

REICE
Revista Electrónica de Investigación en Ciencias Económicas
Abriendo Camino al Conocimiento
Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, UNAN-Managua

REICE | 185

Vol. 11, No. 22, julio - diciembre 2023 REICE ISSN: 2308-782X
<http://revistacienciaseconomicas.unan.edu.ni/index.php/REICE>
revistacienciaseconomicas@gmail.com

Factors affecting the brand equity of dong thap university – research based on students

Factores que afectan al valor de marca de la universidad de dong thap - investigación basada en los estudiantes

<https://doi.org/10.5377/reice.v11i22.17362>

Fecha recepción: octubre 15 del 2023
Fecha aceptación: noviembre 05 del 2023

Nguyen Giac Tri
PhD in Economic, Faculty of Economics, Dong Thap University, Vietnam
Address: 783 Pham Huu Lau Street, Ward 6, Cao Lanh City, Dong Thap Province,
870000, Vietnam
ngtri@dthu.edu.vn
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8378-5282>



Derechos de autor 2021 REICE: Revista Electrónica de Investigación en Ciencias Económicas. Esta obra está bajo licencia internacional Creative Commons Reconocimiento-NoComercial-CompartirIgual 4.0. Copyright (c) Revista Electrónica de Investigación en Ciencias Económicas de la Unan- Managua

Resumen

La investigación analiza los factores que afectan al valor de marca de la Universidad de Dong Thap desde el punto de vista de los estudiantes a través de cuatro factores: REICE | 186 conocimiento de marca, asociación de marca, calidad percibida y fidelidad a la marca. El estudio utiliza datos primarios mediante encuestas a estudiantes de la Universidad de Dong Thap y 298 respuestas recogidas mediante cuestionarios a través de un muestreo de conveniencia (muestreo no probabilístico). Los datos se analizaron para obtener estadísticas descriptivas, alfa de cronbach y otros análisis (es decir, análisis factorial exploratorio, estimación y pruebas de regresión). Los resultados muestran que los cuatro factores considerados afectaron al valor de marca de la Universidad de Dong Thap, seguidos de otros factores. Así pues, este valor de marca no sólo se ve afectado por las percepciones de los estudiantes, sino también por los servicios de formación. En consecuencia, la investigación pone de relieve las implicaciones prácticas y la dirección sugerente para que el personal directivo construya el valor de marca de la Universidad Dong Thap.

Palabras clave: Asociación, concienciación, valor de marca, lealtad, calidad percibida, valor de marca basado en el estudiante, marca universitaria.

Abstract

The research investigates the factors affecting Dong Thap University brand equity based on students' view through four factors, namely Brand awareness, Brand association, Perceived quality and Brand loyalty. The study uses primary data by surveying students studying at Dong Thap University and 298 responses collected by using questionnaire through convenience sampling (non-probability sampling). Data were analyzed to obtain descriptive statistics, cronbach alpha, and other analyses (i.e. exploratory Factor Analysis, estimation and regression testing). Result shows that the four factors in consideration affected the brand equity of Dong Thap University, followed by other factors. Thus, this brand equity is not only affected by student perceptions, but also by training services. Accordingly, the research highlights practical implications and suggestive direction for managerial staffs to build their brand equity of Dong Thap University.

Keywords: Association, awareness, brand equity, loyalty, perceived quality, student - based brand equity, university branding.

Introduction

In recent years, education reform activities at all educational levels, especially the tertiary level, have had many remarkable results. Universities not only focus on innovating teaching and learning contents and methods, but also strengthening coordination and cooperation with agencies, enterprises and employers to meet responsive workforce societal needs. Besides, in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning, universities have constantly invested in facilities, teaching and learning equipment, libraries, practice rooms, experiments, and so on. However, an important factor equally important, vital to the existence and development of a university, is the strength of its brand name. The university brand helps universities attract students' choice, investment and cooperation from employers for quality improvement. Although research on brand equity has been done extensively in the fields of conventional goods and services manufacturing, it has not been widely studied in the education sector.

Therefore, this study is conducted to find out the extent to which each factor has an impact on brand equity based on the assessment of students studying at Dong Thap University, thereby giving some directions helping leaders and managers effectively develop Dong Thap University's brand equity.

