
10  
11 brand in this context (e.g. Melewar & Akel, 2005; Balmer & Liao, 2007; Davies & Chun,  
12  
13 2008, Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014). Also, this is perhaps due to the newness of the area and  
14  
15 its apparent multidisciplinary nature.  
16  
17

18  
19 This study intends to provide more insights and understanding on the role of corporate  
20  
21 brand image in attracting incoming students to the university. In doing so, we will integrate  
22  
23 attitudinal components (brand image and brand experience) and investigate their effects on  
24  
25 consumer behavioral response. Incorporating both brand attributes to understand a specific  
26  
27 university's corporate brand image, may shed light upon clearer strategic corporate brand  
28  
29 positioning in this highly competitive market. In particular, focusing on UK based Malaysian  
30  
31 students, this study anticipates providing explanations of consumer behavioral responses  
32  
33 (Oliver, 1997; Bennett & Ali-Choudhury, 2009) by developing, exploring, and presenting a  
34  
35 student-consumer behavioral response model based on their experiences at university. Hence,  
36  
37 the following research questions are formulated: *What is the relationship between brand*  
38  
39 *experiences and corporate brand image and what are the resulting behavioral responses of*  
40  
41 *this relationship, to Universities in the UK. In other words, how does satisfaction with the*  
42  
43 *University relate to brand image and with word-of-mouth?*  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 To provide insights into these questions, the following research objectives are formulated  
50  
51 focusing on brand image of HEIs among Malaysian students in a University in the UK:  
52  
53

- 54 (1) To examine the relationship between university brand experiences (positive and/ or  
55  
56 negative) with perceived corporate brand image of the UK university.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 (2) To investigate the behavioral responses to the brand experiences and perceived brand  
4 image, including the extent to which they will recommend the university to others in  
5 the future, specifically their word-of-mouth in favor of a specific university.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 The focus upon branding from an HEI perspective among current Malaysian students  
11 is of great interest for several reasons: First, Malaysia is the most important target market for  
12 new student recruitments for several universities in the UK including X University.  
13  
14 Secondly, at many UK-based universities, the number of students recruited from South East  
15 Asia and China tends to number in the hundreds each year (student recruitment from  
16 Malaysia is one of the largest). Thirdly, X University has been aggressive in its marketing  
17 and branding worldwide making it an excellent research context. The university has been  
18 actively promoting their brand at several education fairs in Malaysia.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Most of the previous studies which have looked at similar relationships, were in the  
29 context of consumer products, whereas this study examines the higher education context  
30 which is quite different. Moreover, it has been shown that services marketing methods used  
31 in other services cannot be transferred easily to higher education marketing (Canterbury,  
32 2008). The way customers (namely students) interact with other customers and a range of  
33 different employees (academics and administrative staff) as well as the fact that higher  
34 education usually involves a high-involvement purchase with life-long consequences, make  
35 it different from other contexts (Dean, Arroyo-Gamez, Punjaisri & Pich, 2016). In examining  
36 the issues involved, this study builds on Schmitt's (1999) conceptualization of brand  
37 experience. According to Schmitt (1999), brand experience can be developed from several  
38 sources such as sensory, affective, cognitive, behavioral and social. However, it was not clear  
39 how brand experience is influenced by service and educational quality.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The study has implications for the way in which university branding is expected to  
56 result in positive recommendations to universities in the form of positive word-of-mouth for  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 its future marketing and branding campaigns. Contributions are made to the corporate brand,  
4 student-consumer behavior, marketing, and HEI literature by exploring student interests as  
5 well as their experiences at a corporate brand level and relates their effects on behavioral  
6 response (such as word-of mouth). The practical contribution of the study and its managerial  
7 implications lie in the context of defining strategy in relation to positioning the university or  
8 institution in an increasingly competitive higher education market.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The organization of this study is as follows: first, a brief review of branding in HEI's  
18 in general, and specifically brand image and brand experience, are carried out. A systematic  
19 review of past studies on what forms university corporate brand image and their effect on  
20 behavioral response is then discussed. This is followed by the research methodology. The  
21 results of this study are then presented and analyzed, followed by discussion, conclusions and  
22 research implications. Finally, limitations and suggestions for further research are  
23 highlighted.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **2. Literature Review**

### 36 ***2.1 Corporate brand as a strategic higher educational positioning tool***

37  
38  
39  
40 The importance of positioning a university using corporate brand has been well-  
41 acknowledged in the past (Argenti, 2000; Balmer & Liao, 2007; Hemsley-Brown &  
42 Goonwardana, 2007; Davies & Chun, 2008; Curtis et al., 2009; Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014).  
43 Substantial budgeting is allocated for branding activities in many HEIs. Yet, managing  
44 corporate brand strategies may be difficult because organizations may lack understanding of  
45 how to manage their corporate brand strategies, perhaps due to the multi-faceted nature of the  
46 branding concept (Melewar & Akel, 2005; Bennet & Ali-Choudhry, 2009; Curtis et al.,  
47 2009). Previously, Curtis et al., (2009) analyze corporate brand management in a USA-based  
48 HEI at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU); Melewar & Akel (2005) explore the  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 corporate identity of Warwick University in the UK; Davies and Chun (2008) examine  
4 corporate brand identity for Manchester Business School, UK; Bennett & Ali-Choudhury  
5 (2009) investigate educational services and brand covenants of HEI's at new universities in  
6 East London, UK; Hemsley-Brown & Goonwardana (2007) explore how to harmonize a  
7 brand within a corporate brand (focusing on brand architecture) in a USA-based HEI, and;  
8 Nguyen et al. (2016) examine the brand ambidexterity concept across several major  
9 universities in China. While the many HEI branding concepts vary, a common theme exists  
10 for these previous studies in that there is an increasingly business-like approach adopted by  
11 many HEI's. With this scenario, developing a corporate brand image becomes an integral part  
12 of the higher education context as it enhances a student brand's experience and understanding  
13 of what an institution's values and stances are. These experiences increase the clarity of how  
14 to differentiate an institution's brand (Davies & Chun, 2008). Likewise, students choose a  
15 university not only based on the program or location, but also an institution's stances which  
16 ultimately serves an important part of brand differentiation (Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 ***2.2 Corporate brand image and brand experience in higher education***

39  
40 Several literatures (e.g. Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001; Holford & Reindeers, 2001;  
41 Brakus et al., 2009; Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014; Hemsley-Brown et al., 2016) are reviewed  
42 in order to understand the main driving forces that enhance a university brand image and its  
43 outcomes (e.g. positive word of mouth and the student decision making). In particular, two  
44 constructs are found to be relevant and combined to describe the overall corporate image of a  
45 university in this study - namely brand experience and corporate brand image.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 In general, an institution (educational) brand image is driven by stakeholders' brand  
55 experiences (example, the students) and these explain how the overall corporate or university  
56 brand image is derived (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012). The literature reveals that corporate brand  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 image is made up of different concepts. First, corporate brand image concerns the overall  
4 impression in the minds of the public, stakeholders and constituencies about an organization  
5 (Nguyen & Leblanc, 2001). Image consists of various organizational physical and behavioral  
6 attributes, such as the business name, products and services, tradition, ideology, and quality  
7 cues communicated by an organization's products, services and people (Abratt & Kleyn,  
8 2012). Patterson (1999, p.419) describes brand image as "consumer perceptions of brand  
9 attributes and associations from which [those] consumers derive symbolic value". Construing  
10 an overall image of an organization is a result of a process which entails understanding a  
11 mental map (MacInnis & Price, 1987) and such a map is shaped in several ways via ideas,  
12 feelings, and previous experience into an organization that can be retrieved from memory and  
13 transformed into an overall mental map (Yuille & Catchpole, 1977). Thus, an image of a  
14 company refers to not only "...what we hear and see from company messages" but  
15 experiences its product or service as well (the direct contact consumers have with the  
16 product, etc.)', (Ind, 1997, p.5). Moreover, an institution's image could be described by two  
17 components: functional or cognitive, which is related to tangibles such as product or service  
18 offered, which pertains to the service and perceived educational quality; and emotional or  
19 affective which is the psychological dimension manifest in feelings, attitudes and values  
20 towards an institution (Kennedy, 1977; Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001; Davies, Chun, Roper & Da  
21 Silva, 2004).

