

An Administrative Insight into Branding in Management Institutions

¹K. Sivaramana Gouda, ²B. Shambhu Lingappa

¹Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, VTU's Centre for PG Studies, Kalaburagi

E-mail: shivaramana.gouda@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, VTU's Centre for PG Studies, Kalaburagi

E-mail: shambhubale01@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

The article looks at the viewpoint of the Management Institutions Administrators on the branding of management education institutes in six major districts. As the higher education market becomes more competitive, a good brand image is very important to draw students and faculty, get funding, and be a thought leader. This research details the results of a very detailed 100 administrator survey, including the understanding of branding, preferred strategies, and challenges as perceived by the administrators. The research shows that administrators are very aware of the importance of branding, especially in terms of raising the profile of the institution and getting students, but they mainly lack the funds and resources. The paper shows that there is a heavy dependence on the use of digital and social media as a means of brand promotion and communication. This manuscript develops a detailed picture of the administrators' perspective on the branding issue and thus helps institutional leaders figure out ways to raise their brand identity and competitive position.

Keywords: Branding, Management Institutions, Higher Education, Administrative Perspectives, Institutional Branding, Brand Strategy, Digital Marketing, Social Media, Student Recruitment, Reputation Management, Budget Constraints, Strategic Planning, Marketing in Education

1. Introduction

In the constantly changing landscape of higher education, management institutions are struggling to compete for the best talent, funding, and recognition as thought leaders. Therefore, strategic branding has become a vital weapon for such institutions to set themselves apart, gain a good reputation, and sustain their success. In this sense, branding is not just about logos or advertising phrases; it is primarily about the values, mission, and offering of the institution. An effective brand identity instils a sense of loyalty, trust, and confidence in all stakeholders, such as students, faculty, and business partners. However, a strong brand is not a one, time achievement; it demands a thorough, well, rounded approach involving sound decision, making and periodic reviews. The role of management school administrators in this context is crucial as they engage with numerous opportunities and challenges, the creation of a compelling brand message being one of them, while evaluating the benefits of their initiatives is another one.

The present study reports a thorough analysis of administrative views on branding, which is backed by a survey conducted among 100 administrators from management institutions. It explores core issues that include the main goals of branding, the best methods for marketing and communication, the key challenges encountered, and how branding is expected to influence the institution's reputation and the attraction of different stakeholders. This study, through a wide and detailed exploration of these administrative perspectives, intends to shed light on the complexities of branding in the area of management education and to offer guidance to the leaders who are aiming at developing their institution's brand identity and succeeding in a highly competitive setting.

1.1 Objectives:

- a) To analyze the viewpoints of the administrative staff regarding institutional branding in management education.
- b) To investigate how administrators conceptualize branding, what strategies they Favor, and what issues they recognize.
- c) To help college leaders understand the complexities of branding in management education.

- d) To offer meaningful insights as well as suggested measures for the betterment of the institutional brand identity.

1.2 Scope Of The Study:

The scope of this quantitative survey, based research was limited to collecting information only from the administrators in the management schools located in six major districts: Kalaburagi, Bidar, Raichur, Koppal, Ballari and Yadgir. The total population considered for this study were 1, 000 administrators from 213 management institutions across these districts. Administrator representatives were selected by a proportional stratified random sampling method. They represent a sample of 100 administrators, which is 10% of the total administrative population. Hence districts having more administrators were given proportionate representation. Data was collected via a structured questionnaire that was mainly a multiple, choice format. The questions were designed to allow respondents to share broadly their different administrative perspectives towards branding.

1.3 Limitations

- a) The study was limited to management institutions from only six particular districts and thus the results cannot be generalized to the whole population.
- b) The study was conducted on a sample size of 100 administrators which was representative of the selected districts but still may not fully represent the diversity of opinions.
- c) The use of a quantitative survey with multiple, choice questions only may be limiting the extent to which qualitative insights can be provided.
- d) The study is only about the perspectives of administrations which might be missing other important viewpoints of stakeholders.

