International Review of Management and Marketing

ISSN: 2146-4405

available at http: www.econjournals.com

International Review of Management and Marketing, 2025, 15(3), 200-208.

The Impact of University Presentation on Quality and Quantity of Students: The Case of Azerbaijani Students

Leyla Aliyeva[1], Vasif Aliyev[2]*

[1]Karabakh University (KU), Azerbaijan, [2]Azerbaijan State University of Economics (UNEC), Azerbaijan, & Khazar University, Azerbaijan. *Email: vasif.aliyev@unec.edu.az

Received: 12 November 2024 **Accepted:** 26 February 2025 **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.18024

ABSTRACT

In the last decade, Azerbaijan has seen the establishment of numerous higher education institutions. These newly founded universities aim to fulfill two primary goals: Ensuring the quality of education for students and attracting enough students to maintain institutional viability. This study analyzes the factors that influence students' university preferences and evaluates the effectiveness of university promotional activities. The research assesses the concept of service in relation to universities in Azerbaijan and examines the impact of promotional activities through a survey. The study sample consists of 243 students enrolled in various departments across three universities (two public and one private), established at different times and differing in quality and facilities. The sample includes 185 female students (76.1%) and 58 male students (23.9%), with 134 students (55.1%) on full or partial scholarships and 109 students (44.9%) without scholarships. Geographically, 141 students (58%) are from Baku, 88 (14%) from other regions, 12 (4.9%) from Sumgait, and 2 (0.8%) from Ganja. The universities represented include Khazar University (119 students, 49%), Pedagogical University (66 students, 27.2%), and Economics University (57 students, 23.5%). A survey was developed and administered to these students, with responses analyzed using reliability analysis and t-tests. The study's results revealed that Hypothesis 6, which posited that tuition fees and scholarship opportunities influence university choice, showed a statistically significant difference. Other hypotheses were not validated. Based on these findings, it is recommended that universities focus on improving service quality and student satisfaction to remain competitive. Future studies could include final-year students from additional faculties to broaden the scope of the findings.

Keywords: Service Quality in Higher Education, Education Management, Quality in Education, Service Quality in Universities
JEL Classifications: I23, I28, M31

1. INTRODUCTION

With the increase in the number of universities and available quotas, competition among universities, which operate as service enterprises, is also intensifying. Therefore, it is crucial that the teaching services provided by universities are of high quality and responsive to needs. It is necessary to understand students' expectations well and to provide educational services that can meet and respond to these expectations. In educational services, in addition to basic needs such as faculty members, classrooms, libraries, and computer facilities, essential needs like food, accommodation, and security, as well as requirements for sports, arts, and cultural activities to facilitate students' socialization, must also be met. Given that education is a service and universities are service-providing institutions, the satisfaction of students, who are effectively the customers of these educational services, is important for universities. Public and private sector higher education institutions must satisfy students with the education services they provide and make this satisfaction sustainable. A student who is satisfied with their education will be loyal to their university and recommend it to others. This, in turn, will ensure the long-term sustainability of the university. In recent years, with programs like Erasmus and Bologna, universities have also become open to international competition.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In a study conducted by Butt and Rehman (2010) with data collected from 350 students studying at private and public universities in Pakistan, it was found that factors affecting student satisfaction include teacher experience, course delivery, learning environment, and the physical structure of classrooms. They noted that while all these factors impact student satisfaction, teacher experience stands out as the most important factor among them (Butt and Rehman, 2010).

"In their study, Sapri et al. (2009) examined the factors affecting students' satisfaction with university services and identified teaching and learning-related factors as the most significant determinants of student satisfaction" (Sapri et al., 2009). Khoshtaria et al. (2020) explore how brand equity dimensions like awareness, quality, and loyalty shape university reputation in Georgian higher education (Khoshtaria et al., 2020).

Kaushal and Ali (2020) explore how university reputation, brand attachment, and brand personality drive student loyalty. They find that reputation directly impacts loyalty, while satisfaction acts as an intermediary. Factors like age, seniority, and scholarships influence the satisfaction-loyalty relationship (Kaushal and Ali, 2020).

However, in their research on the antecedents of student loyalty, Helgesen and Nesset (2007) demonstrated that it is not the university's image that influences student satisfaction, but rather that satisfaction drives the university's image. In other words, student satisfaction enhances the university's image (Helgesen and Nesset, 2007).

