

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARKETING
ORIENTATIONS AND ENROLLMENTS AT SELECTED
COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

By

DOUGLAS OWEN DOLLAR

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1983

Copyright

By

Douglas Owen Dollar

July, 1983



A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARKETING
ORIENTATIONS AND ENROLLMENTS AT SELECTED
COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

John J. Gardiner
Thesis Adviser

James E. Minor

William R. Heug

Walter J. Ward

Norman J. Durbin
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to those who assisted me in pursuing my graduate studies. In particular, I would like to thank the members of my committee: Professor Thomas Karman, who has provided guidance and encouragement throughout my long tenure in the program; Professor John Gardiner, who has introduced me to exciting areas of academic and career pursuit as well as ably bearing the burden of supervising my research as thesis adviser; Professor William Steng, Jr., who has provided valuable advice and professional perspective to this study; and Professor Walter Ward, who initially urged me to enter this program and then continued to offer encouragement and motivation for completing the program.

Let me also express my sincere gratitude to the individuals who took the time out of their demanding schedules to examine and comment upon the typology and survey instrument developed in this study: Robert Cope, Lee Noel, Karen Fox, Dennis Johnson, Philip Kotler and Randi Levitz.

In addition, I would like to thank those persons who helped with the testing of the survey instrument and by providing useful suggestions for its development: Charles Evans, Ralph Hamilton, Bob Hendersen, Tom Keys, Frank McFarland, Mary Miller, Pat Murphy, Dave Perrin, Craig Robison, Walter Starks, Earl VanEaton, Dan Wesley, Eric Williams, and Larry Zirkle.

Special thanks also are extended to the following persons: Sharon Griffith and Rosemary Wohlers of the American Association of Community, Junior and Technical Colleges for providing valuable information and suggestions; Professor William Warde for his advice and time concerning

statistical treatments; Iris McPherson for her expert help at the computer center; Pat Goff and Joyce Gazaway of the Graduate College for their advice and patience; and Charlene Fries and Jama Lietzke for a masterful job of typing the manuscript.

Finally, I wish to thank Gayla, not only for the long hours she spent helping to transfer endless sets of numbers and stuff countless envelopes, but for her understanding and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Background and Purpose of Study	2
Statement of Problem	5
Definition of Terms	5
Assumptions and Limitations	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Marketing of Nonprofit Organizations	14
Marketing in Higher Education	15
Recruitment in Higher Education	19
Retention in Higher Education	28
Marketing in Community Colleges	37
The Marketing Process	39
Summary	44
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	52
A classification Scheme	52
Population and Sample	54
Data Collection	55
Instrumentation	56
Data Analysis	58
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	62
Introduction	62
Analysis of Data	62
Description of Marketing Orientation Types	75
Summary	80
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
Introduction	83
Findings	84
Conclusions	90
Recommendations	94
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	98

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX A - A FIVE-STAGE MARKETING TYPOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES	103
APPENDIX B - SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	115
APPENDIX C - FREQUENCY OF POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS OF FOUR MARKETING ORIENTATION DIMENSIONS	123
APPENDIX D - TABLES OF ANALYSIS	127
APPENDIX E - DESCRIPTIVE COMPARISON OF MARKETING ORIENTATION CAMPUS TYPES BY CLASSIFICATION	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions of Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification 3	68
II. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 5	69
III. Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Long-Range Enrollment Stability Mean Scores for Classification 5	70
IV. Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Long-Range Enrollment Stability Mean Scores for Classification 4	71
V. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions of Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification 1	128
VI. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification 2	129
VII. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification 4	130
VIII. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions of Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification	131
IX. Comparison of Chief Executives' Perceptions of Campus Enrollment Goal Attainment Success for Classification 6	132
X. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 1	133
XI. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 2	134
XII. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 3	135

Table	Page
XIII. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 4	136
XIV. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Classification 6	137
XV. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Marketing Philosophy Stages	138
XVI. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Marketing Information System Stages	139
XVII. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Marketing Organization System Stages	140
XVIII. Analysis of Variance on Mean Scores of Three Enrollment Measures for Marketing Planning and Control System Stages	141
XIX. Analysis of Covariance on Long-range Enrollment Stability Scores for Classification 3	142
XX. Analysis of Covariance on Long-range Enrollment Stability Scores for Classification 4	143
XXI. Descriptive Comparison of Marketing Orientation Campus Types By Classification	145

FIGURE

Figure	Page
1. Student Life-Cycle	18

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

The relationship of individual colleges and universities to the larger society in the United States traditionally has been defined as successful when enrollments are up. Employees of institutions of higher education feel successful when enrollments are increasing; public support for institutions is dependent upon the size of enrollments.

The emphasis by legislative bodies upon colleges' ability to attract and retain students or customers for their educational services clearly has placed institutions of higher education into competitive positions in the market place of postsecondary education. Perhaps that position was not as apparent during the years of booming enrollments, when for various reasons, demand exceeded supply in higher education; but, recent circumstances have made the marketing relationship apparent. Veysey illustrated the change:

. . . there is no doubt that the period from World War II until 1970 was the great golden age of enrollment growth . . . So new are so many of the conditions powerfully affecting us now that much of our own history simply does become irrelevant, only of occasional interest to scholars. All of us in higher education are truly living in a brand-new, much bleaker era, and with no OPEC to blame, only the millions of no-doubt wise decisions by middle-class parents to limit their families.¹

The crisis in enrollments was not confined to traditional higher education institutions. In 1979 when, for the first time, community,

junior and technical colleges experienced an enrollment decline nationally, Edmund Gleazer, president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, noted:

What the figures suggest is something that planners have been predicting for a number of years. That community, junior and technical colleges--as well as other institutions of post-secondary education--will need to redefine their markets for the next decade. They will need to mount greater efforts to make their services and strengths known to older people and to a vast segment of the population that remains untouched by education.²

Gleazer's comments candidly presented the challenge to community, junior and technical colleges as well as the answer to the challenge as seen by many writers within higher education. Enrollments were a key concern of colleges in the United States. Marketing, with all its implications for administrative and organizational change within higher education, was increasingly becoming a visible concern.

Background and Purpose of Study

Since the early 1970s, when the first rumblings of declining enrollments began to indicate troubled times for higher education, the term "marketing" appeared with increasing frequency in the vocabulary of college and university administrators as a means to positively affect enrollments. Met with initial skepticism and even hostility, the marketing concept nonetheless gained wider acceptance in higher education, especially as the pressures of declining enrollments, and consequently fewer state and federal funds, increased.

From the time Krachenberg first published the term marketing in the context of an article dealing with higher education,³ the literature on the subject grew steadily. While earlier articles dealt with innovative practices in admissions or fund raising, for example, Krachenberg's

article signaled an opening attempt to understand marketing as a management tool in colleges.

Subsequent writers addressed the application of marketing principles to the more specific problems of student recruitment and retention. Kotler broadened the horizons of marketing in higher education to include alumni loyalty and development.⁴

Lovelock and Rothschild echoed Kotler's vision when alluding to a truer spirit of modern-day marketing which included career development and eventually fund raising, voluntarism and alumni work as natural extensions of recruitment and retention in a "total marketing program" spanning the entire "life cycle" experienced by the consumers of higher education.⁵

The bulk of research concerning marketing in higher education was confined to examining specific recruiting and retention activities. Only a few researchers attempted to integrate into a single study the entire range of activities which institutions followed and the relative success of those activities. Examples of this latter type of research include the work of Beal and Noel who conducted a landmark study into the extent of specific retention activities employed by colleges.⁶ Murphy and McGarrity conducted one of the handful of research studies of recruitment activities employed by colleges.⁷ Even fewer studies attempted to assess the overall marketing orientations of colleges in terms of broad theoretical marketing principles. Hoppe, in a doctoral dissertation, for example, examined the relationship of the levels and the types of marketing activities to enrollment fluctuations in community, junior and technical colleges.⁸ Hoppe, however, could establish no significant relationship between enrollment change and the few selected marketing activity

variables used in her study.

In fact, the few studies (outlined in Chapter II) which attempted to compare marketing orientation of colleges to enrollments essentially dealt with collections of specific marketing activities, but did not fully examine other aspects of the marketing process such as planning, control, information gathering, and organization. In addition, no method had been devised to classify colleges according to their marketing orientation, which could be an invaluable aid to research.

In summary, many practitioners and some researchers suggested specific marketing activities and general marketing guidelines for non-profit organizations, including higher education institutions. Several researchers examined the scope of recruiting and retention activities that institutions employed to affect enrollments. Yet, while a broad theoretical framework for higher education marketing was implied in the literature--along with an extensive list of practical suggestions for specific marketing activities--little research was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of various marketing orientations in terms of student enrollments. If the advice given in the marketing literature was to be followed, college administrators must have wondered, "Will improvements in enrollments necessarily follow?"

The question suggested research efforts in several directions. One obvious and pressing research question was to assess the relationship of marketing of orientations to student enrollments. That was the proposed purpose of this study--to examine the scope and nature of marketing orientations currently used in community, junior and technical colleges and to relate those orientations to enrollment trends within those same institutions.

Statement of the Problem

With student enrollments in higher education becoming increasingly uncertain, the following questions arose to guide the research study:

1. What marketing orientations characterize community, junior and technical colleges?
2. What relationships, if any, exist between marketing orientations and enrollment changes in selected community, junior and technical colleges?
3. What effects do completion, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution, and enrollment goal have upon the relationships between marketing orientations and enrollment changes?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

Kotler defined marketing as follows:

Marketing is the analysis, planning, implementation and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets for the purpose of achieving organizational objectives. It relies heavily on designing the organization's offering in terms of the target markets' needs and desires, and on using effective pricing, communication, and distribution to inform, motivate and service the markets.⁹

The marketing concept was defined by Kotler as:

A management orientation that holds that the key to achieving organizational goals consists of the organization's determining the needs and wants of target markets and adapting itself to delivering the desired satisfactions more effectively and efficiently than its competitors.¹⁰

Marketing process was defined by Kotler as:

The managerial process of identifying, analyzing, choosing, and exploiting marketing opportunities to fulfill the company's

mission and objectives. More specifically, it consists of identifying and analyzing marketing opportunities, segmenting and selecting target markets, developing a competitive marketing mix strategy, and designing supporting marketing management systems for planning and control, information, and marketing personnel.¹¹

Marketing orientation was defined as the degree to which an institution has implemented the marketing process.

For the purpose of this study, the marketing process within specific community, junior and technical colleges was measured through use of a two-part survey instrument included in Appendix B.

Marketing activities were defined as the tools that an institution uses to achieve its marketing objectives and may be classified into product, pricing, promotion, and distribution types.

The target market was defined by Kotler as:

A well-defined set of customers whose needs the company plans to satisfy.¹²

The marketing mix was defined by Kotler as:

The particular blend of controllable marketing variables that the firm uses to achieve its objective in the target market.¹³

Marketing strategy was defined by Kotler as:

The fundamental marketing logic by which the business unit intends to achieve its marketing objectives. Marketing strategy consists of a coordinated set of decisions on (1) target markets, (2) marketing mix, and (3) marketing expenditure level.¹⁴

Enrollment, for the purpose of this study, was defined as the headcount of full- and part-time students enrolled in courses for credit. Continuing education enrollments were not considered. Changes in enrollment were determined by a comparison for each institution studied of enrollments reported in the 1976 through 1983 editions of the Directory of Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges.

Competition was defined as the perceived degree of competition experienced by an institution as indicated by a designated official of that institution on a five-item scale ranging from very low to very high contained in the survey instrument in Appendix B.

