

BRANDING OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTES

ANURAG SINGH CHAUHAN



DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

OCTOBER 2018

BRANDING OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTES

by

Anurag Singh Chauhan

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology

October 2018

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2018

Certificate

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**Branding of Educational Institutes**” being submitted by Mr. **Anurag Singh Chauhan** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a bonafide record of the research work carried out by him under my supervision and guidance. The thesis work, in my opinion, has reached the requisite standard, fulfilling the requirements of the said degree. The results contained in the thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Dr. Harish Chaudhry
Department of Management Studies
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi – 110016
India

Acknowledgement

“Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day; teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime”

There are many people who have made valuable contributions to this dissertation, words cannot do justice to the gratitude I have for the unconditional love and support of these people.

I am very grateful for the unwavering support of my advisor, Dr. Harish Chaudhry. He had the unenviable task of not only helping me work through my ideas and pushing me intellectually, but he also served as a constant source of encouragement, especially during those times when the research stuck roadblocks and seemed to have little direction. I would like to thank my review committee members: Dr. Mahim Sagar, Dr. Vignesh Ilavarashan and Dr. V.M. Chariar, each of you provided me with invaluable advice and feedback on my work and kept me focused. I would like to thank Prof. Gavin Brown, for putting me onto the statistical path of research.

The words can't convey how deeply I owe my father, my mother and my lovely sisters Monika and Meenakshi, for everything they have done for me so that I am at this stage of my life today. Their infinite support made me every single moment more confident in my journey towards the summit of my life. My warmest thanks ever to them to be there always for me and never ever make me feel unbacked.

It would be unfair if I do not express my appreciation to my other colleagues at the department; Nisha Mary Thomas, Mohita Maggon, Priyank Narayan, Noorulain Rizvi, Amit Sachdeva and others who spared their valuable time for providing useful insights for carrying out this research.

This study could not have been embodied without the help, encouragement, cooperation and guidance of a lot of people, mentioned or not mentioned here. I deeply thank every single person who directly or indirectly contributed towards this research.

October 2018

Anurag Singh Chauhan

Contents

		Page
Chapter	Topic	No.
	Certificate	ii
	Acknowledgement	iii
	Abstract	viii
	List of Figures	xi
	List of Tables	xiii
I	Introduction	
	Need for Study	1
	Research Questions	2
	Research Objectives	3
	Chaperization Plan	3
II	Literature Review	
	The Brand	6
	Corporate Brands	18
	Brand Identity	25
	Brand Identity Planning System	29
	Hexagonal Brand Identity Prism	33
	Brand Equity	34
	Brand Associations	42
	Service Branding	48
	Internal Branding	54
III	Education	
	Education Sector: An Overview	58
	Returns in Education	59
	Changing Trends in Education	60
	Challenges Faced by Education	61
	Effect of Competition on Education	63
	Quality in Education	66

	Commissions on Education	69
	Government Policy Towards Education	74
	History of Schooling and Education	75
	History of Schooling in India	80
IV	Research Objectives and Methodology	
	Research Questions	86
	Research Objectives	87
	Methodology	87
	Selection of Tools and Techniques	90
	Sampling Methodology	92
V	Results and Findings	
	Qualitative Study	94
	Grounded Theory	94
	Factors identified from Grounded Theory	106
	Developing School Branding Framework using (TISM) Total Interpretive Structural Modeling	109
	Academic factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	125
	Academic factors affecting branding: Parent's Perspective	130
	Extra and Co-curricular factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	136
	Extra and Co-curricular factors affecting branding: Parent's Perspective	139
	Infrastructure factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	144
	Infrastructure factors affecting branding: Parent's Perspective	147
	IT Infrastructure factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	151
	IT Infrastructure factors affecting branding: Parent's Perspective	156
	Marketing and Advertising factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	162
	Marketing and Advertising factors affecting branding: Parent's Perspective	165
	Teacher and Staff Quality factors affecting branding: Principal's Perspective	169

	Teacher and Staff Quality factors affecting branding: Parent’s Perspective	173
	School branding framework developed using TISM	179
	SEM based school branding model	180
	Revised SEM based school branding model	181
VI	Case Study	
	Case Study Methodology	185
	Problem Statement	186
	Methodology	187
	Suggestions and Recommendations	196
VII	Results and Conclusions	
	Identified School Branding Factors	202
	Perceived same level of significance by both the stakeholders	204
	Perceived different level of significance by both the stakeholders	204
	Other Results	206
	Limitations and Future Scope of work	207
	Annexure I: Questionnaire	208
	Annexure II: Grounded Theory Coding	213
	References	217

