

The Impact of Social Influence and School Reputation on Perceived Brand Image: Moderating Role of Social Media Influence

Jiemarie D. Paderes¹, Virginia Lourdes Yacapin²

^{1,2}Lourdes, College Inc.

ABSTRACT

This study examined how social influence and school reputation affect students' perception of a school's brand image, with social media influence considered as a moderating variable. The study focused on understanding how peer influence, institutional reputation, and online exposure contribute to students' evaluation of a school. While social media is now widely used in promoting schools, there is still limited research that looks at how it interacts with social influence and school reputation in shaping brand perception, especially in the local context. A quantitative descriptive–correlational design was used, involving 210 Grade 12 students from selected schools in Bukidnon. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics, multiple regression, and Canonical Correlation Analysis. The results showed that school reputation significantly predicts perceived brand image, while social influence does not significantly effect. It was also found that social media influence does not significantly moderate the relationship between social influence and perceived brand image, as well as the relationship between school reputation and perceived brand image. Overall, students seem to rely more on the school's reputation when forming their perception. Future researchers may consider including other factors such as school facilities, tuition costs, and academic programs to better explain students' choices.

Keywords: school reputation, social influence, social media influence, perceived brand image, senior high school students

INTRODUCTION

Today, schools are not only seen as places for learning but also as brands. Students and parents often compare schools based on their reputation, the opinions of others, and what they see online. Because of this, it is important to understand how students form their perceptions of schools.

Social influence refers to how people around a student, such as friends and family, affect their decisions (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Many students consider the opinions of others when choosing a school. At the same time, school reputation plays an important role. It includes factors such as prestige, student satisfaction, and how employers view the school (Nguyen & Le, 2023).

Social media has also become an important source of information. Students often use platforms like Facebook, TikTok, and Instagram to learn about schools. These platforms allow them to see reviews, posts, and experiences shared by others, which can influence their perception (Rauschnabel et al., 2022).

While previous studies have examined social influence, school reputation, and brand image independently, there remains limited research that integrates these variables within a single framework, particularly in the context of educational decision-making. Recent studies have also focused more on general higher education settings, with fewer investigations addressing senior high school students as pre-enrollment decision-makers (Nguyen & Le, 2023; Kaushal & Ali, 2023). Moreover, existing research often examines social media as a direct factor rather than as a moderating variable, highlighting a gap in understanding how it interacts with social influence and school reputation. This study aims to address these gaps by examining the combined and moderating effects of these variables in a local context.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded in Social Cognitive Theory, which explains that individuals form perceptions and make decisions based on the interaction of personal, behavioral, and environmental factors (Bandura, 1986). In the context of this study, students develop their perceptions of a school's brand image by observing others, interpreting available information, and evaluating their own experiences. This theory supports the idea that both social and institutional factors influence how students assess schools.

To further explain how individuals process information, this study is supported by the Information Adoption Model, which states that people accept and use information based on its perceived usefulness and credibility (Sussman & Siegal, 2003). In this study, students are exposed to information from peers and social media, but they carefully evaluate this information before forming their perceptions. This explains why social influence and social media influence may not always strongly affect students' decisions.

In addition, Signaling Theory explains how institutions communicate their quality through observable indicators such as reputation, achievements, and recognition (Spence, 1973). School reputation, which includes prestige, student satisfaction, and industry recognition, serves as a signal that helps students evaluate the credibility and quality of a school. When a school has a strong reputation, students are more likely to form positive perceptions of its brand image.

Based on these theories, the study assumes that social influence and school reputation affect perceived brand image, while social media influence may strengthen or weaken these relationships. However, consistent with the findings of the study, institutional factors such as school reputation appear to play a more important role than social or digital influences in shaping students' perceptions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study is ought to answer the following questions;

1. What is the participants' assessment of social influence?
2. What is the participants' assessment of school reputation in terms of:
 - 2.1 Prestige
 - 2.2 Student satisfaction
 - 2.3 Industry recognition?
3. What is the participants' assessment of social media influence?
4. What is the participants' assessment of perceived brand image?
5. Do social influence and school reputation predict perceived school brand image?
6. Does social media influence moderate the relationship between social influence, school reputation and perceived school brand image?

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study used a quantitative descriptive–correlational design to examine the relationships among social influence, school reputation, social media influence, and perceived brand image. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to describe students’ perceptions and determine whether the independent variables significantly predict the dependent variable without manipulating any conditions (Creswell, 2014).