Age of program was defined as the number of years a given marketing activity or marketing system had been utilized by an institution as indicated by a designated official of that institution on the survey instrument in Appendix B.

Control or affiliation was defined as the affiliation of a particular institution and was either public, private church, independent non-profit, or independent profit as designated in the Directory of Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges.

Institution type was defined as the academic and functional nature of a particular institution and was either community/junior, vocational/technical, two-year branch of a four-year institution, or one campus of a multi-campus as defined by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Location was defined as the region of the United States in which a given institution was located according to accrediting agency and was either middle states, north central, New England, northwest, southern or western.

Community size was defined as the nature of the population density of the community in which a particular institution was located and was either urban (communities over 100,000 population), suburban (communities from 50,000 to 100,000 population), or rural (communities under 50,000 population) as designated by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Age of institution was defined as the number of years that had transpired since the year classes began at a given institution as reported in the Directory of Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges.

Enrollment goal was defined as the full- and part-time, for-credit headcount enrollment goal for an institution as indicated by the campus chief executive on the survey instrument in Appendix B. Enrollment goal categories used in the survey included the following: increase, maintain at present level, decrease, alter (to achieve a specified 'mix' of certain types of students), increase/alter, maintain/alter, and decrease/alter.

Assumptions and Limitations

It was assumed in this study that while community, junior and technical colleges in the United States may seek to increase, maintain, or even decrease enrollments, these institutions seek stable enrollments. The term stable enrollments, in this instance, refers to enrollments that do not fluctuate greatly from year to year.

One limitation of this study was its concern with only one segment of American higher education--community, junior and technical colleges.

A second limitation of this study was its primary concern with two aspects of the total marketing concept in higher education--recruitment and retention.

ENDNOTES

¹Lawrence Veysey, "Undergraduate Admissions: Past and Future," Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives (New York, 1980), p. 11.

²Edmund Gleazer, Jr., Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (Washington, D.C., 1979), p. 1.

³A. R. Kranchenberg, "Bringing the Concept of Marketing to Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43 (1972), p. 380.

⁴Philip Kotler, "Applying Marketing Theory to College Admissions," A Role for Marketing in College Admissions (New York, 1976), p. 54.

⁵Christopher H. Lovelock and Michael L. Rothschild, "Uses, Abuses, and Misuses of Marketing in Higher Education," Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives (New York, 1980), p. 35.

⁶Philip E. Beal and Lee Noel, What Works in Student Retention (Boulder, Colo., 1980), p. v.

⁷Patrick E. Murphy and Richard McGarrity, "Marketing Universities: A Survey of Student Recruitment Activities," College and University, Vol. 53 (1978), pp. 249-261.

⁸Sherry L. Hoppe, "An Analysis of the Relationship of Marketing to Enrollment in Selected Community, Junior and Technical Colleges" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1981), pp. 100-137.

⁹Philip Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975), p. 5.

¹⁰Philip Kotler, Principles of Marketing (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980), p. 22.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 85.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹³ Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 107.

CHAPTER 11

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature involved a summary of the literature regarding marketing of nonprofit organizations, marketing in higher education, recruitment in higher education, retention in higher education, marketing in community colleges, and the marketing process.

Initially, it was apparent that marketing practices were not really all that new to higher education. Cutlip, for example, pointed to public relations as perhaps the oldest form of marketing in higher education, appearing as early as 1869 when educators saw the need to inform the public of the needs, benefits, and aims of their institutions.¹

Traditionally, however, higher education operated in the comfortable atmosphere of a seller's market, especially during the years of booming enrollments following World War II. The 1970s finally brought a rude awakening to many educators when the renowned baby-boom effect began to wane.

The National Center for Education Statistics reported that the number of high school graduates was in a period of steady decline, on its way to a low of less than 2.7 million in 1983. The Center further reported that campus enrollments nationwide actually fell by 1.5 percent in 1976, after it had been rising steadily for a full quarter-century from 1951 to 1975, often at rates exceeding 10 percent a year. The net

increase from fall 1976 to fall 1978 was only 2.4 percent for the two-year period.²

Breneman indicated that the nation's number of 18-year-olds will drop 26 percent from 1979 (the peak year) to 1994 (the trough).³

The result of this sudden change in higher education to a buyer's market was, in many cases, a lot of discussion and examination of the concept of marketing, which coincided with recent developments in marketing theory that emphasized meeting customer needs as opposed to a preoccupation with production or sales.⁴

The new attention given to marketing in higher education, at least in terms of discussion, was widespread. Alexander conducted a study to ascertain the administrative level of acceptance or rejection of marketing activities when considered for incorporation in the management of higher education institutions. After soliciting opinions from 1,800 administrators at 600 institutions, Alexander concluded there was "general support for incorporation of marketing strategies in higher education management." Of the 1,022 administrators who responded, 90.3 percent favored the utilization of marketing activities, and 71.6 percent of the chief executives indicated that marketing activities were being used at their schools.⁵

This pronouncement of support for marketing activities may have been only at the surface level, however. In the course of developing a conceptual model for a marketing approach for administering community colleges and a subsequent handbook for marketing community colleges, White found discrepancies between what college administrators reported as marketing activities in their institutions and what catalogs, reports and other records actually revealed. In many cases, documents showed the

administrators were not doing what they said they were doing. According to White:

Although there is a growing interest in the use of marketing techniques by community college administrators, most of them do not know the proper procedures to use in order to accomplish their marketing goals.⁶

White was not alone in his opinion. Among others to express dismay at the lack of marketing sophistication in higher education was John Anthony Brown, himself a college president, when he noted among other points that: colleges communicate their academic programs poorly to students; it seems easier for colleges to photograph their campuses than to explain their academic programs; colleges have great opportunity to specialize, but they fail to publicize clear and distinct differences; colleges fail to explain experimental or innovative programs to students; and, to combat enrollment drops, colleges often innovate the curriculum rather than try to better explain existing programs.⁷

As a final example of the lack of understanding of marketing principles by planners within higher education, Murphy and McGarrity found in a survey of 200 private colleges that 90 percent of the respondents believed marketing to be synonymous with promotion which was, in fact, only one highly visible but narrow aspect of marketing activities.⁸

In answer to the growing interest and, in a sense, to the general lack of understanding in marketing by those in higher education, a growing body of related literature appeared between 1972 and 1982. That literature was examined in light of the research question: How are the marketing orientations of community, junior and technical colleges related to enrollments?

Marketing of Nonprofit Organizations

Noting the effective use of the tools of modern-day marketing by profit-oriented businesses and industries, managers of public and private nonprofit organizations demonstrated a growing interest in applying those same tools to problems they faced in offering their services and meeting the expenses of their organizations. Perhaps foremost of writers who addressed the issues of marketing in the nonprofit sector, Philip Kotler noted:

. . . Nonprofit organizations face a host of problems that would be analyzed as straightforward marketing problems if found in the profit sector. Museums and symphonies have a difficult time attracting sufficient funds to carry on their cultural activities. Blood banks find it hard to enlist enough donors. Churches are having difficulties attracting and maintaining active members . . . National parks such as Yellowstone are plagued with overdemand and are seeking ways to discourage or 'demarket' the parks. There is hardly a public or private nonprofit organization in existence that is not faced with some problems stemming from its relations to its markets.⁹

Kotler defined marketing as "the effective management by an organization of its exchange relations with its various markets and publics," adding that all organizations, profit or nonprofit, operate in an environment of one or more markets and publics.¹⁰ He emphasized that business marketing concepts such as market segmentation, market positioning, marketing mix, channels of distribution, and logistical systems, among others, serve to organize the analysis of any marketing problem, and that these concepts had already proved their value in the nonprofit sector.¹¹

Kotler also explained why some confusion might arise along with some problems when introducing marketing principles into the nonprofit sector:

. . . the transposition of a conceptual system from one domain (the profit sector) to another (the nonprofit sector) poses a number of challenges that call for new creative conceptualization. The concepts of product, price, promotion, and

distribution, which are employed by profit-sector marketers, have to be redefined for maximum relevance to all organizations. The concepts of markets and exchange processes must be generalized. The concept of profit maximization must be translated into benefit-cost maximization so that marketing models can be applied fruitfully in the nonprofit sector.¹²

Those knowledgeable writers who attempted to explain the application of marketing strategies to administrators in nonprofit organizations seemed to have faced three difficulties in presenting their cases: first was the problem of convincing a suspicious audience that marketing in fact did have a respectable role to play in nonprofit sectors; second, if those administrators did accept marketing strategies, they would always have to keep in mind the unique difference of their nonprofit organizations to the profit sector; and finally, was the problem of showing converts in the nonprofit sector that marketing philosophy would have to be applied in its entirety rather than in one or only a few concepts, such as promotion, to the exclusion of others.

Marketing in Higher Education

The term "marketing" was used with many connotations throughout the literature in higher education, most generally to a single range of activities--promotion--and to the recruitment of students. Several writers, however, attempted to explain marketing in higher education in terms of its broader interpretation. For example, Kotler noted, "My thesis is that the college marketing process starts before the work of the admissions office and continues beyond the work of the admissions office."¹³

Kotler then outlined seven basic concepts within the college marketing process: institutional positioning, or the articulation of a distinct posture of the college relative to other colleges; portfolio planning involving the number of kinds of programs offered by a particular

institution; applicant development, or identifying those student markets displaying a natural interest in the college's institutional concept and portfolio and then communicating information and excitement to those students in order to influence their decision process; applicant evaluation and notification, involving successfully screening the pool of qualified applicants to produce a new freshman class; recruitment effort evaluation to learn the weaknesses and strengths of the effort and to spot opportunities for improvement; college improvement planning, which involved identifying key dimensions of on-campus student satisfaction, evaluating student satisfaction along each dimension and developing plans for improvement; and finally alumni loyalty development, which included determining the current level of alumni loyalty and then developing objectives and strategies for building alumni loyalty.¹⁴

Kotler also provided a nine-step model of the student decision process explaining that "the starting point for college marketing planning should be a thorough understanding" of the process.¹⁵ The process depicted the student receiving and evaluating information about various colleges through various systems of logic. To further explain his model, Kotler provided a list of student information sources including personal, public, commercial and experiential.¹⁶

Lovelock and Rothschild further illuminated the marketing concept in higher education by explaining:

. . . not all organizations practice the marketing concept. Some espouse the product concept, which leads to production of whatever an organization is competent at producing under the assumption that good products reasonably priced will essentially sell themselves. Others subscribe to the selling concept, a management orientation that emphasized the use of sales and advertising techniques to 'push' whatever the organization has produced. Many observers have centered their criticisms of marketing on firms that practice the selling

concept by trying to persuade consumers to buy things that the former has produced but the latter don't need.¹⁷

In discussing the concept and importance of maintaining customer loyalty, Lovelock and Rothschild noted that "educational consumers go through a 'life cycle' with their alma mater," and suggested that at each stage in the life cycle the marketing task for an institution is different, as are the concerns of the target customer and the influences that are brought to bear on his or her decision.¹⁸ Figure 1 presents the model. From an initial phase as prospects, inquirers, and then applicants, educational consumers "go on to become admittees, matriculants, and students," said the authors. "After a lapse of some years, they graduate to alumni status, becoming (the institution hopes) loyal donors and volunteers. In time, many become parents of the new generation who may go through the same institution."¹⁹

The impact of good or poor treatment of customers, added the authors, is compounded by the power of word-of-mouth advertising and the fact that students are not only consumers of educational services, they are changed by that experience and themselves become a product of the institution in the eyes of third parties such as other publics of the institution.²⁰

John Lucas added an important ingredient to the higher education literature with the idea of a total marketing concept. Noted Lucas:

If universities and colleges are to adapt to a rapidly changing external environment, their faculty and leadership must understand the concept of total marketing and accept it as an integral part of their long-range plan . . . A marketing plan must be developed that embraces all elements of the total marketing concept.²¹

In applying the total marketing concept, Lucas envisioned an institution as needing to develop various forms of marketing research, an outline for identifying community target groups, a detailed list of

The Student Life-Cycle: Changing
Marketing/Tasks for Changing Roles

<u>Task</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Influences</u>
Recruitment	Prospect Inquirer Applicant	Parents Friends High school counselors & teachers
Retention	Admittee Matriculant Student	Parents Fellow Students Other Friends
Career Development . . .	Match Graduating student to Prospective employers and Graduate schools	Faculty Counselors Fellow students Employers Graduate schools Family & Friends
Fund Raising and Voluntarism	Alumnus/alumna Donor/volunteer Parent	Fellow alumni Spouses Peer groups Children?