Literature review

During the past few decades, the concept of *brand equity* has increasingly concerned marketing managers and researchers due to its major role as an important corporate intangible asset. There are many definitions of brand equity. Firstly, it has been defined by Aaker (1991, p. 4) as: a set of brand assets such as name awareness, loyal customers, perceived quality, and associations that are linked to the brand and add value to the product or service being offered. On the other hand, Keller (1993) focusing on marketing described it as the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand. It is clear that the above definitions indicate that brand equity is a very broad and abstract concept and can be viewed from a number of different perspectives.

There are at least four perspectives on brand equity, namely customer market/consumer-based, product market/firm-based, financial market, and employee-based (Aaker 1996; Ailawadi et al. 2003; Keller 1993; Kim et al., 2003; Netemeyer et al. 2004; Supornpraditchai et al., 2007; Yoo and Donthu 2001).

- Financial-based brand equity (FBBE): The key role of FBBE is to quantify the financial value that brand equity provides to the firm. Aaker (1991, 1996), Agarwal and Rao (1996) delineate the financial value of brand equity by defining it as the ability of a brand to charge a higher price than an unbranded equivalent charges. Kapferer (2008, p.14) defines FBBE as the ‘net cash flow attributable to the brand after paying the cost of capital invested to produce and run the business and the cost of marketing’.
- Consumer-based brand equity (CBBE): Keller (1993, p.2) views CBBE as “the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand”, and CBBE occurs “when the consumer is familiar with the brand and holds some favorable, strong, and unique brand associations in memory”. He further elucidates that the “primary” associations with the brands result in brand beliefs and attitudes. The beliefs and attitudes can stem from the functionality, derived experiences, or symbolic values of the brand. Underlying this perspective is the notion that the power of a brand lies in what customers have learned, felt, seen, and heard about the brand.
- Product market/firm-based brand equity (MBBE): From a firm's point of view, brand equity represents attributes such as lower financial risk, incremental cash flow, higher rent, higher entry barriers, lower marketing, and distribution cost for extensions and protection from imitation via trade marking. The benefit of brand equity should ultimately be reflected in the brand’s performance in the marketplace (Aaker 1991, 1996; Agarwal and Rao 1996). Price premium is measured either by asking consumers how much more they would be willing to pay for a brand than for a private label or an unbranded product or by conducting conjoint studies in which brand name is an attribute.

- Employee based-brand equity (EBBE): is another brand equity dimension focusing on the employees' perception toward the organization brand. EBBE reflects “uniqueness of company brand associations, brand consistency, brand creditability and brand clarity” (Supornpraditchai et al., 2007, p. 1728; Mourad et al., 2011, p. 405).

University brand equity and measurement aspects

According to Law No. 34/2018/QH14 on amendments to the Law on higher education, the higher education institution is an educational institution of the national education system performing the training function of Higher education (university degree, master's degree and doctoral degree), science and technology activities, community service.

In recent years, higher education institutions have focused on university brand equity. To do this, universities have constantly improved the quality of training to meet the needs of learners, university training association with enterprises, investing in modern learning facilities and equipments. However, the most important issue is that higher education institutions need to take into consideration students' opinions of training quality and the university's image, thus evaluating their opinions (as consumers) to the university brand equity.

From this assessment, university managers will identify the direction to promote the value of the university, thereby contributing to attracting students, attracting cooperation with employers. According to Chu Nguyen Mong Ngoc (2010), today's universities should consider students to be the service subjects to be provided with a special kind of service, especially training service (the concept of "training" here is much narrower than that with "education" on the humanity and concretized as professional training).

Some international and local researches inheriting from the brand equity model based on consumers (Aaker, 1991) have suggested a brand equity model that can be adapted and used in the training services sector such as Dennis et al. (2016), Dung (2019), Mourad et al. (2011), Pham Thi Minh Ly (2014), Vu Thi Thu Ha (2019). In the above-mentioned researches, four components of the university brand were mentioned, namely *Brand awareness*, *Brand associations*, *Perceived quality*, *Brand loyalty*. REICE | 191

Therefore, in this study, the authors decide to apply these four brand equity components in the context of Dong Thap University.

