

## **Indicator for Measuring University Reputation in Thailand**

**Assoc.Prof. Rungnapar Pitpreecha**

**Faculty of Communication Arts, Chulalongkorn University**

### **Abstract**

Indicator for Measuring University Reputation in Thailand is a quantitative research with an objective to investigate the indicator for measuring university reputation. The research focuses on the opinions of stakeholders and service receivers including high school and university students, parents, and employers. Sample group of the research comprises population residing in the Bangkok metropolitan area and four selected provinces representing the four regions of Thailand, which are Chonburi (Central region), Chiangmai (Northern region), Nakhon Ratchasima (Northeastern region) and Songkhla (Southern Region) with the total of 2,500 respondents.

Result of the survey research employing questionnaire with the sample found that among 2,500 respondents, 63.60 percent were female and 36.40 percent were male. 31.00 percent of the respondents were between 18 to 22 years of age, followed by 18.20 percent between 23 to 30 years of age, and 15.70 percent between 13 to 17 years of age. Of the total number of respondents, 24.10 percent were university students and 23.80 percent were civil service officers or government officers.

Considering the research result overview, it is shown that the factor with highest mean was performance (4.17), followed by products and services of the organization (4.16) and innovation (4.15).

According to Multiple Regression Analysis, the result found that products and services of the organization, performance, innovation, workplace, and governance had a significant influence on organization reputation; the products and services of the organization was the most influencing indicator ( $\beta = 0.45$ ).

The research also identifies indicators for measuring reputation of higher educational institutions in Thailand as follows.

**1. Products and Services**, which consist of: teaching Quality , courses with highly demand in the country, quality researches that can be applied well for society development,a number of doctoral faculty members with academic position and acceptable knowledge and skills,noble instructors who are good models, balanced number of instructors to students, international courses and/or research in association with leading university in other countries

**2. Performance**, which consists of: qualified graduates inquired by employers and holding high employment rate, academic achievement or researches being publicized

broad , academic achievement or researches being useful to the society, academic achievement or researches being often cited,stable and continuous growth of the university, university potential to compete with internationally, successful alumni being socially acclaimed ,university with both good and intelligent students and academic staffs,ability to raise funds for researches or institution development , quality curriculum and university's self-sufficiency.

**3. Innovation**, which consists of: initiative curriculums or instructions, creative academic achievements – useful and acceptable innovations or new technology ,holding ability to adapt to changes, advanced facilities, equipment, studios and workshop rooms, leadership for academic and researches

**4. Workplace**, which consists of: modern, clean, and safe landscape and environment,good atmosphere suitable for learning, library or academic data base for research and learning, university valuing art works and using them to create learning atmosphere, intelligence, tastes, and worth, proper payment or welfare for personnel, fair career path for employee.

### Key words

1. **Organization Reputation** is the performance that an organization has had from the past. The performance includes an ability of an organization in having a good performance which benefits all parties concerned. In other words, organization reputation is a report of organization performance disclosed to public.
2. **Indicator for Measuring University Reputation in Thailand**, in this research, the approach of RepTrak® Scorecard (Cees B. M. van Riel and Charles J. Fombrun, 2007.) was employed and developed attributes in each factor by revising indicators for measuring university reputation in Thailand and abroad from relevant researches. 7 factors are defined to be the framework of attributes as follows.
  - 1) **Products and Services** are the factor that educational institutions have for servicing or instructing students which are not concerned with technology or workplace; for example, acknowledged academic instructors with ethics who can become good models for society and teaching quality.
  - 2) **Innovation** is the factor about creating new or modern academic work; for example, initiative curriculums or instructions or being creative academic achievements with useful and acceptable innovations or new technology.
  - 3) **Workplace** is the factor about the place of higher educational institutions for students and staffs including working atmosphere for institution staffs; for example, modern, clean, and safe landscape and environment, proper payment or welfare for personnel.

- 4) **Governance** is the factor about ethics of the higher educational institutions; for example, operation with transparency and audit ability, and fairness with ethics.
- 5) **Citizenship** is the factor about social service and social role of higher educational institutions; for example, being a social resource for intellectual and academic knowledge and intellectual leading of the society.
- 6) **Leadership** is the factor about management and attribute of the leader in higher educational institutions; for example, having an explicit vision, quality institution management and being a good model for the society.
- 7) **Performance** is the factor about work performance, productivity, potential and growth of higher educational institution; for example, successful alumni being socially acclaimed, academic achievement or researches being publicized broad and useful to the society with continuous development.