### 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 **2.2.1: Functional (cognitive) and Emotional (affective) responses towards branding**

50 In the higher education context, consumers may evaluate the university or corporate brand  
51 image through the sum of brand values attached to the name or any related corporate brand  
52 activities based on their experiences as well as others (Davies & Chun, 2008; Curtis et al.,  
53 2009; Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014). One way to build superior customer experiences is by  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 understanding how the consumer experiences the brand, as this guides the marketing and  
4 branding strategies for goods and services (Berry, 2000; Brakus et al., 2009; Schmitt, 2009).  
5  
6 Brand experience or the experiential approach has been proposed as important to the  
7 formation of retail brands (Schmitt, 1999; Berry, 2000; Morrison & Crane, 2007), particularly  
8 in the services industry including educational institutions (Theus, 1993; Holdford &  
9 Reinders, 2001; Vidaver-Cohen, 2007). While looking at online corporate brand experience,  
10 Khan et al., (2016) also assert that corporate visual identity, emotional experience and  
11 functionality are the strongest predictors of brand satisfaction and loyalty. In their study, the  
12 emotional experience construct was adapted from the affective brand experience construct as  
13 conceptualized by Hamzah et al., (2014) refer to consumer's feelings or emotions generated  
14 in response to their brand. Schmitt (1999) further adds that brand experience can be  
15 developed from several sources such as sensory (engage sense), affective (mood, emotion,  
16 feelings), cognitive (intrigue, curiosity), behavioral (lifestyle, actions) and social  
17 (relationship, social rules).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Students may associate an institution based on their functional (cognitive) and  
36 emotional (affective) experiences (Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014). A functional experience is  
37 the service quality of an institution or university, and emotional concerns its image. Although  
38 service quality has received considerable attention in marketing there is a relative paucity of  
39 research concerning understanding of educational quality (Theus, 1993; Vidaver-Cohen,  
40 2007). Indeed, higher education is about service rather than a tangible product (see Kennedy,  
41 1977; Holdford & Reinders, 2001; Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001). Consistent with this notion,  
42 Grönroos (1990) suggests three groups of quality dimensions: technical quality, functional  
43 quality, and corporate image when evaluating brands in the service-related context. What is  
44 being measured here is the brand attributes of university or known as educational quality, and  
45 perceived corporate brand image through current experiences. The image construct comprises  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 both functional and technical quality, hence, a university's brand attributes can be defined as  
4  
5 an attitude resulting from student experiences and perceptions of university performance  
6  
7 from the angle of the service process (functional) and service outcome (technical quality)  
8  
9 (Holdford & Reinders, 2001).  
10  
11

12  
13 Whilst ranking on service or educational quality have been useful indicators in the  
14  
15 past, the changing environment especially when students are becoming more critical when  
16  
17 selecting institutions (Syed Alwi & Kitchen 2014), make these insufficient today to underpin  
18  
19 consumer buying decisions (Davies & Chun, 2008; Bennet & Ali-Choudhry, 2009).  
20  
21

22  
23 To summarize, two main drivers are found to be relevant when explaining the forces  
24  
25 that drive student decision namely; Corporate (university) brand image and brand experience  
26  
27 with the university. That is, corporate brand image is concerned with an organization's i.e.,  
28  
29 university's innate attributes (brand values), as experienced by students (Davies et al., 2003;  
30  
31 2004; Keller & Richey, 2006; Balmer, 2009). These innate attributes (as the sum of values  
32  
33 that represent an organization), in turn, form the corporate brand image (Ind, 1997). The  
34  
35 values or perceptions held by stakeholders are based on the accumulated experiences (of  
36  
37 these students) with an organization (Davies et al., 2003). Thus, corporate brand image is  
38  
39 about consumers' (or students') cognitive and affective (emotional) responses to a brand that  
40  
41 lead to the personification of brand attributes, which can be used to differentiate between  
42  
43 alternative offerings (Patterson, 1999; Davies et al., 2004; Nguyen et al., 2019).  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 As the topic of corporate brand image in higher education is still unclear and  
49  
50 relatively new (Theus, 1993; Balmer & Liao, 2007), and because the existing literature is not  
51  
52 robust enough to explain the concept, this study attempts to ascertain the essential dimensions  
53  
54 and components of functional attributes (service/educational quality) and emotional attributes  
55  
56 (corporate brand image) of the university's brand image. This is in line with the previous  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 research objective concerning the exploration of corporate branding at higher education level  
4  
5 with different stakeholders (Hemsley-Brown & Goonawardana, 2007).  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **2.3 Satisfaction, Brand Image and WOM**

11  
12 Several studies have examined the relationship between corporate image and  
13  
14 customer satisfaction with varying findings. While others have indicated that corporate brand  
15  
16 image is an important antecedent of customer satisfaction (Tu et al., 2012; Andreassen &  
17  
18 Lindestad, 1998). In the context of higher education, Alves & Raposo (2010) state that  
19  
20 university corporate image has a strong influence on student satisfaction and loyalty but, their  
21  
22 model shows satisfaction is not related to WOM. However, the study does not explain why.  
23  
24 On the other hand, other studies have shown that customer satisfaction is an import part of  
25  
26 brand marketing campaigns and an antecedent of brand image (Nam et al., 2011). Andreassen  
27  
28 & Lindestad (1998) also indicate that corporate image is the strongest predictor of customer  
29  
30 loyalty while surprisingly, there is no significant impact of satisfaction on loyalty.  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 The importance of word-of-mouth is highlighted by Kamboj & Rahman (2017), as  
37  
38 one of the consequences as a result of interaction between antecedents of participation in  
39  
40 online brand communities, with mediators and moderators. Some studies have also shown  
41  
42 that WOM communication, especially, online, from both current students and alumni directly  
43  
44 affect prospective students' enrolment choices (Yang & Mutum, 2015). However, very few  
45  
46 studies have empirically examined the relationship between satisfaction and/or brand image  
47  
48 with WOM. Some studies have indicated some potential link, for example, Tran et al., (2015)  
49  
50 state that corporate image, with time and experiences, can create consistent reputation.  
51  
52 According to them, reputation has five different levels, namely, awareness, familiarity,  
53  
54 favorability, trust, and finally advocacy. Though they did not exactly indicate the forms of  
55  
56 advocacy, it would most certainly include WOM.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This study was based on Schmitt's (1999) theoretical conceptualization of brand  
4 experience and also examines service and educational quality, relating to universities  
5 (Holford & Reindeer, 2001) and the corporate brand image (Balmer & Liao, 2007; Hemsley-  
6 Brown & Goonawardana, 2007; Davies & Chun, 2008). This study attempts to shed light on  
7 strategic corporate brand positioning in this competitive market and accordingly offer better  
8 explanations of consumer-student behavioral responses (Bennett & Ali-Choudhury, 2009).  
9 Specifically, this study proposes that the service process and outcome (or educational quality-  
10 the cognitive brand attributes) of a university as experienced by students may influence a  
11 student's satisfaction with the university/school (e.g. happy or pleased with the  
12 university/school), which will enhance their overall perception of the school (or corporate  
13 brand image – the affective brand attribute) and subsequently foster loyalty to the  
14 university/school (such as coming back for advanced studies, recommending to others or  
15 saying positive things about the university/school).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **3. Method**