Abstract

Education, especially the k-12 education has traditionally been seen as a state responsibility and a ‘not for profit’ activity and on the face of it, would perhaps remain so. In the post-independence era the Indian government faced serious and severe challenges of poverty and defence and the budgets allocated to the education sector were meagre and inadequate. Also, India needed more of the skilled manpower to take on the wagon wheel of the Indian economy ahead, and the focus of the education sector in the first few decades in the post-independence era was significantly on higher education. Adequate impetus could not be given to the school education sector. Moreover, owing to the sheer magnitude of the numbers and cultural diversity, the focus of school education was reach and inclusiveness and somewhere the quality of education took a back seat. This is where the privately run schools mushroomed and over a period of time scored over the government schools. Being fee charging schools, they attracted the upper-middle and upper socio-economic class of students and they have been able to deliver better quality of education not only in terms of the academic results but also updating themselves with the needs of the industry and society as well. In order to provide infrastructural facilities and superior quality, the schools needed to charge a higher fee to meet the rising costs. Also, in order to attract quality students and teachers they needed to brand themselves so that they become the preferred choice among the targeted parents.

The study of the available literature on branding of educational institutes suggests little on branding of schools globally in general and in developing countries in particular. Whilst there is no concrete methodology or approach to brand or re-brand a school, there is a general recognition of the need to closely identify the antecedents of the school branding and the inter-

linkages between the same, especially in view of the contribution of school education in delivering quality education and contributing to the economic growth and job creation.

Whereas the state-run schools do not charge a fee (or charge a nominal fee at best), the non-government schools have to meet their expenses from the fees from the students. The willingness of the parents to pay the same is contingent on the 'brand' of the school. Given that nearly 40-45% of the students enrolled in the k-12 sector in India are enrolled in the non-government schools, this study is of special importance to them. However, the findings are equally relevant for state run schools as well.

The research started with an extensive review of the existing literature on branding of educational institutes. A significant gap in the literature was observed while studying the same for branding of schools. Three objectives were then identified for the study as under:

- To identify the factors that drive the school brand
- To identify similarities and dissimilarities in the branding parameters as perceived by the school principals and parents
- To develop a model for creating a school brand

Owing to the dearth of literature in the school segment, Grounded Theory Method was used to identify the antecedents of school branding and the items contributing to each of the. Total of six factors, namely Academic Performance, Extra and Co-curricular Activities, Physical Infrastructure, Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure, Marketing and Advertising and Teacher and Staff Quality were identified as the factors contributing towards the school branding. Further second objective was to identify the similarities and dissimilarities between

how school branding is perceived by school principals and parents. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were conducted to identify the perceived importance of each item towards contribution to the school branding as perceived by the school principals and parents. Independent sample t-test was conducted to identify similarities and dissimilarities in perception of branding based on each factor. Null hypothesis was rejected for four factors indicating difference in perception of their impact on the school branding. Two factors i.e. Physical Infrastructure and Marketing and Advertising failed to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that both the stakeholders are of the similar opinion about their impact on the school branding. Objective three dealt with developing a school branding model using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). The input framework for the school branding was developed using Total Interpretive Structural Modeling (TISM) and further the framework was modified to develop the school branding model using SEM.

From the study, it emerged that ‘Academic performance’ and ‘Marketing and Advertising’ were the most significant factors impacting the school brand. It also emerged that there is a strong inter-linkage between ‘Extra and co-curricular activities’ and ‘Academic performance’.

A model has been developed for the branding of schools and the same is validated through action research using the case method approach. This study is a significant contribution to the understanding of branding of schools. As stated earlier, while the study was carried out with focus on the non-government schools, the methodology and the findings are applicable to the state-run schools as well, though it may need some customization. That may be an agenda for future research.