The descriptive approach was used to summarize students’ assessments of each variable, while the correlational approach was used to test the relationships among them. In addition, moderation analysis was applied to examine whether social media influence strengthens or weakens the relationship between the independent variables and perceived brand image.

PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The participants of the study were Grade 12 Senior High School students from selected schools in Bukidnon. These students were chosen because they are at the stage of making decisions about college enrollment, making them suitable for examining perceptions of school brand image.

The total population was approximately 460 students. Using the Taro Yamane formula with a 0.05 margin of error, a sample size of 210 respondents was determined. This sample size is considered sufficient for regression and moderation analysis. Simple random sampling was used to ensure that each student had an equal chance of being selected. Participation was voluntary, and only students who agreed to participate were included in the study.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed using a combination of descriptive and inferential statistical techniques.

First, descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to summarize the respondents’ assessments of social influence, school reputation (prestige, student satisfaction, and industry recognition), social media influence, and perceived brand image. Mean scores were interpreted using a five-point Likert scale to determine the level of agreement of the participants.

To ensure the quality of the measurement model, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were conducted. EFA was used to identify the underlying structure of the variables and remove weak items, while CFA was used to confirm the validity of the constructs. Factor loadings of at least 0.60 were considered acceptable.

Reliability and validity were further assessed using Cronbach’s alpha (≥ 0.70) for internal consistency, Composite Reliability (CR) (≥ 0.70), Average Variance Extracted (AVE) (≥ 0.50). Sampling adequacy was evaluated using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure, with values above 0.80 indicating good adequacy, and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, where a significant result ($p < .001$) confirmed that the data were suitable for factor analysis.

To test the hypotheses, multiple regression analysis was performed to determine whether social influence and school reputation significantly predict perceived brand image. This method allowed the researcher to assess the individual contribution of each independent variable. To examine the moderating effect, moderation analysis was conducted to determine whether social media influence significantly affects the relationship between social influence and perceived brand image, and school reputation and perceived brand image. Interaction terms were created between the independent variables and the moderating variable to test whether the strength of the relationships changes at different levels of social media influence.

All statistical tests were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance, and results were interpreted based on p-values and regression coefficients.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1. What is the participants' assessment of social influence?

Table 1 presents the participants' assessment of social influence, with an overall mean of 3.40, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that students only moderately consider the opinions of peers, classmates, and family when evaluating schools. While they are aware of these influences, they do not fully rely on them and instead combine them with their own judgment in decision-making. The distribution of responses shows that 33.81% agreed, 34.29% were neutral, 19.52% disagreed, 2.38% strongly disagreed, and 10% strongly agreed, suggesting a balanced level of agreement rather than a strong dependence on social influence. Notably, a large portion of responses falls within the neutral category, indicating that although students recognize external opinions, these are not the primary basis of their decisions, and other factors also play a role. This finding is consistent with previous studies which suggest that social influence contributes to awareness and initial consideration but becomes less important when individuals evaluate their options more carefully (Kaushal & Ali, 2023; Suh & Lee, 2021).

Table 1

Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants' Assessment of Social Influence

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	21	10.00
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	71	33.81
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	72	34.29
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	41	19.52
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	5	2.38
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.40
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.93

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
I took into account where my classmates planned to enroll in college.	3.49	Neutral	1.08
I was influenced by the experiences my peers shared about their chosen college	3.33	Neutral	1.06
I considered the advice of people I look up to when deciding on a college.	3.44	Neutral	1.04
I joined conversations on social media or group chats that influenced my college choice.	3.34	Neutral	1.16

Problem 2. What is the participants' assessment of school reputation in terms of:

2.1 Prestige

2.2 Student satisfaction

2.3 Industry recognition?

Table 2 shows the participants' assessment of school reputation in terms of prestige, with an overall mean of 3.31 and a standard deviation of 0.90, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that students moderately consider a school's academic standing, recognition, and public image when evaluating schools. The distribution reveals that the largest percentage of responses falls under Neutral (42.38%), followed by Agree (31.43%), while only 8.57% strongly agreed. This suggests that although students recognize the importance of prestige, they do not fully depend on it and may consider other factors in their decision-making. This finding is consistent with previous studies which explain that institutional prestige is often based on rankings and academic recognition (Kayyali, 2023), and that perceived quality is closely linked to prestige (Casanoves-Boix et al., 2025). In addition, prestige may be reflected through visible elements such as achievements and institutional identity (Dwitasari et al., 2025). In this study, the moderate result suggests that prestige is acknowledged but remains only one of several factors considered by students when evaluating schools.