- **Brand awareness:** Brand awareness refers to the ability of a customer to recognize or remember a brand of a certain product (Aaker, 1991). According to Keller (1993), brand awareness consists of two factors: brand recall and brand recognition. Brand awareness indicates the ability of a customer to identify and differentiate a brand's characteristics from other brands in the market. Brand awareness is an important component of brand equity. In higher education services, the university brand awareness is reflected in the ability of learners to recognize outstanding features when referring to higher education institutions, helping to distinguish one university from another. Thus, in order to make a decision to choose a school, students must first identify which school is suitable for their needs so that they can make a choice decision. Thus, brand awareness is an indispensable component of brand equity in higher education institutions.

- **Brand association:** A brand association is anything that connects a consumer's mind with a brand. The related information helps to process and retrieve information, a source of differentiation and brand positioning, making consumers buy intentions, create a positive attitude, as the foundation for the wide branding (Aaker, 1991). In the field of educational services, brand association shows that, when referring to universities, students associate specific attributes of the university such as good educational environment, majors/chapters diverse curriculum, good facilities, a team of experienced lecturers, and especially employment opportunity after graduation. This is the basis for

learners to choose higher education institutions. Therefore, brand association is also an indispensable component in the field of education.

- Perceived quality is the overall opinion or assessment of a customer about the superiority or excellence of a product. Aaker (1991) defines perceived quality as the consumer's perception of the quality or superiority of a product brand. It is the difference between the total value a customer receives and the value they expect in a product or service when deciding to consume at a certain price. A brand is often accompanied by an overall perception of a customer about a product's quality. In fact, the actual quality of the brand that the business provides and perceived quality do not often coincide, because the customer is not an expert in the field. However, the quality that customers perceive is the factor that customers use as a basis for implementing consumer behavior. Perceived quality in university is reflected in the learners' perceptions of the quality or superiority of a university brand, which is the subjective and relative assessment of the learner for the quality of the faculty, the curriculum or the extra-curricular activities of higher education institution. It must reflect the university's capacity to meet the needs of students, creating confidence in the ability to deliver higher levels of education and helping learners make admission decisions. Only when students feel good service quality can they decide to choose and stick with the school's services. In order to improve the quality of students' perception of the school, university administrators need to create a unique advantage of the school, thereby creating the school's reputation (Dung, 2019).

- Brand loyalty: A consumer loyalty to a brand shows a consumer's tendency to buy and use products or services of a brand and repeat this behavior (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 1999). For a loyal customer who are satisfied with the company's product or service, the company also has a great benefit that these customers will recommend and persuade relatives and friends to use our products (by word of mouth). The core of brand equity is customer loyalty. Loyalty level higher means the number of customers of the company more and thus, the company will increase sales and save marketing costs. In higher education and training services, brand loyalty is reflected in the strong connection between learners and the university. Student loyalty is seen as the most valuable asset

of the university because once students gain loyalty, they can stay with the university for a long time and ready to recommend to other people and especially, after graduation, they are willing return to university to share their experience and contribute financially to the university.

Research models and hypotheses

Aaker (1991) proposed the first comprehensive model of brand equity. He identified five aspects of brand equity, that is brand name perception, brand association, perceived quality, brand loyalty and other proprietary assets (for example: patent, trademark). Keller (1993) developed a consumer-based brand equity model that focused on familiarity and awareness, while at the same time facilitating strong and unique brand associations. He believed that brand equity is determined primarily by brand knowledge (including perception, attributes, interests, images, thoughts, feelings, attitudes and experiences). Then, these and other models were tested in many different contexts. Yoo and Donthu (2001) developed a multi-dimensional consumer based brand equity scale, adapting the Aaker and Keller model but specifically focusing on brand awareness, perceived quality, associations and loyalty.

Keller (1993), who named the brand equity as customer-based brand equity (CBBE), drew on cognitive psychology to define brand equity as “the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand” (p.8). A brand with strong equity is easily recognizable and recalled, and importantly creating a distinction strong enough to generate favorable response towards the brand.


In response to global competitive challenges, universities recently started developing better strategies for branding. Branding has been used as a differentiation strategy for education institutions. As the number of universities (public and private) has increased, the competition for students has risen. Moreover, facing local and global competition, education administrators in general, Dong Thap University administrators have realized

that external or traditional branding efforts are important to build strong university brands as most of these efforts applied recently seemed to be focused on promotion and identity. As a result, universities started developing better brand strategies in response to global competitive challenges (Whisman, 2007), and branding has been considered as a differentiation strategy not only for traditional education but also higher education institutions (Jevons, 2006).

