Educational resources, Teaching quality, logistics services and Personnel for Private University in Hunan

Zihao Zhao, Eakolarn Chotianusorn
Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand
Email: s64567810038@ssru.ac.th; eakolarn.ch@ssru.ac.th

ABSTRACT

The research investigated the educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel for private University in Hunan. The conceptual framework was developed from the literature review, survey, and other contemporary research in management and education. Accordingly, the researchers consider the importance of Educational resources, Teaching quality, logistics services and Personnel. In this, the researchers employed the quantitative research approaches. The instruments of research were the steps of a questionnaire. Data were collected from 366 people who are students of private university in Hunan. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics as mean, standard deviation, and percentage on the basis of observing the actual tourist satisfaction of the organizations studied through all operational links in management. Findings are applications of educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel are high-level.

Keywords: educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel

INTRODUCTION

The universities, good reputation crisis is beneficial to enhance cohesion within the universities, enabling staff and students to naturally enhance internal identity and loyalty, play a positive role in internal unity, construction of campus harmonious culture, and teaching management; from the universities, the operation and development without the social recognition and support of universities, universities with high reputation often get greater assistance in policy, financial and technical support, more conducive to further optimize the allocation of educational resources, make universities in a more favorable position in the competition.

A good social reputation is a long-term and continuous process, which is the overall impression of social groups on the long-term behavior and comprehensive strength of colleges and universities. The formation of reputation is not achieved overnight, and its management concept, academic ability, education and teaching, and social mission can all directly or indirectly affect the social evaluation of the reputation of colleges and universities. A good reputation in colleges and universities means the trust of the public, the support of the government, and the attention of society, and also means the collaborative consciousness, cooperation spirit, cohesion, and centripetal force of teachers and students in colleges and universities. All these will eventually bring a lot of social returns to universities, that is, a variety of rich student resources and financial support. Therefore, the reputation of colleges and universities is one of the important factors related to the sustainable development of colleges and universities.

The concept of reputation has not been clearly defined in academia. Scholars (Mahon, J.E, 2002) once pointed out that reputation is "hidden and invisible". Scholars from different

areas of research, research perspective, and reputation is given various definitions. Therefore, this paper sorted out some of the existing literature on the definition of reputation at home and abroad and strives to have a simple definition of universities reputation on the basis of the concept of reputation.

In the field of management, Wartick (1992) and Gray & Ballmer (1998) indicate that reputation is a comprehensive understanding of stakeholders about the existing situation and the future expectations of the organization. Reputation is the rational assessment of organizational characteristics by all stakeholders. From the perspective of the formation mechanism, Saxton (1998) believes that reputation is an impression of the organization's stakeholders based on what they see and hear that are expressed through ideas and language. Mahon (2002) believes that the formation of reputation is a dynamic process, which is a social impression formed through the communication and interaction between the organization and external stakeholders. From the perspective of organizational theory, reputation is a valuable asset and resource that can give the evaluated institutions sustainable competitiveness.

In the field of economics, David M. Kreps (1982) from the perspective of game theory research reputation refers to under the condition of information asymmetry, one participant for the other party participant is a certain type (preference or feasibility behavior) probability of a kind of cognition, the cognition is constantly updated to contain the repeated game between the two information. Shenker & Yuchtmanyar (1997) pointed out from the perspective of network information theory that reputation is a mechanism formed in the process of social development. Every member of this social mechanism exists as a network, and they have their own social status, and are connected to each other at a relative distance. George.Mailath LarrySamuelson (1998) points out from trading theory that reputation is an "invisible" material asset, but its formation and demise require a certain process, maintenance, and investment in order to maintain its sustainability.

Therefore, there is a view that the reputation of colleges and universities is actually a kind of organizational construction of the internal assets of the evaluated colleges and universities. According to the perspective of behavioral psychology, reputation is the concept and evaluation of the third party on the basis of receiving various signals and information about the evaluated institution. Therefore, another view is that college reputation is a kind of psychological construction of the ideas and views of colleges and universities. Charles Fombrun provides a third explanation of the universities reputation, which is not only directly related to the views and evaluation of third parties, but also closely related to the resources of the university's organization (such as unique teaching ability, brand assets). This paper agrees with the third point of view, as scholars said, in the process of reputation formation, organizational assets, the concept of understanding, market behavior is closely linked, cannot be ignored, so universities reputation should not be defined as one of the aspects, especially should not only be attributed to the concept of understanding. Referring to the reputational theory of organizational reputation, this paper understands universities reputation as "a comprehensive evaluation of the ability and resources that universities organizations can provide them with valuable output, including the emotional and cognitive components".