Table 2

Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants of School Reputation in Terms of Prestige

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	18	8.57
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	66	31.43
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	89	42.38
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	35	16.67
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	2	0.95
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.31
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.90

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
1 I enrolled in a college that has a strong and well-recognized reputation	3.42	Neutral	1.00
2 I believe graduating from a prestigious college will improve my career opportunities	3.29	Neutral	0.97
3 I considered colleges that are selective in their admission process as more prestigious	3.22	Neutral	1.11

Table 3 shows the participants' assessment of school reputation in terms of student satisfaction, with a computed mean of 3.16 and a standard deviation of 0.98, interpreted as neutral. This indicates that students neither strongly agree nor strongly disagree with statements related to satisfaction factors such as faculty support, career services, and overall school experience. While students are aware of these aspects, they do not strongly rely on them when evaluating schools. The distribution of responses also shows that although some students agree that these factors are important, a noticeable portion remains neutral, suggesting that satisfaction indicators are considered but do not strongly shape students' perception of brand image at this stage. This finding is consistent with previous studies which explain that student satisfaction reflects how individuals assess their experiences within an institution (Mendoza-Villafaina et al., 2024), and that it is influenced by the quality of services and support provided by the school (Zakirullah, 2025). In addition, student satisfaction includes both academic and non-academic experiences (Ali & Ahmed, 2021). In this study, the neutral result suggests that satisfaction is recognized but does not have a strong influence on students' evaluation of schools.

Table 3*Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants of School Reputation in Terms of Student*

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	17	8.10
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	69	32.86
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	67	31.90
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	45	21.43
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	12	5.71
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.16
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.98

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
How accessible and supportive the faculty are	3.18	Neutral	1.12
The career services like internships and job placement	3.12	Neutral	1.03
Their overall school experience	3.18	Neutral	1.16

Table 4 shows the participants' assessment of school reputation in terms of industry recognition, with a computed mean of 3.17 and a standard deviation of 0.94, interpreted as neutral. This indicates that students neither strongly agree nor strongly disagree with statements related to employer respect, industry connections, and graduate success. The distribution of responses suggests that while industry-related factors are considered in evaluating a school, they are not strongly emphasized. Students appear to recognize the importance of employability and job-market outcomes, but their responses remain balanced. This neutral result implies that although students are aware of industry recognition, they do not fully rely on it when making decisions and instead consider it alongside other factors. This finding is consistent with previous studies which explain that recognition from employers helps indicate the value of an institution (Nguyen, 2021), and that industry partnerships and graduate outcomes can influence how schools are evaluated (Buzohera, 2025). In this study, the neutral mean suggests that industry recognition is acknowledged but does not strongly shape students' perceptions.

Table 4*Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants' of School Reputation in terms of Industry Recognition*

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	12	5.71
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	61	29.05
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	73	34.76
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	53	25.24
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	11	5.24
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.17
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.94

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
I consider a college's industry connections when deciding where to enroll.	3.12	Neutral	1.04
I want to study at a college that employers respect and acknowledge	3.20	Neutral	1.09
A strong reputation in the job market makes a college more attractive to me	3.15	Neutral	1.05
I am more confident in choosing a college known for producing successful graduates	3.20	Neutral	1.03

Table 5 presents the summary of school reputation across its three dimensions, showing an overall moderate assessment among the participants, with an aggregate mean of 3.21 and a standard deviation of 0.78, indicating relatively consistent responses. This suggests that students generally consider reputation-related factors when evaluating schools, but their level of agreement remains balanced rather than strong. Among the dimensions, prestige obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.31$), indicating that students are slightly more attentive to a school's academic standing, recognition, and public image. This is followed by industry recognition ($M = 3.17$), which reflects students' awareness of employer respect, graduate outcomes, and industry connections. Student satisfaction ($M = 3.16$) recorded the lowest mean, suggesting that aspects such as faculty support, services, and overall experience are considered but not strongly emphasized. Overall, although there are slight differences among the dimensions, all fall within the moderate range, indicating that students evaluate school reputation in a balanced way rather than relying heavily on a single factor.

Table 5
Summary Table of School Reputation

Dimensions	Mean	Interpretation	SD
Prestige	3.31	Moderate	0.90
Student satisfaction	3.16	Moderate	0.98
Industry recognition	3.17	Moderate	0.94
School Reputation	3.21	Moderate	0.78

Problem 3. What is the participants' assessment of social media influence?