Figure 1. Student Life-Cycle

recruitment and advertising steps, a curriculum evaluation and a strong retention program, a well-researched study of the institutional image and an idea of how to build on this image, a scheme for evaluating the institution's marketing strategies, a look to see if marketing steps are incorporated into existing functions when appropriate, and the insurance that marketing responsibility is clearly assigned to faculty and staff.²²

Ihlanfeldt saw the concept of marketing in higher education consisting of three components: research, strategy and communications,²³ where information for decision making was gathered through research; strategies based upon the elements of the "marketing mix" were developed; and both internal and external communications became critical to the marketing program's success.

The remainder of the literature review was devoted to a concentration on the first two marketing tasks identified in Lovelock and Rothchild's model--recruitment and retention. It was recognized that the other two marketing tasks presented in the model--career development, and fund raising and voluntarism--were equally important components of a total marketing program. Nevertheless, the scope of the study was limited to the first two tasks with regard to their impact upon enrollments.

Recruitment in Higher Education

Most often associated with marketing in higher education, the recruitment of students usually received more attention as well as more criticism than other aspects of marketing. While many specific pragmatic suggestions had been given to improve recruitment, Chapman noted there had been little theory to guide research or aid administrators in setting recruiting policy.²⁴ Following Kotler's earlier model,²⁵ Chapman

presented a model of student college choice which suggested that student college choice was influenced by a set of student characteristics in combination with a series of external influences. These characteristics and influences contributed to, and were shaped by, students' generalized expectations of college life called the "freshman myth."²⁶

The sequential nature of the marketing process for student recruitment was emphasized by Barton and Treadwell who described a sequence that led from research, strategy consideration, and decisions on techniques, to implementation, communication, and ongoing evaluation, as well as strong backing and brutal objectivity from those in power.²⁷ Among several questions the authors raised were: Does the chief administrative officer of the institution give high priority to its marketing needs? On what research should recruiting programs be based? What strategy is the most appropriate for our institution? What role does communication play in the plan?²⁸

In a similar vein, Sutton recommended a six-step approach to marketing college admissions: (1) diagnosis to include a study of competitor tactics and marketing research into student motivations; (2) prognosis to estimate where the college was headed in light of past practices and current trends; (3) goal setting for enrollment and scholastic standards; (4) devising strategies for recruiting; (5) devising tactics or specific activities to be employed; and (6) finally programming controls set up for the continuous evaluation of efforts.²⁹

Research

About the first component presented in his discussion of marketing in higher education, Ihlanfeldt said:

The research component determines why potential candidates and other people like your particular institution or, for that matter, why they do not like it. The research effort also should provide information with regard to primary, secondary, and test markets and how candidates interested in a particular institution go about making the college choice. The decision-making process may be quantified by location, ability, race, socio-economic background, etc.³⁰

Sullivan and Litten illustrated by means of a case study how some of the information necessary for admissions and enrollment planning could be obtained through systematic research. They outlined three general principles: (1) determine recruiting questions needing answers and if research will provide the answers; (2) in any marketing audit in admissions and recruitment, a research effort is always made to evaluate impact of each factor on the "bottom line" of how many students actually enroll and arrive on campus; and, (3) some aspects of the marketing audit should become part of an annual effort.³¹

While emphasizing that research should be viewed as an ongoing process, Murphy noted that a more long-term approach to institutionalizing marketing research into the college or university organization is to set up a marketing information system (MIS). He defined MIS as a complex of persons, machines, and procedures designed to generate an orderly flow of pertinent information collected from both intra- and extra-firm sources for use as the basis for decision making in specific responsibility areas of marketing management.³²

Riggs and Lewis emphasized that marketing research could be very simplistic and very inexpensive and, at the same time, beneficial when describing research at Austin Peay University to determine why students came to that institution, or what influenced their decisions.³³

Activities

A good number of specific marketing activities cited in the literature were adopted from the profit sector and applied to higher education. Advice ranged all the way from suggestions for how administrators could begin to organize their thinking, to specific techniques that could be applied for recruiting students. For example, Uehling outlined a decision model for administrators that included emphasis on leader initiative, a close look at the institution at present, an effort to define and understand clientele, an assessment of the production capacity of the institution, an assessment of the potential for change within the institution, assessing whether current production capacities fit clientele needs, planning strategy, the actual marketing, and evaluation of the effort.³⁴

A key activity proposed in the marketing process was the "marketing plan" which Kotler described as the act of specifying in detail what will be done, to whom, with what, and when, to achieve the organization's objectives.³⁵ Weirich, explaining the marketing plan used by Temple University, noted the following segments: enrollment objectives for the coming year, market objectives, demographic characteristics of Temple students, market share analysis, and specified strategies and activities including advertising and mass mailings, high school visits, a black scholars' luncheon, monthly mailings to all admitted students, and special publications to parents, among others.³⁶

Another key activity recommended for higher education recruiting guidance was introduced by Levitt as the generic definition of a product.³⁷ By placing a broad definition on an organization's product--a definition emphasizing the customer's basic needs being served--opportunities

as well as problems were less likely to be overlooked, according to Levitt.

Numerous authors recommended the activity of segmenting members of the potential student population into subgroups using characteristics such as geography, demography, attitudes and behavior. Segmentation was proposed to allow for specific recruiting techniques to be applied to specific groups of prospects rather than using a general "shotgun" approach. Spiro noted that the result intended was for students to be visualized as members of distinct subgroups with specific descriptions rather than as an undifferentiated mass.³⁸

Buchanan added customer behavior analysis as an activity for marketing management when discussing evaluation of potential users of continuing education. Among other things in the analysis, Buchanan stressed gaining insight into the customer's decision making process, a client's history of continuing education utilization, and more specific data concerning why people and their organizations behave as they do.³⁹

Marketing writers further recommended differentiating product offerings and communications, once the prospective student market is segmented and analyzed--an activity known as differentiated marketing. Bassin illustrated how segmentation and differentiated marketing work together:

The core of the administrator's problem is to identify segments of the college-age population which are currently underrepresented at the college but which the college could effectively serve. Having identified these market segments, the task is to develop curricular, tuition, and recruitment policies to increase their representation.⁴⁰

Proposed as a logical step following market segmentation was the activity of creating a special value in the minds of its potential

customers concerning a given institution. Known as positioning, this activity was described by Geltzer and Ries as valuable in finding an unmet range of needs in the market place and avoiding undue head-on competition with institutions already well established in a certain market position.⁴¹ Also referred to in the literature as differential advantages, positioning involves an analysis of an institution's image. Lucas advocated a well-researched study of the institutional image and an idea of how to build on that image. This, said Lucas, leads to community involvement in decision making through advisory committees, constituent-group and program-design task forces, and others.⁴² Levitt, in discussing intangible aspects of products, noted that organizations always depend to some extent on both appearances and external impressions in marketing products.⁴³

Other specific activities available to higher education institutions were revealed through the series of marketing tools known traditionally as the marketing mix and consisting of product, price, promotion and distribution decisions.

Numerous authors outlined suggestions for adjusting an institution's products to better meet the needs of clients. Leach, for example, suggested such product modifications as revising course syllabi to include expected instructional outcomes, developing courses in study skills and career planning, and expanding tutorial services to support classroom learning.⁴⁴ Murphy and McGarrity's survey, however, indicated that nearly 60 percent of the respondents had not significantly modified their academic programs within the past five years in order to attract new or different kinds of students.⁴⁵ Any alteration made was usually achieved

by adding or dropping whole programs rather than by modifying course content.

Pricing appeared to be one of the most neglected marketing activities available to higher education administrators. According to Krachenberg, colleges usually followed a one- or two-price policy such as in-state/out-of-state or graduate/undergraduate. Realistically, however, certain factors should be more fully recognized and considered in price determination: the differences in programs, location of program, cost of program, level of demand for program, the appeal of the program to different target groups, etc.⁴⁶ As examples of pricing variations, Erickson reported use of a deferred tuition plan in which more than 20 percent of Yale's undergraduates participated.⁴⁷ Tatham reported on the successful use of credit cards to pay tuition at Johnson County Community College.⁴⁸

As mentioned earlier, promotion evolved as the most visible and controversial aspect of marketing in higher education. Promotional activities can be classified into five broad groups: advertising, publicity, personal contact, incentives and atmospherics.⁴⁹ Murphy and McGarrity reported that the "backbone" of promotion activity was personal recruiting by college representatives who visited high schools to attract the traditional prospective students.⁵⁰ Other often-cited promotional activities were direct mail efforts, campus visits by prospective students, and public service announcements on radio and television. Ihlanfeldt said the most efficient promotion activities put the institution in direct contact with the largest possible number of potential applicants in the most efficient and personal manner.⁵¹ As previously mentioned, marketing writers recommended that a specific promotional mix be developed

to communicate directly with the particular target group an institution intends to reach. Rinnander pointed out that recruitment begins with market research which is basic to determining what approach will be most effective in reaching a specific group.⁵² Lucas advocated a detailed list of recruitment and advertising steps to include visitation programs, speakers' programs, display programs, special courses and orientation programs, mailings and literature distribution, and the use of various media.⁵³

The importance of place, stated Krachenberg, was illustrated in such approaches to distribution as branch campuses, extension centers, remote television outlets, and the "university without walls" concept.⁵⁴ Place has been often referred to by other terms such as "delivery" or "distribution," indicating a concern with time as well as physical location. Kotler noted that distribution of courses or programs could reflect a great deal of imagination and at the same time reach particular market segments. He wrote:

There is no reason to confine the delivery system for education to the classroom. Some universities offer correspondence courses which enable a student to do his study on his own time at home. Other universities have placed their product on educational television channels . . . Occasionally, a college conceives of a very novel distribution possibility, such as the commuter railroad classroom.⁵⁵

In addition to the marketing mix, other general marketing activities were found in the literature. Kotler and Levy noted in their writings that institutions of higher education were poorly organized for marketing because many marketing positions were scattered throughout the institution and their activities were not necessarily coordinated. Such positions included the dean of students, director of alumni affairs, public relations director, and development director.⁵⁶ Carea and Kemerer, for

example, proposed a fundamental change in organization and administration within higher education to achieve a successful marketing program through a new position of vice president for institutional advancement. This new vice president would coordinate all marketing activities.⁵⁷ Lucas further explained that when all personnel within the institution recognized that their actions--in addition to the actions of those personnel responsible solely for marketing--had a profound effect on the organization's ability to develop, retain and satisfy clients, then "integrated market planning" would be achieved.⁵⁸

Another reported marketing activity was that of "continuous marketing feedback." Lucas noted the necessity of a scheme for evaluation of marketing strategies.⁵⁹ While businesses have gathered continuous information about changes in the environment and in their own performance through salesmen, research departments, etc., nonbusiness organizations have been more casual about collecting such vital information.⁶⁰

Kotler explained the application of another valuable marketing activity to higher education: the marketing audit. Designed to reveal the major practices, problems and opportunities facing the organization, the marketing audit, said Kotler, would serve as a basis for more effective planning. The marketing audit described by Kotler comprised three parts. The first part was to evaluate the marketing environment of the organization, specifically its markets, clients, competitors and macro-environment. The second part evaluated the marketing system within the organization, specifically, the institution's objectives, programs, implementation and organization. The third part aimed at evaluating the major areas of marketing activity in the organization, its products, pricing, distribution, personal contact, advertising, publicity and sales

promotion.⁶¹ The marketing audit was described as a potentially valuable aid in searching for opportunity and identifying malfunctions.