A study by Yuan et al. (2016) explored the concepts of brand identity and image associations of brand extensions in higher education, and found that the identity-image linkage is influenced by consumers' perceived congruence and legitimacy of the brand extension. Based on extensive review of brand equity and university branding literature, Pinar et al. (2014) identified and validated the CBBE dimensions for reliable measurements of university brand equity. Hence, this current research will use a university brand equity assessment model based on existing models of consumers-based brand equity and adapt them for use in the training service sector because universities around the world and in Vietnam in particular operate more and more like service providers, and students are becoming more and more "consumers" (Mazzarol and Soutar, 2008).

As mentioned in conceptual framework, the current study opted to follow the model proposed by Dennis (2016), Dung (2019), Mourad et al. (2011), Pham Thi Minh Ly (2014), Vu Thi Thu Ha (2019) with four components: Brand awareness, Brand association, Perceptible quality, Brand loyalty (figure 1).

Figure 1. Proposed research model



This model is used to measure four components of brand equity based on consumers (students), which is also used to measure brand equity of Dong Thap University with 17 observed variables (14 measurable observational variables for brand equity components, and 03 measurable observational variables for brand equity). This study uses a 5-point Likert scale from 1 - Totally disagree to 5 - totally agree. After testing the reliability of the scale by analyzing Cronbach's Alpha with SPSS software. The results show that all 17 observed variables to measure the concepts are satisfactory (total variable correlation coefficient > 0.3), presented in Table 2. So, these variables are used for exploratory factor analysis (EFA). REICE | 195

This research model demonstrates the relationship between the factors affecting the brand equity of Dong Thap University based on students. To do this research, the hypotheses are set up as follows:

Brand awareness has a positive influence on the brand equity of the University, this relationship has been tested in studies Aaker (2011), Dung (2019) and Vu Thi Thu Ha (2019). Accordingly, when learners have a positive awareness of a university brand, it will increase the value of the university's brand equity. Therefore, hypothesis H₁ is proposed:

H₁: The brand awareness has a positive impact on the brand equity of the university.

Brand association plays a particularly important role because once students have strong associations and think well about the brand they will love the brand. moreover, a brand association will increase the value of the university brand (Dung, 2019; Vu Thi Thu Ha 2019). A favorite brand becomes more competitive within a set of brands, so the tendency to engage and choose will increase. Therefore, hypothesis H₂ is proposed:

H₂: The brand association has a positive impact on the brand equity of the university.

In the education field, students' choice of schools is carefully considered. Therefore, only when students perceive the quality of relevant services as a good service before, during and after the delivery of the service can they decide to choose and stick with their services. school. In addition, previous studies (Dung, 2019; Vu Thi Thu Ha, 2019) have also shown a positive influence between perceived quality and brand equity of the University. Therefore, hypothesis H₃ is proposed:

H₃: The perceived quality has a positive impact on the brand equity of the university.

Establishing a close link between students and the school for a long time is considered an important foundation for building the brand equity of the university (Dung, 2019; Pham Thi Minh Ly, 2014; Vu Thi Thu Ha, 2019). Student loyalty is considered as the most valuable asset of the school because once students gain loyalty, they can stay with the school for a long time. Therefore, hypothesis H₄ is proposed:

H₄: The brand loyalty has a positive impact on the brand equity of the university.

Materials and Methods

Research data was collected by surveying senior students studying at Dong Thap University. The sample was collected through two steps: (1) selected the norm samples by majors (75% of pedagogical students and 25% of non-pedagogical students; this rate is taken in proportion to the proportion of students currently enrolled at Dong Thap University); (2) convenience sampling (non-probability sampling) with sample sizes from 135 - 270 and more (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Nguyen Dinh Tho, 2011). To achieve the expected number of sampling, the research team submitted 80 questionnaires to non-pedagogical students and 250 questionnaires to pedagogical students. After collecting and checking, 32 questionnaires were rejected. Thus, after collecting the 298 responses, these questionnaires were implicit and entered into SPSS software or further analysis.

