

Investigation and Comparison the Present and Future Situations of
Sustainable Management in Private University
การศึกษาและเปรียบเทียบสถานะการณ์ปัจจุบันและอนาคตของการบริหารจัดการอย่าง
ยั่งยืนในมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน

Nongnapas Thiengkamol¹, Velu Sinvayupak²

Tanarat Khoowaranyu Thiengkamol³

นงนภัส เทียงกมล¹, เวฬุ สีนวายุภักซ์²

และ ธนรรรตต์ คู่วรัญญู เทียงกมล³

Received: September 6, 2025

Revised: November 19, 2025

Accepted: December 9, 2025

Abstract

The objectives of this research were 1) to investigate the present and future situations of sustainable management in private universities, and 2) to compare the present and future situations of sustainable management in private universities. A mixed-method research design was employed, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The sample selection was based on two criteria: 1) private universities that have been established for at least half a century, and 2) those ranked by both the Webmetrics Ranking of World Universities and the UniRank University Ranking. Based on these criteria, the top five institutions were selected: Assumption University, Rangsit University, Bangkok University, Sripatum University, and the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, respectively.

The research was conducted in two phases. In Phase 1, in-depth interviews were used as the research instrument with five-key Informants who were senior executives of private universities in order to explore present and future situations of sustainable management. In Phase 2, a sample of 400 participants, consisting of academic staff and personnel, was employed to compare the present and future situations of sustainable

¹ Sustainable Environmental Management Program, Faculty of Environment and Natural Studies, Mahaekham University หลักสูตรการจัดการสิ่งแวดล้อมอย่างยั่งยืน คณะสิ่งแวดล้อมและทรัพยากรธรรมชาติ มหาวิทยาลัยมหาสารคาม, Email: mahidol@gmail.com

² Independent Scholar, นักวิชาการอิสระ, Email: sinvayupak@gmail.com

³ Independent Scholar, นักวิชาการอิสระ, Email: tanarat.th@gmail.com

management. The research tools were verified using content validity (IOC) and reliability based on standard criteria.

The results revealed that in Phase 1, the sustainable management model for private higher education institutions was formulated based on the 7Ps marketing mix, consisting of product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence/environment, integrated with ESG principles: environment, social, and governance. The results indicated high to the highest levels. In Phase 2, comparisons of the present and future situations of sustainable management in private universities containing 10 aspects: product, price, place, promotion, people, process, physical evidence/environment, social, and governance showed statistically significant differences at the .01 level.

Keywords: Future Situation, Present Situation, Sustainable Management, Private University, 7Ps, ESG

บทคัดย่อ

วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัยครั้งนี้ คือ 1) เพื่อศึกษาสภาพอนาคตและสภาพปัจจุบันด้านการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืนของมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน และ 2) เพื่อเปรียบเทียบสภาพอนาคตและสภาพปัจจุบันด้านการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืนของมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน การวิจัยใช้ระเบียบวิธีแบบผสมผสาน (Mixed Method) โดยบูรณาการทั้งเชิงปริมาณและเชิงคุณภาพ กรณีในการคัดเลือกกลุ่มตัวอย่าง ได้แก่ 1) มหาวิทยาลัยเอกชนที่ก่อตั้งมาแล้วไม่น้อยกว่าครึ่งศตวรรษ และ 2) มหาวิทยาลัยที่ได้รับการจัดอันดับใน Webometrics Ranking of World Universities และ UniRank University Ranking โดยเลือก 5 อันดับแรก ได้แก่ 1) มหาวิทยาลัยอัสสัมชัญ 2) มหาวิทยาลัยรังสิต 3) มหาวิทยาลัยกรุงเทพ 4) มหาวิทยาลัยศรีปทุม และ 5) มหาวิทยาลัยหอการค้าไทย

การดำเนินการแบ่งออกเป็น 2 ระยะ ได้แก่ ระยะที่ 1 ใช้เครื่องมือวิจัยเป็นแบบสัมภาษณ์เชิงลึก ดำเนินการกับผู้ให้ข้อมูลสำคัญ (Key Informants) จำนวน 5 คน ซึ่งเป็นผู้บริหารระดับสูงของมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชนเพื่อศึกษาสภาพปัจจุบันและอนาคตด้านการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืน และระยะที่ 2 ใช้กลุ่มตัวอย่างจำนวน 400 คน ครอบคลุมทั้งคณาจารย์และบุคลากร เพื่อเปรียบเทียบสภาพปัจจุบันและอนาคตด้านการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืนของมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน เครื่องมือวิจัยผ่านการตรวจสอบค่าดัชนีความตรงเชิงเนื้อหา (IOC) และค่าความเชื่อมั่นตามเกณฑ์มาตรฐาน