Relevant concepts of Customer satisfaction

The term "customer satisfaction" has already appeared in consumer psychology research in the early 20th century to measure products and services from the satisfaction of customer

needs. In 1965, some scholars formally put forward the concept of customer satisfaction, which was widely used in the field of management.

Customers are an individual or group that obtains any products and services provided by any organization through capital output."Satisfaction comes from the imagined value return of the product with the same or higher expected value return."(Philip Kotler, 2004) Therefore, customer satisfaction is divided into two aspects, namely, customer expectations, the value return of the product or service. The contrast between customers 'feelings about capital investment and their expectation is a reaction process of customer satisfaction, which is affected by the expectation before consumption. In a sense, customer satisfaction is a psychological reaction state that customers' consumption desire is satisfied or not satisfied. However, due to individual differences in expectations, the satisfaction of the same value experience will also vary.

The Student's "Customer" status

Colleges and universities have three major functions of personnel training, scientific research and social service. From the perspective of customers, teachers, students, employers and parents of students' parents are all among the service objects of universities, but the most direct and critical "customers" are students. Students acquire the knowledge, diplomas and abilities provided by universities through capital investment. In this process, they have dual identities and are not only consumers of higher education, but also beneficiaries of higher education. Students accept the products and services provided by colleges and universities to improve their own quality and realize the sublimation of self-value. Therefore, students' satisfaction with college education, teaching, service and other aspects directly affects the organizational reputation of colleges and universities. Therefore, the improvement of student satisfaction plays a very important role in the improvement and promotion of the reputation of colleges and universities.

METHODOLOGY

The research was to investigate the current issue of educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel for private University in Hunan. The conceptual framework was developed from the literature review, survey in the area, and other contemporaneous research in management. Accordingly, the researchers consider the importance of educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel.

In this, the researchers employed the quantitative research approaches. The instruments of research were the steps of a questionnaire. They have collected data from the students of the Private University in Hunan, China by distributing a total of 366 questionnaires to ask for information from the sample group in order to complete all parts of the questionnaire. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics as mean, standard deviation, and percentage on the basis of observing the actual employee satisfaction of the organizations studied through all operational links in human resource management. Findings are applications of educational resources, teaching quality, logistics services and personnel is high-level.

RESULTS

4.1 Personal characteristics of student of private university of Henan

Characteristics of entrepreneurs	number (n=366)	Percentage
1. Gender		
- Male	164	44.81
- Female	202	55.19
2. Age		
- 18 - 25 Year	120	32.79
- 26 – 35 year	122	33.33
- 36 – 45 year	48	13.11
- More than 46 year	76	20.80
3. Marital status		
- single	130	35.52
- married	138	37.70
- divorced	98	26.77
4. Degree of education		
- lower than bachelor's degree		
- Bachelor's degree	97	26.50
- graduate	148	40.44
	121	33.06
5. Working time		
- 1-3 years	118	32.24
- 4-6 years	145	39.62
- More than 7 years	103	28.14
-		
6. Monthly income	-	
- 1000-3000 Yuan	137	37.43
- 3001-5000 Yuan	131	35.79
- 5001-8000 Yuan	98	26.78
-		

From the table 4.1, the perspective of gender, female are significantly higher than male, accounting for 44.18 percentage, and male 55.19 percentage.

Regarding the age of student, the highest proportion was 26-35 years old, accounting for 33.33%, followed by student aged 18-25 years and student, aged more than 46 years, accounting for 32.79% and 20.80%, respectively, and student, aged 36-45 years 13.11% said that student satisfaction who responded to the survey were generally middle age. Regarding marital status, 37.70% were single, 35.52% were divorced, and 26.77% were related to married. The company had many single student satisfaction travel guide entrepreneurs.

From the perspective of educational background, student in private university generally have lower than bachelor's degree, Bachelor's degree, and graduate accounting for 26.50, 40.44%, and 33.06% respectively.

From the perspective of working years, the student is generally in the range of 1-3 years, 4-6 years of employment, accounting for 33.24 and 39.62 respectively, and the student for more than 7 years also account for a certain proportion, 28.14%.

In terms of monthly income, 37.43% of student have a monthly income of 3000-5000 Yuan, 26.78% of studenthave a monthly income of 5000-8000 Yuan, and only 35.79% of students have a monthly income of 1000-3000 Yuan, indicating that the average income per month of students has basically reached the middle-income level.