The foregoing key activities--marketing plan, generic product definition, market segmentation, customer behavior analysis, differentiated marketing, positioning or differential advantages, the multiple marketing mix, integrated market planning, continuous marketing feedback and marketing audit--were reported as the tools available to higher education for student recruitment.

Retention in Higher Education

After reviewing a series of retention studies, Kermerer, Baldrige and Green concluded that most colleges had not done much in attempting to lower their attrition rates. In addition to citing a lack of immediate need for effective retention programs in the past, the three researchers noted organizational and administrative barriers to effective retention programs. They stated:

. . . compare retention activities to recruitment efforts. From an organizational and administrative viewpoint recruitment is significantly different in that (1) it has a central administrative office, (2) success or failure is easy to evaluate, (3) resources (money, personnel, equipment) are clearly assigned, and (4) responsibility is highly centralized so that changes can be made directly by top managers. In short, recruitment is a centralized, focused, well staffed, administrative function -- and administrators can do something about it.

By contrast, retention has almost exactly opposite organizational and administrative characteristics. Who is in charge of retention? How do you evaluate the effort, and what administrators can be held responsible? Just how visible is the effort to the campus community? The answer to these questions suggest that retention efforts are decentralized, difficult to evaluate, not under the jurisdiction of a single administrator, understaffed, and underbudgeted. In short, retention efforts are an administrative nightmare, and they do not have a focal point. Nevertheless, every institution must now consider how to change this situation, how to have an impact on the retention problem.⁶²

Another explanation for lack of emphasis on retention activities was that college administrators, even at a seemingly late date, were not worried about declining enrollments. Breneman noted a disturbing disbelief by college presidents that enrollments in their own institutions would decline. Following an informal survey, Breneman said:

Much to my surprise, I found that almost every chief executive queried felt his or her institution would maintain enrollments in a stable pattern for the next 10 years. A few presidents mentioned that they dare not say anything to the contrary, for fear it would become a self-fulfilling prophecy.⁶³

It was obvious, however, that some institutions would experience severe enrollment declines in the decade ahead, and that the issue of retention would play an important part. This was illustrated by Frances who noted that enrollment data for the years 1975 through 1978, when compared with the years 1970 through 1973, demonstrated that recent increases in total enrollments were largely in the freshman and sophomore years and the level of enrollment in the junior and senior years had not increased much. Frances surmised that either students were completing their educational objectives in two years, or that they were not completing them and attrition was a problem that could be addressed in increasing or maintaining enrollments.⁶⁴

In recent years, more attention was given to retention within higher education--specifically, to how institutions could actively intervene in order to influence retention. After a great deal of emphasis on recruitment, some administrators began to see that the retention of only a small percentage of students could have a substantial impact upon enrollments. As Ramist noted:

In the past few years, recognition of the imminent leveling off and decline of the number of students of college-going

age has lent a certain sense of institutional urgency not only to the understanding of which student drops out and why, but also to influencing them to stay. In addition to its role in describing a societal ill, the research on the causes of attrition has now taken on the dimension of an urgent administrative necessity to keep students.⁶⁵

Before World War II, studies on retention were primarily descriptive and sought to identify the types of students most likely to drop out of college. Following the war, emphasis in retention research shifted to prediction. Much research emphasizing the fit between student and institution occurred in the late 1950s, and in the 1960s typologies of student dropouts and student experience in school were emphasized. Not until the 1970s was serious attention given to institutions and to improving higher education in order to retain students.⁶⁶

Recognizing shortcomings and lack of explanation in retention research, Tinto developed a theoretical model of dropout behavior, derived in part from Durkheim's theory of suicide, and economic notions of cost-benefit analysis. Individual characteristic factors were added to his longitudinal model of dropout by Tinto in order to make the model predictive. Tinto's theory argued that the process of dropout from college could be viewed as a process of interaction between the individual student and the academic and social systems of the college during which a person's experiences in these systems continually would modify his goal and institutional commitments in ways which lead to persistence and/or to varying forms of dropout. According to Tinto:

Individuals enter institutions of higher education with a variety of attributes . . . precollege experiences . . . and family backgrounds . . . , each of which has direct impacts upon performance in college . . . (and) influence the development of the educational expectations and commitments the individual brings with him into the college environment.

. . . Given individual characteristics, prior experiences, and commitments, the model argues that it is the individual's integration into the academic and social systems of the college that most directly relates to his continuance in that college . . .

In the final analysis, it is the interplay between the individual's commitment to the goal of college completion and his commitment to the institution that determines whether or not the individual decides to drop out from college and the forms of dropout behavior the individual adopts. Presumably, either low goal commitment or low institutional commitment can lead to dropout.⁶⁷

Tinto developed the model to explain certain modes and/or facets of dropout behavior in particular educational settings. It was concerned with accounting for the difference, within academic institutions, between dropout as academic failure and as voluntary withdrawal. It sought to focus attention upon the role the institution itself played in the dropout of its own students.

While Tinto did not seek to address the role of finances or of external social pressure (among other issues) upon dropout behavior in his model, he later pointed to this lack of consideration for financing and a failure to distinguish between behaviors which led to institutional transfer and those which resulted in permanent withdrawal as shortcomings of his theory. However, he noted that the impact of finances seemed to occur at the point of entry into higher education and at the margins of decision-making after other matters had been considered.⁶⁸

Reasons given for why students drop out of college were about as numerous and varied as the writers who cited them--from the general to the specific. Cross stated that her view of a viable national purpose of postsecondary education was to help individual students to learn as much and as well as possible. She added however, that this view was hampered

by the influence of the production concept in higher education. Much of higher education practice, noted Cross, existed to meet administrative and fiscal requirements rather than to enhance student learning.⁶⁹

Observing that two-year colleges had higher drop out rates than expected, Astin stated that the most likely explanation for this could be found in the transfer process. Students could be expected to be lost simply from the problems of the anticipated move and the paper work involved. "Any potential transfer student can become discouraged," noted Astin, "by inefficiency or any sign of reluctance on the part of upper-division institutions."⁷⁰

While Tinto--in pointing to a rather persistent 45 percent dropout rate in American higher education over the last 100 years--questioned the likelihood of significantly diminishing dropout on the national level without seriously altering the nature and function of higher education in our society, he noted individual institutions could do much to influence the rate of dropout of their own student bodies.⁷¹

Activities

Researchers ultimately tried to identify activities that colleges could adopt in order to lower their dropout rates. In their extensive study of retention practices, Noel and Beal utilized self-reported information from colleges and universities of all types to document what they had done or were doing at the time to improve retention and how they evaluated and perceived the results of their efforts. Portions of their survey instrument were adopted for this study to include a list of 19 retention activities, referred to as "action programs" by the authors.

Beal and Noel's survey resulted in the identification of a large number of separate and distinct efforts under way at colleges for improving student retention. The authors found that 60 percent of the institutions surveyed reported no specific individual had been assigned responsibility for retention coordination. One existing staff person had been assigned in 24 percent of the institutions surveyed; 12 percent reported existing staff had been assigned from several areas; and 4 percent reported a new position had been created. All but 17 percent of the institutions surveyed reported undertaking retention action programs from the list of 19 provided by the authors. An additional 45 action programs that did not fall easily within the general categories presented in the list of 19 were identified. These programs were aimed at approximately 40 different target groups identified in the study.⁷²

When special indexes were devised by the authors to analyze better respondents' evaluations of action programs they initiated, program emphasis on new policies and structures for retention showed the greatest improvement in retention, followed by new learning/academic support programs, orientation, early warning systems and curricular developments. Exit interviews ranked lowest.

The authors went on to identify "retention leaders"--from among action programs reported on special retention activity forms. A total of 50 programs were reported as having improved retention by 10 or more percentage points, while 149 programs were reported as having "contributed to multiple benefits showing broad impact and satisfaction."

In their conclusions and recommendations, Noel and Beal noted that program successes were higher when a position was created to coordinate the retention effort. That perhaps the most critical aspect was the

priority assigned to retention by the president and other chief administrators was pointed out. A steering committee charged with the responsibility of giving ongoing direction to the retention effort also was emphasized as an important measure.⁷³

Ramist, in discussing what colleges can do to enhance retention, discussed activities in the following areas: Pre-enrollment, admissions, college costs, orientation, faculty-student interaction, academic programs, counseling and advising, career development, campus activities, housing, the withdrawal procedure, and administration of the retention program. He also alluded to the importance of research:

Although a great deal of evidence has been presented here and elsewhere associating many student and college characteristics with retention and attrition, there are substantial differences among institutions. Therefore, it is important to begin by doing a local dropout study.⁷⁴

Noel pointed out that concerted effort to increase student retention would force the institution to examine itself closely and what was observed would not always be pleasant or easy to accept. Students would persist if the institution delivered lively, substantive learning and growth experiences.⁷⁵

Noel then identified a 14-step approach to establishing a campus retention program that draws from current research. The steps were (1) establish steering committee; (2) determine dropout rate; (3) conduct dropout study; (4) conduct self-study; (5) establish task committees within units; (6) increase faculty and staff awareness, encourage attitude of serving students; (7) build marketing approach into recruitment; (8) develop meaningful orientation programs; (9) build strong counseling/advising program; (10) provide career-planning for undecided students; (11) provide support for students with marginal credentials; (12) build early

priority assigned to retention by the president and other chief administrators was pointed out. A steering committee charged with the responsibility of giving ongoing direction to the retention effort also was emphasized as an important measure.⁷³

Ramist, in discussing what colleges can do to enhance retention, discussed activities in the following areas: Pre-enrollment, admissions, college costs, orientation, faculty-student interaction, academic programs, counseling and advising, career development, campus activities, housing, the withdrawal procedure, and administration of the retention program. He also alluded to the importance of research:

Although a great deal of evidence has been presented here and elsewhere associating many student and college characteristics with retention and attrition, there are substantial differences among institutions. Therefore, it is important to begin by doing a local dropout study.⁷⁴

Noel pointed out that concerted effort to increase student retention would force the institution to examine itself closely and what was observed would not always be pleasant or easy to accept. Students would persist if the institution delivered lively, substantive learning and growth experiences.⁷⁵

Noel then identified a 14-step approach to establishing a campus retention program that draws from current research. The steps were (1) establish steering committee; (2) determine dropout rate; (3) conduct dropout study; (4) conduct self-study; (5) establish task committees within units; (6) increase faculty and staff awareness, encourage attitude of serving students; (7) build marketing approach into recruitment; (8) develop meaningful orientation programs; (9) build strong counseling/advising program; (10) provide career-planning for undecided students; (11) provide support for students with marginal credentials; (12) build early

number of complaints. The audit emphasized using surveys of student feelings about the student services atmosphere, and identifying the degree to which staff and faculty understand their service role. "Organizations truly interested in marketing . . . cannot ignore persons who have contact with students . . .," stated the writers.⁸⁰

In addressing retention problems, Cope and Hannah pointed out that colleges differ dramatically, and when their entering students are also diversified, it was reasonable to expect dropout problems would vary among colleges. They stated:

We find stopouts, dropouts, and transferring students from small, conservative, church-related colleges have different personality characteristics and problems than students from technical-vocational colleges, than students at liberal, experimental, 'heathen' institutions, than students in the mega-, multi-, and magapopulist state universities."⁸¹

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education reinforced this idea in the book Three Thousand Futures with the idea that every American institution of higher education was, and should be, going in a unique direction to serve effectively its own specific student market segment. The members of the council stated:

We conclude . . . by noting how much of what needs to be done and can be done is subject to achievement at the institutional level. We have only suggested state and federal action in connection with the preservation of the private colleges and the enhancement of research efforts. All other goals can be achieved mostly, even only, by the action of institutions themselves. This places great responsibility on teachers, administrators, faculty leadership, and trustees; and on private financial support. Institutional action with private support is the single best key to unlock future possibilities.⁸²

It seemed reasonable to conclude that the battle to improve student retention would be won or lost on the campuses of individual colleges. The consequences of what seemed to be an inevitable struggle need not

be inevitably bad for colleges, as Gardiner and Nazari-Robati observed.