#### 37 **3.1. Research design**

38 In order to develop a better understanding of consumer/student behavioral responses,  
39 this study explores current students' experiences with X University and their perceived  
40 corporate brand image through a series of focus group discussions (FGDs) at different levels.  
41 In particular, this study uses focus groups to obtain insights from participants at the  
42 undergraduate and postgraduate level and seeks to elicit and analyze information concerning  
43 their university experiences, perceived brand image and more favorable or more unfavorable  
44 outcome such as WOM or loyalty. An exploratory focus group-based approach is relevant to  
45 this study context (Churchill, 1979; Goulding, 2005). For example, Churchill (1979) explains  
46 that the use of FGDs is important to increase the probability of producing valid measures. As  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 past studies concerning the brand experience concept had a traditional setting, the phenomena  
4  
5 or items embedded in the concept do not necessarily relate to the higher educational brand  
6  
7 environment, and, generally, as argued, are confined to: (1) service or product brand  
8  
9 experience only, (2) limited rather than a multi-dimensional approach (e.g., cognitive and  
10  
11 affective), and (3) are commonly researched in the West.  
12  
13

14  
15 Malaysian students in a UK University were selected as the sampling frame in this  
16  
17 study because Malaysia constitutes one of the biggest target markets for X University from  
18  
19 Southeast Asia. In fact, Malaysia is the second largest country in terms of contributions to HE  
20  
21 students' enrolments in UK, from non-EU countries (UKCISA, 2018). Furthermore, culture  
22  
23 and consumer perception may be different in Asian countries due to inter-subjectivity  
24  
25 (Gillespie & Cornish, 2010) and language differences (Richard & Toffoli, 2009). Language  
26  
27 affects consumer information processing, cognition and decision-making. As a result, people  
28  
29 may infer different experiences and meanings, which may well result in different responses  
30  
31 when answering questions or exploring issues. Thus, a qualitative research design is both  
32  
33 relevant and consistent with procedures used historically, where brand-related experience  
34  
35 studies are the objective (Parasuraman et al., 2005; Akinci et al., 2010). As highlighted in the  
36  
37 corporate and branding literature, different study environments may result in different  
38  
39 dimensions (Davies et al., 2003). Corporate brand differs geographically, as the degree of  
40  
41 importance attached to corporate branding varies as much between countries as it does  
42  
43 between institutions. Thus, utilizing an East Asian sample is justified in that it might provide  
44  
45 new or extend or confirm extant theoretical insight (Balmer & Liao, 2007).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

### 56 ***3.2 Sampling and data collection procedure*** 57 58 59 60



1  
2  
3 This study focuses on Malaysian students studying at X University, which was selected  
4 because of the large number of Malaysian students studying in the University. The  
5  
6 Malaysians represented the largest group of East Asian students from one country and  
7  
8 relatively homogenous culturally. As the impact of culture was not the focus of this study,  
9  
10 this study focused on the students from Malaysia which are relatively homogenous culturally.  
11  
12 The sample comprised of four groups: two from the undergraduate level, one from the  
13  
14 Masters' level and a further group comprised of PhD students. Research went ahead after  
15  
16 ethical research approval was given by X University. We decided on the Focus Group  
17  
18 Discussion method (FGD) as we wanted to gain an in-depth understanding and to understand  
19  
20 the perceptions of the participants based on their experiential knowledge, with the researchers  
21  
22 facilitating/ moderating the discussions (Bloor et al., 2001). The ethical approvals were  
23  
24 conveyed to the students at the beginning of the focus group sessions. These students were  
25  
26 invited to participate through a Malaysian X student website as well as through a gathering  
27  
28 and via regular meetings held at the Amenities X center. Several follow-up emails were sent  
29  
30 individually to all levels and text messages were sent to target respondents (particularly  
31  
32 undergraduate) to remind them of the research focus group meetings.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 All of the respondents were either: (a) The minimum/at the very least, in their third  
41  
42 semester of their first year, or in the second/third year of their undergraduate study when data  
43  
44 was collected, (b) The postgraduate (MSc/MBA) level which had completed their exams, (c)  
45  
46 PhD students (postgraduate level) comprising of different years from first to fourth year. The  
47  
48 above selection criteria ensured that the participants possessed enough knowledge of X  
49  
50 University, in line with the procedure suggested by da Silva & Syed Alwi (2008). Roper  
51  
52 (2004) also suggests that assessment over time will ensure a truer representation and a more  
53  
54 accurate reflection of experience and satisfaction with an organization, thus having some  
55  
56 experience before the session was considered highly important.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Based on Morgan's (1996) suggestion, this study conducted four FGDs. In total, the FGDs  
4 involved 31 participants from different disciplines/degrees, with a mix of genders (17 females  
5 and 14 males), and age ranging from 20 to 45 years old. Specifically, there were two  
6 undergraduate groups comprising of six and nine participants respectively, which is  
7 considered as an ideal group size (Fern, 1982) and two postgraduate groups (MSc/MBA and  
8 PhD level) consisting of seven and nine respondents respectively. The series of FGDs  
9 terminated when the data achieved saturation; with the third and fourth groups capturing very  
10 little new information (Morgan, 1996). To maintain anonymity of the respondents, they were  
11 labeled as UG1 to UG15, which denotes undergraduate, PG1- PG7 denotes postgraduate  
12 (MSc/MBA level) and PhD1-PhD9 denotes data from PhD respondents. The students in each  
13 group were from similar education/ degree levels so that they would feel more comfortable  
14 within their age group (see Table 1). The researchers conducted the four FGDs conducted  
15 within a month-long period, following the ethical approvals. On average, each FGD lasted for  
16 90 minutes and took place at a quiet location based at the University, convenient for students.  
17 One author acted as moderator and a facilitator was appointed to assist in providing field  
18 notes. This approach follows the essential aspects in conducting the focus group procedures  
19 of Calder (1977) and Morgan & Spanish (1984), in which the 'moderator' refers to a person  
20 who conducts a discussion in a focus group session (Calder, 1977; Morgan & Spanish, 1984;  
21 Knops et al., 2010) and the 'facilitator' refers to someone who helps the moderator jot down  
22 the notes or quotes expressed by the participants in a focus group (Knops et al., 2010).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 This study employed the directed content analysis and thematic approach and  
50 procedure to analyze the data from the FGDs. The analysis starts with a theory or relevant  
51 research findings as guidance for the determination of the initial codes of the concept studied  
52 (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). For example, when unfolding a new construct/concept and its  
53 related components or dimensions i.e., corporate brand image, the method allows for  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 supporting or extending the existing theory. In particular, it is useful when the main objective  
4 is to further refine, extend and enrich a specific concept or theory (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).  
5  
6 This procedure is the best approach to analyze the content of findings, and, furthermore, it is  
7  
8 in line with the procedure suggested by Kidd & Parshall (2000) and Braun & Clarke (2006),  
9  
10 and other studies with similar objectives, such as Hsieh & Shannon (2005) and Claes &  
11  
12 Heymans (2008).  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 Guided by the content analysis procedure, the data analysis followed five steps: (1)  
18  
19 preparing full transcripts of FGDs; (2) establishing coding according to themes; (3) reviewing  
20  
21 the dimensionalities from the extant literature; and (4) naming of dimensionalities. Their  
22  
23 details are as follow.  
24  
25