4.1 Education Source

Table 4.2 the level of opinion about the Education source

Education source	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. School hardware equipment	3.961	.588	high	4
2. Campus environment (green area, school road construction, etc.)	4.120	.531	high	1
3.The learning atmosphere in the school	4.110	.661	high	2
4.Schoo and room size	3.999	.593	high	3
5.History of running schools (generally speaking, the longer the history of running schools, the better the management in all aspects	3.787	.654	high	5
Total	3.996	.604	high	

From Table 4.2, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the student satisfaction variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.996. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "Campus environment (green area, school road construction, etc.)" high level average of 4.120, followed by " The learning atmosphere in the school", high level of average of 4.110, the last is " History of running schools (generally speaking, the longer the history of running schools, the better the management in all aspects", the average is 3.787, in the high level.

4.2 Teaching quality

Table 4.3 the level of opinion about the teaching quality

Teaching quality	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. The school has teachers who specialize in teaching.	3.871	.533	high	4
2. The school has enough teachers for the number of students.	4.122	.555	high	1
3. The school is interested in teaching and mentoring.	3.989	.522	high	2
4. The school has teachers with specific expertise.	3.971	.549	high	3
Total	3.988	.540	high	

From Table 4.3, both the mean value and the standard deviation regarding the opinion level affecting the teaching quality are at a high overall level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.988. From the various aspects of the variables involved, we found that the highest average is " The school has enough teachers for the number of students " (4.122), at a high level, followed by " The school is interested in teaching and mentoring " (3.989), at a high level, the lowest is "The school has teachers who specialize in teaching", the average of 3.871, in the same high level.

4.3 Teaching

Table 4.4 the level of opinion about the teaching

Teaching	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
.1Teaching quality (theoretical and practical teaching level)	3.771	.654	high	3
2. Teacher teaching level	3.997	.675	high	1
3. Teachers' scientific research ability	3.956	.643	high	2
Total	3.908	.660	high	

From Table 4.4, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the teaching variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a high level being 3.908. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is " Teacher teaching level", high-level average of 3.997, followed by "Teachers' scientific research ability" high level of an average of 3.956, the last is " Teaching quality (theoretical and practical teaching level)" the average is 3.771, in the high level

4.4 Personnel

Table 4.5 the level of opinion about Personnel

Personnel	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
.1The cultivation of students' creative ability	4.123	.536	high	1
2. Teaching practice, practice, etc	3.887	.514	high	3
3. The development of academic activities	3.749	.666	high	4
4. Emphasis on students' ideological and moral and mental health education	3.999	.512	high	2
Total	3.939	.557	high	

From Table 4.5, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the personnel variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.939. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "The cultivation of students' creative ability", high level average of 4.123, followed by "Emphasis on students' ideological and moral and mental health education", high level of average of 3.999, the last is "The development of academic activities", the average is 3.749, in the high level

4.5 Facility location

Table 4.6 the level of opinion about the Facility location

Facility Location	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1.The development level of the city where the school is located	3.949	.553	high	2
2.Employment opportunities in the school location	4.112	.573	high	1
3.Convenience of the school area (train, high-speed rail, airport, bus station	3.887	.566	high	3
4.Social influence of where the school is located	3.823	.557	high	4
Total	3.943	.562	high	

From Table 4.6, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the facility location variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.943. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "Employment opportunities in the school

location ", high-level average of 4.112, followed by "The development level of the city where the school is located "high level of an average of 3.949, the last is "Social influence of where the school is located", the average is 3.823, in the high level

4.6 Logistic Service

Table 4.7 the level of opinion about the Logistic service

Logistic service	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. The school has a security system.	4.111	.563	high	2
2. The school has a good document management system.	4.116	0.567	high	1
3. The school has a quick coordination between departments.	3.986	0.545	high	3
4. The school has provided the corresponding news information.	3.886	0.586	high	4
Total	4.025	.656	high	

From Table 4.6, the mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the logistic service variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 4.025. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "The school has a good document management system", high-level average of 4.116, followed by " The school has a security system" high level of an average of 4,111, the last is "The school has provided the corresponding news information ", the average is 3.886, in the high level

4.7 Student satisfaction

Table 4.8 the level of opinion about the student satisfaction

Student Satisfaction	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. You take pride in studying in this school.	3.998	.563	high	2
2. You intend to study in this school	4.121	0.528	high	1
3. You ready to recommend friends, relatives to study at this school	3.877	0.538	high	3
4. You take pride in studying in this school.	3.743	0.585	high	4
Total	3.934	.553	high	

From Table 4.7, both the mean and the standard deviation regarding the opinion level affecting student satisfaction are both at a high overall level, with the average at a higher level being 3.934. From all aspects of the variables involved, we found that the highest average value was "You intend to study in this school" (4.121), at a high level, followed by " You take pride in studying in this school" (3.998), at a high level. The last is "You take pride in studying in this school", the average is 3.743, in the high level