ผลการวิจัย พบว่า ระยะที่ 1 ได้สร้างรูปแบบการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืนของสถาบันอุดมศึกษาเอกชน โดยอ้างอิงแนวคิด ส่วนประสมทางการตลาด 7Ps ได้แก่ 1) ผลิตภัณฑ์ (Product) 2) ราคา (Price) 3) ช่องทางการจัดจำหน่าย (Place) 4) การส่งเสริมการตลาด (Promotion) 5) บุคลากร (People) 6) กระบวนการ (Process) และ 7) สิ่งแวดล้อมทางกายภาพ (Physical Evidence/Environment) ผสานกับแนวคิด ESG ได้แก่ 1) สิ่งแวดล้อม (Environment) 2) สังคม (Social) และ 3) ธรรมาภิบาล (Governance) ซึ่งอยู่ในระดับสูงถึงสูงที่สุด และระยะที่ 2 การเปรียบเทียบสภาพอนาคตและปัจจุบันด้านการจัดการอย่างยั่งยืนของมหาวิทยาลัยเอกชนใน 10 ด้าน ได้แก่ 1) ผลิตภัณฑ์ 2) ราคา 3) ช่องทางการจัด

จำหน่าย 4) การส่งเสริมการตลาด 5) บุคลากร 6) กระบวนการ 7) สิ่งแวดล้อมทางกายภาพ 8) สิ่งแวดล้อม
9) สังคม และ 10) ธรรมชาติ พบว่ามีความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .01

คำสำคัญ: สภาพอนาคต, สภาพปัจจุบัน, การจัดการอย่างยั่งยืน, มหาวิทยาลัยเอกชน, 7Ps, ESG

Introduction

Sustainable private university management in Thailand aims to address environmental, social, and economic factors as part of university-wide operations. This includes engaging with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), educating students and staff in sustainability competences, and cooperating with communities, all carried out in pursuit of a more sustainable future as noted in Doppelt (2017), CFA (2018), Jampaklay et al. (2021), and the United Nations (2025a).

Then, most private sector universities in Thailand are looking for international students, also from every corner of Thailand. Internationalization in higher education success factors are seen to include the institution's international atmosphere, reputation, and affordability of education programs together with their operational capacities for international student provision and support (Jampaklay et al., 2021). Specifically, the country needs to emphasize that initiatives related to quality achievement (QA) policies should be delivered as support for graduate achievements, university rankings, and country competitiveness, which are fundamental in promoting higher education development in Thailand (Chaiya & Ahmad, 2021).

Private universities in Thailand have founded the basis for growth and development in national education. Their contributions cut across four core missions: to produce graduates with competences, conduct research, provide academic services, and conserve arts and culture. In the recent past, the private university sector has progressed immensely over the last 50 years, consequently evolving organically to confront societal, economic, and technological changes influenced by admirably enforced government education policies (Charoensuk, 2014; Saichai, 2018; Chaisuwan et al., 2020; Jampaklaya et al., 2021; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022).

Also among the arguments: competition in higher education, instead of being individual or national, is now institutional. This has, over time, produced a many-strata complex of competition between universities as competitors and insurers. It is believed to be quality-focused, more formal, and corporately governed competition supported by increasing reliance on objective, standardized evaluative methods (Chaisuwan et al., 2020; Jampaklaya et al., 2021; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022).

In addition, private universities face growing competition not only from public institutions but also increasingly from international education providers. Technologically driven disruptions, demographic changes (such as decreasing population sizes of young school-aged children), and altered student expectations are transforming this competitive environment. The change has also been fueled by the effect of Covid-19, which greatly influences the preferences and behaviour associated with learning (Malisuwan, 2017; Phuworawan, 2019; Chaiya & Ahmad, 2021; Dharmendra et al., 2024).

Private universities also faces insufficient financial and moral support from federal authorities, coupled with the effects of ongoing economic recessions that have worsened internal and external challenges. Undergraduate enrollment rapidly decreases. This shift is occurring because of a continuing demographic decline in the traditional college-aged population. Such factors include the increasing cost of higher education, rapidly escalating student debt, the disruptive impact on teaching and learning created by AI and technology (Dharmendra et al., 2024; Chaisuwan et al., 2020; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022), and intensified competition across institutions (Zickafoose et al., 2024).

Consequently, a large number of institutions are now experiencing diminished enrollment, escalating financial pressures, and an imperative to embrace more agile and durable ways of operating. The book discusses a number of challenges facing the sector, as outlined in Table 1: Tackling Complex Societal Challenges (Yimprasert & Tubtimcharoon, 2015), which requires higher education institutions to reshape their own systems to meet rising demand.

Financial sustainability – Reductions and increases in public funding: Even with robust endowments, schools are heavily dependent on state and federal income support (The Change Leader, INC, 2025).