26  
27 After the completion of each FGD session, the researchers listened to the audiotape  
28  
29 several times and produced an initial transcript in Microsoft Word. Thereafter, a comparison  
30  
31 was undertaken of the initial transcript and the field notes to complete the full transcript. The  
32  
33 researchers re-read the transcripts several times to understand the discussions based on the  
34  
35 research objectives reflecting the early interest in selecting X, corporate brand image, brand  
36  
37 experience and behavioral responses. Established coding manually is done according to the  
38  
39 themes that appeared based on the existing theory (Kidd & Parshall, 2000; Claes & Heymans,  
40  
41 2008), for instance, from the marketing and branding communication domain (Belch &  
42  
43 Belch, 2003). Based on the findings, new perspectives were summarized in relation to the  
44  
45 existing theory (Kidd & Parshall, 2000; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) and then sorted in  
46  
47 accordance to the identified themes and coding relating to the research objectives using  
48  
49 respondent's quotations.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

#### 56 **4. Findings and discussion**

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Based on the four conducted FGDs, the research identified several themes (dimensions) of  
4 corporate brand image from the respondents' experiences and discussed associated sub-  
5  
6 corporate brand image from the respondents' experiences and discussed associated sub-  
7  
8 themes. A sample of the quotes from participants appears in the Table 1 to 3 with the  
9  
10 identification of each dimension.  
11

#### 12 13 14 15 ***4.1 Perceived university corporate brand image based on the students' brand experiences*** 16 17 ***studying at X University – Social experience with the university*** 18

19  
20 As highlighted earlier, the consumer (student) experience of the university-brand  
21  
22 could be from their sensory, functional, affective, and social and experience as 'engaging  
23  
24 one's senses', appealing, and 'perceptually interesting'. This dimension relates to all five  
25  
26 human senses, comprising sight, sound, scent, taste, and touch, which aim to create the brand  
27  
28 identity (Schmitt, 1999). Based on the content analysis, the present study finds that at the  
29  
30 corporate brand level, social experience comprises specific components, namely, university-  
31  
32 corporate brand name, website appeal, their designs, and information provided through X's  
33  
34 website, its subsidiaries/entities such as recruitment agencies and their brand name, previous  
35  
36 employers, their families and friends, the combination of which is named as corporate visual  
37  
38 identity (Melewar & Jenkins, 2002; van den Bosch, De Jong, & Elving, 2006).  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Most participants assert that these components and form of communication are  
44  
45 evident that enhance their perception about the university brand image and early interest that  
46  
47 drives their selection of X University. In particular, they are based on these elements: existing  
48  
49 with experiences/seniors, sponsor, websites, families, employers, and recruitment agencies as  
50  
51 indicated by the participants below:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Brand (social) experience and perceived university corporate brand image

Questions	Dimensions	Quotes from respondents
Where did you first hear about X University?	Social experience (existing students - senior and friends)	<i>"I first learnt about X through my seniors that were studying there" [UG5]</i> <i>"I registered and decided to come to X because of my friend that I met at the recruitment agent's office, she recommended me to join her studying in X University because she told me she learnt from her seniors about the university" [PG7]</i>
	Family	<i>"I hear about X from my parents who asked from my sponsor" [UG9]</i>
	Social experiences (Sponsor & website)	<i>"My sponsor suggested that I check X's website with regard to my course" [UG3]</i> <i>"I didn't really know about X until my sponsor told me about it.... [PG4]</i> <i>"I follow my sponsor, as my sponsor recommended X for my course...all my friends just follow our sponsor" -[ UG15]</i>
	Employer	<i>"My boss actually told me about X,, because I wanted to do engineering, he told me the university has a good school on engineering...."[PG6]</i>
	Agent	<i>"...From agent A, Agent B, but X is not even associated with Agent C, the top recruitment agent in Malaysia..." [PG7]</i>
Note: Most of UG students indicate they first hear about X from their sponsors		

Based on these findings, social experience is thus found to be relevant as the first dimension that enhances a student's perception about the university's brand image. Social experience is about brand relationship with the student and how the student is able to relate or connect with other people's experience about the university they are thinking of (Hamzah et al., 2014). For example, social experience are developed from several sources in this study such as seniors and friends, or other external cues including employers, financial sponsors, course-related material, and recruitment agencies, all appear to be important when communicating the benefits of an HEI (Table 1). Similarly, as indicated in previous literature, in a service-related setting, customer purchase decisions relied upon external cues of the corporate brand such as image and positive word-of-mouth (Grönroos, 1984). Furthermore, Argenti & Druckenmiller (2004) explain that organizations should make their assets tangible (possibly through corporate visual identity) in order to position and differentiate themselves in the minds of their stakeholders. This may be due to the fact that an image of a company

1  
2  
3 refers not only to “*what we hear and see from the company’s messages (impression formed*  
4 *from other people’s opinion or media advertising), but experience its product (the direct*  
5 *contact the consumer has with the product)*’, (Ind, 1997, p.5). According to Antonides and  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Van Raaij (1998), people differ in their perception of *reality* depending on their own  
11  
12 experiences, life histories and personal situations when perceiving people, product or brand.  
13  
14 As a result of these differences, each individual has a subjective view of reality or his/her  
15  
16 own unique brand knowledge. In addition, the consumer brand knowledge may be derived  
17  
18 from several sources: (1) objective reality (consumer personal experience); (2) constructed  
19  
20 reality (message from advertising and media) and (3) experiences of others (such as word-of-  
21  
22 mouth) (Antonides and Van Raaij, 1998). Therefore, a consumer’s association may be  
23  
24 comprised of both cognitive i.e. from personal experience and affective or/and symbolic  
25  
26 elements (e.g. through advertising) (Rauschnabel et al., 2016). Burke and Edell (1989) assert  
27  
28 that it is becoming clear that the affective, symbolic and cognitive aspects of persuasion are  
29  
30 intertwined rather than separate and Rauschnabel et al. (2016) explain that this is because the  
31  
32 university brand represent the overall perceptions and feelings that stakeholders associate  
33  
34 with a particular university.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

#### 42 ***4.2 Perceived university corporate brand image based on the students’ (brand) experiences*** 43 ***studying at X University – Functional (Cognitive) and Emotional experience with the*** 44 ***university*** 45 46 47 48

49 The second and third dimensions found to be relevant in explicating the university’s  
50  
51 corporate brand image are functional and emotional/affective experience (Schmitt, 1999;  
52  
53 Hamzah et al., 2014). Through functional experience (e.g. atmosphere, expertise/staff,  
54  
55 facilities, location), respondents of the focus groups indicated mixed emotional experiences  
56  
57 to several perceived university brand images. Emotional experience, on the other hand, refers  
58  
59  
60

to the participation in or observation of events that involve feelings and vary in intensity from moods to emotions, and are important in consumer responses (Schmitt, 1999). Providing consistent ‘good feeling’ emotions to customers may foster and build a lasting relationship (Schmitt, 1999). Laros & Steenkamp (2005) conceptualize brand emotions as comprising both positive and negative dimensions. In this study, most of the participants express mixed emotions (positive and negative) about their experiences with the university. The respondents indicate six components, namely, happy with X University and satisfied but also worried and disappointed with facilities, staff, and administration. Many of them express the view that they were happy with the X atmosphere, environment, supportive lecturers (which a case of functional experience), but propose that the school could further improve to enhance their experiences with the university (they refer to their own experience of the university and to their friends at X as well) as indicated below:

Table 2: Brand (functional and emotional) experience and perceived university corporate brand image