They noted:

The upcoming period of declining enrollments presents an excellent opportunity for administrators to restructure their colleges and universities into responsive, student-centered institutions. This requires that administrators shift their focus from attrition to retention, from trying to understand why students leave to actively converting their colleges into caring institutions, with increased emphasis on quality and service.⁸³

Marketing in Community Colleges

Community, junior, and technical colleges seem to have displayed the greatest amount of sophistication in terms of marketing orientation within higher education. Many writers, however, pointed to shortcomings. Clarkson noted:

Most colleges maintain some degree of promotion effort. However, too many lack imaginative planning or innovative enterprise in the analysis and stratagem needed in addressing our number one problem--declining enrollments.⁸⁴

In addition, even while community, junior, and technical colleges were considered to be highly student oriented, Ramist pointed out:

Even after controlling for the high dropout-proneness of entering students in terms of background, ability, and aspirations, and the lack of financial aid, job opportunities, and student housing, two-year colleges still have higher dropout rates than expected. Their students also are less likely to be involved with the college, experience a relatively small increase in interpersonal self-esteem, and are less likely to implement their college plans.⁸⁵

Johnson outlined the policies and procedures of four community colleges that employ the total marketing concept (TMC). Johnson saw TMC as an instrument for planned and positive change in two-year institutions. His suggestions to administrators included: be patient and persistent, set reasonable goals and priorities, establish a success model on the campus as soon as possible, bring faculty into the marketing process

from the very beginning, conduct on-campus marketing workshops with faculty, staff, and administration; evaluate the impact of internal marketing on a regular basis; and base publications and promotions on market research and segmentation.⁸⁶

Research into the effectiveness of the marketing approach in community colleges had been inconclusive. Hoppe, in an analysis of data of a mail survey to 138 two-year institutions, revealed that no significant relationship could be established between past or expected enrollment change and selected marketing variables--scope of the marketing plan, segmentation of target audiences, and size of the marketing budget. Segmentation of markets, while not statistically significant, was determined to be the best predictor of enrollment change.⁸⁷

In a combination of in-depth interviews and close scrutiny of publications and documents, Dezek found that administrators were not always accomplishing the market activities they claimed to be.⁸⁸

In a survey of marketing practices employed by successful continuing education programs, Compton found that, in general, institutions of successful continuing education programs were committed to marketing continuing education and were extensively engaged in the use of marketing activities. There were both perceived benefits and problems associated with marketing, however.⁸⁹

Keim noted that community and junior college marketing should include a full understanding of the market and an objective study of the product. "We must understand the full mission of our colleges and be willing to examine our current programs for their effectiveness," said Keim.⁹⁰ He added that a broad marketing system inevitably would produce

a wide range of perhaps new educational problems and these would affect available human resources and institutional patterns.

The Marketing Process

Kotler and Goldgehn described marketing in the community college as an eight-step process during which such activities as defining the mission, identifying publics and markets, researching the market, and implementing and controlling marketing plans would take place.⁹¹

In his review of marketing's role in the business sector, Kotler identified the stages of the marketing process. Kotler also demonstrated application of the marketing process in the nonprofit organization.⁹²

The initiation of the marketing process, said Kotler, involved the assumption that institutional leaders, through a strategic planning process, would have established organizational goals and objectives drawn from a previously articulated organizational mission. The marketing process was described as the managerial process of identifying, analyzing, choosing, and exploiting marketing opportunities to fulfill a company's mission and objectives.⁹³

According to Kotler, there were four main aspects of the marketing process: the marketing opportunity analysis which involved marketers in generating, evaluating, and selecting attractive company marketing opportunities; target market selection which involved market segmentation and then deciding upon the best part of the market to enter, or the target market; marketing mix strategy which involved deciding upon the competitive position an organization wanted to occupy in the target market and subsequently blending appropriate marketing activities; and marketing management systems development which involved creating the three

principal systems needed to manage a marketing effort--the marketing planning and control system, the marketing information system, and the marketing organizational system.⁹⁴

Kotler stated, "Sooner or later all organizations ask themselves whether they need a business- and marketing-planning system, what shape it should take, and what should be done to make it work effectively."⁹⁵ Effective and long-range planning for the institution as a whole seemed rather new to higher education, not to mention marketing planning. Most institutions probably chose to solve problems as they arose. According to Kotler, business-planning systems tended to move through four stages on their way to greater sophistication.⁹⁶

In the first (unplanned) stage, management was totally engrossed in the day-to-day operations required for survival. There was no planning staff or hardly any time to plan. In the next stage, management eventually recognized the desirability of installing a budgeting system to improve the planning of the company's cash flow. In the third stage, management recognized the need to develop annual plans and adopt a formal planning system. In the final strategic-planning stage, long-range planning was achieved usually through five-year plans which would lead to the annual plan (called rolling planning). Computer programs were used to examine alternate marketing plans, and contingency plans were developed. Marketing control must go hand in hand with marketing planning, noted Kotler. He said, "It is possible to set marketing objectives, analyze markets, develop marketing plans, and establish a marketing organization and yet fail miserably because of a failure to establish control."⁹⁷

Relating to the second system involved in marketing management,

Kotler stated, "The crucial administrative steps of marketing planning and control cannot be carried out effectively unless the organization has developed an adequate and reliable base of marketing information."⁹⁸ He described the marketing information system for both profit and nonprofit organizations, and the systems were the same.

The marketing information system comprised four parts: (1) the internal records system in which information about what had happened, or results data such as sales and inventories, were stored and retrieved; (2) the marketing intelligence system in which happenings data were processed and through which the organization's managers were kept informed about changing conditions in the environment; (3) the marketing research system which involved specific studies of problem and opportunity areas; and (4) the marketing management science system which involved the building and use of marketing models in a search for improved understanding, prediction and control.⁹⁹

Kotler noted that the degree to which a nonprofit organization was justified in establishing a formal marketing organization system depended to a large extent upon size of the organization. "We can expect to see the establishment of more marketing departments in nonprofit organizations where their size and problems call for continuous study, planning, and implementation of market-related concerns," said Kotler.¹⁰⁰ He provided a model for a five-stage evolution of marketing departments in the business sector.

In the model, all companies began in stage one (simple sales department) performing four simple functions: finance, operations, accounting and sales. The selling function was headed by a sales manager or vice president, who basically managed a sales force and also did some selling.

In stage two (sales department with ancillary functions), as the company expanded, it encountered a need for marketing research, advertising and customer service on a more continuous and expert basis. In response, the sales vice president hired a few specialists and perhaps a marketing director to control these nonselling functions.

In stage three (separate marketing department), continued company growth inevitably increased the importance of other marketing functions--marketing research, new-product development, advertising and promotion, customer service. At this stage, a separate marketing department equal to the sales department was established. Stage four (modern marketing department) was entered by a company essentially through rivalry between the sales and marketing departments. The sales vice president tended to be short-run oriented and preoccupied with achieving current sales. The marketing vice president tended to be long-run oriented and preoccupied with planning the right products and marketing strategy to meet the customers' long-run needs. One possible outcome of this conflict was placement of the marketing vice president over sales which formed the basis of the modern marketing department with subordinates reporting from every marketing function.

A company only entered stage five (modern marketing company), when company officers correctly understood the marketing function, and resistance from other vice presidents did not seriously hamper the marketing function. Ultimately, the job may have called for increasing the power and authority of the marketing vice president over the other business functions, stated Kotler.¹⁰¹

Kotler stated it was desirable that marketing activities be carried out under a clear concept of responsive and responsible marketing.¹⁰²

He added there were five alternative concepts or philosophies under which organizations could conduct their marketing activity. The first, the production concept, was one of the oldest concepts guiding sellers, according to Kotler. It was a management orientation that assumed consumers would favor those products that were available and affordable. Therefore, the major task of management was to pursue improved production and distribution efficiency.

A second major concept guiding sellers was the product concept, which was a management orientation that assumed consumers would favor those products that offered the most quality for the price. Therefore, the organization should have devoted its energy to improving product quality. Another way in which many producers guided their exchange activity was the selling concept, noted Kotler. It was a management orientation that assumed consumers would either not buy or not buy enough of the organization's products unless the organization made a substantial effort to stimulate their interest. The marketing concept was a more recent idea in the history of exchange relations in which a management orientation was evident that held that the key to achieving organizational goals consisted of the organization's determining the needs and wants of target markets and adapting itself to delivering the desired satisfactions more effectively and efficiently than its competitors.

In recent years, according to Kotler, some people began to question whether the marketing concept was an adequate philosophy for business in an age of environmental deterioration, resource shortages, explosive population growth, worldwide inflation, and neglected social services. It was recognized in the final, the societal marketing, concept that consumers' wants did not always coincide with their long-run

interests or society's long-run interests. Needs, wants, and interests of target markets would be met in a way that preserved or enhanced the consumer's and the society's well-being.¹⁰³

Summary

This review of literature revealed selected items from the growing body of literature concerning marketing practices in higher education. A great deal had been written suggesting proper recruitment and retention activities to be followed by community, junior, and technical college administrators. Research on how effective these activities actually were had only begun. It was time for a research comparison of the marketing orientations and enrollment trends observed at selected institutions of higher education.

ENDNOTES

¹ Scott M. Cutlip, "Advertising Higher Education: The Early Years of College Public Relations," College and University Journal, Vol. 9 (1970), p. 21.

² National Center for Education Statistics, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1984-85 (Washington, D.C., 1979), p. 124.

³ David W. Breneman, The Coming Enrollment Crisis: What Every Trustee Must Know (Washington, D.C., 1982), p. 9.

⁴ Jerome E. McCarthy, Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach (Homewood, Ill., 1975), pp. xvi, 694.

⁵ Fred J. Alexander, "Administrative Opinions Concerning Utilization of Marketing Strategies in Management of Higher Education Institutions in the United States" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Memphis State University, 1978), p. 183.

⁶ Edward T. White, "The Development of a Handbook for Marketing the Community College" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1980), p. 73.

⁷ John Anthony Brown, "The Role of Academic Programs in Institutional Marketing," in David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1978), p. 3.