2. Research Methodology

This study has taken a quantitative survey, based method to collect the opinions of administration staff about branding. The research was limited to administrators of management schools from six prominent districts i.e. Kalaburagi, Bidar, Raichur, Koppal, Ballari, and Yadgir.

- 2.1 Sample Selection and Size** The entire population united 1, 000 administrators from 213 management institutions in the six districts.. To make sure a representative sample was obtained, a proportional stratified random sampling method had been utilized. It was decided that 100 administrators would be the final sample, which is 10% of the total number of administrators. This way of sampling guarantees that a district with more administrators gets more weight in the sample, thus the validity and the representativeness of the findings would be higher. The breakdown of the sample is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: District-Wise Administrator Sample Distribution

District	Administrators	Sample Size Calculation	Sample Size
Kalaburagi	200	$200 \times 0.10 = 20$	20
Bidar	180	$180 \times 0.10 = 18$	18
Raichur	150	$150 \times 0.10 = 15$	15
Koppal	120	$120 \times 0.10 = 12$	12
Ballari	250	$250 \times 0.10 = 25$	25
Yadgir	100	$100 \times 0.10 = 10$	10
Total	1,000		100

2.2 Data Collection and Analysis: The data was gathered through a structured questionnaire mainly made up of multiple choice questions. The questionnaire consisted of a series of questions that sought to elicit different aspects of the administrators' viewpoints about branding. These included their understanding of the concept, their favoured strategies, the challenges that they perceived, and the role of branding in the reputation of an institution. The data was analysed through the use of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Tables have been used to present the results of the study where various statistical measures were also discussed to help identify the most significant patterns and trends. These included the use of standard deviation (S.D.), variance, and skewness.

3. Findings And Interpretation

The examination of survey data enables us to gain a deep understanding of how the management staff views branding in management institutions. The main results are organized in the thematic subsections below.

- 3.1 Profile of Administrative Respondents:** The administrative cross, section varied in terms of role and length of service. Deans/Associate Deans (31%) and Directors/Principals (23%) were the two biggest groups, which means that the opinions of senior management are quite represented. Apart from that, the sample reflected a broad spectrum of length of service, and the biggest group consisted of those having 1 to 3 years of experience (27%), while a significant 15% had more than 10 years of experience. The respondents were very knowledgeable since, altogether, 79% of them had either a Master's degree (37%) or a Doctoral degree (42%), which implies that they had both a high academic and a professional background. The major field of specialization was Management (38%). The analysis of the survey data provides a comprehensive overview of the administrative perspective on branding in management institutions. The key findings are grouped into thematic sections below.
- 3.2 Administrative Understanding and Objectives of Branding:** Administrators revealed a strong understanding of branding concepts. A total of 64% of them indicated that they were either "Very familiar" (29%) or "Somewhat familiar" (35%) with the concept of branding in higher education. Such knowledge at the basic level guides the formulation of their strategic objectives. One of the most frequently mentioned branding goals was to "Enhance reputation" (33%), which was identified by a third of the respondents. At the same time, "Draw in a larger student population" (24%) and "Set apart from competitors" (21%) were also notable goals. A clear focus of the administration is visible on branding as a means to increase prestige and enrolment.

Table 2: Main Objective of Branding

Objective	Frequency	Percentage
Enhance reputation	33	33%
Draw in a larger student population	24	24%
Set apart from competitors	21	21%
Boost visibility	16	16%
Other	6	6%
Total	100	100%

(*S.D = 1.15, Variance = 1.32, Skewness = 0.18*)

- 3.3 Effective Branding Strategies and Communication:** The majority of administrators agree on the best ways to promote the brand. They heavily lean towards digital channels especially social media. As illustrated in Table 3, Social media (32%) stands out as the top go to, brand Promotion Avenue, and Social media marketing (30%) is regarded as the most effective single branding strategy. This digital orientation gets an additional nod when the administrators point out "Social media engagement" (30%) as the primary way to measure the impact of the branding activities.