Study of Zainul and Maskur shows that enhancing service quality in Indonesian higher education significantly improves perceived value and student loyalty. By focusing on student experience through better facilities, faculty, and feedback mechanisms, universities can strengthen loyalty and boost regional rankings, positioning themselves for greater prominence (Zainul and Maskur, 2024).

Calma and Dickson-Deane (2020) explore the "student as customer" model, highlighting its potential to enhance responsiveness to student needs but cautioning against the risks of commodifying education and compromising academic standards (Calma and Dickson-Deane, 2020).

In their study, Darawong and Sandmaung (2019) aimed to examine the impact of five different dimensions of service quality on student satisfaction in international programs at higher education institutions. They found that the most influential sub-dimensions of service quality on student satisfaction were responsiveness, empathy, and facilities. Additionally, they emphasized that service quality significantly affects student satisfaction (Darawong and Sandmaung, 2019).

Fakhrudin et al. (2024) review how university image influences student enrollment, emphasizing factors like academic quality, facilities, and reputation in attracting diverse, high-quality applicants (Fakhrudin et al., 2024).

In their study, Luo et al. (2019) aimed to examine the engagement and satisfaction of Chinese university students in their learning experiences. Specifically, the study focused on emotional engagement and its relationship with student satisfaction. The findings revealed that emotional engagement positively predicted student satisfaction and showed that cognitive engagement also has an impact on satisfaction (Luo et al., 2019).

Shahsavar and Sudzina (2017) aimed to identify the impact strength of factors determining student satisfaction and the importance of these factors in influencing the satisfaction and loyalty of students in higher education institutions in Denmark. The study concluded that these factors indeed play a significant role in enhancing the satisfaction and loyalty of students attending higher education institutions in Denmark (Shahsavar and Sudzina, 2017).

2.1. Characteristics of Educational Services and Perception of Quality

The quality dimension in higher education has been steadily developing since the second half of the 20th century. The most significant factors driving this development include the increase in the number of higher education institutions and students, along with the expansion of higher education's scope. This scope has gained a new dimension with the rapid advancement of the global economy and technology. Information, once the most crucial component of higher education, has now become quickly and affordably accessible to a large part of society. Massification, internationalization, and market influence are the strongest factors driving changes within the higher education sector (Paliulis and Labanauskis, 2015).

Owlia and Aspinwall (1996), who addressed service areas in higher education under the term "university evaluators," identified the quality elements related to products and services, as well as the target customers for these quality elements, as follows: (Owlia and Aspinwall, 1996).

When considered in the context presented in Table 1, service quality can be applied in many areas within universities. These areas can range from the tangible service aspects of universities to the intangible service areas. For example, physical space universities have, the adequacy of infrastructure, a well-equipped campus environment, ensuring student satisfaction through the services provided, the satisfaction of internal customers, the satisfaction of external stakeholders, and the availability of sufficient and qualified human resources can be mentioned. At this point, one of the most important functions of human resource management can be regarded as the employment of qualified employees.

Parasuraman et al. approached the concept of service quality from a broader perspective, first aiming to define it and identify the factors that affect it and then attempting to develop a general model applicable to all types of services. According to the authors, service quality increases or decreases based on whether consumers' expectations from the service are met. Differences between consumer expectations and service delivery will reduce the quality of the service. This is because the gap between what

Table 1: Quality elements in higher education (Owlia and Aspinwall, 1996)

Quality elements in higher education	Customers
Tangible elements	
Ease of transportation	Students
Pleasant environment	Academic staff
Support services (accommodation, sports, social services)	
Modern equipment and facilities	
Adequate equipment and facilities	
Competence	
Sufficient academic staff	
Qualifications	Students
Communication skills	
Attitude	
Understanding of students' needs	
Willingness to help	
Accessibility for help and counseling	Students
Providing individual attention	
Content	
Relevance of programs to students' future careers	Students
Validity	
Computer usage	Academic staff
Communication skills and teamwork	Personnel
Presentation	
Effective presentation	Students
Consistency	
Fairness of exams	
Feedback from students	
Encouragement of students	
Reliability	
Reliability	Students
Providing valid rewards	
Keeping promises	
Addressing complaints	
Solving problems	

the consumer desires and what is provided by the service provider naturally means that the expected service is not delivered from both parties' perspectives. As a result, a decline in service quality occurs (Parasuraman et al., 1994).