⁸ Patrick E. Murphy and Richard A. McGarrity, "Marketing Universities: A Survey of Student Recruitment Activities," College and University Journal, Vol. 53 (1978), p. 253.

⁹ Philip Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975), p. ix.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. x.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³Philip Kotler, "Applying Marketing Theory to College Admissions," A Role for Marketing in College Admissions (New York, 1976), p. 57.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 56-66.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 66-71.

¹⁷Christopher Lovelock and Michael L. Rothschild, "Uses, Abuses, and Misuses of Marketing in Higher Education," Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives (New York, 1980), p. 45.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 48.

²¹John A. Lucas, Developing a Total Marketing Plan (Washington, D.C., 1979), p. 87.

²²*Ibid.*

²³William Ihlanfeldt, "A Management Approach to the Buyer's Market," Liberal Education, Vol. 61 (1965), pp. 133-148.

²⁴David Chapman, "A Model of Student College Choice," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 52 (1981), pp. 490-505.

²⁵Kotler, Role for Marketing, p. 44.

²⁶Chapman, p. 500.

²⁷David W. Barton, Jr. and David R. Treadwell, Jr., "Marketing: A Synthesis of Institutional Soul-Searching and Aggressiveness," in David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1978), pp. 77-84.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 77.

²⁹David S. Sutton, "Marketing Tactics Put Into Recruiting," College and University Business, Vol. 52 (1972), pp. 52-53.

³⁰Ihlanfeldt, pp. 133-148.

³¹Daniel F. Sullivan and Larry H. Litten, "Using Research in Analyzing Student Markets: A Case Study," A Role for Marketing in College Admissions (New York, 1976), pp. 86-113.

³²Patrick E. Murphy, "The Promises and Pitfalls of Marketing Research in Higher Education," Liberal Education, Vol. 66 (1980), pp. 102-115.

³³Robert O. Riggs and Willard L. Lewis, "Applicability of Marketing Research to Student Recruitment," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 22 (1980), pp. 467-468.

³⁴Barbara S. Uehling, "Marketing and the Future of Institutions," Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives (New York, 1980), pp. 132-147.

³⁵Philip Kotler and Sidney J. Levy, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," Journal of Marketing, Vol. 33 (1969), pp. 10-15.

³⁶Margaret C. Weirich, "A Marketing Case History Profile," in David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1978), pp. 65-76.

³⁷Theodore Levitt, "Marketing Myopia," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 38, No. 4 (1960), pp. 45-56.

³⁸Louis M. Spiro, "The Uses of Student Market Segmentation Techniques in College Recruitment" (a paper presented at the annual Association for Institutional Research Forum, Houston, Texas, May, 1978), p. 20.

³⁹W. Wray Buchanan and H. C. Barksdale, "Marketing's Broadening Concepts Real in University Extension," Adult Education, Vol. 25 (1974), pp. 36-46.

⁴⁰William M. Bassin, "A Marketing Technique for Student Recruitment," Research in Higher Education, Vol. 3 (1975), pp. 51-65.

⁴¹Howard Geltzer and Al Ries, "The Positioning Era: A Marketing Strategy for College Admissions in the 1980s," A Role for Marketing in College Admissions (New York, 1976), pp. 73-75.

⁴²Lucas, p. 88.

⁴³Theodore Levitt, "Marketing Intangible Products and Product Intangibles," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 59, No. 3 (1981), pp. 94-102.

⁴⁴Ernest R. Leach, "Implementing the Marketing Process," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 48 (1977), pp. 20-24.

⁴⁵Murphy and McGarrity, p. 254.

⁴⁶A. R. Krachenberg, "Bringing the Concept of Marketing to Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43 (1972), p. 376.

⁴⁷Stanford Erickson, "Marketing is Only a Part of Admissions," College and University Business, Vol. 52 (1972), pp. 56-57.

⁴⁸Elaine L. Tatham, "Community Response to Direct Mail From a Community College, Including an Evaluation of a Credit Card Plan" (an unpub. paper, Overland Park, Kansas, January, 1976), p. 43.

⁴⁹Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, pp. 201-202.

⁵⁰Murphy and McGarrity, p. 254.

⁵¹Ihlanfeldt, p. 14.

⁵²Elizabeth Rinnander, "Recruiting Adult Students," Community College Review, Vol. 5 (1976), p. 58.

⁵³Lucas, p. 87.

⁵⁴Krachenberg, p. 376.

⁵⁵Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, p. 198.

⁵⁶Kotler and Levy, p. 14.

⁵⁷William L. Carea and Frank R. Kemerer, "The Internal Dimensions of Institutional Marketing," College and University, Vol. 20 (1979), pp. 173-188.

⁵⁸Lucas, p. 88.

⁵⁹*ibid.*

⁶⁰Kotler and Levy, p. 14.

⁶¹Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, p. 56.

⁶²Frank R. Kermerer, Victor J. Baldrige, and Kenneth C. Green, Strategies for Effective Enrollment Management (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 102-103.

⁶³Breneman, p. 4.

⁶⁴C. Frances, College Enrollment Trends: Testing the Conventional Wisdom Against the Facts (Washington, D.C., 1980), p. 55.

⁶⁵Leonard Ramist, College Student Attrition and Retention (New York, 1981), p. 1.

⁶⁶Philip E. Beal and Lee Noel, What Works in Student Retention (Boulder, Colo., 1980), p. v.

⁶⁷Vincent Tinto, "Dropout From Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 54 (1975), pp. 89-129.

⁶⁸Vincent Tinto, "Student Disengagement Revisited: Some Thoughts on the Limits of Theory and Practice in Dropout" (a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 3-5, 1981), p. 3.

⁶⁹K. P. Cross, "Old Practices and New Purposes," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1979), pp. 4-8.

⁷⁰Alexander W. Astin, Preventing Students From Dropping Out (San Francisco, 1977), pp. 160-161.

⁷¹Tinto, "Student Disengagement Revisited," p. 9.

⁷²Beal and Noel, pp. 21-22.

⁷³Ibid., p. 90.

⁷⁴Ramist, p. 30.

⁷⁵Lee Noel, "First Steps in Starting a Campus Retention Program," in L. Noel (Ed.), Reducing the Dropout Rate, New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1978), p. 87.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 87-98.

⁷⁷T. J. Pantages and C. F. Creedon, "Studies of College Attrition: 1950-1975," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 48 (1978), pp. 94-96.

⁷⁸L. B. Mayhew, Surviving the Eighties: Strategies and Procedures for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems (San Francisco, 1980), pp. 191-223.

⁷⁹O. T. Lenning, P. E. Beal, and K. Sauer, Attrition and Retention: Evidence for Action and Research (Boulder, Colo., 1980), pp. 95-98.

⁸⁰B. Knight and D. Johnson, "Marketing Higher Education," Education Record, Vol. 62, No. 1 (1981), p. 31.

⁸¹R. G. Cope and W. Hannah, Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stopping Out, and Transferring (New York, 1975), p. 68.

⁸²Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years in Higher Education (Iowa City, Iowa, and Boulder, Colo., 1980), p. 117.

⁸³John J. Gardiner and Ali Nazari-Robati, "Student Attrition Research: Implications for Retention Strategies," NASPA Journal, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1983), p. 26.

⁸⁴Tom Clarkson, "The Selling of Our Product," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1981), pp. 34-37.

⁸⁵Ramist, p. 30.

⁸⁶Dennis L. Johnson, "New Tools for the Creative Manager," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1980), pp. 28-32.

⁸⁷Sherry Lee Hoppe, "An Analysis of the Relationship of Marketing to Enrollment in Selected Community, Junior and Technical Colleges" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1981), pp. 136-137.

⁸⁸John George Dezek, "Marketing Techniques Utilized by Community College Continuing Education Divisions in Michigan" (unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1980), pp. 171-177.

⁸⁹Paula K. Compton, "Marketing Practices of Administrators of Successful Continuing Education Programs" (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1980), p. 44.

⁹⁰William A. Keim, "Applying Good Sense to Marketing," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1979), pp. 10-13.

⁹¹Philip Kotler and Leslie A. Goldgehn, "Marketing: A Definition for Community Colleges," New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 36 (1981), pp. 7-11.

⁹²Kotler, Principles of Marketing, pp. 85-92.

⁹³Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, pp. 79-254.

⁹⁴Kotler, Principles of Marketing, p. 85.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 100-102.

⁹⁷Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, p. 249.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 254-278, and Kotler, Principles of Marketing, pp. 133-165.

¹⁰⁰Kotler, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, p. 230.

¹⁰¹Kotler, Principles of Marketing, pp. 172-174.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, pp. 20-26.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter includes a discussion of a classification scheme for colleges in terms of marketing orientation, the study population and sample, data collection, instrumentation, and data analysis used in responding to the research problem identified in Chapter I.

A Classification Scheme

In attempting to relate marketing in community colleges to enrollment, researchers were faced with the problem of quantifying in a meaningful way differences between colleges in terms of their marketing efforts. It could be concluded from the previous literature review that a simple listing of marketing activities used by a given institution was not a sufficient indicator of what would lead to success in student enrollment objectives. Specific activities could be expected to vary in their degree of success at different institutions which face varying circumstances. One would expect enrollment success to be dependent upon whether an institution had implemented specific strategies based upon information obtained through a total marketing concept or approach.

In this study, an attempt was made to classify colleges according to marketing orientation which had been defined as the degree to which an institution had implemented the marketing process. The literature review demonstrated that authors had identified the marketing process as a

series of managerial activities and systems designed to fulfill the college's mission and objectives. The process consisted of identifying and analyzing marketing opportunities, segmenting and selecting target markets, developing a competitive marketing mix strategy or strategies, and designing supporting marketing management systems for planning and control, information, and marketing personnel.

It followed, therefore, that meaningful examination of colleges in terms of their marketing orientation could be made by analyzing how marketing planning and control were conducted, how marketing information or intelligence was gathered, and how marketing personnel and activities were organized and coordinated. An examination of specific recruiting and retention activities employed by colleges also was useful, since the number of activities tried or actually under way, tended to indicate the vigor of a college's marketing effort. Specific types of recruiting and retention activities employed also indicated the nature or emphasis of a college's marketing orientation. Finally, the importance of presidential leadership to any marketing effort had been stressed in the literature and represented an important aspect of marketing orientation.

This study attempted to classify selected community, junior, and technical colleges according to the construct of marketing orientation through an examination of the planning and control, information, and organization systems; the recruiting and retention activities employed by the institutions; and the marketing orientation of presidents of the institutions.

A five-stage marketing typology for community, junior and technical colleges was developed initially to structure the survey and is presented in Appendix A.

According to Hoy and Miskel:

Organizational typologies are useful because they focus attention on important structural and functional similarities between organizations and help explain behavior. Typologies allow for comparative study of diverse organizations. Primarily descriptive rather than explanatory, good typologies are logical, consistent with theory, and comprehensive.¹

Following development of this typology, the following research null hypotheses were tested:

1. Marketing orientations have no relationship to changes in enrollments in selected community, junior, and technical colleges.

2. Marketing orientations have no relationship to changes in enrollments in selected community, junior, and technical colleges when the mediating variables of competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution and enrollment goal are held constant.

Population and Sample

The population for this study included all community, junior, and technical college campuses listed in the 1976 through 1983 issues of the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. To be included in the study, a campus had to be listed in all directories so that enrollment figures for an entire nine-year period could be obtained. Administrative units of multi-campus institutions were not included. A brief questionnaire initially was sent to chief executives who were asked to supply the name of an individual who would complete the larger questionnaire on marketing practices at their campus. The research population, therefore, comprised chief executives and the primary marketing officers at their campus.