4.7 The factors affecting the overall

Table 4.8 the level of opinion about the factors affecting the overall

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Level	Rank
Education source	3.996	.604	medium	2
Teaching quality	3.988	.540	high	3
Teaching	3.908	.660	high	6
Personnel	3.939	.557	high	5
Facility location	3.943	.562	high	4
Logistic service	4.025	.656	high	1
Total	3.967	.597	high	

As can be seen in Table 4.8, the mean and standard deviation of opinion levels regarding factors affecting student satisfaction are at a high overall level, with a higher-level mean at 3.967. From each variable, we found that the highest average was Logistic service (4.025), at a high level, followed by Education source (3.996), and the lowest was teaching, with an average of 3.908.

CONCLUSION

Summary the results of level of opinion about factors influencing Employee satisfaction

(1) The level of opinion about the factors affecting the overall

The mean and standard deviation of opinion levels regarding factors affecting student satisfaction are at a high overall level, with a higher-level mean at 3.967. From each variable, we found that the highest average was Logistic service (4.025), at a high level, followed by Education source (3.996), and the lowest was teaching, with an average of 3.908.

(2) Education source

The mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the student satisfaction variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.996. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "Campus environment (green area, school road construction, etc.)" high level average of 4.120, followed by " The learning atmosphere in the school", high level of average of 4.110, the last is " History of running schools (generally speaking, the longer the history of running schools, the better the management in all aspects", the average is 3.787, in the high level

(3) Teaching quality

The mean value and the standard deviation regarding the opinion level affecting the teaching quality are at a high overall level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.988. From the various aspects of the variables involved, we found that the highest average is " The school has enough teachers for the number of students " (4.122), at a high level, followed by " The school is interested in teaching and mentoring " (3.989), at a high level, the lowest is "The school has teachers who specialize in teaching", the average of 3.871, in the same high level.

(4) Teaching

The mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the teaching variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a high level being 3.908. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is " Teacher teaching level", high-level average of 3.997, followed by "Teachers' scientific research ability" high level of an average of 3.956, the last is " Teaching quality (theoretical and practical teaching level)" the average is 3.771, in the high level

(5) Personnel

The mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the personnel variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.939. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is " The cultivation of students' creative ability", high level average of 4.123, followed by " Emphasis on students' ideological and moral and mental health education", high level of average of 3.999, the last is "The development of academic activities", the average is 3.749, in the high level

(6) Facility location

The mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the facility location variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 3.943. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is "Employment opportunities in the school location ", high-level average of 4.112, followed by "The development level of the city where the school is located "high level of an average of 3.949, the last is "Social influence of where the school is located", the average is 3.823, in the high level

(7) Logistic service

The mean and standard deviation of the opinion level of the logistic service variable is at a high level, with the mean value at a higher level being 4.025. Comprehensive from all aspects, the average of the highest side is " The school has a good document management system", high-level average of 4.116, followed by " The school has a security system" high level of an average of 4,111, the last is "The school has provided the corresponding news information ", the average is 3.886, in the high level

(8) Student Satisfaction

The mean and the standard deviation regarding the opinion level affecting student satisfaction are both at a high overall level, with the average at a higher level being 3.934. From all aspects of the variables involved, we found that the highest average value was "You intend to study in this school" (4.121), at a high level, followed by " You take pride in studying in this school" (3.998), at a high level. The last is "You take pride in studying in this school", the average is 3.743, in the high level

REFERENCES

Albert, C. (1997). Corporate Reputation: Concept and Measurement. *Journal of Product and Brand Management,* 6(2):109116

Davies, (2002). *G Corporate Reputation and Competitiveness [M].* London, UK: Routledge,1-272

Gray, E.R., & Balmer, John, M.T. (1998). Managing Corporate Image and Corporate Reputation. *Long Range Planning,* 31(5):695 – 702.

Mahon, J.E. (2002). Corporate Reputation: Are search agenda using strategy and stake holder literature. *Business sand Society,* 41(4):415 -447.

Saxton, M.K. (1998). Where do corporate reputations come from. *Corporate Reputation Review,* (4):393 - 399

Wartick, S.L. (2002). Measuing corporate reputation: Definition and data. *Business and Soeiety,* 41(4):371-392

Wartick, S.L. (1992). The relationship between intense media exposure and change in corporate reputation. *Business & Society,* (31):33 -42

Yu Jinjin. (2003). A Review of the Modern Western Reputation Theory. *Contemporary Finance and Economics,* (11): 18-22