With this pressure, the 7Ps marketing mix strategy (Product, Price, Place, Promotion, People, Process, and Physical Evidence) is now no longer optional but a necessity with ESG driven practices. Strategic Imperative: Promoting sustainability is a strategic imperative for institutional survival, relevance, and growth (Doppelt, 2017; CFA, 2018; United Nations, 2025a).

Therefore, an approach to this landscape is the integration of the 7Ps marketing mix: People, Process, and Physical Evidence with ESG principles as recommended by CFA (2018), Sherwood & Pollard (2018), Kotler & Keller (2019), and Kotler et al. Embedding environmental responsibility, social engagement, and transparent governance into core operations. Sustainability allows institutions to evolve by adopting a sustainability-for-schools approach (Sherwood & Pollard, 2018; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022; Kaewhao, 2022).

The 7Ps is a flexible and effective model in increasing competitiveness in an education space. It provides an integrated systems approach that helps organizations respond to changing market needs while enhancing brand equity, promoting social responsibility, and supporting long-term sustainable value creation (Kotler et al., 2020; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022; Bloomberg Professional Services, 2023; Mattiello et al., 2024).

Thai Private universities must commit to a strategic vision with specific priorities in order to grow and be resilient for the long term. The projects include:

- Establishing a unique, future-driven institutional icon
- Investing in student-centred academic practices to improve quality of education
- Fostering lifelong learning and digital transformation capabilities
- Reviving the research ecosystem by building high-quality infrastructure

Furthermore, institutions are asked to enhance governance-led management, make the most effective use of resources (Phuworawan, 2019; Srisathanon, 2022), collaborate with business sectors, improve faculty selection and development as well as compensation (Prachyapruit, 2023; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022), and create dynamic, interconnected networks in the larger higher education system (Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, 2021).

The proposed research first advocates conceptualization by combining the 7Ps marketing mix principles with ESG considerations as an appropriate response to these pressing challenges (CFA, 2018; Sherwood & Pollard, 2018; Intan, 2021). The consolidated methodology drives the integration and alignment between higher education institutions and sustainability objectives, in a way that strengthens their core business of teaching and learning while addressing operational issues to improve long-term sustainability. It therefore encourages integrating sustainability throughout the university system, including course curricula, research projects, campus facilities, and community involvement (Gerhardt and Karsan, 2022; Kaewhao, 2022; Saini and Pokhriyal, 2022; Prachyapruit, 2023; United Nations, 2025a; United Nations, 2025b).

The findings of this study can potentially help private universities in Thailand learn from them and improve their resilience-making capacities, especially when global competitiveness has come to the fore and longer-term sustainability remains a challenge. This can be done by incorporating socially responsive, environmentally concerned governance and strategic marketing management that finally contribute to more sustainable higher education practices (Nattha, 2015; Kunwong, 2015; Intan, 2021; Kotler & Keller, 2019; Kotler et al., 2020; Kaewhao, 2022; Saini & Pokhriyal, 2022).

Objectives of this research

- To investigate the present and future situations of sustainable management in private universities.
- To compare the present and future situations of sustainable management in private universities.

However, the study used a mixed method which integrated both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Selection of the sample

The sample selection was based on two criteria: 1) private universities that have been established for at least half a century, and 2) those ranked by both the Webmetrics Ranking of World Universities and the UniRank University Ranking.

In the top five rankings, they were listed in order as follows:

1. Assumption University
2. Rangsit University
3. Bangkok University
4. Sripatum University
5. The University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce

The measures were phased in over two periods.

Phase 1: Research instruments were in-depth interview forms, conducted with five key informants comprised of five senior executives, to examine the near future and present headways in private higher education sustainable management.

Phase 2: A study was carried out to examine the future and current situations of sustainable management in private universities with 400 persons members. The research instruments were deemed valid and reliable based on standard values of IOC and reliability.

Methodology

Mixed method: This type of study was investigated, and it resulted in the integration between quantitative and qualitative methods (Creswell, 2014).

Research Process

The study is split into 2 phases. Phase 1: Getting opinions from 5 senior executives of 5 private universities of 1) Assumption University, 2) Rangsit University, 3) Bangkok University, 4) Sripatum University (PSU), and 5) UTCC based on 2 criteria as mentioned above. The In-depth interview were conducted with 5 top executives in the present and

future situations of sustainable management in private universities. Phase 2: Sample are 400 persons that were collected with questionnaire.

Population and Sample

Population private universities were based on two criteria: 1) private universities that have been established for at least half a century, and 2) those ranked by both the Webmetrics Ranking of World Universities and the UniRank University Ranking. Therefore, the top 5 university list for ranking score is as follows: No. 1 Assumption University 2) Rangsit University 3) Bangkok University 4) Sripatum University 5) The Thai Chamber of Commerce / UTCC. Simple random sampling was employed to implement to collect sample group of 400 persons.