## Introduction

Present intensive business competition in free trade market has led to improvements in products and services standard to satisfy consumer. The competition has been widespread to every section including education sector. Studies have found that several universities emphasized on institution rankings by organizations especially those international. The rankings have therefore influence on reputation and esteem of each educational institution.

University Rankings by several organizations have been conducted globally and regionally; for example, QS World University Ranking which collected academic works and operated rankings of universities across the world through website QS TopUniversities.com or Time Higher Education which is the organization that operates university rankings and cooperated together in the past ( Cited from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=408908>).

It is interested that in 2010, Time Higher Education focused on reputation issue for university rankings. It referred to research conducted by Thomson Reuters under the title “A Worldwide Academic Reputation Survey” in 2010 which studied 13,388 respondents from every region and field of study. The research suggests that sample group emphasized on reputation from academic instruction and research at 34.5 percent divided into 15 percent at reputation from academic instruction and 19.5 percent at reputation from academic research (Cited from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2010-2011/analysis-methodology.html>).

Moreover, in measuring organization reputation, indicating organization reputation measurement focusing on stakeholders is very important. Multi-Faceted organization reputation measurement is presented in measuring reputation from the stakeholders. Each group of stakeholders is seen to emphasize on different attributes of organization reputation; furthermore, consistency of organization reputation of each stakeholder indicates reputation strength of that organization. If organization reputation of each stakeholder is significantly different, it may weaken overall reputation of such organization. This fact of knowledge has an influence on the administration of organization reputation for stakeholder groups.

Therefore, it is interested to conduct a research focusing on factors of indicator for university reputation or acknowledgement measurement in the opinions of stakeholders and service receivers including high school and university students, parents, and employers. Stakeholders of the organization are the important factor influencing organization reputation measurement (Dowling, 2004). Each group of educational institution stakeholders may have different opinions on educational institution reputation, thus this research is conducted to identify that apart from factor of instruction and research, are there any other factors that indicate reputation and acknowledgement from the stakeholders of higher educational institution in Thailand.

### **Research Objective**

To identify indicator for university reputation measurement in Thailand

### **Research Scope**

The research focuses on high school and university students, parents, and employers residing in the Bangkok metropolitan area and four selected provinces representing the four regions of Thailand.

### **Research Contributions**

1. Research result can be contributed to curriculums or instructions in Bachelor and Master degree of Faculty of Communication Arts
2. Research result can be contributed to Thai university reputation measurement.

### **Research Methodology**

“Indicator for Measuring University Reputation in Thailand” is a quantitative research which had the sample group in high school and university students, parents, and employers residing in the Bangkok metropolitan area and four selected provinces

representing the four regions of Thailand. There were 2,500 samples who were applied Multi-Step Random Sampling with the following steps.

Step 1 : Purposive Sampling. Samples were selected from the province with the most intensive population in each region (according to the deptment of provincial administration 2008) and from Bangkok. Therefore, The selected provinces were Bangkok, Chonburi (Central Region), Chiangmai (Northern Region), Nakorn Ratchasima (Northeastern Region), and Songkhla (Southern Region).

Step 2: Quota Sampling. Samples were selected according to the quota calculated from the proportion of population in each province which were 400 samples each except Bangkok with 900 samples as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1 Number of population and samples in each selected province**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Province</b>	<b>Number of Population</b>	<b>Number of sample</b>
Central	Chonburi	1,209,290	400
North	Chiangmai	1,658,298	400
Northeast	Nakorn Ratchasima	2,555,587	400
South	Songkhla	1,317,507	400
	Bangkok	5,695,956	900
		<i>Total</i>	<i>2500</i>

Step 3: Purposive Sampling. Samples were selected from Muang district of each province.

Step 4: Convenience Sampling. Samples were selected from questionnaire respondents whom were met while collecting research data.

### **Research Tool**

The research tool was the questionnaire to study the “Indicators for measuring university reputation in Thailand” that included both close and open-ended questions divided into two parts:

1. Personal information such as gender, profession, education background, salary and graduated educational institution.
2. Evaluation of the factors of both state and private universities with positive reputation in Thailand which were developed and identified attributes of 7 factors as in the definitions mentioned previously.

State and private universities in the questionnaire included 5 acclaimed universities, which were Chulalongkorn University, Mahidol University, Thammasat University, Bangkok University and Assumption University

Moreover, the research tool was tested for validity and reliability as follows.

### Validity

Face validity was evaluated by the specialist to determine questionnaire details comprehension and their level of difficulty and capability to be understood as well as the clarity of the language employed to make any necessary adjustments to improve the questionnaire so that it would be most effective before presenting it to the actual samples.