Table 6 presents the participants' assessment of social media influence, with an overall mean of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 0.79, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that students moderately consider social media when evaluating schools, and the relatively low standard deviation suggests that their responses are fairly consistent. In terms of distribution, the highest percentage of responses falls under Neutral (34.76%), followed by Agree (29.05%), while a notable portion selected Disagree (25.24%), and only a small percentage strongly agreed (5.71%) or strongly disagreed (5.24%). This pattern shows that although students are aware of social media as a source of information, many remain undecided or only moderately influenced by it. This finding is consistent with the Information Adoption Model, which explains that individuals evaluate information based on its usefulness and credibility (Sussman & Siegal, 2003). In this case, students appear to assess social media content carefully, leading to a moderate level of influence rather than strong reliance.

Table 6
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants of Social Media Influence

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	12	5.71
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	87	29.05
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	82	34.76
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	26	25.24
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	3	5.24
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.37
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.79

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
1 I often discover colleges through content on social media platforms.	3.44	Neutral	1.09
2 What I see on social media affects how I perceive a college	3.31	Neutral	0.95
3 I am more likely to consider a college that has active and engaging social media presence	3.47	Neutral	0.93
4 I trust colleges that consistently engage with students on social media	3.32	Neutral	0.87
5 I see many likes, shares, or positive interactions on its posts	3.31	Neutral	0.99

Problem 4. What is the participants’ assessment of perceived brand image?

Table 7 presents the frequency, percentage, and mean distribution of the participants’ perceived brand image, with an overall mean of 3.29 and a standard deviation of 0.99, interpreted as moderate. This indicates that students have a balanced perception, meaning they neither strongly agree nor strongly disagree with statements related to the school’s brand image, while the standard deviation shows some variability in their responses. In terms of distribution, the highest percentage falls under Neutral (34.76%), followed by Agree (29.05%), with a considerable portion selecting Disagree (25.24%), and only a small percentage strongly agreeing (5.71%) or strongly disagreeing (5.24%). This pattern suggests that although some students have a positive view, many remain undecided or only moderately positive in their perception. The moderate mean also implies that students have some level of awareness and familiarity with the school, but their overall perception is still developing, as some have formed positive impressions while others remain uncertain. This finding is consistent with studies showing that brand perception develops gradually as individuals process information from different sources (Sudirman et al., 2024), and that perceptions are shaped by both direct and indirect experiences depending on familiarity (Setyaningrum et al., 2023). In this study, the moderate result suggests that students’ perceptions are not yet strongly established.

Table 7
Frequency, Percentage, and Mean Distribution of the Participants of Perceived Brand Image

Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	16	5.71
3.51-4.50	Agree	High	74	29.05
2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderate	64	34.76
1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low	47	25.24
1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low	9	5.24
Total			210	100.0
Overall Mean				3.29
Interpretation				Moderate
SD				0.99

Specific Indicators	M	Description	SD
1 I see the school as having a clear and consistent identity	3.33	Neutral	1.22
2 I can easily describe what makes this school different from others	3.20	Neutral	1.04
3 I feel that this school’s identity matches my personal goals	3.37	Neutral	1.11
4 I believe this school is committed to service and contributing to the community	3.27	Neutral	1.04

Problem 5. Do social influence and school reputation predict perceived school brand image?

HO1: Social influence does not significantly predict perceived brand image.

HO2: School reputation does not significantly predict perceived brand image.

The study examined whether social influence and school reputation predict perceived school brand image. Table 26 shows that the overall regression model was statistically significant ($F = 66.227, p < .001$), with a strong correlation coefficient ($R = 0.625$) and a coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.390$), indicating that 39.0% of the variance in perceived school brand image can be explained by social influence and school reputation taken together. This result leads to the rejection of Ho1, confirming that the predictors collectively have a significant effect on perceived brand image. When examined individually, school reputation emerged as a strong and significant predictor ($\beta = 0.594, t = 8.708, p < .001$), indicating that for every one-unit increase in school reputation, perceived brand image increases by 0.594 units. This shows that institutional reputation strongly shapes how students perceive a school's brand. This finding is consistent with studies emphasizing that institutional prestige, quality, and overall standing are key factors in shaping brand perception (Setyaningrum et al., 2023; Sudirman et al., 2024).