Population

Phase 1: population are senior executive directors of top 5 Private universities including as follows: 1) Assumption University, 2) Rangsit University, 3) Bangkok University, 4) Sripatum University, and 5) University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce0

Phase 2: The population is 3,694 persons of these 5 universities (Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, 2021).

Sample

Phase 1: The sample were senior executive directors of top 5 Private universities 1) Assumption University, 2) Rangsit University, 3) Bangkok University, 4) Sripatum University, and 5) University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. The purposive sampling was used for data collection.

Phase 2: The sample was determined by opening the Krejcie and Morgan tables (Krejcie, & Morgan, 1970). The sample size was 349 persons, but in this research, a sample size of 400 persons would be collected by simple random technique for their working personnel of top 5 private universities.

Research Instruments

Phase 1: In-depth Interview using semi-structured questionnaire having 10 questions which covered 7Ps Marketing Mix (Product, Price, Place, Promotion, People, Process, and Physical Evidence) with the input of Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) concept for sustainable management operating a private university. The Tool quality was determined and reviewed by 5 experts in item-writing based on the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC). The results of the IOC is 1.00 and it also meets a standard criterion above 0.5.

Phase 2: Questionnaire comprised 33 items:

Each component of 7Ps contains 3 items, and each component of ESG contains 4 items. Each questionnaire was validated the value of the assessment with 5 levels by Likert method (Likert, 1932) as follows: the least = point 1, low = point 2, medium = point 3. A point is returned for the high score and 2 points for the highest. A questionnaire was developed which had both IOC and reliability. 5 Experts were carried out for calculation of tool quality assessment using IOC (Lawshe, 1975; Thiengkamol, 2016). More than 0.5 so this meets the standard criterion. The outcome of IOC is 1.00 Test-retest reliability was established by conducting a pilot trial with 50 persons of top 5 Private universities and it is not the sample group which have similar demographic characteristics of sample population. Reliability was analyzed using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1984). The questionnaire ranged from 0.787 to 0.983 (acceptable values > 0.700). It means it falls within acceptable levels (Nunnally, 1978). The standard values for IOC and reliability are determined using research tools.

Data Analysis

Phase 1: Content analysis conducted on semi-structured interview data.

Phase 2: Descriptive statistics included mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage and inferential statistics was one sample group t-test.

Results

Phase 1: Interviewing with 5 senior executive directors of top 5 PUIs The Content Analysis of Overall Opinions as present in Table 1.

Table 1. Content Analysis of Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors

Variables	Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors	
	Present situation	Future situation
1) Product	1. Normal products 2. Ordinary products 3. Produce general graduates 4. Obsolete product	1. Distinctive feature Product 2. Excellent product for government and business sectors 3. Qualified graduate 4. Modern product
2) Price	1. Expensive price 2. Stand alone. 3. No clear communication on price	1. Reasonable price 2. Good connection with external partners 3. Clear communication on price

Variables	Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors	
	Present situation	Future situation
	4. Only registration revenue sources	4. Registration revenue sources and additional service fees
3) Place	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No strategy and plan on distribution place 2. No effective distribution channels. 3. Without public awareness of innovative and attractive course offerings 4. Utilize simple and diverse distribution platforms. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare supported strategy and plan on distribution place 2. Provide effective distribution channels 3. Raise public awareness of innovative and attractive course offerings 4. Utilize multiple and diverse distribution platforms
4) Promotion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide normal communication methods and platforms. 2. No attractive promotion for students and parents. 3. Simple media content 4. No global partnership networks. 5. No skilled marketing team 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide diverse communication methods and platforms. 2. Offer attractive promotions for students and parents. 3. Develop diverse media content 4. Establish global partnership networks. 5. Build a skilled marketing team on media and digital technologies.
5) People	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No structured strategies and initiatives for personnel development 2. Simple method to select staff 3. Employ normal staff 4. Pay no attention to retain talented personnel 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement structured strategies and initiatives for personnel development 2. Recruit individuals with strong reputations and proven qualifications. 3. Employ high-quality staff with strong service mindset. 4. Retain talented personnel

Table 1. Content Analysis of Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors (cont.)

Variables	Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors	
	Present situation	Futur situation
6) Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No improvement in service levels to increase customer satisfaction 2. Maintain the reputation of the organization. 3. Using ordinary IT systems. 4. Normal operations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve service levels to increase customer satisfaction 2. Enhance the good reputation of the organization. 3. Provide accurate services using modern, effective, and user-friendly IT systems. 4. Efficient and transparent operations
7) Physical Evidence, Environment and Presentation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Management of building plans and environmental designs 2. Not concerned on beautiful, rejuvenating, and secure environment. 3. No monitoring on sustainable environmental management. 4. Simple environments without fun spaces for good experience. 5. No suitable and convenient environment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management of building plans and environmental designs 2. Concern on beautiful, rejuvenating, and secure environment. 3. Monitoring on sustainable environmental management 4. Welcoming environments, fun spaces for good experience. 5. A suitable and convenient environment.
8) Environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ignore maintaining natural resources and protecting the environment. 2. Regardless energy-efficiency 3. No pollution-prevention practices. 4. No Paperless initiation for efficient waste management 5. No building the foundation of wiring for future EV chargers and solar 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintains natural resources and protects the environment. 2. Adoption of energy-efficiency 3. Pollution-prevention practices. 4. Paperless initiation for efficient waste management 5. Building the foundation of wiring for future EV chargers and solar.