Table 3: Most Effective Branding Strategy

Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Social media marketing	30	30%
Content marketing	25	25%
Event marketing	20	20%
Influencer marketing	18	18%
Other	7	7%
Total	100	100%

($S.D = 1.17$, $Variance = 1.37$, $Skewness = 0.29$)

3.4 Impact on Reputation and Stakeholder Attraction: They see branding as the factor that most directly influences the reputation that a university has and through this power, its impact is highly emphasized. The largest part of the group thinks that brand identity has had a "Very positive" (44%) or "Somewhat positive" (30%) effect on reputation. This good reputation as a result of branding is viewed as the main reason for the attraction of the most important stakeholders.

- Attracting Talent:** A large majority of the administrators (73%) are of the opinion that efforts aimed at branding have been effective in attracting faculty and staff of high calibre.
- Attracting Students:** Students who make up the student body are considered to be the result of a good reputation, by 75% of the respondents who believe reputation has a positive influence on attracting students.
- Industry & Alumni Relations:** Seven out of ten people say that branding has a positive impact on their relations with industry partners and the same percentage see a positive contribution to alumni engagement. This evidence points to the fact that the administration sees branding as an essential tool for the overall business of the institution: through attractive brand you keep the students, staff, and partners who are crucial for the success of the institution.

3.5 Challenges and Future Priorities in Branding: Even though branding is considered vitally important, there are still major challenges that face school administrators. The main challenge figured out is "Budget constraints" (39%), next is "Insufficient resources" (23%) and "Competition from rival institutions" (20%). These challenges, which are related to resources, can barely allow branding campaigns to be done less in their influence and reach.

Table 4: Primary Obstacles to Advancing the Brand

Obstacle	Frequency	Percentage
Budget constraints	39	39%
Insufficient resources	23	23%
Competition from rival institutions	20	20%
Low brand recognition	12	12%
Other	6	6%
Total	100	100%

($S.D = 1.08$, $Variance = 1.17$, $Skewness = 0.51$)

Looking ahead, administrators' priorities for branding in the future are in line with the current trends. The biggest future priority is to make branding "More digital and interactive" (35%), with the next

priority being making it "More personalised and targeted" (28%). This shows that the shift towards data, driven, digitally, focused strategies is being used to overcome competition and to connect with stakeholders in a meaningful way.

4. Discussion

The results of this survey paint a clear and comprehensive picture of an administrative perspective on branding in the management institutions. Most of the administrators seem to agree on one point that branding is not just a side marketing activity but it is actually a major element of the institutional overall strategy, as evidenced by the 72% of these respondents who see it as "Extremely significant" or "Moderately significant" for overall strategy and planning.

The main goals of branding, which are to improve the reputation and to draw more students, clearly reflect the basic survival and growth metrics of any educational institution. This illustrates a strategic recognition of the role of branding. The heavy emphasis on digital and social media strategies is just a reflection of the marketing world at present. Not only for promotion, administrators also use these channels to communication and performance measurement, which they consider to be the most effective tools as well. This digital, first mindset is the main takeaway of modern educational administration.

On the other hand, the research also points out a significant disconnect. Whereas administrators see branding as a key strategic element and digitally, savvy approaches as the most effective methods, at the same time, they lack the money and people to do it. Institutional investment has not yet aligned with the acknowledged strategic importance of branding, as shown by the fact that 'Budget constraints' are the leading limitation. The shortage of resources is the biggest hurdle that stands in the way of institutions leveraging their brand to the fullest.

In addition, the research data keeps indicating that college administrators think that a well, executed branding strategy will help improve the college's reputation and get more students, faculty, and partners. The administrators' conviction to the last point legitimizes the need for more funding for institutional branding as a leading function of the institution, not just a cost of doing business.