### Reliability

A prototype of the questionnaire was tested with a sample of 30 participants. Reliability was then analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha method. Reliability for question 2 of part 2 for indicators for good corporate reputation was  $\alpha = .95$ , while for question 3 for different business attributes was  $\alpha = .99$

### **Data Analysis**

SPSS for Windows was employed to record and analyze research data using descriptive statistics for total numbers, percentages, mean and standard deviation; and inferential statistics employed to evaluate data was the Multiple Regression Analysis.

### **Data Presentation**

Data is presented in tables for total number, percentage, mean, and standard deviation as well as tables for **Multiple Regression Analysis**.

### **Research result and discussion**

Indicator for Measuring University Reputation in Thailand is a quantitative research with an objective to investigate the indicator for measuring university reputation in Thailand. The research focuses on the opinions of stakeholders and service receivers including high school and university students, parents, and employers. Sample group of the research comprises population residing in the Bangkok metropolitan area and four selected provinces representing the four regions of Thailand, which are Chonburi (Central region), Chiangmai (Northern region), Nakhon Ratchasima (Northeastern region) and Songkhla (Southern Region) with the total of 2,500 respondents.

Result of the survey research employing questionnaire with the sample found that among 2,500 respondents, 63.60 percent were female and 36.40 percent were male. 31.00 percent of the respondents were between 18 to 22 years of age, followed by 18.20 percent

between 23 to 30 years of age, and 15.70 percent between 13 to 17 years of age. Of the total number of respondents, 24.10 percent were university students and 23.80 percent were civil service officers or government officers.

Most respondents ranked **Products and Services of the organization factor such as acknowledged academic instructors with ethics who can become good models for society and teaching quality as the first most important factor in building good organization reputation**. Performance factor such as successful alumni being socially acclaimed, academic achievement or researches being publicized broad and useful to the society, stable and continuous growth of the university, ability to raise funds for researches or institution development, being supported and donated from other organizations for academic development; and Leadership factor such as having explicit vision and management quality, being a good model for society and leading in academic works and researches were ranked the second and the third most important factor respectively.

Comparing factor overview, esteem had the highest mean (4.33), followed by admire (4.21) liking (4.20) and trust (4.17). Therefore, it can be seen that **esteem is the most important factor to university reputation in Thailand**.

The result is similar to that of the research **“Indicators for Measuring Corporate Reputation in Thailand” conducted by Rungnapar Pitpreecha (2010)** which has an objective to study the indicators for measuring corporate reputation in Thailand from the perception of the target group who consumes products and/or services, and the public. The research found that there are 4 attributes business with good reputation should have: **1. Esteem**, except clothing and shoes business, **2. Admire 3. Trust and 4. Liking**.

Considering the attributes mentioned above (Esteem, Admire, Trust and Liking) classified into 5 higher educational institutions with positive acknowledged reputation, which were Chulalongkorn University, Mahidol University, Thammasat University, Bangkok University and Assumption University, it was found that **Chulalongkorn University had higher mean than the other institutions in every attribute with total mean at 4.52**, followed by Mahidol University and Thammasat University (mean 4.47 and 4.41 respectively).

Moreover, when the sample group determined 7 factors important to the indicators for measuring university reputation in Thailand employing the approach of RepTrak® Scorecard (Cees B. M. van Riel and Charles J. Fombrun, 2007.), which are 1. Products and Services of the Organization factor 2. Innovation factor 3. Workplace factor 4. Governance factor 5. Citizenship factor 6. Leadership factor and 7. Performance factor, factor with the highest mean was **Performance** (mean 4.17), followed by **Products and**

**Services of the Organization** (mean 4.16) and **Innovation** (mean 4.15); additionally, Chulalongkorn University had the highest mean in 6 factors expect Governance.

According to Multiple Regression Analysis, the result found that products and services of the organization, performance, innovation, workplace, and governance had a significant influence on organization reputation; the products and services of the organization was the most influencing indicator ( $\beta = 0.45$ ). This is similar to University rankings by **Time Higher Education which measured 5 groups of factor with 13 indicators and score points were applied.** (<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2010-2011/analysis-methodology.html>)

**Group 1: Teaching**, which is learning atmosphere. It scored 30 percent in the final ranking consisting of: Proportion of instructors to students and teaching quality: 15 percent, Granted Doctoral Degree: 6 percent, Number of students in bachelor degree: 4.5 percent, Organization income: 2.25 percent, Proportion of Doctoral Degree to Bachelor Degree: 2.25 percent

**Group 2: Research**, which is a number of research, income from research. It scored 30 percent consisting of: Indicators for research reputation: 19.5 percent, Income from the research: 5.25 percent, Academic work publicized to the researchers: 4.5 percent, Proportion of external research funds to all internal research funds: 0.75 percent

**Group 3: Citations**, which are researches cited in other academic works. It scored 32.5, counted from the frequency of citations.