Keywords: Branding of Schools, Service Branding, Grounded Theory Method, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Total Interpretive Structural Modeling (TISM), Triangulation Research, Case Study

सार

शिक्षा, विशेष रूप से के -12 शिक्षा पारंपरिक रूप से राज्य की जिम्मेदारी के रूप में देखी गई है और ऊपरी तौर पर ये 'लाभ के लिए नहीं' गतिविधि के रूप में ही देखी जाएगी। स्वतंत्रता के बाद के युग में भारत सरकार को गरीबी और रक्षा क्षेत्र की गंभीर से गंभीर चुनौतियों का सामना करना पड़ा जिसकी वजह से शिक्षा क्षेत्र को आवंटित बजट कम और अपर्याप्त थे। इसके अलावा, भारतीय अर्थव्यवस्था के वैगन व्हील को आगे ले जाने के लिए अधिक कुशल जनशक्ति की आवश्यकता थी, और आजादी के बाद के पहले कुछ दशकों में शिक्षा बजट का ध्यान महत्वपूर्ण रूप से उच्च शिक्षा पर था। शिक्षा क्षेत्र में विद्यालयों को ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन नहीं दिया गया। इसके अलावा, बड़ी जनसंख्या और सांस्कृतिक विविधता के कारण, स्कूल शिक्षा का ध्यान पहुंच और समावेश पर था और कहीं शिक्षा की गुणवत्ता थी ने पिछली सीट ले ली। यहाँ से प्राइवेट स्कूलों की संख्या बढ़ती गयी और समय के साथ उन्होंने सरकारी स्कूलों से बेहतर परिणाम देने शुरू कर दिए। फीस चार्जिंग स्कूल होने के नाते, उन्होंने ऊपरी-मध्य और ऊपरी सामाजिक-आर्थिक वर्ग के छात्रों को आकर्षित किया और शिक्षा की बेहतर गुणवत्ता न केवल अकादमिक परिणामों के संदर्भ में बल्कि खुद को अद्यतन करते हुए उद्योग और समाज की जरूरतों के साथ वितरित करने में सक्षम हुए। आधारभूत सुविधाएं और बेहतर गुणवत्ता को प्रदान करने के लिए, स्कूलों को एक उच्च शुल्क चार्ज करने की आवश्यकता होती है बढ़ती लागतों को पूरा करने के लिए। मे भी गुणवत्ता वाले और अच्छे छात्रों और शिक्षकों को आकर्षित करने के लिए स्कूलों का खुद को ब्रांड करना आवश्यक है ताकि वे लक्षित माता-पिता के बीच पसंदीदा विकल्प बनें।

शैक्षणिक संस्थानों के ब्रांडिंग पर उपलब्ध साहित्य का अध्ययन बहुत थोड़ा सुझाव देता है विकासशील और विश्व स्तर के स्कूलों की ब्रांडिंग पर। जबकि स्कूलों की ब्रांडिंग एवं री-ब्रांडिंग के लिए कोई ठोस कार्यप्रणाली एवं दृष्टिकोण उपलब्ध नहीं, एक सामान्य मान्यता है स्कूलों की ब्रांडिंग के पूर्ववर्ती कारक और उनके बीच के अंतर-संबंधों की बारीकी से पहचान करने की, विशेष रूप से स्कूल शिक्षा के गुणवत्ता, आर्थिक विकास और नौकरी निर्माण में योगदान को देखते हुए।

राज्य संचालित स्कूल शुल्क नहीं लेते हैं (या बहुत मामूली शुल्क लेते हैं) गैर सरकारी स्कूलों को छात्रों से फीस से अपने खर्चों को पूरा करना होता है। माता पिता के द्वारा इस फीस का भुगतान करना स्कूल के ब्रांड पर निर्भर है। भारत के -12 सेक्टर में नामांकित छात्रों में से लगभग 40-45% गैर-सरकारी स्कूलों में नामांकित हैं, इसे देखते हुए यह अध्ययन और भी अधिक महत्वपूर्ण हो जाता है। हालांकि, निष्कर्ष राज्य सरकार द्वारा चलने वाले स्कूलों के लिए भी समान रूप से प्रासंगिक हैं।

यह अनुसंधान ब्रांडिंग पर मौजूदा साहित्य की व्यापक समीक्षा के साथ शुरू हुआ। मौजूदा साहित्य में स्कूल ब्रांडिंग को पढ़ते हुए महत्वपूर्ण अन्तर देखा गया। अध्ययन के लिए तीन उद्देश्यों को तब पहचाना गया:

- स्कूल ब्रांडिंग के कारकों की पहचान करना
- स्कूल के प्रिंसिपल और माता-पिता के द्वारा स्कूल ब्रांडिंग प्राचल में समानताएं और असमानताओं की पहचान
- स्कूल ब्रांड बनाने के लिए एक मॉडल विकसित करना