Questions	Dimensions	Quotes from respondents
What is your overall experience about X?	Affective image (Positive/emotional Experience) e.g. Happy, good feeling and satisfied	<i>“It’s course content [...] I am so glad I chose X”</i> [PG5] <i>“[...] Good experience, worth quit my job to come to X”</i> [PG6] <i>“X is good in providing support to students. When my supervisor left, they are quick in assuring me that they are doing everything they can to provide temporary support until I will be assigned a new supervisor”</i> [PhD3]
How do you best see X as?	Cognitive image: Excellent program/courses  Reputable	<i>“[...] The program (mix-module, very comprehensive) [...] for me, the program is more important than the university name”</i> [PG2]. <i>“I compared the program with other universities (University of Y and Z) but they didn’t have the exact program I wanted”</i> [PG3]; <i>“X is reputable for my module; it is seen as is tough &amp; reputable”</i> [PG4] (the student is referring to Engineering degree); <i>“My employer suggests X is top for Engineering”</i> [PG5]; <i>“I came to X because of my supervisor’s reputation”</i> [PhD9]
		*Note: Most of UG/PG students during the interview agreed that their sponsor suggest X University due to its top program for engineering school
	Other services and communication	<i>“Fast admission service from Admission [...] the guy that represents Malaysia. He is so good, care about us and so supportive and very quick, so I decided to come because he explains very clearly to me. I received the acceptance letter from X first”</i> [PG7]

---

University facilities	“[...] Their facilities are great (e.g. library is open 24/7)...” [UG6]
	“Facilities are generally good but some facilities (example sports) are outdated” [UG3]
	“My PhD supervisor is great however my school needs to do more to help us as PhD students, such as special training for our topic. But they said they can’t do it ...this is frustrating” [PhD6]
The Lecturer	“When my father died, my supervisor provides all information and supported me until I finally completed my dissertation, I am grateful to her”
	“My lecturer is very helpful, sometimes I can see her without appointment” [UG5]
	“The support & extra classes/seminar or workshops for PhD students are excellent in the Business School, it is up to us to join or not” [PhD3]
University environment & location	“The environment was what as my senior explains, for example, the International environment, good environment within campus, faculties, accommodation is nearby with our own Malaysian community” [UG4]
	“It’s in London...Location is good” [PG1]
	“X is a safe university. The security is always present and I feel relax coming back home late at night as bus stop are located within campus. You feel safe here” [UG13]
	The atmosphere within the university is friendly. We [Malaysian student community] has participated in International food where we provide taste of Malaysian food. You can see they always have international activity from time to time. [UG11]
	*Note: most of the respondents agreed during the FGD that location (X University is in London) and campus-based environment also play important role to their decision of enrollment.

---

### ***4.3 Brand experience and perception of university corporate brand image and their effects on university behavioral outcomes: Satisfaction and positive word-of-mouth***

Previous research suggests that brand experience enhances a student’s perceived university corporate brand image via both functional and emotional elements, the effect it has against one another however was not clear (Curtis et al., 2009; Syed Alwi and Kitchen, 2014), thus hamper university marketing administrator’s understanding of designing a more appropriate brand strategy when targeting students. While affective brand attribute is thought to be explained by cognitive brand attributes (the outcomes of educational and service quality), students’ behavioral responses (positive word-of-mouth) to schools depended



1  
2  
3 largely on the affective component and their happiness (satisfaction) rather than upon the  
4 cognitive element (Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014). In the long-term, satisfied students may  
5 develop a sense of belonging to their university, seen as their alma mater and be proud to be  
6 associated with the corporate brand (Curtis et al., 2009). They would then offer positive  
7 word-of-mouth feedback to colleagues, prospective students' parents, subordinates or  
8 whoever seeking advice before pursuing their studies. In other words those graduates which  
9 would evaluate their university as a good, respected, and admired institution (overall attitude  
10 evaluation-corporate brand image) (Bennet & Ali-Choudhry, 2009), would be followed by  
11 feelings of satisfaction (feelings such as affinity, happiness or pleasure in being associated  
12 with the school) (Davies et al., 2004) and finally loyalty towards the University (e.g., positive  
13 word-of-mouth about the school). Loyal students would be most likely to engage in favorable  
14 word-of-mouth communications about the school or recommending the university or school  
15 (Bennet & Ali-Choudhry, 2009), remembering that not all schools have a natural association  
16 with an umbrella institution.

17  
18 Respondents of this study, when asked for their overall feelings about the overall brand  
19 experiencing, gave positive behavioral responses - namely, happy, glad, good feelings,  
20 leading to satisfaction, leading to outcomes such as recommending to their friends, sponsors  
21 and families as highlighted by some of the quotes given below:  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Table 3: Brand experience, perceived university corporate brand Image and behavioral response – X University


Questions	Findings Dimensions	Quotes from respondents
Now that you have experienced X, how do you feel about the brand? (Satisfaction)	Positive feelings: Happy Feeling Satisfied	<i>"I am so glad I chose X"</i> [PG5]  <i>"[...] Good experience, worth quit my job to come to X"</i> [PG6]  <i>"It met my expectation- as what my senior told me [...] overall, I am happy"</i> [PG3]
Would you recommend X? (Behavioral response-Word-of-mouth)	Loyalty Word-of-mouth	<i>"I would love to recommend X but many Malaysian still didn't know about it, X should increase their visibility in Malaysia"</i> [PG4]  <i>"We would love to recommend and participate in any X event (e.g. Alumni) in Malaysia"</i> [PG5]
How best to attract Malaysia (prospective) students?	Increase visibility among Malaysian	<i>"We would love to recommend and participate in any X event in Malaysia but X should do more because Malaysian relies heavily on ranking, however with helping us on appeal letter to our sponsor, and increase visibility (more marketing, promotion) could change/influence our sponsor decision"</i> [PhD3]
What could X do more?	Talk to sponsors  Marketing activities & international agent	<i>"[...] X need to talk to the Sponsor!"</i> [PG7]  <i>"[...] Sometimes some sponsor did not know how good X is"</i> [PG3]  <i>"Explain to our sponsor and agents that engineering is top in X as well as other school"</i> [UG6]  <i>"X is not pushing themselves in Malaysia, not as hard as other universities, market their name and qualities [...] as they (the sponsor) will rely on ranking unless other marketing promotion is done to clarify [...] Explain further that X has top expertise (their lecturers), this is not communicated"</i> [PG5]  <i>"[...] Agent A, Agent B (e.g. Agent's names), but X is not even associated with Agent C, the top recruitment agent in Malaysia..."</i> [PG7]  <i>"[...] however not all agents knew X very well for example, Agent C, X does not even appear via Agent C"</i> [PG3]

These findings state that the affective outcomes are viewed as a pleasurable level of consumption related fulfillment (Oliver, 1997), as a result of consumer-student reactions evaluated through their experiences over time, (Roper, 2004). Loyalty as the behavioral intention of students can produce greater value, as this is highly related to the actual behaviors and has richer diagnostic value than overall service quality (Zeithaml et al.,1996).

Based on the findings of this study, we have developed a conceptual framework as shown in Figure 1. The figure highlights the key themes/ dimensions and the relationships,

which emerged from this study. In particular, the study proposes that: The social, functional and emotional brand as experienced by student will form or enhance the student's university corporate brand image which in turn may influence her/his satisfaction (e.g. happy or pleased with the school), and subsequently be loyal to the university (coming back for advanced studies, recommend to others or say positive things about the school).

Figure 1: Proposed conceptual framework



## 5. Conclusion

This study has provided an in-depth investigation of the corporate brand image concept in the HEI context. The findings are expected to aid the strategic brand positioning of the institution, with emphasis upon the Malaysian market and consideration of brand attitudinal components such as corporate brand image and brand experience when analyzing university/corporate brand image and students' behavioral responses.