From the population, 300 campuses were randomly selected utilizing

a table of random numbers. Initially, the institution campuses in the 1982 directory were numbered consecutively. The table was then entered by placing a pencil on a number while not observing the table. Four digits were used in each column of the table. Each time a number within the desired range was encountered, the campus represented by the number was included in the sample. This procedure was followed until the sample of 300 was obtained.

Data Collection

Data were collected in three ways: (1) by means of a two-part questionnaire administered to key administrators at the selected campuses, (2) from the 1976 through 1983 issues of the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, and (3) from records supplied by the American Association of Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges.

From the two-part questionnaire were obtained responses describing the marketing procedures employed at the various campuses as well as views about marketing of certain campus administrators.

The following information was obtained from the directories: enrollment figures for each campus for the years 1974 through 1982, control or affiliation, age of the institution and location according both to state and region of the nation by accrediting agency. Enrollment figures used involved total enrollment headcount (full- and part-time for credit, but not community education) as of October each year. The AACJC records provided data for institution type and community size for each campus.

On January 17, 1983, the first questionnaire (Appendix B) and explanatory cover letter were mailed to the chief administrators of the 300

selected campuses. On February 21, 1983, a follow-up note with the original cover letter and first questionnaire were sent to all chief administrators who had not responded. Also on this date, the second questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent to those individuals whose names were provided by the chief executives who had responded. The second questionnaire was subsequently sent to each campus as the first questionnaires were returned. On April 25, 1983, a follow-up note with the second questionnaire was sent to all individuals who had not responded to the first mailing of the second questionnaire. The final response rate for the first questionnaire to campus chief executives was 66 percent or 199. Of the second questionnaire to the administrators named by the chief executives, 176 were returned for a final response rate of 58 percent. Of this number, 15 were lacking portions of the requested information and were used only in certain parts of the analysis.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study was derived from the marketing typology presented in Appendix A and comprised two parts. The first (see Appendix B) was designed to be completed by the chief executive of each campus surveyed. Item 1a was designed to identify the chief executive's marketing philosophy as either production, product, selling, marketing, or societal marketing. Item 1b indicated how long the respondent had held this philosophy. Item 2a was designed to indicate the chief executive's stated enrollment goal for the campus as either to increase, maintain, decrease, alter to a specified mix, alter and increase, alter and maintain or alter and decrease full- and part-time, for-credit headcount enrollments. Item 2b was intended to indicate the number of

years this goal had been in effect. Item 2c was designed to obtain the chief executive's perception of the degree of enrollment-goal success on a standard Likert-type scale ranging from "very high" to "very low."

Brooks and Emmert defined this rating method:

This is the type of scale used for most rating tasks in communication research. In general, judges are told the dimension on which the objects are to be rated and are given labels for the end points of the scale . . . Sometimes scales which go from a positive to a negative extreme label the zero or neutral point. Some researchers have even seen fit to label all points on a scale . . . Others have used numerical values to label the points on a scale. Little evidence indicates that these differences in labeling affect the substantive outcomes of one's research.²

Item 2d was included to determine if the chief executive had established a target enrollment goal and what that goal was.

The second questionnaire (see Appendix B) was prepared for completion by the individual named by the chief executive as best able to identify the activities and parameters of the campus's marketing effort and was organized into three sections. Section A was designed to determine the nature of an institution's marketing information system (item 1a), marketing organization system (item 2a), and marketing planning and control system (item 3a). Items 1b, 2b and 3b were intended to determine the number of years each of these systems had been in place. In addition, item 4 was designed to determine the degree of competition in terms of student recruitment the respondent perceived for his or her campus, through the use of Likert-type scale ranging from "very high" to "very low." Item 5 was designed to obtain the respondent's perception of how marketing decisions were approached on his or her campus--through the perspective of a generic product definition or otherwise. Item 6 was designed to obtain the respondent's perception of how often his or her campus's administration designed program offerings through the essentials

of marketing positioning techniques. A Likert-type scale ranging from "very often" to "never" was employed. Item 7 was designed to obtain the respondent's perception of whether the essential steps of a marketing audit ever had been conducted on his or her campus and, if so, whether it was done on a regular basis. Item 8 was designed to determine whether marketing orientation training programs were conducted on the respondent's campus.

Sections B and C were designed to ascertain the number and types of recruitment and retention activities employed on a given campus and approximately how long these activities had been in place. The survey instrument also allowed for open-ended responses.

Content validity of the research instrument was established through a group of judges knowledgeable of marketing principles and higher education. Kerlinger stated, "Content validation consists essentially in judgment. Alone or with others, one judges the representativeness of the items."³ A few modifications of the instrument were suggested by the judges whose advice was followed.

Reliability of the research instrument was estimated by administering the survey to a group of higher education administrators on the OSU campus on two separate occasions three months apart. Lindeman and Merenda noted, "One procedure for obtaining reliability estimates is by repetition of the same test on two occasions."⁴ An index of the stability over time of the responses was estimated using the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient for the primary marketing dimension items of the survey instrument as follows: marketing philosophy, .50; marketing information, .75; marketing organization, .82; and marketing planning and control, .72.

Data Analysis

The data were treated according to requirements of the research questions. The first question (concerning the classification of selected community, junior, and technical colleges according to marketing orientation) was addressed through descriptive statistics. According to Huck, Cormier and Bounds, Jr., descriptive statistics are methods used to derive from raw data certain indices that characterize or summarize the entire set of data and involve measures of central tendency, measures of variability, and measures of relationship.⁵

The second research question (concerning what relationships, if any, exist between marketing orientations and enrollment changes in selected community, junior and technical colleges) was addressed through analysis of variance. According to Huck, Cormier, and Bounds, Jr., a one-way analysis of variance can be used to compare two or more groups in terms of mean scores.⁶

The third research question (concerning what effects do competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution, and enrollment goal have upon the relationships between marketing orientations and enrollment changes) was addressed through two-way analysis of variance and one-way analysis of covariance. According to Huck, Cormier and Bounds, Jr., the analysis of covariance is used by researchers to compare group means on a dependent variable after these group means have been adjusted for differences between the groups on some relevant covariate variable. A one-way analysis of covariance involves two or more comparison groups which differ from one another along a single dimension.⁷ Data from the survey were key-punched and processed through an SAS computer program, as outlined above.

For purposes of the analyses, enrollments were expressed in four different ways. In the first, the results of responses to item 2c of the chief executive's questionnaire were used. In this item, a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "very high" to "very low" was used to obtain the campus's degree of enrollment goal attainment success as perceived by the chief executive.

In the second, the average nine-year percent of enrollment change was calculated by dividing the full- and part-time, for-credit headcount enrollment for each year by the same enrollment for the previous year. This produced, for eight consecutive years, a percentage with 100 percent indicating no change in enrollments, greater than 100 percent indicating an enrollment increase from the previous year, and less than 100 percent indicating an enrollment decrease from the previous year. The resulting eight percentages then were averaged to arrive at a single percentage.

In the third method, the near short-range average percent of enrollment change was calculated in the same manner as for the average nine-year percent of enrollment change with the exception that only the 1980 through 1982 enrollments were used.

In the fourth method, the long-range enrollment stability was calculated by obtaining the absolute difference between the average nine-year percent of enrollment change and the individual percent of enrollment change for each of the eight consecutive years covered in the study. These eight absolute differences were then averaged.

ENDNOTES

¹Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel, Education Administration: Theory, Research and Practice (New York, 1982), pp. 32, 48.

²W. D. Brooks and P. Emmert, Methods of Research in Communication (Boston, 1970), p. 216.

³Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York, 1973), p. 458.

⁴Richard H. Lindeman and Peter F. Merenda, Educational Measurement (Glenview, Ill., 1979), pp. 60-61.

⁵Schuyler W. Huck, William H. Cormier, and William G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research (New York, 1974), pp. 18-20.

⁶Ibid., p. 58.

⁷Ibid., p. 136.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the scope and nature of marketing orientations currently used in community, junior and technical colleges and to relate those orientations to enrollment trends within those same institutions. There were a total of 199 responses by campus chief administrators to the survey, followed by responses from 174 key marketing administrators from those same campuses.

Analysis of Data

The presentation of the research results were organized according to the three research questions. The first research question, concerned with the classification of selected community, junior, and technical colleges according to marketing orientation, was addressed through descriptive statistics. The second research question, concerned with relationships, if any, that exist between marketing orientations and enrollment changes in selected community, junior, and technical colleges, was addressed through Chi-square tests and analysis of variance. The third research question, concerned with the effects of competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution and enrollment goal, upon the relationships between marketing orientations and enrollment changes, was addressed

through two-way analysis of variance and one-way analysis of covariance.

Research Question 1: What marketing orientations characterize community, junior and technical colleges? A wide range of marketing orientations characterized the 174 campuses whose administrators responded to the survey. In the study, however, contrasting "low" and "high" marketing orientations were identified that characterized a significant portion (50 to 65 percent) of the responding campuses. It was possible to identify these two marketing orientations because the survey instrument (Appendix B) expressed each of four major marketing orientation dimensions along continuums (expressed in five stages), ranging from "low" to "high" degrees of marketing activity, as was conceptualized in the typology presented in Appendix A. The procedure used to identify these marketing orientations was as follows: initially, a frequency program was used based upon responses to survey questionnaire items dealing with the president's marketing philosophy, the marketing information system, the marketing organization system, and the marketing planning and control system. From these four marketing orientation dimensions, each of which contained five stages plus an "other" category for one dimension, 88 dimension combinations resulted as shown in Appendix C.

Of the 88 dimension combinations that resulted from the frequencies program, only four represented seven or more college campuses. The largest number of campuses represented by one such dimension combination was 11. Only three of the 88 dimension combinations conformed to any of the five possible "pure" dimension combinations or stages depicted in the marketing typology in Appendix A. These three combinations represented only three college campuses.

Because of the wide array of dimension combinations, college campus

marketing orientation classifications were defined based upon a "high" marketing orientation vs. "low" marketing orientation dichotomy. Such classifications were designed first involving all four dimensions, then involving three selected dimensions, and finally involving three separate pairs of dimensions. It was reasoned that a useful characterization of marketing orientation would be identified by considering as many dimensions as possible in a classification scheme. However, because so few campuses fell into the "high"-"low" definitions when all four dimensions were considered, it became necessary to consider combination variations involving fewer numbers of dimensions. Additionally, the possibility existed that one or more marketing orientation dimensions, as expressed in the survey instrument, might not relate to enrollment trends as strongly as other dimensions and therefore might detract from comparisons made later in the study. Consequently, alternate classifications were defined based on different pairings of marketing orientations dimensions. Classifications were designated to allow nearly equal numbers of college campuses to fall within each type defined by the classifications. It was reasoned that the classification of responding college campuses in this manner would allow for later comparison of the campuses according to marketing orientation.

An explanation of the classification follows. Reference to the summary table in Appendix A will help in interpretation of results.

Classification 1 involved all four dimensions used in the frequency program. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing philosophy dimension of stage 1 or 2; a marketing information system dimension of stage 1 or 2; a marketing organization system dimension of stage 1 or 2; and a

marketing planning and control dimension of stage 1 or 2. The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing philosophy dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; a marketing information system dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; a marketing organization system dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; and a marketing planning and control dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5.

Classification 2 involved three selected dimensions. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 1 or 2; a marketing organization system dimension of stage 1; and a marketing planning and control dimension of stage 1. The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; a marketing organization system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4 or 5; and a marketing planning and control system orientation of stage 2, 3, 4 or 5.