**Group 4: Industry Income and Innovation**, which is the income from publicizing knowledge and innovation of the organization, counted per researcher. It scored 2.5 percent.

**Group 5: International Mix.** It scored 5 percent consisting of: Proportion of international instructors and staff: 3 percent, Proportion of international students: 2 percent

However, the result of this research is different from the indicators for University Rankings of Time Higher Education since industry income and innovation, granted degree, number of students, proportion of international instructors and staff were not included in this research since the income from publicizing knowledge and innovation of the organization was counted per researcher but Thai Universities are not emphasizing on this. Moreover, a number of students, proportion of international instructors and staff is only a fragment and considered insignificant. Some issues are not suitable to the context of Thai Universities; for example, proportion of international instructors and staff.

The result of this research is similar to the result of the research **“Indicators for Measuring Organization Reputation of Communication University in China”**



**conducted by Huane He (2011)**, which found the ranking of priority of indicators for measuring organization reputation of Communication University in China. In this research, both sample groups, instructors, staff and students, and common people, agreed to rank products and services of the organization factor as the first important factor while giving different rankings for the second, the third and the fourth factor. Instructors, staff and students emphasized on leadership factor which was ranked the second important factor while innovation and workplace factor were ranked the third and the fourth important factor respectively. On the other hand, common people emphasized on innovation factor which was ranked the second important factor while workplace and leadership factor were ranked the third and the fourth important factor respectively. However, the result found that both sample groups emphasized on the same ranking for the fifth to the seventh important factor; performance, governance and citizenship were ranked the fifth, the sixth and the seventh important factor respectively.

The result of this research is also similar to the result of the research “Factors reflect Corporate Reputation of Telecommunication Business in Thailand” conducted by Rungnapar Pitpreecha (2009), which has an objective to study factors reflecting corporate reputation of telecommunication business in Thailand from the perception of Thai public. The result found that comparing attributes according to the approach of RepTrak® Scorecard (Cees B. M. van Riel and Charles J. Fombrun, 2007) which are products and services, innovation, workplace, governance, citizenship, leadership and performance; respondents emphasized on the attribute with the highest mean and products and services of the organization was ranked the first while performance and innovation was ranked the second and the third respectively. In conclusion, it can be said that the first important factor that the stakeholders emphasize on the indicators for measuring organization reputation either higher educational institution or corporate organization is products and services of the organization factor.

In addition, the result of this research is similar to the research “**Indicators for Measuring Corporate Reputation in Thailand**” conducted by Rungnapar Pitpreecha (2010) which has an objective to study the indicators for measuring corporate reputation in Thailand from the perception of the target group who consumes products and/or services, and the public. The research found that indicators for measuring corporate reputation in Thailand can be ranked according to the priority as: products and services factor ( $\beta = 0.37$ ), citizenship factor ( $\beta = 0.18$ ), performance factor ( $\beta = 0.17$ ), workplace factor ( $\beta = -0.10$ ), innovation factor and leadership factor ( $\beta = -0.07$ ). However, governance factor has no influence on overall corporate reputation in Thailand. Furthermore, respondents had different emphasis on 16 factors of indicators for measuring corporate reputation in each business.

## References

- Argenti, P. A. 2007. **Corporate communication** (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Cees B. M. van Riel and Charles J. Fombrun. 2007. **Essentials of corporate communication: Implementing practices for effective reputation management**. NY:Routledge. 255.
- Dowling, G. R. 2004. **Corporate reputations. Should you compete on yours?**. California Management Review 46(3): pp. 19-36.
- Rungnapar Pitpreecha. 2009. *Factors reflect Corporate Reputation of Telecommunication Business in Thailand*. Bangkok : Faculty of Communication Arts. Chulalongkorn University
- Rungnapar Pitpreecha .2010. *Corporate Reputation in Thailand: An Analysis of Indicators*. Faculty of Communication Arts .Chulalongkorn University.
- Huane He (2011) . *Indicators for Measuring Organization Reputation of Communication University in China*” . Faculty of Communication Arts, Chulalongkorn University

## Website

- <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=408908>
- <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2010-2011/analysis-methodology.html>
- <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2010-2011/analysis-methodology.html>