स्कूल खंड में साहित्य की कमी के कारण, स्कूल ब्रांडिंग के कारकों की पहचान करने के लिए ग्राउंडेड थ्योरी विधि का उपयोग किया गया। कुल छह कारक, अकादमिक प्रदर्शन, अतिरिक्त और सह-पाठ्यचर्या गतिविधियां, बुनियादी ढांचा, सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी (आईटी) ढांचा, विपणन एवं संवर्धन और शिक्षक एवं स्टाफ की गुणवत्ता को स्कूल ब्रांडिंग की ओर योगदान करने वाले कारकों के रूप में पहचाना गया ।

आगे दूसरा उद्देश्य स्कूल के प्रिंसिपल और माता-पिता द्वारा स्कूल ब्रांडिंग को कैसा महसूस किया जाता है, इसके बीच समानताओं और असमानताओं की पहचान करना था। प्रधानाचार्य और माता-पिता के द्वारा स्कूल ब्रांडिंग में योगदान के लिए प्रत्येक आइटम के महत्व का अनुमान एक्सप्लोरेटरी फैक्टर विश्लेषण (ईएफए) और कन्फर्मेटरी फैक्टर विश्लेषण (सीएफए) द्वारा लगाया गया। प्रत्येक कारक के आधार पर ब्रांडिंग की धारणा में समानताओं और असमानताओं की पहचान करने के लिए स्वतंत्र नमूना टी-टेस्ट योजित किया गया। चार ब्रांड कारको के लिए शून्य परिकल्पना को खारिज कर दिया गया, यह ब्रांडिंग पर उनके प्रभाव की दोनों हितधारियों की धारणा में अंतर दर्शाते हैं। दो कारक i.e. आधारभूत संरचना और विपणन और संवर्धन शून्य परिकल्पना को अस्वीकार करने में विफल रहे, यह दर्शाती है कि दोनों हितधारकों की स्कूल ब्रांडिंग पर उनके प्रभाव के बारे में समान राय है । उद्देश्य तीन संरचनात्मक समीकरण मॉडलिंग (एसईएम) का उपयोग कर एक स्कूल ब्रांडिंग मॉडल विकसित करना था। स्कूल ब्रांडिंग के लिए इनपुट ढांचा कुल व्याख्यात्मक संरचनात्मक मॉडलिंग (टीआईएसएम) का उपयोग करके विकसित किया गया और इस ढांचे पर एसईएम का उपयोग कर संशोधित स्कूल ब्रांडिंग मॉडल विकसित किया गया।

अध्ययन से, यह उभरा कि 'अकादमिक प्रदर्शन' और 'विपणन और संवर्धन' स्कूल ब्रांड को प्रभावित करने वाले सबसे महत्वपूर्ण कारक थे । यह भी उभर कर आया कि 'अतिरिक्त और सह-पाठ्यचर्या गतिविधियों' और 'अकादमिक प्रदर्शन' के बीच एक मजबूत अंतर-संबंध है।

स्कूलों के ब्रांडिंग के लिए एक मॉडल विकसित किया गया है और केस विधि दृष्टिकोण का उपयोग कर उस मॉडल की मान्यता स्थापित की गयी है। स्कूलों की ब्रांडिंग समझने में इस अनुसन्धान का महत्वपूर्ण योगदान है । यह अध्ययन गैर सरकारी स्कूलों पर केंद्रित है, लेकिन पद्धति और निष्कर्ष राज्य संचालित स्कूलों पर भी लागू होते हैं, हालांकि इसे कुछ अनुकूलन की आवश्यकता हो सकती है। यह एक एजेंडा हो सकता है भविष्य की खोज के लिए।

मुख्य शब्द: स्कूलों की ब्रांडिंग, सेवा ब्रांडिंग, ग्राउंडेड थ्योरी विधि, संरचनात्मक समीकरण मॉडलिंग (एसईएम), कुल व्याख्यात्मक संरचनात्मक मॉडलिंग (टीआईएसएम), त्रिकोण अनुसंधान, केस अध्ययन