Quality in education can be defined as a philosophy in which all employees of an institution embrace a culture of continuous improvement to achieve the highest standards of excellence in all educational and instructional activities (Bridge, 2003).

2.2. Student Satisfaction

Satisfaction in education is a positive precursor to loyalty to institutions and a result of a successful educational system. Supporting this perspective, Mukhtar et al. (2015) defined student satisfaction as a function of students' learning levels, the relative perceived quality of their experiences, and the performance of higher education institutions in providing educational services (Mukhtar et al., 2015).

Student satisfaction is a multidimensional construct that can be influenced by various factors. Studies have identified different correlations with factors affecting student satisfaction levels. Knapp and Krentler (2006) categorized the factors influencing student satisfaction in higher education into personal and institutional factors. Personal factors include gender, employment status, preferred learning style, and grade point average. Institutional factors, on the other hand, include the quality of faculty, the timeliness of feedback from instructors, clarity of expectations, and teaching style (Knapp and Krentler, 2006).

2.3. Student Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutions

It has been stated that the physical conditions, such as the necessary infrastructure for libraries, cafeterias, and social, cultural, and sports activities, which are outside the educational activities, are some of the expectations of students. These expectations are seen to influence students' perceptions of quality and their satisfaction levels. Therefore, the relevant institutions and researchers should view students' opinions as an important data source to assess student satisfaction and improve the service quality provided by universities, as students are considered the most important stakeholders in this process (İçli and Vural, 2010).

Another important reason for student satisfaction is that dissatisfied students often leave the programs they are enrolled in during their early years at university. From a financial perspective, retaining current students has been found to be more cost-effective than attracting new ones. Failing to retain existing students results in both human and financial resource loss, and it has been identified as a primary concern for major stakeholders, such as students and parents, in higher education. Additionally, many universities recognize that retaining students (investing in student retention) is more efficient than attracting new ones (investing in new student recruitment), as retaining students is less costly than the later expense of recruiting new students (Elliott and Shin, 2002).

In higher education institutions, it has been observed that institutions that are successful in ensuring student satisfaction also positively impact the performance of their students Bryant and Bodfish (2014) conducted research on student satisfaction and graduation rates at four different higher education institutions and concluded that as the level of student satisfaction increases, the number of graduates also increases (Bryant and Bodfish, 2014).

3. METHODOLOGY

This study was designed according to a quantitative research model. Identifying causal relationships with non-experimental designs involves examining the natural variations in dependent and independent variables without any intervention by the researcher. In this research, a five-point Likert scale was used as the measurement tool. A significance level of 0.05 was considered for significance tests. For the analysis of data related to sub-problems, the SPSS-25 statistical program was used, and descriptive statistics such as arithmetic mean (X), standard deviation (S), and percentage (%) were calculated. For parametric tests, the independent samples t-test was applied.

As shown in Table 2, the reliability analysis calculated the Cronbach's Alpha value for a scale consisting of 25 items. A Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.901 indicates the internal consistency reliability of the scale. It takes a value between 0 and 1, and a value above 0.70 is generally considered acceptable for the scale to be regarded as reliable. In this analysis, Cronbach's Alpha

value was found to be 0.901, which is quite high. This shows that the items of the scale are highly consistent with each other and that the scale has a reliable structure.

Table 3 clearly illustrates the gender distribution among the 243 participants, with 58 males (23.9%) and 185 females (76.1%). This indicates that female participants are significantly overrepresented compared to male participants. This distribution could be a result of the research topic or the sample selection, or it might reflect a higher willingness among female participants to engage in the survey. As a result, this gender imbalance should be considered an important factor when evaluating the impact of gender in the study's findings.

Table 4 presents the frequency, percentage, valid percentage, and cumulative percentage data for the 'Scholarship Status' variable, which is classified into two groups: "Scholarship" and "No Scholarship,"

- Frequency**:** There are 109 individuals in the "scholarship" group and 134 individuals in the "Without scholarship" group.
- Percent: The "scholarship" group represents 44.9% of the total sample, while the "Without scholarship" group represents 55.1%.

Table 5 shows the distribution of participants based on the 'City of Registration' variable. This variable represents the participants' cities and is categorized into four groups: Baku, Sumgait, Ganja, and Other.