Variables	Overall Opinions of 5 senior executive directors	
	Present situation	Futur situation
9) Social	1. No social responsibility programs co-equal to all professional groups 2. No Developing community relations 3. No gaining public trust through a local engagement plan. 4. Keep the brand stability and a reputation 5. No support for development across all organizational units 6. Maintaining respect for human rights	1. Develop social responsibility programs co-equal to all professional groups 2. Developing strong community relations 3. Gaining public trust through a local engagement plan 4. Leveraging the brand and a reputation 5. Support for development across all organizational units 6. Maintaining respect for human rights
10) Governanc e	1. All dimensions are not best managed through transparency, accountability, credibility, and measurable outcomes. 2. No guarantee of an equal playing field 3. Stakeholder is not a priority 4. Principles of good governance is ignorant.	1. All dimensions are best managed through transparency, accountability, credibility, and measurable outcomes. 2. To guarantee an equal playing field 3. Stakeholder trust is a priority. 4. Embed principles of good governance into the institute.

Phase 2: The results comparison of present and future situations of sustainable management for private university as present in Table 2.

The questionnaire was used for data collection with 400 persons of these Private universities includes 1) Assumption University, 2) Rangsit University, 3) Bangkok University, 4) Sripatum University, and 5) University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. There 10 aspects of sustainable management was conducted to determine their opinions on present and future situations. The findings were as presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of comparison of present and future situations of sustainable management for private university

Questions	Present		Future		t-test	P-value
	Situations		Situation			
	\bar{x}	SD.	\bar{x}	SD.		
Product	3.78	0.89	4.19	0.91	6.4421	0.01**
Price	3.82	0.88	4.22	0.90	6.3556	0.01**
Place	3.85	0.87	4.23	0.92	6.0021	0.01**
Promotion	3.81	0.91	4.20	0.89	6.1279	0.01**
People	3.80	0.90	4.24	0.91	6.8756	0.01**
Process	3.79	0.89	4.21	0.92	6.6523	0.01**
Physical	3.87	0.88	4.27	0.87	6.4649	0.01**
Evidence/Environment and Presentation						
Environment dimension	3.92	0.94	4.44	0.92	7.9070	0.01**
Social dimension	3.87	0.93	4.32	0.92	6.8799	0.01**
Governance dimension	3.76	0.87	4.25	0.89	7.8741	0.01**

From Table 1, it was found that the environmental dimension of the future situation had the highest mean ($\bar{x} = 4.44$, S.D. = 0.92), followed by the social dimension and Physical Evidence/Environment and Presentation with the same mean ($\bar{x} = 4.32$, S.D. = 0.92), Physical Evidence/Environment and Presentation ($\bar{x} = 4.27$, S.D. = 0.87), the governance dimension ($\bar{x} = 4.25$, S.D. = 0.89), people ($\bar{x} = 4.24$, S.D. = 0.91), place ($\bar{x} = 4.23$, S.D. = 0.92), price ($\bar{x} = 4.22$, S.D. = 0.90), process ($\bar{x} = 4.21$, S.D. = 0.92), promotion ($\bar{x} = 4.20$, S.D. = 0.89), and product ($\bar{x} = 4.19$, S.D. = 0.91), respectively.

The environmental dimension of the present situation had the highest mean ($\bar{x} = 3.92$, S.D. = 0.94), followed by the social dimension and Physical Evidence/Environment and Presentation with the same mean ($\bar{x} = 3.87$, S.D. = 0.93), place ($\bar{x} = 3.85$, S.D. = 0.87), price ($\bar{x} = 3.82$, S.D. = 0.88), promotion ($\bar{x} = 3.81$, S.D. = 0.91), people ($\bar{x} = 3.80$, S.D. = 0.90), process ($\bar{x} = 3.79$, S.D. = 0.89), product ($\bar{x} = 3.78$, S.D. = 0.89), and the governance dimension ($\bar{x} = 3.76$, S.D. = 0.87), respectively.