List of Figures

Figure	Page No.
Figure 1: Hatch and Schultz Corporate Branding Model (2003)	22
Figure 2: Knox and Bickerton Corporate Branding Model (2003)	23
Figure 3: Aaker Brand Identity Model (2000)	32
Figure 4: Hexagonal Brand Identity Prism, Kapferer (2004)	33
Figure 5: Dimensions of Brand Equity, Aaker and Joachimsthaler (2000)	39
Figure 6: Customer Based Brand Equity Model	40
Figure 7: Employee Based Brand Equity Model	41
Figure 8: LOGMAN Brand Management Model	46
Figure 9: Brand Assessment Management Model	47
Figure 10: Berry's Service Branding Model	53
Figure 11: Integrated Service Brand Model, De Chernatony	54
Figure 12: History of Schooling and Education	79
Figure 13: History of Schooling and Education in India	85
Figure 14: Research Methodologies Mapped to Each Research Objective	88
Figure 15: Steps in Grounded Theory Method	105
Figure 16: Core Steps of ISM/TISM Methodology	111
Figure 17: TISM Model for School Brand Development	120
Figure 18: CFA Measurement Model for Academic Factors for Principals	130
Figure 19: CFA Measurement Model for Academic Factors for Parents	134
Figure 20: CFA Measurement Model for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Principals	139

Figure 21: CFA Measurement Model for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	143
Figure 22: CFA Measurement Model for Infrastructure Factors for Principals	147
Figure 23: CFA Measurement Model for Infrastructure Factors for Parents	150
Figure 24: CFA Measurement Model for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	156
Figure 25: CFA Measurement Model for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	161
Figure 26: CFA Measurement Model for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	165
Figure 27: CFA Measurement Model for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	168
Figure 28: CFA Measurement Model for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	173
Figure 29: CFA Measurement Model for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	177
Figure 30: TISM Model for School Brand Development	179
Figure 31: SEM based school branding model	180
Figure 32: Revised SEM based school branding model	181
Figure 33: CFA Measurement Model for Academic Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	189
Figure 34: CFA Measurement Model for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	190
Figure 35: CFA Measurement Model for Infrastructure Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	191
Figure 36: CFA Measurement Model for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	193
Figure 37: CFA Measurement Model for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	195
Figure 38: CFA Measurement Model for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents of Gurukul School	196

List of Tables

Table	Page No.
Table 2.1: Branding Basics	8
Table 2.2: Brand Features	12
Table 2.3: Brand Elements	14
Table 2.4: Corporate Branding	18
Table 2.5: Brand Image Attributes	27
Table 2.6: Brand Equity	35
Table 2.7: Brand Strategies	42
Table 5.1: Axial Coding Basic Frame	102
Table 5.2: Reachability Matrix	114
Table 5.3: Post-iterative matrix	114
Table 5.4: Partitioning Matrix (Iteration 1)	115
Table 5.5: Partitioning Matrix (Iteration 2)	116
Table 5.6: Partitioning Matrix (Iteration 3)	116
Table 5.7: Partitioning Matrix (Iteration 4)	116
Table 5.8: Interaction Matrix	117
Table 5.9: Interaction Matrix (Interpretive Matrix)	118
Table 5.10: Geographical zone-wise distribution (Principal)	122
Table 5.11: Teaching Experience-wise (Principal)	123
Table 5.12: Geographical zone-wise (Parents)	123

Table 5.13: Gender-wise (Parents)	123
Table 5.14: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Academic factor for Principals	125
Table 5.15: Total Variance Explained for Academic factor for Principals	126
Table 5.16: Reliability Statistics for Academic factor for Principals	127
Table 5.17: Rotated Component Matrix for Academic factor for Principals	127
Table 5.18: Fit Indices for Academic factor for Principals	129
Table 5.19: CFA factor Loadings for Academic factor for Principals	129
Table 5.20: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Academic factor for Parents	131
Table 5.21: Total Variance Explained for Academic Factors for Parents	131
Table 5.22: Reliability Statistics for Academic Factors for Parents	132
Table 5.23: Rotated Component Matrix for Academic Factors for Parents	132
Table 5.24: Fit Indices for Academic factor for Principals	133
Table 5.25: CFA factor Loadings for Academic factor for Parents	134
Table 5.26: Independent Samples Test for Academic Factors for Parents	135
Table 5.27: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Principals	136
Table 5.28: Reliability Statistics for Extra and Co-curricular factors for Principals	136
Table 5.29: Total Variance Explained fo Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Principals	137
Table 5.30: Rotated Component Matrix for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Principals	137
Table 5.31: Fit Indices for Extra and Co-curricular factors for Principals	138
Table 5.32: CFA factor Loadings for Extra and Co-curricular factors for Principals	138
Table 5.33: KMO and Bartlett's Test Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	139
Table 5.34: Total Variance Explained for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	140
Table 5.35: Reliability Statistics for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	140