Frequency:

- Baku: 141 participants, meaning the majority of the sample is from this city.
- Sumgait: 12 participants, showing a lower frequency.
- Ganja: 2 participants, the least represented city.
- Others: 88 participants, which means 36.2% of the participants are from other cities.

This table shows that the majority of participants in the sample are from Baku (58%), followed by smaller proportions from Sumgait (4.9%) and Ganja (0.8%), with the remaining 36.2% from other cities.

Table 6 shows the distribution of participants based on the universities they attend. The "University You Are Attending " variable is categorized into four universities: UNEC, ADPU, KhU, and Others.

Frequency:

- UNEC 57 participants are from this university.
- ADPU 66 participants are from this university.
- KhU (119 participants): This university has the highest number of participants.
- Only 1 other participant is from a different university.

Valid percent: Since there is no missing data, the valid percentages are the same as the total percentages.

According to this table, the majority of participants (49.0%) are from KhU, followed by ADPU (27.2%) and UNEC (23.5%). The number of participants from "Others" is quite small (0.4%).

3.1. Hypotheses

H_1: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "Gender" and the dependent variable "The reason for choosing your university is its historical foundation date."

H_2: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "Scholarship" and the dependent variable "The influence of your family on your university choice."

H_3: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "Scholarship" and the dependent variable "The influence of your family on your university choice."

Table 2: Reliability statistics

Reliability statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	**No. of Items**
0.901	25

Table 3: Frequency and percentage values for the "Gender" variable of the students

Sex				
Valid	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid percent**	**Cumulative percent**
Male	58	23.9	23.9	23.9
Female	185	76.1	76.1	100.0
Total	243	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Frequency and percentage values for the "Educational Status" variable of the students

Scholarship condition				
Valid	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid percent**	**Cumulative percent**
Scholarship	109	44.9	44.9	44.9
Without scholarship	134	55.1	55.1	100.0
Total	243	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: Frequency and percentage values for the "Where Does Your Family Reside?" variable of the students

Where does your family reside?				
Valid	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid percent**	**Cumulative percent**
Baku	141	58.0	58.0	58.0
Sumgait	12	4.9	4.9	63.0
Ganja	2	0.8	0.8	63.8
Others	88	36.2	36.2	100.0
Total	243	100.0	100.0	

Table 6: University you are attending

University you are attending				
Valid	**Frequency**	**Percent**	**Valid percent**	**Cumulative percent**
UNEC	57	23.5	23.5	23.5
ADPU	66	27.2	27.2	50.6
KhU	119	49.0	49.0	99.6
Others	1	0.4	0.4	100.0
Total	243	100.0	100.0	

H_5: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "The reason for choosing your university is its physical infrastructure and social amenities (building, laboratory, library, equipment, etc.)" and the dependent variable "Scholarship."

H_6: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "The reason for choosing your university is its tuition fees and scholarship opportunities" and the dependent variable "Scholarship."

H_7: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "The reason for choosing your university is your visit to the campus before making the decision" and the dependent variable "Scholarship."

H_8: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "The reason for choosing your university is its media promotions (press, radio, TV, etc.)" and the dependent variable "Scholarship."

H_9: There is a significant difference between the independent variable "The reason for choosing your university is the availability of dormitories and accommodation options" and the dependent variable "Family residence status."

3.2. Findings Related to Research Hypotheses

In this section of the study, the t-test results are presented to determine whether the scores students received regarding the behaviors they encountered when choosing universities differ according to variables such as age, gender, nationality, and the department they study. The results of the t-tests conducted to examine whether their scores differ are provided below.

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference in the scores regarding the question about choosing the university based on its long history when comparing male and female students. The P = 0.495 (for equal variances assumed) and 0.475 (for equal variances not assumed) are both >0.05 significance level, meaning the hypothesis that gender affects the reason for choosing a university based on its history is not supported.

Table 8 shows that since the confidence interval includes zero, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. This suggests that family influence on university choice does not differ meaningfully between students with and without scholarships. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the meaning of the two groups for the 'Family Influence on University Choice' variable (P > 0.05). As a result, the hypothesis is not confirmed.

Table 9 presents the results of Levene's test, where the F-statistic is 0.056 and the significance value (Sig.) is 0.812. Since 0.812 > 0.05, we do not reject the assumption of equal variances and proceed with the t-test results assuming equal variances. In both cases, the P > 0.05, meaning we fail to reject the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the groups. Therefore, there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups for the variables in question (P > 0.05).