2.1 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that environmental dimension of future situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 4.44$, S.D.=0.92) higher than environmental dimension of present situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 3.92$, S.D.=0.94) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.2 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that social dimension of future situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 4.32$, S.D.=0.92) higher than social dimension of present situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 3.87$, S.D.=0.93) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.3 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Physical Evidence/Environment and Presentation of future situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 4.27$, S.D.=0.87) higher than Physical Evidence/Environment and Presentation of present situation had the mean ($\bar{x} = 3.87$, S.D.=0.88) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.4 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Governance dimension ($\bar{x} = 4.25$, S.D.=0.89), higher than Governance dimension ($\bar{x} = 3.76$, S.D.=0.87) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.5 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that People ($\bar{x} = 4.24$, S.D.=0.91), higher than People ($\bar{x} = 3.80$, S.D.=0.90) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.6 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Place ($\bar{x} = 4.23$, S.D.=0.92), higher than Place ($\bar{x} = 3.85$, S.D.=0.87) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.7 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Price ($\bar{x} = 4.22$, S.D.=0.90), higher than Price ($\bar{x} = 3.82$, S.D.=0.88) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.8 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Process ($\bar{x} = 4.21$, S.D.=0.92) higher than Process ($\bar{x} = 3.79$, S.D.=0.89) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.9 The comparison between present situation and future situation, the result shows that Promotion ($\bar{x} = 4.20$, S.D.=0.89) higher than Promotion ($\bar{x} = 3.81$, S.D.=0.91) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

2.10 The comparison present situation and future situation, the result shows that Product ($\bar{x} = 4.19$ S.D.=0.91) higher than Promotion ($\bar{x} = 3.81$, S.D.=0.91) with statistically significant at level of 0.01 as shown in Table 1.

Discussion

Phase 1: Five senior executives interview. In-depth interviews using a semi-structured format were conducted to examine the present situation of sustainable management in private universities, using purposive sampling.

1) Product: Interviewees agreed that products must have distinctive features and products meet to the requirements of both government and business sectors, produce graduates who gain recognition from the community, and product is up-to-date and inclusive of various fields. These insights reflect the diverse backgrounds of the informants, supporting the relevance of the 7Ps. Moreover, students and parents expect for modern curriculum development to leverage foster student individual growth and capabilities. This matches Orji's (2013) study on consumer behavior models, which emphasizes that marketing success depends on meeting consumer expectations and the research of Saini, & Pokhriyal, (2022) revealed that the program has an impact on the students' decision to higher education.

2) Price: Interviewees agreed that prices among Private universities are commonly alike, except those directed at international standards. Private universities should transparently interconnect reasonable price. The tuition and fees are common income for Private universities. Private universities must prepare high technology to support student learning outcome. These findings align with the research of Saini, & Pokhriyal (2022) revealed that the cost has an impact on the students' decision to higher education, and Nattha Thubtimjaroon's (2015) study on market mix responsiveness and Sopin Piyachat & Jirapol Jinachan's (2018) study on marketing strategies affecting university marketing performance.

3) Place: (Distribution Channels): Interviewees agreed that prices among Private universities must introduce new circulation and dominant marketing strategies to encourage customers with new programs through different channels to nourishment for internal and external connection. These align with studies by Nattha Thubtimjaroon (2015), Sopin Piyachat & Jirapol Jinachan (2018), and research of Bu-lud (2017), indicated that pricing and channel mix strongly influence user decisions.

4) Promotion: Interviewees agreed that Private universities must communicate to consumers, it needs to use numerous procedures and operations. Innovative promotions should request the demands of clients. Diverse social means and worldwide needs to be pay attention. The results of promotion aspect goes along with the research of Saini, & Pokhriyal (2022) revealed that the promotional strategy has an impact on the students' decision to higher education, and is to the study of Piyachat & Jinachan's (2018) research that identified service process as a key factor in student satisfaction.

5) People: Interviewees agreed that Private universities must have progressive policy and plans to support staff at all levels to drive themselves development and acknowledge staff through service-oriented mindset. Moreover, Private universities need to method to

maintain the qualified staff through equality, and human rights concepts. The findings supported by the work of Gerhardt & Karsan (2022), revealed that the academic staff needs to be motivated to increase their expectation of career path to achieve more research and publication. They found that career pathways and institutional support for academic staff are essential to ensure retention and advancement. The result is pertinent to the research of Saini, & Pokhriyal (2022) revealed that the staff has an critical impact on the students' decision to higher education enrollment.

6) Process: Interviewees agreed that Private universities must improve service and increase customers satisfaction through university image. Private universities provide accurate processes, and hi-technology. This involves streamlining workflows, implementing digital solutions, and prioritizing customer satisfaction through efficient and reliable service delivery. This result is supported by the research of Hwang,et al. (2019) revealed that tangibles, reliability, empathy, and assurance) of service quality process.