Research methods

We deployed the research in two stages:

Stage 1: Qualitative research to adjust and supplement the observed variable for the scale of research concepts to suit the research space of Dong Thap University. To do this, we conducted a target group discussion for students of Dong Thap University with a sample size of $n = 10$. All interviews were in the form of face-to-face interviews with a duration of 30 to 60 minutes, with an average of 45 minutes. Interview period is February 2023 to March 2023. REICE | 197

The use of interview, as the first phase data collection method in this study, is indicated by the need for face-to-face, in-depth exploration of issues, raised by respondents to the quantitative survey, which help to support more detailed investigation in the hope of gaining new insights into recurring problems. The initial intention in choosing 10 candidates of sample in this first stage had been to control and rejudge the relevance of the observed variables used in previous studies, whether they were completely consistent with this research space or not. The results showed that there was not much change in the sentences for the questions. Therefore, 17 observed variables are continued to be used for stage 2.

Stage 2: Quantitative research to test the reliability of the scale, as well as measure the impact of factors on the brand equity of Dong Thap University. To achieve this, we used analytical methods including: (1) Descriptive statistical methods to statistic relevant information about the research sample such as gender, specialty, school year, etc.; (2) Cronbach's Alpha reliability test method is used to consider the reliability of observed variables measuring component concepts of brand equity, as well as the concept of brand equity; (3) Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is used to again evaluate the reliability of observed variables measuring component concepts of brand equity, as well as the concept of brand equity through value convergence and differentiation; (4) Correlation analysis is used to examine the relationship between the four components of analysis (brand awareness, brand association, perceived quality and brand loyalty) to brand equity

university. In addition, in this study, the authors also used multiple regression analysis to measure the impact of these components (X) on the brand equity of the university (Y). Data were collected by distributing questionnaires to a direct survey for the period from April 1, 2023 to May 1, 2023.

Result and discussion

Sample Description Statistics

After interviewing 80 non-pedagogical students and 250 pedagogical students using convenient sampling method, 298 valid survey samples meeting the requirements were included in the official study (Table 1).

Table 1. Survey sample information

Characteristics		Samples size n = 298	
		Frequency	Percent %
Gender	Male	196	65.7
	Female	102	34.3
Majors	Pedagogical students	225	75.3
	Non- pedagogical students	73	24.7
School year	Junior	125	42.0
	Senior	173	58.0

(Source: The author's data collection and analysis results)

Testing Scale Reliability

Table 2. The official scales of components of the brand equity based on consumers

Encode	Variable description
BAW1 BAW2 BAW3	Brand awareness I can easily distinguish Dong Thap University from others I could quickly remember the characteristics of Dong Thap University I can remember and recognize Dong Thap University's logo quickly
BAS1 BAS2 BAS3 BAS4	Brand association When talking about Dong Thap University, I think of a very good education Dong Thap University has many diverse disciplines Dong Thap University has many achievements in teaching and social activities Modern facilities of Dong Thap University ensure a good learning and researching
PQ1 PQ2 PQ3 PQ4	Perceived quality Lecturers of Dong Thap University are capable and teach well The facilities of Dong Thap University meet the needs of students Information exchange between Dong Thap University and students is very well done The staff of Dong Thap University can handle very well all the students' questions
BL1 BL2 BL3	Brand loyalty I choose Dong Thap University because of its brand I will not transfer schools during the school period I will introduce Dong Thap University to my acquaintances
CBBE1 CBBE2 CBBE3	Although the universities have the same educational environment, I still prefer to study at Dong Thap University instead of studying at another universities. Although other universities have the same learning conditions as Dong Thap University, I still choose to study at Dong Thap University. Although other universities have strengths such as Dong Thap University, I still prefer studying at Dong Thap University.

(Source: *The author's data collection and analysis results*)

The test of scale reliability of Student – based brand equity of Dong Thap University is done through Cronbach's Alpha's reliability coefficient. After analyzing Cronbach's Alpha, all 14 observable variables of the four factor groups met the criteria (Cronbach's Alpha coefficient ≥ 0.6 and correlation variable coefficient - total correction ≥ 0.3), that is, the suitability of the model with the data is accepted (Table 3). Therefore, they are used to analyze the EFA.