Table 10 presents the analysis of whether there is a significant difference between the averages of the two groups for the variables. The mean difference is 0.06039, with a standard error of 0.15044. The 95% confidence interval ranges from −0.23595 to 0.35673. Since this interval includes zero, it suggests that there is no significant difference between the averages. Therefore, for the variables in question, there is no significant difference between

Table 7: Independent samples t-test results for the question "The reason for choosing the university you are studying at is the university's long history" based on students' gender

	Independent samples test								
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								lower	upper
H_1									
Equal variances assumed	1.298	0.256	−0.684	241	0.495	−0.11249	0.16447	−0.43647	0.21150
Equal variances not assumed			−0.718	103.507	0.475	−0.11249	0.15673	−0.42331	0.19834

Table 8: Independent samples t-test results for "Family Influence on University Choice" based on scholarship status

	Independent samples test								
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_2									
Equal variances assumed	7.816	0.006	0.562	241	0.575	0.08435	0.15008	−0.21128	0.37998
Equal variances not assumed			0.555	216.897	0.580	0.08435	0.15208	−0.21539	0.38408

Table 9: T-test results to determine whether "The Reason You Chose Your University is its Image" shows a significant difference according to the scholarship variable

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_3									
Equal variances assumed	0.056	0.812	−0.339	241	0.735	−0.05594	0.16482	−0.38060	0.26873
Equal variances not assumed			−0.339	228.892	0.735	−0.05594	0.16520	−0.38144	0.26957

Table 10: Independent samples t-test to determine whether there is a significant difference based on scholarship status for the question "Is Your Reason for Choosing This University Its Physical Infrastructure and Social Facilities (building, laboratory, library, equipment, etc.)?"

Independent samples test									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_4									
Equal variances assumed	4.460	0.036	0.395	241	0.693	0.06039	0.15285	−0.24071	0.36149
Equal variances not assumed			0.401	240.357	0.688	0.06039	0.15044	−0.23595	0.35673

the means of the two groups (P > 0.05). The observed difference is likely due to random variation rather than a real effect.

Table 11 presents the results of a t-test conducted between two independent samples. The details are as follows:

- Levene's Test: The "F" value is 1.104 with a "Sig." value of 0.294, which is >0.05, indicating that we do not have sufficient evidence to reject the assumption of equal variances. Thus, we proceed with the "Equal variances assumed" row for further interpretation.
- The "t" value is −6.295 with a degree of freedom (df) of 241.
- The "Sig. (2-tailed)" value is 0.000, which is below 0.05, suggesting a statistically significant difference between the two groups.
- The mean difference between the groups is −0.94160, with a standard error of 0.14957.
- The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference is from −1.23624 to −0.64696.
- The results confirm a statistically significant difference between the two groups (P < 0.05). Since the mean difference is negative, it indicates that one group has a lower mean than the other. This difference is considered statistically significant and unlikely to be due to random variation.

Table 12 presents the analysis of whether there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups for the variable. The results are interpreted as follows:

Since the P > 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Mean Difference, Standard Error, and Confidence Interval:

- The mean difference is 0.12974, with a standard error of 0.15859.
- The 95% confidence interval ranges from −0.18266 to 0.44214. Since this interval includes zero, it suggests that the difference between the means is not significant. Thus, there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups (P > 0.05). This indicates that the observed difference is likely due to random variation rather than a meaningful effect

Table 13 presents the analysis of differences in the means of two groups for the variables to determine if a significant difference exists. The interpretation of the results is as follows:

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances:

- F = 0.111, Sig. = 0.739

Levene's test checks if the variances between the two groups are equal. Since the P-value (Sig. = 0.739) is >0.05, we fail to reject the assumption of equal variances. Therefore, we can proceed with the "Equal variances assumed" row in the t-test results.