The model explains 39% of the variance in perceived brand image, suggesting that the remaining 61% may be influenced by other factors not included in the study, such as school facilities, tuition fees, academic programs, and service quality. Previous studies support this, showing that service quality and institutional support can influence students' perceptions and decisions (Ali & Ahmed, 2021), while academic experience and satisfaction also contribute to how schools are evaluated (Lee & Kim, 2022). In contrast, social influence did not significantly predict perceived brand image ($\beta = 0.049, t = 0.719, p = 0.473$), indicating that the opinions of peers and social networks alone are not enough to strongly shape students' perceptions. This suggests that while students may listen to others, they rely more on institutional factors when forming their judgments. Overall, these findings highlight that schools should focus more on strengthening their reputation and quality, while social influence plays only a supporting role (Lankauskienė et al., 2025; Supriyanto et al., 2020).

Table 8

Regression Analysis of the Influence of Social Influence, School reputation on Perceived Brand Image

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.718	.239		2.999	.003
Social Influence	.052	.073	.049	.719	.473
School reputation	.746**	.086	.594	8.708	.000
Model Summary					
R = 0.625	R ² = 0.390	Adj. R ² = 0.384	F = 66.227**	p = .000	

**significant at 0.01 level

Problem 6. Does social media influence moderate the relationship between social influence and School reputation on perceived school brand image?

Ho3: Social media influence does not moderate the relationship between social influence and perceived school brand image.

Ho4: Social media influence does not moderate the relationship between school reputation and perceived school brand image.

Table 9 presents the moderation analysis of social media influence on the relationship between social influence and perceived school brand image. The interaction term (Social Influence \times Social Media Influence) was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.573, t = 1.440, p = 0.151$), indicating that social media influence does not meaningfully change the effect of social influence on perceived brand image. Since the p-value is greater than

0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected, which means that the relationship between peer or social network input and students' perception of school brand image remains consistent regardless of the level of social media influence. The results also show that both social influence ($\beta = -0.134$, $p = 0.617$) and social media influence ($\beta = 0.103$, $p = 0.634$) are not significant predictors. This suggests that although students are exposed to social media, they do not rely on it to strengthen or amplify peer influence when forming their perceptions. Instead, students appear to treat peer opinions and online information separately in their decision-making process, indicating that peer influence remains limited regardless of exposure to social media content.

Overall, these findings suggest that while social media may serve as a channel for sharing opinions or information, it does not strengthen or weaken the impact of social influence in shaping brand perception. This is consistent with previous studies which explain that the moderating role of social media is often limited when the main predictor is weak or when stronger factors, such as institutional reputation, play a more dominant role in shaping perceptions (Bhukya & Paul, 2023; Dong & Lazaro, 2024). Therefore, efforts to improve perceived brand image may be more effective if focused on strengthening institutional credibility rather than relying on social media to influence peer effects.

Table 10

Moderation Analysis of Social Media Influence on Social Influence and perceived Brand Image

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
Social Influence	-.143	.285	-.134	-.501	.617	Not significant
Social Media Influence	.129	.269	.103	.477	.634	Not significant
Int SI \times SMI	.116	.081	.573	1.440	.151	Not significant

**Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

Table 10 presents the moderation analysis of social media influence on the relationship between school reputation and perceived school brand image. The interaction term (School Reputation \times Social Media Influence) was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.498$, $t = 1.377$, $p = 0.170$), indicating that social media influence does not significantly change the effect of school reputation on perceived brand image. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected, which means that the positive relationship between school reputation and students' perception of brand image remains stable regardless of social media influence. The results also show that both school reputation ($\beta = 0.200$, $p = 0.381$) and social media influence ($\beta = -0.042$, $p = 0.828$) are not significant in this interaction model. This suggests that even though social media provides access to information and communication, it does not strengthen or weaken how school reputation influences students' perceptions.

These findings imply that institutional factors, particularly school reputation, remain more influential in shaping brand perception than social media. This supports previous studies which highlight that reputation and program quality are strong determinants of how institutions are evaluated, while the moderating role of social media is often limited when the main predictor is already strong (Bhukya & Paul, 2023; Dong & Lazaro, 2024). Based on the overall moderation results, both interaction terms were found to be not statistically significant. The interaction between social influence and social media influence ($p = 0.151$) and the interaction between school reputation and social media influence ($p = 0.170$) both failed to reach significance. Therefore, the null hypotheses (Ho3 and Ho4) are not rejected. Overall, the findings confirm that social media influence does not function as a moderating variable, and the relationships between social influence, school reputation, and perceived brand image remain consistent regardless of the level of social media influence.