Table 3. Results of the reliability calculation of the scale

Observable variables	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Brand awareness (BAW), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.872				
BAW1	7.4532	2.415	0.855	0.726
BAW2	7.3132	2.870	0.632	0.930
BAW3	7.4132	2.624	0.793	0.787
Brand association (BAS), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.811				
BAS1	10.3532	4.295	0.619	0.768
BAS2	9.6399	4.137	0.673	0.742
BAS3	10.0566	4.173	0.612	0.772
BAS4	10.2999	4.457	0.616	0.770
Perceptible quality (PQ), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.850				
PQ1	11.2366	4.622	0.712	0.800
PQ2	10.7632	5.438	0.588	0.850
PQ3	11.6366	4.418	0.715	0.799
PQ4	11.4232	4.538	0.753	0.782
Brand loyalty (BL), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.757				
BL1	7.1732	1.915	0.641	0.610
BL2	6.7666	2.178	0.589	0.674
BL3	7.2932	2.127	0.533	0.734
Consumer-based brand equity (CBBE), Cronbach's Alpha = 0.806				
CBBE1	7.5499	1.418	0.820	0.555
CBBE2	7.5632	1.483	0.718	0.664
CBBE3	7.5132	1.862	0.455	0.927

(Source: The author's data collection and analysis results)

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Our research team conducted an EFA analysis on the four brand equity components (14 observed variables), the analysis results showed that all 14 observed variables were satisfactory (with Factor loading > 0.5) and extracted into the four factors as proposed model.

Using extraction method as Principal Component Analysis and Varimax with Kaiser Normalization as rotation method, the EFA for the independent variables shows the KMO coefficient = 0.760 > 0.5 with Sig = 0.000 < 0.05, indicating that the observed variables are close to the same factor correlating. Also, the total extracted variance of 71.156% > 50% shows that these four factors explain 71.156% the variation of the dataset.

Using extraction method as Principal Axis Factoring and Promax with Kaiser Normalization as rotation method, the EFA of the dependent variable group showed that KMO and Bartlett's in the analysis of factors have sig. = 0.000 and KMO = 0.573 > 0.5. Therefore, the extracted scales are acceptable. All three observed variables have factor loadings greater than 0.5. Thus, the scale satisfies the convergence value and reliability.

Table 4. Results of EFA of components impact university brand equity

Observable variables	Factor loading			
	1	2	3	4
PQ4	0.870			
PQ3	0.853			
PQ1	0.842			
PQ2	0.750			
BAS1		0.813		
BAS4		0.809		
BAS2		0.761		
BAS3		0.694		
BAW1			0.928	
BAW3			0.921	
BAW2			0.722	
BL2				0.840
BL1				0.810
BL3				0.690
Post EFA testing				
Eigenvalue	4.125	2.788	1.725	1.321
Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Cumulative%)	29.470	49.390	61.715	71.156
Cronbach's Alpha	0.850	0.811	0.872	0.757

(Source: The author's data collection and analysis results)

At the same time, the authors also performed an EFA analysis for the brand equity scale (03 observed variables), the analysis results showed that all three observed variables were satisfactory (with Factor loading > 0.5) and extracted into 01 factor; 0.5 < KMO = 0.573 < 1, so the EFA analysis was appropriate. In addition, the total extracted variance was 73.148%, which means that the extraction factor explained 73.148% of the variation of the data set.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 5. Results of the regression analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.680	0.225		3.010	0.002		
BAW	0.331	0.036	0.434	8.934	0.000	0.812	1.229
PQ	0.242	0.036	0.286	6.509	0.000	0.993	1.005
BL	0.141	0.044	0.159	3.185	0.001	0.764	1.311
BAS	0.132	0.044	0.146	2.971	0.002	0.785	1.272
Adjusted R Square = 0.422							
Durbin-Watson = 1.679							
Anova (F = 55.905; Sig. = 0.000)							

(Source: The author's data collection and analysis results)

a. Dependent Variable: CBBE

Multiple Regression Analysis shows that the adjusted R^2 is 0.422, ie 42.2% the variation of CBBE explained by variation of 4 independent variables BAS, BAW, PQ, BL. Durbin – Watson $d = 1.679$ ($1 < d < 3$) showed no correlation between residuals. The sig. value of $F (= 55.905)$ equals to 0.000, ie the linear regression model given is consistent with the collected data.

This regression model shows that the independent variables (Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Perceived Quality, Brand Loyalty) have a positive impact on the brand value of Dong Thap University. The results completely agree with those of Vu Thi Thu Ha (2019). However, in terms of the impact level, there is a heterogeneity between the study of the authors and the study of Vu Thi Thu Ha (2019), specifically in the author's study, the impact level of the brand equity factors of universities in order: brand awareness, perceived quality, brand loyalty and brand association, while Vu Thi Thu Ha's (2019) study shows sequential impact: brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality.