Independent Samples t-test for equality of means:

- Since the P > 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Table 11: T-test results examining whether there is a significant difference in the "Your reason for choosing your university is its tuition fee and scholarship opportunities" question based on the scholarship variable

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Standard Error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_5									
Equal variances assumed	1.104	0.294	−6.295	241	0.000	−0.94160	0.14957	−1.23624	−0.64696
Equal variances not assumed			−6.255	224.674	0.000	−0.94160	0.15054	−1.23825	−0.64494

Table 12: Results of the T-test to determine which groups differ based on the "Your decision to choose your university was influenced by personally visiting the campus before making a choice" question, according to the scholarship status variable

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_6									
Equal variances assumed	0.348	0.556	0.818	241	0.414	0.12974	0.15859	−0.18266	0.44214
Equal variances not assumed			0.823	235.573	0.411	0.12974	0.15768	−0.18090	0.44038

Table 13: Independent samples t-test results to determine whether there is a significant difference in students' responses to the question, "The reason for choosing your university is its promotion through media such as press, radio, and TV," based on the scholarship variable

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_7									
Equal variances assumed	0.111	0.739	0.183	241	0.855	0.02205	0.12064	−0.21561	0.25970
Equal variances not assumed			0.182	226.215	0.856	0.02205	0.12125	−0.21688	0.26097

This means that the observed difference is likely due to random variation and is not statistically significant. Therefore, we conclude that there is no significant difference between the two groups ($P > 0.05$).

Table 14 presents the analysis of whether there is a significant difference between the means of two groups. The results are interpreted as follows:

- The P-value (Sig. = 0.126) is >0.05, meaning that we do not reject the assumption of equal variances.
- Therefore, when interpreting the results, we can use the "Equal variances assumed" row.
- Since the $P > 0.05$, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups.
- There is no significant difference between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). This suggests that the observed difference is likely due to random variation and not a statistically meaningful effect.

Table 15 presents the analysis of the significance of the difference in means between the two groups for the variable. The results are interpreted as follows:

- The P-value (Sig. = 0.589) is >0.05, which means we do not reject the assumption of equal variances. Therefore, we can refer to the results under the "Equal variances assumed" line.
- Since the $P > 0.05$, there is no statistically significant difference between the groups.
- Mean difference: 0.27482, Standard error: 0.40117.

Table 14: Results of the t-test for determining significant differences between groups regarding the question "the reason for choosing the university you attended is the availability of dormitories and accommodation options" based on family's residency status variable

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_8									
Equal variances assumed	2.367	0.126	−1.428	151	0.155	−0.34397	0.24089	−0.81992	0.13198
Equal variances not assumed			−1.130	12.099	0.280	−0.34397	0.30447	−1.00675	0.31881

Table 15: Independent samples t-test results to determine whether there is a significant difference between groups based on the family's residency status for the question "Did the information on the university's website influence your decision to choose the university?"

Independent samples test									
	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Significance	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Standard error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
H_9									
Equal variances assumed	0.293	0.589	−0.685	151	0.494	−0.27482	0.40117	−1.06745	0.51781
Equal variances not assumed			−0.696	13.021	0.499	−0.27482	0.39492	−1.12786	0.57822

- 95% Confidence Interval: The interval ranges from 1.06745 to 0.51781, which contains 0, indicating that the difference between the means is not significant.

Thus, there is no significant difference between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). This suggests that the observed difference is likely due to random variation, and the difference is not statistically meaningful.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research aims to determine students' views on the impact of university promotional activities on their university preferences. For this purpose, a survey developed by the researcher was applied to 243 students enrolled in three universities, two public and one private, with different characteristics in terms of quality and facilities. The results were analyzed using reliability analysis and t-tests. Subsequently, a table was created showing the levels of responses regarding the factors influencing students' university preferences.

The sample group consists of 243 students, with 185 (76.1%) females and 58 (23.9%) males. Among them, 134 (55.1%) students are on full or partial scholarships, while 109 (44.9%) are not on scholarships. Geographically, 141 (58%) students are from Baku, 88 (14%) are from other regions, 12 (4.9%) are from Sumgait, and 2 (0.8%) are from Ganja.

Among the sample group, 119 (49%) students are from Khazar University, 66 (27.2%) are from the Pedagogical University, and 57 (23.5%) are from the Economics University.

For the expected level of answers in the survey, the following options were provided:

- 1: Never, 2: No, 3: Unsure, 4: Often, 5: Very often.

Based on the responses to the questions regarding the reasons for choosing their universities, the answers were subjected to one-way analysis of variance and t-tests considering variables such as age, gender, type of program, family residence status, and scholarship status. The results were statistically sorted.

Only Hypothesis 6 "The reason for choosing your university is the tuition fees and scholarship opportunities" showed a statistically significant difference between dependent and independent variables. Other hypotheses were not validated.