Table 5.36: Rotated Component Matrix for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	141
Table 5.37: Fit Indices for Extra and Co-curricular factor for Parents	142
Table 5.38: CFA factor Loadings for Extra and Co-curricular factors for Parents	142
Table 5.39: Independent Samples Test for Extra and Co-curricular Factors for Parents	143
Table 5.40: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Infrastructure Factors for Principals	144
Table 5.41: Total Variance Explained for Infrastructure Factors for Principals	145
Table 5.42: Reliability Statistics for Infrastructure Factors for Principals	145
Table 5.43: Rotated Component Matrix for Infrastructure Factors for Principals	146
Table 5.44: Fit Indices for Academic factor for Principals	146
Table 5.45: CFA factor Loadings for Infrastructure factor for Principals	146
Table 5.46: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Infrastructure factors for Parents	148
Table 5.47: Total Variance Explained for Infrastructure Factors for Parents	148
Table 5.48: Reliability Statistics for Infrastructure Factors for Parents	148
Table 5.49: Rotated Component Matrix for Infrastructure Factors for Parents	149
Table 5.50: Fit Indices for Infrastructure Factors for Parents	150
Table 5.51: CFA factor Loadings for Infrastructure factor for Parents	150
Table 5.52: Independent Samples Test	151
Table 5.53: KMO and Bartlett's Test for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	151
Table 5.54: Total Variance Explained for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	152
Table 5.55: Reliability Statistics for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	152
Table 5.56: Rotated Component Matrix for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	153
Table 5.57: Fit Indices for IT Infrastructure Factors for Principals	154
Table 5.58: CFA factor Loadings for IT Infrastructure factors for Principals	154

Table 5.59: KMO and Bartlett's Test for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	157
Table 5.60: Total Variance Explained for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	157
Table 5.61: Reliability Statistics for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	158
Table 5.62: Rotated Component Matrix for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	159
Table 5.63: Fit Indices for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	159
Table 5.64: CFA Factor Loadings for IT Infrastructure Factors for Parents	160
Table 5.65: Independent Samples Test for IT Infrastructure Factors	161
Table 5.66: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	162
Table 5.67: Total Variance Explained for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	163
Table 5.68: Reliability Statistics for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	163
Table 5.69: Rotated Component Matrix for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	164
Table 5.70: Fit Indices for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	164
Table 5.71: CFA Factor Loadings for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Principals	164
Table 5.72: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	165
Table 5.73: Total Variance Explained for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	166
Table 5.74: Reliability Statistics For Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	166
Table 5.75: Rotated Component Matrix for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	167
Table 5.76: Fit Indices for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	167
Table 5.77: CFA Factor Loadings for Marketing and Advertising Factors for Parents	167
Table 5.78: Independent Samples Test for Marketing and Advertising Factors	168
Table 5.79: KMO and Bartlett's Test for teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	169

Table 5.80: Total Variance Explained for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	169
Table 5.81: Reliability Statistics for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	170
Table 5.82: Rotated Component Matrix for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	171
Table 5.83: Fit Indices for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	171
Table 5.84: CFA Factor Loadings for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Principals	172
Table 5.85: KMO and Bartlett's Test for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	173
Table 5.86: Total Variance Explained for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	174
Table 5.87: Reliability Statistics for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	174
Table 5.88: Rotated Component Matrix for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	175
Table 5.89: Fit Indices for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	176
Table 5.90: CFA Factor Loadings for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors for Parents	176
Table 5.91: Independent Samples Test for Teacher and Staff Quality Factors	177
Table 5.92: Fit Indices for School Branding Model	181
Table 5.93: Standardized Regression Weights for SEM based School Branding model	181
Table 6.1: Learner Generation-wise distribution	187
Table 6.2: Occupation-wise distribution	187
Table 6.3: Rotated Component Matrix based on Academic Factors	188
Table 6.4: Rotated Component Matrix based on Extra and Co-curricular Factors	189
Table 6.5: Rotated Component Matrix based on Infrastructure Factors	191
Table 6.6: Rotated Component Matrix based on IT Infrastructure Factors	192
Table 6.7: Rotated Component Matrix based on Teacher and Staff Quality Factors	193
Table 6.8: Rotated Component Matrix based on Marketing and Advertising Factors	195