This difference could be due to the different research space. In addition, brand loyalty is proven to have an impact on the brand equity of Dong Thap University. This finding is in agreement with research results of Pham Thi Minh Ly (2014) and at the same time, the difference in the authors' study with Pham Thi Minh Ly's is that the authors' study found REICE | 203 the impact of three components: brand awareness, brand association and perceived quality of university's brand equity. This may be because Pham Thi Minh Ly's research is a joint study for universities in Ho Chi Minh City, not specific to any particular university, so the difference in the results of the study. Therefore, the results of authors' study are completely acceptable.

As presented in table 3, all of the T-Statistics are larger than 1.95, so it can say that the outer model loadings are highly significant. So H_1 , H_2 , H_3 and H_4 are adopted.

From the results of regression analysis, it shows that four factors in the model made up Student – based brand equity of Dong Thap University. Branding is not only for firms but also for the education sector. The empirical data and the statistical tests in this study support the existence of causal relationship between the four components – brand awareness, brand associations, perceived quality and brand loyalty and Student – based brand equity of Dong Thap University, which is consistent with the research hypothesis and the results of previous relevant studies.

According to Aaker (1991), perceived quality acts as a differentiation tool, brand awareness builds the familiarity-liking sight and is a signal of substance. The research results actually show that the student's assessment contributes greatly to the brand equity of Dong Thap University, in which brand awareness is the most influential factor to the brand equity of Dong Thap University and perceived quality in the second place. The image and identity of the university is the key determinant in which students consider reputation as important.

The quality in education with other related services provided by the university develop satisfaction which resultantly enhance the image of the university. Therefore, The Communications' Dong Thap University is established as a perfectly right decision, in line with today's trend, when students/learners are the main decision-maker in choosing a major school. REICE | 204

One question may come up at this point *“Is the research model really suitable when the four factors in the research model only explain 42.2% for the dependent variable - brand equity of Dong Thap University based on consumers?”* The previous studies on this issue using Aaker's brand equity scale also show similar research results, with three or four factors as in the authors' study. However, maybe due to the characteristics of the education sector in general and Dong Thap University in particular, the brand equity of Dong Thap University is not only based on the student's perceptions but also strongly influenced by the student's family (parents tend to orient or choose a major for their children), or based on the services of training at the university (degree of acceptance by the employer to the student after graduation). Therefore, it is necessary to have a follow-up study expanding the research model to more fully evaluate the factors that make up brand equity of Dong Thap University.

Conclusion

Creating a brand in the field of higher education requires a lot of time and effort. For Dong Thap University (a university with strengths in the pedagogical field has switched to multi-disciplinary and multi-field training in recent years) building brand assets is a necessary, important and vital task, creating momentum for sustainable development in the future. From there, it is possible to create a competitive advantage over other universities in the region.

The research results have shown that among factors affecting brand equity of Dong Thap University, brand awareness is the most influential factor, followed by perceived quality, brand loyalty, and brand association. Therefore, the School Board should assign tasks to each subordinate unit, especially the Communications roles in promoting brand awareness features, brand image of Dong Thap University.

From the point view of this research findings, it has been recommended that Dong Thap University should focus on advertisement to increasing awareness, so that the potential students consider their name as an alternative while making university selection decision. In order to build the brand equity of Dong Thap University, some recommended solutions are proposed by the research team such as: promote the building of characteristics of Dong Thap University to distinguish it from other universities: color, logo, student uniform, etc., continue to improve the quality of the teaching staff, the quality of scientific research, the ability to communicate, answer questions, and advise students.

Other solutions to be considered is investing in building facilities, building a friendly learning environment to help students promote their abilities and creativity. Thereby, students will likely feel satisfied when studying at the school, improving student loyalty.