What drives brand reputation (e.g. academic quality) in an educational context, other than that established through ranking position, has continued to be a major question (Vidaver-Cohen, 2007; Syed Alwi & Kitchen, 2014; Rauschnabel et al., 2016). This study has provided

1  
2  
3 some understanding towards this by giving insights into what helps create a favorable brand  
4 image of a university that may influence a student's decision to stay for advanced studies  
5  
6 (Nguyen & LeBlanc, 2001). The results of this study add to the body of knowledge by  
7  
8 indicating that brand reputation of the university is directly linked to the brand experiences  
9  
10 and perceived brand image of the university. This is extremely important for universities. A  
11  
12 strong positive brand reputation helps firms achieve a competitive advantage by encouraging  
13  
14 repeat purchases and creates a source for generating future income streams (Schultz and de  
15  
16 Chernatony, 2002). As indicated by the findings of this study, positive brand image and  
17  
18 experiences can lead to loyalty and positive word-of-mouth generated by the students.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **5.1 Theoretical contributions**

27  
28 This study contributes to theoretical knowledge in at least two different ways: (1) by  
29  
30 identifying possible corporate brand image attributes and brand experiences, that guide brand  
31  
32 positioning (for the Malaysian market), and (2) by exploring the relationship between these  
33  
34 attributes and satisfaction and behavioral response (word-of-mouth) as presented in this  
35  
36 study's proposed conceptual framework. This study has identified the specific attributes that  
37  
38 influence Malaysian students' early interest in selecting X University via, for example,  
39  
40 through social brand experience e.g. recommendation from existing students at X, their  
41  
42 sponsors, employers, the courses or modules X offers and location – in London. This study  
43  
44 further revealed that corporate brand image attributes of the University (cognitively and  
45  
46 affectively) enhance corporate brand differentiation and positioning (Rauschnabel *et al.*,  
47  
48 2016). These include the product/programs, modules, reputable courses/modules, lecturer  
49  
50 (expertise and supportive), university atmosphere and environment, administration aspect,  
51  
52 service quality such as responsiveness and empathy and good feeling towards the overall  
53  
54 university (which a case of functional and emotional brand experiences).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In addition, in studying the current students' brand experience, a mix of feelings and  
4 experiences are reported, ranging from positive (happy, pleased, and satisfied) to negative.  
5  
6 For example, the university could do more to enhance their learning and teaching experience  
7  
8 by improving lecturer communication or offering more support in terms of training for  
9  
10 specific courses or enhancing their entry experiences (marketing communication) such as  
11  
12 talking to sponsors (especially at postgraduate level). Finally, this study proposes a  
13  
14 conceptual model that shows the theoretical relationships between cognitive and affective  
15  
16 brand attribute relative to corporate brand image, satisfaction and finally consumer-student  
17  
18 behavioral response (loyalty, word-of-mouth). These attributes vary according to the different  
19  
20 levels of the degrees (PhD, MSc or Bachelor undergraduate). Arguably, corporate brand  
21  
22 promise is seen through this effect (de Chernatony, 2002), which in turn aids the formation of  
23  
24 corporate identity (Melewar & Akel, 2005; Davies & Chun, 2008). Thus, from a conceptual  
25  
26 perspective, the notion of both brand aspects (brand experience and corporate brand image)  
27  
28 follows a rational thought process first before an affective component is then considered,  
29  
30 resulting in the brand promise and loyalty. Hence, both corporate brand image and  
31  
32 satisfaction are important constructs in universities as they directly and indirectly link with  
33  
34 loyalty.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 ***5.2 Managerial implications***

46  
47 HEI brand positioning may not only be based upon ranking or product, service quality  
48  
49 or educational quality (which represent the cognitive elements of the brand) (de Chernatony,  
50  
51 2002), but also on affective elements such as corporate brand values and personality (Davies  
52  
53 & Chun, 2008; Rauschnabel *et al.*, 2016). The present study contributes to the identification  
54  
55 of specific students' needs and attributes including courses and modules, reputable schools  
56  
57 (engineering), the environment (e.g. campus – near to lecturer, international), helpful  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 lecturers, the university location. Addressing the right brand attributes enhance and clarify the  
4  
5 positioning aspect of the university brand, while simultaneously addressing the needs and  
6  
7 wants of consumers (Peter & Olsen, 2008). For example, by understanding the culture –  
8  
9  
10 consumer buying behavior within this setting, marketers or school administrators can identify  
11  
12 exactly which behaviors could be changed and by which mechanism, for example, talking to  
13  
14 sponsors, and introducing activities to increase visibility/image in Malaysia. Interacting with  
15  
16 sponsors can influence them towards sending students to X instead of to other universities in  
17  
18 the UK. This could be translated into relationship building by X University with the  
19  
20 Malaysian or for that matter other sponsors while still maintaining a relationship with  
21  
22 recruitment agencies. Interestingly, almost all respondents ‘strongly agree’ that they would  
23  
24 base their recommendation on the above factors, but it is their senior existing students’  
25  
26 experiences in relation to all of these aspects at X that drives them to make (entry) decisions  
27  
28 in favor of X, from the context of the current study.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 However, there are also issues highlighted about how marketers/school administrators  
34  
35 at X can further improve activity to increase its presence, corporate brand identity and  
36  
37 visibility in Malaysia through a more aggressive promotion. At present, the Malaysian  
38  
39 sponsors lack brand awareness (of X). The existing students propose promoting X  
40  
41 particularly to Malaysian sponsors through X alumni activities. This can also be done by  
42  
43 communicating with them directly seeing as the nature of decision-making (entry) is such  
44  
45 that sponsors heavily rely on rankings and the top 100 universities. Continuously providing  
46  
47 support to students so that they can justify their entry decision with a supporting letter  
48  
49 explaining ranking will assist in bringing about behavioral changes among the sponsors. The  
50  
51 main priority for marketing and branding messages and campaigns should be to target the  
52  
53 main sponsors of the students rather than just students within this context. This approach  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 helps improve the brand reputation of the university as well as provide promotional messages  
4  
5 and marketing and branding strategy for new student in-take.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **5.3 Research limitations and further research**

11  
12 This study is not without limitations. It was conducted in a single university and  
13  
14 future research could replicate this in other schools/institutions. Cross-validation to other  
15  
16 private institutions lies outside the scope of this study. Furthermore, although this study has  
17  
18 identified specific attributes of university brands, they tend to be seen or interpreted as  
19  
20 overall for both brand experiences and corporate brand image attributes due to the reflective  
21  
22 nature of the construct, and also they tend to be seen as higher order rather than at individual  
23  
24 levels. Further research is needed to analyze these dimensions using a quantitative approach  
25  
26 at individual levels and testing the conceptual model as presented in the conceptual model.  
27  
28 This study is focused on one Asian market (Malaysian students in X University) chosen for  
29  
30 its potential growth in the future. Thus, the empirical work could be replicated via other  
31  
32 international students and comparisons made with the present finding in order to find the  
33  
34 standardized messages for promoting the university's corporate brand. Future studies should  
35  
36 look at different groups of South East Asian students to examine whether cultural differences  
37  
38 had an impact on perceptions of brand identity and other themes. It would also be especially  
39  
40 interesting to examine whether there are any differences between Asian students and students from  
41  
42 other European Countries. Finally, the proposed conceptual framework can be empirically  
43  
44 tested in quantitative study in the future in order to understand the varied constructs and their  
45  
46 relationships. Thus, this study provides a good starting point for further research.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **References**

56  
57  
58 Akinci, S., Atilgan-Inan, E., & Aksoy, S. (2010). Re-assessment of E-S-Qual and E-RecS-  
59  
60 Qual in a pure service setting. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(3), 232–240.