7) Physical and Presentation: Interviewees agreed that All buildings must emphasize clean, safety, and visual attraction. Environmental sustainability should be assessed by using monitoring systems by focusing on environmental outcomes. Establishing pleasant and well-designed environments enhances customer perception and satisfaction. This aligns with the research of Saini and Pokhriyal (2022), which found that location significantly influences students' decisions to pursue higher education. Similarly, Kunwong's (2013) study highlights the critical role of physical appearance in shaping customer decision-making.

8) Environment dimension: Interviewees agreed that Private universities should pay attention to environmental management with proactive emphasizing on the conservation of natural resources, energy efficiency, and pollution control. Initiatives such as paperless operations, installation of EV charging stations, and adoption of solar energy reflect a forward-looking approach. Institutions should also foster environmental awareness and take part in ecosystem restoration efforts. This aligns with Sherwood & Pollard (2018) and the research of Palazzi, et al., 2025 that integrated ESG in the business model operation.

9) Social dimension: Interviewees agreed that Private universities should implement comprehensive social initiatives that benefit professionals across all sectors, foster community cohesion and acceptance, strengthen their reputation to attract skilled personnel, and uphold human rights and fair labor practices. These actions are consistent with ESG principles and supported by Sherwood and Pollard (2018), whose research on ESG investment in emerging markets affirms its critical role in driving sustainable development and the research of Palazzi, et al., 2025 that integrated ESG in the business model operation.

10) Governance Dimension: Interviewees agreed that Private universities should uphold transparency, accountability, reliability, and fairness. Policies must promote equality, address disparities, and embed good governance principles within student development. Integrity and adherence to legal and regulatory frameworks should serve as foundational values. These practices align with ESG management frameworks and are supported by Sherwood and Pollard (2018), who emphasized the integration of ESG principles into investment strategies and the research of Palazzi, et al., 2025 that integrated ESG in the business model operation.

Phase 2: The results of 10 aspects of 7Ps Marketing Mix and ESG of future situations are expected with better sustainable management of private university with the mean scores higher than present situations at statistically significant of 0.01 level. This implied that these top 5 universities need to enhance and accelerate in 10 aspects intensively and frequently.

Across all dimensions, the mean scores for the future situation were consistently higher than those for the present situation. This indicates that personnel foresee substantial improvements in institutional practices, resource utilization, and organizational governance. The relatively narrow standard deviation in both present and future evaluations reflects a cohesive and shared consensus among personnel regarding the current challenges and the anticipated direction of institutional growth.

The highest future mean, which is the environmental dimension ($\bar{x} = 4.44$), suggests that personnel expect significant shifts toward environmentally responsible operations. This aligns with global and national trends in higher education, where sustainability, energy efficiency, and eco-friendly infrastructure have become major indicators of institutional quality and relevance.

The lowest future mean, which is the product dimension ($\bar{x} = 4.19$), although still high, indicates strong expectations for curriculum modernization, program differentiation, and enhanced educational value. At the same time, it highlights the substantial amount of work needed to transition from traditional academic offerings toward more market-responsive and innovation-driven learning experiences.

New knowledge and the effects on society and communities

The research demonstrates broad societal and community impacts, offering valuable insights into the future of sustainable development in private universities. The findings can serve as a practical guide for private universities seeking the implementation guidelines for sustainable management practices. By integrating the 7Ps marketing mix and ESG principles, the research results align with the four core missions of national higher

education. This framework fosters long-term institutional resilience, delivers high-quality education, and upholds environmental and social responsibility. It empowers universities to more effectively serve students, communities, and the public through transparent governance

References:

- Bloomberg Professional Services. (2023). *ESG data*.
<https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/product/esg-data/>
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bu-lud, M. (2017). *Service marketing mix and foreign tourists' decision making: The case study of Phuket accommodations in Thailand* (Doctoral dissertation, Prince of Songkla University). Prince of Songkla University.
- CFA Institute. (2018). *ESG case studies and ESG integration framework*.
<https://www.cfainstitute.org/en/research/survey-reports/guidance-case-studies-esg-integration-survey-report>
- Chaiya, C., & Ahmad, M. M. (2021). Success or failure of the Thai higher education development: Critical factors in the policy process of quality assurance. *Sustainability*, 13(17), 9486. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179486>
- Chaisuwan, S., Wattanasak, K., & Buranawongsawat, C. (2020). Survival and safety in the slowdown of Thai private universities. *Academic Journal Suvarnabhumi Institute of Technology*, 6(1), 611–622.
- Charoensuk, C. H. (2014). *Marketing theory*. <https://maymayny.wordpress.com/2014/12/07/>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Cronbach, J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334.
- Dharmendra Hariyani, P., Hariyani, P., Mishra, S., & Sharma, M. K. (2024). Causes of organizational failure: A literature review. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 10, Article 101153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101153>
- Doppelt, B. (2017). *Leading change toward sustainability: A change-management guide for business, government and civil society*. Routledge.
- Gerhardt, T., & Karsan, S. (2022). Talent management in private universities: The case of a private university in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(4), 552–575.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (10th ed.). Prentice Hall.