References

- Aaker, D. (1991). *Building strong brands*. New York: Free Press.
- Aaker, D. A. (1996). Measuring brand equity across products and markets. *California Management Review*, 38(3), 102-120.
- Ailawadi, K. L., Lehmann, D. R., & Neslin, S. A. (2003). Revenue premium as an outcome measure of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(4), 1-17.
- Agarwal, M. K., & Rao, V. R. (1996). An empirical comparison of consumer-based measures of brand equity. *Marketing Letters*, 7(3), 237-247.
- A. Alkhaldeh, A. Alsaad, A. Taamneh, and H. Alhawamdeh, "Examining antecedents and consequences of university brand image," *Management Science Letters*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 953–960, 2020.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
- Chu Nguyễn Mộng Ngọc. (2010). Giá trị cảm nhận về đào tạo đại học từ góc nhìn sinh viên. *Tạp chí Phát triển và Hội nhập*, 4, 7-12.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- Dennis, C., Papagiannidis, S., Alamanos, E., & Bourlakis, M. (2016). The role of brand attachment strength in higher education. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3049-3057.
- Dung, T. V. (2019). Customer based brand equity and university brand management. *VNU Journal of Science: Economics and Business*, 35(4), 94-106.
- Jevons, C. (2006). Universities: a prime example of branding gone wrong. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 15(7), 466-467.
- J. M. Balmer, M. Urde, and S. A. Greyser, "Corporate brands with a heritage," Working Paper, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 2–24, 2007.
- Kapferer, J. N. (2008). *The new strategic brand management: Creating and sustaining brand equity long term*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Keller, K. (2003). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring and managing brand equity* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Keller, K. L. (2001). Building customer-based brand equity: A blueprint for creating strong brands. *Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute*, 3-27
- Kim, H. B., Kim, W. G., & An, J. A. (2003). The effect of consumer-based brand equity on firms' financial performance. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20(4), 335-351.
- K. K. Twum, A. A. Yalley, and G. K.-Q. Agyapong, "The influence of Public University library service quality and library Brand image on user loyalty," *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, vol. 18 , no. 2 , pp. 1–22, 2021.
- Law No. 34/2018/QH14 on amendments to the Law on higher education.
- Mazzarol, T. W., & Soutar, G. N. (2008). Strategy matters: strategic positioning and performance in the education services sector. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 13(2), 141-151.

- L. Leonard, "Cultivating service brand equity," *Journal Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 128–137, 2000.
- Mazzarol, T., & Soutar, G. (2008). Australian educational institutions' international markets: a correspondence analysis. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(3), 229-238.
- Mourad, M., Ennew, C., & Kortam, W. (2011). Brand equity in higher education. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29(4), 403-420.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Krishnan, B., Pullig, C., Wang, G., Yagci, M., Dean, D., & Wirth, F. (2004). Developing and validating measures of facets of customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(2), 209-224.
- Nguyen Dinh Tho. (2011), Scientific research methods in business - Design and reality, Labor and Social Publishing House, Ho Chi Minh City.
- Pham Thi Minh Ly. (2014). University brand equity as perceived by students - Research at universities in Ho Chi Minh City. *Journal of Economics & Development*, 200, 79-87.
- Pinar, M., Trapp, P., Girard, T. and Boyt, T. (2014). University brand equity: an empirical investigation of its determinants. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(6), 616-634.
- Q. Yu, Y. Asaad, D. A. Yen, and S. Gupta, "IMO and internal branding outcomes: an employee perspective in UK HE," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 43, no. 1. pp. 37–56, 2018.
- Supornpraditchai, T., Miller, K., Lings, I. N., & Jonmundsson, J. B. (2007). Employee-based brand equity: antecedents and consequences. *In Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference*. Otago University, 3-5 December, 1723-1733.
- S. Panda, S. C. Pandey, X. Tian, and A. Bennett, "University brand image as competitive advantage: a two-country study," *International Journal of Educational Management*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 234–251, 2019.
- Tran Thi Yen Minh and Pham Thi Huong. (2017). Public awareness of the University of Danang brand. *Journal of Science and Technology University of Danang*, 2(111), 12-17.
- Vu Thi Thu Ha. (2019). Student-oriented brand equity: research with the case of marketing departments at universities in Hanoi. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 52, 111-116.
- Whisman, R. (2007). Internal branding: a university's most intangible asset. Available at: www.brandchampionablog.com (accessed 20 September 2009).
- W. Schlesinger, A. Cervera-Taulet, and W. Wymer, "The influence of university brand image, satisfaction, and university identification on alumni WOM intentions," *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, vol. x , no. x, pp. 1–19, 2021.
- Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(1), 1-14.
- Yuan, R., Liu, M.J., Luo, J. and Yen, D.A. (2016). Reciprocal transfer of brand identity and image associations arising from higher education brand extensions. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3069-3076.