- 1  
2  
3 Alves, H., & Raposo, M. (2010). The influence of university image on student behaviour.  
4 *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(1), 73-85.  
5  
6 Antonides, G., & Van Raaij, W. F. (1998). *Consumer behaviour: a European perspective*.  
7 Chichester: Wiley.  
8  
9 Argenti, P. (2000). Branding b-schools: Reputation management for MBA programs.  
10 *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(2), 171-178.  
11  
12 Argenti, P.A. & Druckenmiller, B. (2004). Reputation and the corporate brand. *Corporate*  
13 *Reputation Review*, 6(4), 368-374.  
14  
15 Balmer, J.M.T (2009). Corporate marketing: apocalypse, advent and epiphany. *Management*  
16 *Decision*, 47(4), 544-572.  
17  
18 Balmer, J.M.T. & Liao, Mei-Na (2007). Student corporate brand identification: An  
19 exploratory: Case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*,  
20 12(4), 356-375.  
21  
22 Belch, G. E., & Belch, M. A. (2003). *Advertising and promotion: An integrated marketing*  
23 *communications perspective*. The McGraw- Hill.  
24  
25 Bennett, R. & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2009). Prospective students' perceptions of university  
26 brands: An empirical study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 19(1), 85-  
27 107.  
28  
29 Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus groups in social research*.  
30 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.  
31  
32 Brakus, J.J., Schmitt, B.H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: What is it? How is  
33 it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52-68.  
34  
35 Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*  
36 *in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.  
37  
38 Bravo, R., Montaner, T., & Pina, J. M. (2012). Corporate brand image of financial  
39 institutions: a consumer approach. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 21(4),  
40 232-245.  
41  
42 Brown, T.J. (1998). Corporate associations in marketing: Antecedents and consequences.  
43 *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(3), 215-233.  
44  
45 Burke, M. C., & Edell, J. A. (1989). The impact of feelings on ad-based affect and cognition.  
46 *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26(1), 69-83.  
47  
48 Calder, B.J. (1977). Focus groups and the nature of qualitative marketing research. *Journal of*  
49 *Marketing Research*, 14(3), 353-364.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Canterbury, R. M. (2000). Higher education marketing: A challenge. *Journal of Marketing*  
4 *for Higher Education*, 9(3), 15-24.  
5  
6 Churchill, G.A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs.  
7 *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73.  
8  
9  
10 Claes, R. & Heymans, M. (2008). HR professionals' views on work motivation and retention  
11 of older workers: A focus group study. *Career Development International*, 13(2), 95–  
12 111.  
13  
14  
15 Curtis, T., Abratt, R. & Minor, W. (2009). Corporate brand management in higher education:  
16 The case of ERAU. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 18(6), 404 – 413.  
17  
18  
19 Da Silva, R.V. & Syed Alwi, S.F. (2008). Online brand attributes and offline corporate brand  
20 images: Do they differ? *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(4), 217–244.  
21  
22  
23 Davies, G., Chun, R, Da Silva, R., & Roper, S. (2003). *Corporate Reputation and*  
24 *Competitiveness*. London: Routledge.  
25  
26 Davies, G., Chun, R, Da Silva, R. & Roper, S. (2004). Corporate character scale to assess  
27 employee and customer views of organization reputation. *Corporate Reputation*  
28 *Review*, 7(2), 125-146.  
29  
30  
31 Davies, G. & Chun, R. (2008). Projecting corporate character in the branding of business  
32 school In Melewar, T.C. (Eds), *Facets of Corporate Identity, Communication and*  
33 *Reputation* (pp. 163-177). UK: Routledge.  
34  
35  
36 Dean, D., Arroyo-Gamez, R. E., Punjaisri, K., & Pich, C. (2016). Internal brand co-creation:  
37 The experiential brand meaning cycle in higher education. *Journal of Business*  
38 *Research*, 69(8), 3041-3048.  
39  
40  
41 De Chernatony, L. (2002). Would a brand smell any sweeter by a corporate name?  
42 *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(2/3), 114–132.  
43  
44  
45 Fern, E.F. (1982). The use of focus groups for idea generation: The effects of group size,  
46 acquaintanceship, and moderator on response quantity and quality. *Journal of*  
47 *Marketing Research*, 19(1), 1–13.  
48  
49  
50 Gillespie, A. & Cornish, F. (2010). Intersubjectivity: Towards a dialogical analysis. *Journal*  
51 *of Theory of Social Behaviour*, 40(1), 19–46.  
52  
53  
54 Goulding, C. (2005). Grounded theory, ethnography and phenomenology: A comparative  
55 analysis of three qualitative strategies for marketing research. *European Journal of*  
56 *Marketing*, 39(3/4), 294–308.  
57  
58  
59 Grönroos, C. (1984). A Service Quality Model and its Marketing Implications. *European*  
60 *Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.



- 1  
2  
3 Grönroos, C. (1990). Relationship approach to marketing in service contexts: the marketing  
4 and organizational behavior interface. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(1), 3-11.
- 5  
6 Hamzah, Z.L., Alwi, S.F.S. and Othman, M.N. (2014), Designing corporate brand experience  
7 in an online context: A qualitative insight, *Journal of Business Research*, 67(11),  
8 2299-2310.  
9
- 10  
11 Hatch, M.J., Schultz, M. and Williamson, J. (2003), Bringing the corporation into corporate  
12 branding, *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(7/8), 1041-64.
- 13  
14 Hemsley-Brown, J. & Goonawardana, S. (2007). Brand harmonization in the international  
15 higher education market. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(9), 942–948.
- 16  
17 Hemsley-Brown, J., Melewar, T.C., Nguyen, B., & Wilson, E.J. (2016). Exploring brand  
18 identity, meaning, image, and reputation (BIMIR) in higher education: A special  
19 section. *Journal of Business Research*, published online.  
20  
21 doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.016  
22  
23  
24  
25
- 26 Hemsley-Brown, J. & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A  
27 systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International*  
28 *Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(4), 316-338.
- 29  
30 Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2015). *Higher Education Consumer Choice*. London  
31 Palgrave Macmillan.  
32  
33
- 34 Holdford, D. & Reinders, P. T. (2001). Development of an instrument to assess student  
35 perception of the quality of pharmaceutical education. *American Journal of*  
36 *Pharmaceutical Education*, 65(1), 125-131.  
37  
38
- 39 Hsieh, H.F. & Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.  
40 *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288.  
41  
42
- 43 Ind, Nicholas (1977). *The Corporate Brand*. New York University Press. Washington  
44 Square, New York.  
45
- 46 Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Understanding customer participation in online brand  
47 communities: Literature review and future research agenda. *Qualitative Market*  
48 *Research: An International Journal*, 20(3), 306-334.  
49  
50
- 51 Keller, K.L. & Richey, K. (2006). The importance of corporate brand personality traits to a  
52 successful 21st century business. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14(1/2), 74–81.  
53  
54
- 55 Kennedy, S.H., 1977. Nurturing corporate image. *European Journal of Marketing* 11(3), 120-  
56 164.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Khan, I., Rahman, Z., & Fatma, M. (2016). The concept of online corporate brand  
4 experience: an empirical assessment. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 34(5), 711-  
5 730.  
6  
7  
8 Kidd, P.S. & Parshall, M.B. (2000). Getting the focus and the group: Enhancing analytical  
9 rigor in focus group research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(3), 293–308.  
10  
11 Knops, A.M., Storm-Versloot, M.N., Mank, A.P.M., Ubbink, D.T., Vermeulen, H., Bossuyt,  
12 P.M.M., & Goossens, A. (2010). Factors influencing long-term adherence to two  
13 previously implemented hospital guidelines. *International Journal for Quality in*  
14 *Health Care*, 22(5), 421–429.  
15  
16  
17 Laros, F. & Steenkamp, J. (2005). Emotions in consumer behavior: A hierarchical approach.  
18 *Journal of Business Research*, 58(10), 1437–1445.  
19  
20  
21 MacInnis, D.J. & Price, L.L. (1987). The role of imagery in information processing: Review  
22 and extensions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(4), 473-491.  
23  
24  
25 McEnally, M.R. & de Chernatony, L. (1999). The evolving nature of branding: Consumer  
26 and managerial considerations. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 1999(2), 1-24.  
27  
28  
29 Melewar, T.C. & Akel, S. (2005). The role of corporate identity in the higher education  
30 sector: A case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 10(1),  
31 41-57.  
32  
33  
34 Melewar, T.C. & Jenkins, E. (2002). Defining the corporate identity construct. Corporate  
35 brands: Literature review and research directions. *Marketing Review*, 11(3), 205–225.  
36  
37  
38 Melewar, T. C., & Akel, S. (2005). The role of corporate identity in the higher education  
39 sector: A case study. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 10(1), 41-  
40 57.  
41  
42  
43 Melewar, T.C. & Nguyen, B. (2015). Five areas to advance branding theory and practice.  
44 *Journal of Brand Management*, 21(9), 758-769.  
45  
46  
47 Morgan, D.L. (1996). Focus groups. *Annual Review Social*, 22, 129–152.  
48  
49  
50 Morgan, D.L., & Spanish M.T. (1984). Focus groups: A new tool for qualitative research.  
51 *Qualitative Sociology*, 7(3), 253–270.  
52  
53  
54 Morrison, S. & Crane, F.G. (2007). Building the service brand by creating and managing an  
55 emotional brand experience. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14, 410–421.  
56  
57  
58 Nam, J., Ekinci, Y., & Whyatt, G. (2011). Brand equity, brand loyalty and consumer  
59 satisfaction. *Annals of tourism Research*, 38(3), 1009-1030.  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Nguyen, H. & Leblance, G. (2001). Image and reputation of higher education institutions in students' retention decision. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(6), 303-311
- Nguyen, B., Yu, X., Melewar, T.C., and Hemsley-Brown, J. (2016). Brand ambidexterity and commitment in higher education: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Research*. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.026
- Nguyen, B., Melewar, T.C., and Hemsley-Brown, J. (2019), *Strategic Brand Management in Higher Education*, (Eds) Routledge, London, UK.
- Oliver, R.L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Malhotra, A. (2005). e-SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for assessing electronic service quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 7(3), 213–233.
- Patterson, M. (1999). Re-appraising the concept of brand image. *Journal of Brand Management*, 6(6), 409-426.
- Peter, P.J. & Olsen, C.J. (2008). *Consumer behavior and marketing strategy*. Boston MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Rauschnabel, P. A., Krey, N., Babin, B. J., & Ivens, B. S. (2016). Brand management in higher education: The University Brand Personality Scale. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Richard, M.O. & Toffoli, R. (2009). Language influence in responses to questionnaires by bilingual respondents: A test of the Whorfian hypothesis. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 987–994.
- Roper, S. (2004). *Corporate Branding: A Reputational Perspective in Business-to-Business Market*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester.
- Schmitt, B. (1999). Experiential marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(1–3), 53–67.
- Schmitt, B. (2009). The concept of brand experience. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(7), 417–419.
- Shultz, M. & de Chernatony, L. (2002). Introduction the challenges of corporate branding. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(2/3), 105–112.
- Simões, C., & Dibb, S. (2001). Rethinking the brand concept: new brand orientation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 6(4), 217–224.