Table 10*Moderation Analysis of Social Media Influence on School Reputation and Perceived Brand Image*

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
School reputation	.252	.287	.200	.878	.381	Not significant
Social Media Influence	-.053	.243	-.042	-.218	.828	Not significant
Int <u>SrR</u> × SMI	.108	.079	.498	1.377	.170	Not significant

**Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

- 1. For School Administrators.** School administrators may strengthen institutional reputation by enhancing academic programs, improving service delivery, and highlighting achievements and recognitions. This can help provide clearer and more reliable information that students can use when evaluating schools.
- 2. For Marketing.** The marketing offices may develop more targeted communication strategies that emphasize the school's strengths, such as prestige, student satisfaction, and industry recognition. They may also ensure that information presented to students is clear, consistent, and accessible.
- 3. For Social Media Managers.** Social media managers may improve the quality and relevance of content shared on digital platforms by focusing on informative, engaging, and authentic posts. While social media does not strongly influence decision-making, it can still serve as a useful channel for awareness and information dissemination.
- 4. For Teachers.** Teachers may provide students with reliable and accurate information about college options, helping them make more informed decisions rather than relying solely on peer opinions or social media.
- 5. For Students.** Students may be encouraged to evaluate schools based on multiple factors, particularly institutional attributes such as reputation and program quality, rather than relying mainly on peer influence or online content.
- 6. For Future Researchers.** Future researchers may explore other factors that could influence perceived brand image, as a large portion of the variation is explained by variables not included in the present study. They may also consider different populations or contexts to further validate the findings.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, F., & Ahmed, R. (2021). The impact of service quality on student satisfaction in higher education. *Journal of Educational Research*, 15(2), 45–60.
2. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
3. Bhukya, R., & Paul, J. (2023). Social media influence and consumer decision-making: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 113–125.
4. Buzohera, N. (2025). Industry partnerships and graduate employability: Implications for higher education institutions. *International Journal of Education Studies*, 18(1), 22–35.
5. Casanoves-Boix, J., et al. (2025). Institutional prestige and perceived quality in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 79(1), 88–102.
6. Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–621.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
8. Dong, X., & Lazaro, M. (2024). The role of digital platforms in shaping consumer perceptions. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 65, 101–115.
9. Dwitasari, D., et al. (2025). The role of institutional identity and achievements in building school reputation. *Journal of Educational Management*, 12(3), 55–70.
10. Hollebeek, L. D., & Macky, K. (2023). Digital engagement and brand perception in higher education. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 39(5–6), 456–478.
11. Jaya, I., et al. (2024). Social and institutional factors influencing brand perception in education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 120, 102–118.
12. Kaushal, V., & Ali, N. (2023). Determinants of student choice in higher education institutions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(4), 4123–4140.
13. Kayyali, M. (2023). Academic rankings and institutional prestige: Effects on student decision-making. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 36(2), 210–225.
14. Lankauskienė, T., et al. (2025). The role of institutional branding in higher education competitiveness. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 35(1), 1–20.
15. Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2022). Academic experience and student satisfaction in higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 23(2), 345–360.
16. Mendoza-Villafaina, M., et al. (2024). Student satisfaction and institutional evaluation in higher education. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 13(1), 90–105.
17. Nguyen, T. (2021). Employer perception and graduate employability. *Journal of Education and Work*, 34(3), 250–265.
18. Nguyen, T., & Le, H. (2023). School reputation and student choice: Evidence from developing countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 95, 102–120.
19. Rauschnabel, P. A., et al. (2022). Social media marketing and consumer perception. *Journal of Business Research*, 142, 1–12.
20. Setyaningrum, A., et al. (2023). Brand image formation in educational institutions. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 45(2), 134–150.
21. Sudirman, A., et al. (2024). The development of brand perception through institutional attributes. *Journal of Brand Management*, 31(1), 66–80.
22. Suh, A., & Lee, J. (2021). Social influence and decision-making behavior in digital environments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106–120.
23. Supriyanto, A., et al. (2020). Institutional reputation and its impact on student decisions. *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(4), 567–582.
24. Sussman, S. W., & Siegal, W. S. (2003). Informational influence in organizations: An integrated approach to knowledge adoption. *Information Systems Research*, 14(1), 47–65.
25. Zakirullah, M. (2025). Student perception of service quality in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 39(2), 210–225.