- Hwang, Y. S., & Choi, Y. K. (2019). Higher education service quality and student satisfaction, institutional image, and behavioral intention. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 47(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.7622>
- Intan, N. (2021). 7Ps marketing strategies that affect changes in local knowledge characteristics: Case study of silk, Ban Saen Suk, Yawuk Sub-district, Chumphon Buri District Surin Province. *Journal of Modern Learning Development*, 6(5), 155–165.
- Jampaklaya, A., Penboona, B., & Lucktong, A. (2021). Internationalization of higher education in Thailand: Promises and reality. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(2022), 183–193.
- Kaewhao, S. (2022). *Sustainable environmental management*. CU Press. (In Thai)
- Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., Harris, L., & He, H. (2020). *Principles of marketing* (8th European ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2019). *Marketing management* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
- Kunwong, S. (2015). Marketing mix factors affecting Thai tourists who decide to use amusement parks in Thailand. *Chandrakasemsan Journal*, 19(37), 57–66. (In Thai)
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 5–55.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563–575.
- Malisuwan, S. (2017). *The year of disruption*. http://tct.or.th/images/article/special_article/25610110/198410_Disruption.pdf (In Thai)
- Mattiello, H., Alijani, O., Moghadam, M., & Ameri, B. (2024). Navigating the future by fuzzy AHP method: Enhancing global tech sustainable governance, digital resilience, and cybersecurity. *AIMS Geosciences*, 10, 371–398. <https://doi.org/10.3934/geosci.2024020>
- Musselin, C. (2018). New forms of competition in higher education. *Socio-Economic Review*, 16(3), 657–683. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwy033>
- Nattha Thubtimjaroon. (2015). Market mix responsiveness in higher education. *Marketing Science Review*.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation. (2021). *Total number of personnel, academic year 2020, classified by*

- type of institution, name of institution, and highest qualification.*
https://data.go.th/dataset/univ_stf_12_02 (In Thai)
- Palazzi, F., Sentuti, A., Cesaroni, F., & Baldo, M. (2025). Integrating ESG into the business model through a network approach: Insights from a case study. In *Proceedings* (pp. 1–15). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-76618-3_34
- Phuworawan, Y. (2019). Technology that creates change.
<https://www.thailibrary.in.th/2019/03/01/disruptive-tech-2/> (In Thai)
- Piyachat, S., & Jinachan, J. (2018). Marketing strategies and university performance. *Asian Journal of Marketing*.
- Prachyapruit, A. (2023). Development of a Thai university model oriented to working adults and the retired elderly. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies*, 23(2), 364–374. <https://doi.org/10.14456/hass.2023.33>
- Saichai, K. (2018). The state educational administration of higher level institutions and the characteristics of organizations promoting innovation. *Research and Development Journal Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University*, 10(1), 1–12. (In Thai)
- Saini, P., Swati, & Pokhriyal, A. K. (2022). Students' perception about 7Ps of higher education marketing mix in private universities in Uttarakhand. *Business Studies Journal*, 14(5), 1–13.
- Sherwood, M. W., & Pollard, J. L. (2018). The risk adjusted return potential of integrating ESG strategies into emerging market equities. *Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investment*, 8(1), 26–44.
- Srisathanon, P. (2022). Management factors affecting the survival of private higher education institutions in Thailand. *Ratchaphak Journal*, 16(46), 98–113. (In Thai)
- The Change Leader, Inc. (2025). *The greatest challenges facing higher education: A comprehensive analysis for 2025 with exemplars in navigating solutions.*
<https://changinghighered.com/higher-ed-challenges-2025-solution-examples/>
- Thiengkamol, N. K. (2016). *Theory development from LISREL research*. CU Printing House. (In Thai)
- United Nations. (2025a). *The 17 goals*. <https://thailand.un.org/th/sdgs>
- United Nations. (2025b). *Our work on Sustainable Development Goals in Thailand.*
<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- Yu, Z. (2023). Research on marketing strategy optimization. *Journal of Buddhist Education and Research*, 9(1), 346–352. <https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jber/article/view/263427>

- Yimprasert, U., & Tubtimcharoon, N. (2015). Developing marketing strategies of educational institutions connected to business using the quality footprint method. *WMS Journal of Management Walailak University*, 4(2), 31–40. (In Thai)
- Zickafoose, A., Ilesanmi, O., Diaz-Manrique, M., Adeyemi, A., Walumbe, B., Strong, R., Wingenbach, G., Rodriguez, M., & Dooley, K. (2024). Barriers and challenges affecting quality education in Sub-Saharan Africa by 2030. *Sustainability*, 16, Article 2657. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072657>