5. Conclusion And Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion: This research reveals that administrators at management schools consider the branding activities as a major factor for building their reputations, attracting more students, and achieving success in general. They are well aware of its strategic goals and thus, a large number of them have converted their brand, related discussions and strategies to the digital platforms. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these branding efforts is drastically restricted due to the lack of budget and other essential operational resources. Although the administration shows the determination to utilize and highlight branding, the availability of the corresponding institutional resources still lags behind.

5.2 Recommendations Based on the findings: the following recommendations are proposed for management institutions:

- a) **Align Budgets with Strategic Priority:** Institutional leaders must take effective measures to bring the branding recognition and the financial resources allocated to it into a closer proportion. The branding should be considered as a long, term strategic investment, rather than a marketing expense that can be cut.
- b) **Invest in Digital Expertise and Tools:** Considering the strong inclination towards digital and social media strategies, institutions need to consider training their administrative and marketing staff, or appointing a digital marketing expert if the budget allows. Besides that, they should also offer access to the latest social media analytics and content creation tools.
- c) **Leverage Reputation for Recruitment:** Since the main goal is to improve the reputation of the institution, the marketing communications should tell the stories of academic excellence, faculty competence, and student success, the main contributors to the institution's reputation according to the perception of the administrators.

- d) Empower a cross, functional branding team: Even though marketing departments frequently lead the way, data reveals that senior leadership and communications are also significant contributors. Therefore, institutions need to create a formal cross, functional branding committee that will provide a united front for all the departments
- e) Develop a Data, Driven Culture: Since meeting the needs for more analytical branding are difficult, one way that colleges could be more responsive to this demand is by defining clear Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which go far beyond just counting how many people have visited the website. Thus, besides website traffic, lead generation quality, conversion rates, and brand sentiment analysis could be used as the measures of the effectiveness of branding investments.

References

- [1] Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2015). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [2] Chapleo, C. (2011). *Branding a university: an examination of the factors influencing reputation*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- [3] Hemsley-Brown, J., & Goonawardana, S. (2007). Brand relationships in higher education: the case for creating and maintaining a strong university brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 14(4), 415-427.
- [4] Temple, P. (2006). *The branding of higher education: the nature of the brand, the student as a customer and the role of marketing*. Institute of Education, University of London.
- [5] Naude, L., & Botha, E. (2014). The perceived challenges faced by marketers when branding a university. *The Journal of Contemporary Management*, 11(1), 164-184.
- [6] *Strategic Brand Management* by Kevin Lane Keller, Vanitha Swaminathan, Ambi M.G. Parameswaran, and Isaac C. Jacob (2020, Pearson)
- [7] Alma, B., & Akca, H. (2011). Brand Orientation in Higher Education: Alma and Akca focus on brand orientation, emphasizing the importance of prioritizing branding and providing insights into brand orientation benefits.
- [8] Judson, K. M., & Aurand, T. W. (2013). *Building University Brand Image: Judson and Aurand explore building university brand image, emphasizing the importance of developing a strong brand identity and providing practical advice*.
- [9] Chapleo, C. (2011). *Branding in Higher Education: Chapleo focuses on branding, emphasizing the importance of developing strong brands and providing insights into branding challenges*
- [10] Mourad, M. (2010). *Brand Equity in Higher Education: Mourad explores brand equity, emphasizing the importance of building strong brands and providing insights into brand equity*.
- [11] Ivy, J. (2001). *Higher Education Institution Image: Ivy focuses on institutional image, emphasizing the importance of managing the image effectively and providing insights into image complexities*
- [12] Bennett, R., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2009). *Prospective Students' Perceptions of University Brands: Bennett and Ali-Choudhury explore prospective students' perceptions, emphasizing the importance of managing the brand effectively and providing practical advice*.
- [13] Soutar, G. N., & Turner, J. P. (2002). *Students' Preferences for University: Soutar and Turner focus on student preferences, providing insights into student choice and practical advice*.
- [14] Simoes, C., & Soares, A. M. (2010). *Students' Expectations and Perceptions of Higher Education Institutions: Simoes and Soares focus on student expectations and perceptions, emphasizing the importance of understanding student needs and providing practical advice*.