As the number of universities in our country increases, universities aiming to be at the forefront of choice and competition must improve their service quality and student satisfaction levels accordingly. To achieve this, the following recommendations are made:

- Since student satisfaction is considered to be more impactful on service quality, universities should implement activities aimed at increasing student satisfaction. These activities should ensure that students proudly talk about their faculties

and engage in behaviors such as recommending them to others.

- Future studies could go further by including final-year students from other faculties, such as the Faculty of Sports Sciences, to compare them with other faculties.
- University administrators should focus on improving service quality and student satisfaction for their institutions. Regional, national, and international projects and research should be supported and prioritized by institutional managers.
- Based on the importance of student satisfaction in university environments, students should be treated as customers, and their interests and expectations should be met. In this regard, all personnel working at the university should be made aware of this approach.
- Furthermore, in line with the importance of faculty environment conditions and service quality, physical facilities, educational technologies, and access to research and resources should be improved for students.

REFERENCES

Bridge, B. (2003), Eğitimde Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Uygulamaları. Istanbul: Beyaz Yayınları.

Bryant, J., Bodfish, S. (2014), Relationship of Student Satisfaction to Key Indicators for Colleges and Universities. Cedar: National Research Report.

Butt, B.Z., Rehman, K. (2010), A study examining the students satisfaction in higher education. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2(2), 5446-5450.

Calma, A., Dickson-Deane, C. (2020), The student as customer and quality in higher education. International Journal of Educational Management, 34(8), 1221-1235.

Darawong, H., Sandmaung, M. (2019), Service quality enhancing student satisfactionin international programs of higher educationinstitutions: A local student perspective. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 29(2), 268-283.

Elliott, K.M., Shin, D. (2002), Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 2002, 197-209.

Fakhrudin, A., Fatmawati, I., Qamari, I.N. (2024), The influence of university image on students' enrollment decision: A literature review. Multidisciplinary Reviews, 7(9), 2024200.

Helgesen, O., Nesset, E. (2007), Images, satisfaction and antecedents: Drivers of student loyalty? A case study of a Norwegian University College. Corporate Reputation Review, 10, 38-59.

İçli, G.E., Vural, B.B. (2010), Toplam kalite yönetimi ve uygulamaları çerçevesinde kırklareli üniversitesi meslek yüksekokulları öğrenci memnuniyeti araştırması. Marmara Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 2010, 335-349.

Kaushal, V., Ali, N. (2020), University reputation, brand attachment and brand personality as antecedents of student loyalty: A study in higher education context. Corporate Reputation Review, 23(4), 254-266.

Khoshtaria, T., Datuashvili, D., Matin, A. (2020), The impact of brand equity dimensions on university reputation: An empirical study of Georgian higher education. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 30(2), 239-255.

Knapp, S.A., Krentler, K.A. (2006), Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: The importance of managing student expectations. Journal of Marketing Education, 28(3), 254-264.

Luo, Y., Xie, M., Lian, Z. (2019), Emotional engagement and student satisfaction: A study of Chinese college students based on a nationally representative sample. The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 28, 283-292.

Mukhtar, U., Anwar, S., Ahmed, U., Baloch, M.A. (2015), Factors effecting the service quality of public and prıvate sector universities comparatively: An empirical investigation. Researchers World-International Refereed Social Sciences Journal, 6(3), 132-142.

Owlia, M.S., Aspinwall, E.M. (1996), A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education. Quality Assurance in Education, 4(2), 12-20.

Paliulis, K.N., Labanauskis, R. (2015), Benchmarking as an instrument for improvement of quality management in higher education. Business, Management and Education, 13(1), 140-157.

Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L., Zeithaml, V.A. (1994), Improving service quality in America: Lessons learned. Academy of Management Executive, 8(2), 32-53.

Sapri, M., Kaka, A., Finch, E. (2009), Factors that influence student's level of satisfaction with regards to higher educational facilities services. Malaysian Journal of Real Estate, 2009, 34-51.

Shahsavar, T., Sudzina, F. (2017), Student satisfaction and loyalty in Denmark: Application of EPSI methodology. PLoS One, 12, e0189576.

Zainul, M., Maskur, M. (2024), Managing higher education: Enhancing student loyalty in a career-focused era. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 29(1), 372-387.