- 1  
2  
3 Syed Alwi, S. F., & Kitchen, P. J. (2014). Projecting corporate brand image and behavioral  
4 response in business schools: Cognitive or affective brand attributes?. *Journal of*  
5 *Business Research*, 67(11), 2324-2336.  
6  
7  
8 Theus, K. T. (1993). Academic reputations: the process of formation and decay. *Public*  
9 *Relations Review*, 19(3), 277-291.  
10  
11  
12 Tran, M. A., Nguyen, B., Melewar, T. C., & Bodoh, J. (2015). Exploring the corporate image  
13 formation process. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 18(1), 86-  
14 114.  
15  
16  
17 Tu, Y. T., Wang, C. M., & Chang, H. C. (2012). Corporate brand image and customer  
18 satisfaction on loyalty: An empirical study of Starbucks coffee in Taiwan. *Journal of*  
19 *Social and Development Sciences*, 3(1), 24-32.  
20  
21  
22 UKCISA (2018) [https://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Research--Policy/Statistics/International-student-](https://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Research--Policy/Statistics/International-student-statistics-UK-higher-education)  
23 [statistics-UK-higher-education](https://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Research--Policy/Statistics/International-student-statistics-UK-higher-education)  
24  
25  
26 Van den Bosch, A.L.M., De Jong, M.D.T., & Elving, W.J.L. (2006). Managing corporate  
27 visual identity – exploring the difference between manufacturing and service, and  
28 profit-making and nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Business Communication*,  
29 43(2), 138–157.  
30  
31  
32 Vidaver-Cohen, D. (2007). Beyond the rankings: A conceptual framework for business  
33 school research. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(4), 278-304.  
34  
35  
36 Yang, H. P., & Mutum, D. S. (2015). Electronic word-of-mouth for university selection:  
37 Implications for academic leaders and recruitment managers. *Journal of General*  
38 *Management*, 40(4), 23-44.  
39  
40  
41 Yuille, J.C. & Catchpole, M.J. (1977). The role of imagery in models of cognition. *Journal of*  
42 *Mental Imagery*, 1(1), 171–180.  
43  
44  
45 Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L. & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of  
46 service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2), 31-46.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Appendix A: Focus Group Respondent Profile

	Participant Code	Program of Studies	Level (UG, PG or PhD)	Year	Age	Gender
1.	UG1	Engineering	Undergraduate	2	22	Male
2.	UG2	Engineering	Undergraduate	1	20	Male
3.	UG3	Engineering	Undergraduate	2	21	Female
4.	UG4	Engineering	Undergraduate	3	23	Male
5.	UG5	Finance and Economics	Undergraduate	2	22	Female
6.	UG6	English/Creative writing	Undergraduate	1	20	Female
7.	UG7	Business Accounting	Undergraduate	3	23	Female
8.	UG8	Business and Management	Undergraduate	2	22	Female
9.	UG9	MEng	Undergraduate	1	20	Male
10.	UG10	Business and Management	Undergraduate	3	23	Female
11.	UG11	Computer Science	Undergraduate	3	23	Female
12.	UG12	Engineering	Undergraduate	3	24	Female
13.	UG13	Business and Management	Undergraduate	2	21	Female
14.	UG14	Business and Management	Undergraduate	3	23	Female
15.	UG15	Engineering	Undergraduate	3	24	Female
16.	PG1	Computer Communication	Postgraduate	1	28	Female
17.	PG2	Engineering Management	Postgraduate	1	27	Female
18.	PG3	Design and Branding	Postgraduate	1	26	Male
19.	PG4	Engineering Management	Postgraduate	1	25	Male
20.	PG5	Finance & Accounting	Postgraduate	1	24	Female
21.	PG6	Engineering Management	Postgraduate	1	24	Male
22.	PG7	Engineering	Postgraduate	1	26	Male
23.	PhD1	Human Resource Management	PhD	3	45	Male
24.	PhD2	Engineering	PhD	2	38	Male
25.	PhD3	Business-Marketing	PhD	3	43	Female
26.	PhD4	Engineering	PhD	3	33	Male
27.	PhD5	Engineering	PhD	3	31	Male
28.	PhD6	Computer and Communication	PhD	3	29	Male
29.	PhD7	IT Management	PhD	4	27	Female
30.	PhD8	International Business	PhD	3	32	Female
31.	PhD9	Software Engineering	PhD	4	34	Male

*Note: UG – Undergraduate; PG – Postgraduate and PhD – PhD. UG constitutes a 3 year or 4 year. MSc or MBA (usually a 12 month program including dissertation or 16 months program including dissertation and placement) and finally, PhD with usually a three or four year program with possibility to extend.*