Classification 3 involved two selected dimensions. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing organization system dimension of stage 1; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 1. The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing organization system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4, or 5; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Classification 4 involved two selected dimensions. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 1 or 2; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 1.

The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4 or 5.

Classification 5 involved the same two selected dimensions involved in classification 4, but utilized a different arrangement of stages within the college campus types. This was done because, in both arrangements, nearly equal numbers of college campuses fell within each type defined by the classification. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 1 or 2; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 1. The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5; and a marketing planning and control system dimension of stage 3, 4 or 5.

Classification 6 involved two selected dimensions. The Type A college campus in this classification ("low" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 1; and a marketing organization system dimension of stage 1. The Type B college campus in this classification ("high" marketing orientation) was characterized by: a marketing information system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4 or 5; and a marketing organization system dimension of stage 2, 3, 4 or 5.

Research Question 2: What relationships, if any, exist between marketing orientations and enrollment changes in selected community, junior and technical colleges? In the study, tests of this research question revealed that, in the case of some classifications, as the marketing

orientation varied, certain expressions of enrollment also varied. Specifically, the results indicated that chief executives of "high" marketing orientation campuses perceived higher enrollment goal attainment success for their campuses than did chief executives of "low" marketing orientation campuses (see Table I). Further, the results indicated that "low" marketing orientation campuses experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during a nine-year period than did "high" marketing orientation campuses (see Tables II, III and IV).

To address this research question, the four expressions of enrollment described in Chapter III were used for comparisons of the various classification types. For the first such enrollment expression (the chief executive's perception of campus enrollment goal attainment success), percentages of responses to each point on the five point Likert-type scale in item 2c of part 1 of the survey were compared, utilizing Chi-square tests, for Type A and Type B campuses in each of the six classifications. Tables I, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX present the results of these comparisons.

In each table, the row percent (Row %) indicates for each campus marketing orientation type (Type A and Type B) its percentage of the total responses made for any given scale point (low, medium, etc.). The column percent (Col %) indicates for each campus marketing orientation type the percentage of its total responses for any given scale point. The Chi-square test for each table indicated whether the differences in responses between Type A and Type B campus chief executives were significant at the .05 level of probability. It should be noted that in Tables I, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX more than 20 percent of the cells in each table had expected counts of less than five. Therefore, the

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 3

		Type A N = 68	Type B N = 43
very low	Row %	0	0
	Col %	0	0
low	Row %	100.00	0.00
	Col %	4.41	0.00
medium	Row %	79.41	20.59
	Col %	39.71	16.28
high	Row %	55.32	44.68
	Col %	38.24	48.84
very high	Row %	44.44	55.56
	Col %	17.65	34.88

CHI-SQUARE 10.534, DF = 3, PROB = 0.0145

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 5

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	106.889132	47	107.429627	39	0.11	0.7449
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	103.166139	47	103.162679	38	0.00	0.9987
Long-range enrollment stability	12.7038831	47	8.5829140	39	4.11	0.0458*

DF = 1, * Significant at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE III
TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON LONG-RANGE ENROLLMENT
STABILITY MEAN SCORES FOR CLASSIFICATION 3

Variable	Type A Mean	N	Type B Mean	N	F Value	Probability
Competition	12.959	68	8.791	43	7.87	0.0060*
Institution Type	12.864	70	8.791	43	4.69	0.0326*
Location	12.864	70	8.791	43	6.73	0.0109*
Community Size	12.864	70	8.799	42	0.87	0.3528
Enrollment Goal	12.882	69	8.619	42	1.12	0.2914

*Significant at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE IV
TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON LONG-RANGE ENROLLMENT
STABILITY MEAN SCORES FOR CLASSIFICATION 4

Variable	Type A Mean	N	Type B Mean	N	F Value	Probability
Competition	13.055	49	9.167	45	3.12	0.0810
Institution Type	13.055	49	9.167	45	4.92	0.0292*
Location	13.055	49	9.167	45	12.17	0.0008*
Community Size	13.055	49	9.183	44	1.88	0.1737
Enrollment Goal	13.055	49	9.011	44	1.77	0.1876

*Significant at the .05 level of probability.

tables are so sparse, the Chi-square tests may not have been reliable.

Of the Chi-square tests, only the test for Table I indicated a significant difference in the Type A and Type B campus chief executives' responses at the .05 level of probability. The remaining tables may be found in Appendix D. Table I is for classification 3 which is based upon the marketing organization system and the marketing planning and control system dimensions. In this case, Type B campus chief executives gave higher enrollment goal attainment success responses than did Type A campus chief executives. The table indicates that 17.65 percent of the Type A ("low" marketing orientation) campus chief executives indicated a "very high" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 34.88 percent of the Type B ("high" marketing orientation) campus chief executives. Likewise, 38.24 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "high" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 48.84 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. Also, 39.71 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "medium" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 16.28 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. Finally, 4.41 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "low" campus enrollment goal attainment success, but none of the Type B campus chief executives indicated this level of goal attainment.

For the remaining three enrollment expressions (average nine-year percent of enrollment change, near short-range average percent of enrollment change, and long-range enrollment stability), mean values for the enrollments of Type A campuses and Type B campuses were compared for each classification by analysis of variance. Tables II, X, XI, XII, XIII

and XIV present the results of these comparisons. All but Table II are contained in Appendix D.

The analysis of variance yielded an F Value for each comparison and a corresponding probability level. Only the analysis of variance reported in Table II, for classification 5, indicated a significant difference in mean values at the .05 level of probability, and this was for the long-range enrollment stability expression of enrollments. Classification 5 is based upon the marketing information system dimension and the marketing planning and control dimension. The table indicates that Type A ("low" marketing orientation) campuses, with a mean value of 12.7038831, experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during the nine-year period involved than did Type B ("high" marketing orientation) campuses, with a mean value of 8.5829140.

It should be noted that in Table XIII (classification 4) and Table XII (classification 3) the mean values of long-range enrollment stability for Type A and Type B campuses approached differences significant at the .05 level of probability.

As a final test of research question 2, the mean values of three enrollment expressions (average nine-year percent of enrollment change, near short-range average percent of enrollment change, and long-range enrollment stability) were compared by analysis of variance for each of the four marketing orientation dimensions individually by stages. Results of these comparisons are presented in Table XV for the marketing philosophy dimension, in Table XVI for the marketing information system dimension, in Table XVII for the marketing organization system dimension, and in Table XVIII for the marketing planning and control system dimension. The analyses of variance revealed no significant mean differences

at the .05 level of probability. These tables are contained in Appendix D.

Research Question 3: What effects do competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution, and enrollment goal have upon the relationships between marketing orientations and enrollment changes? In the study, tests of this research question revealed that, in the case of some classifications, competition, location, and institution type tended to alter the relationships between marketing orientation and one expression of enrollment change. Specifically, the results indicated that the long-range enrollment stability means of "high" and "low" marketing orientations campuses became different when the effects of competition, location and institution type were held constant through two-way analysis of variance (see Tables III and IV).

To address this research question, two-way analysis of variance was used to test the effects of the categorical independent variables competition, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, and enrollment goal. One-way analysis of covariance was used to test the effects of the continuous independent variables of age of program and age of institution. Goodnight, Sall and Sarle state that the analysis of covariance combines some of the features of regression and analysis of variance. Typically, a continuous variable (the covariate) is introduced into the model of an analysis-of-variance experiment.¹

In the analyses, only classifications 3 and 4 were used because only in these classifications did the mean values of an enrollment expression for Type A and Type B campuses approach, in the previously reported analyses of variance, differences significant at the .05 level

of probability without resulting in significance at this level. Also, in the analyses, only long-range enrollment stability mean comparisons were made as this expression of enrollment was the only one with which significant differences at the .05 level of probability had been approached, in the reported analyses of variance, without being attained. Finally, control or affiliation was not tested because over 91 percent of the responding campuses fell into a single category of this variable--public.

Table III for classification 3 and Table IV for classification 4 present the results of the two-way analyses of variance. It can be seen in Table III that the differences in mean values of Type A and Type B campuses became significant at the .05 level of probability when the effects of competition, institution type, or location were controlled in the analyses. Table IV reveals that the differences in mean values of Type A and Type B campuses became significant at the .05 level of probability when the effects of either institution type or location were controlled by the analyses. Tables XIX and XX, contained in Appendix D, present the results of the analyses of covariance, and reveal that no means were significantly different at the .05 level of probability. The LS Means presented in Tables XIX and XX are the same as adjusted means (means adjusted for the covariate).² Classification 3 involved the marketing organization system and marketing planning and control system dimensions. Classification 4 involved the marketing information system and marketing planning and control system dimensions.

Description of Marketing Orientation Types

Following the initial data analysis, a frequency program was used

to reveal the remaining marketing orientation characteristics of Type A and Type B campuses within classifications 3, 4 and 5. Appendix E presents the results of the frequency program.

From Appendix E, one can see that from 60 to 65 percent (depending upon which classification is considered) of the chief executives of Type B ("high" marketing orientation) campuses indicated a preference for the survey statement designed to portray the marketing philosophy. This compares to a rate of from 42.55 to 47.83 percent of the chief executives of Type A ("low" marketing orientation) campuses who indicated a preference for the marketing philosophy statement. At the same time, from 23.40 to 26.09 percent of Type A campus chief executives indicated a preference for the societal marketing statement as compared to from 10.00 to 22.22 percent of Type B campus chief executives. When percentages of responses for the two statements are combined, it can be seen that from 65.95 to 73.92 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a preference for either the marketing or the societal marketing philosophy as compared to 75.00 to 82.22 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. In the survey, 51.77 percent of all chief executives indicated a preference for the marketing philosophy and 22.62 percent indicated a preference for the societal marketing philosophy, or 74.39 percent for the two combined.

Appendix E further reveals that from 15.56 to 21.28 percent of Type B ("high" marketing orientation) campus administrators perceived a "very high" degree of competition for their campus as compared to 4.08 to 11.76 percent of the Type A ("low" marketing orientation) campus administrators.

On the survey item designed to indicate use of the generic product

definition in marketing decisions, 75.56 to 84.21 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated use of the generic product definition as compared to 46.81 to 52.94 percent of the Type A campus administrators.

On the survey item designed to indicate the practice of positioning as a marketing tool, 65.22 to 68.18 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated use of positioning "often" or "very often" as compared to 25.00 to 31.89 percent of the Type A campus administrators.

On the survey item designed to indicate whether or not a marketing audit had been conducted on a given campus, 21.28 to 25.00 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated that such an audit had been conducted as compared to 6.25 to 7.14 percent of the Type A campus administrators. In addition, 11.36 to 15.79 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated that such marketing audits were conducted on a regular basis on their campuses as compared to none of the Type A campus administrators.

From 63.83 to 65.00 percent of Type B campus administrators indicated the use of training programs to develop a service-to-students orientation in faculty and staff on their campuses as compared to 38.30 to 40.91 percent of Type A campus administrators.

Of the 23 recruiting activities listed on the survey, Type A campus administrators reported an average usage of from 10.14 to 11.66 as compared to 15.68 to 16.20 reported as being used by Type B campus administrators. Appendix E shows the percentage of activities being performed by each type of campus by classification. The greatest reported differences between campus types appeared in 12 recruiting activities. The reported establishment of a recruitment steering committee ranged from 16.33 to 25.71 percent for Type A campuses as compared to 52.27 to 62.50

percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of research to identify target groups of students ranged from 24.49 to 40.00 percent for Type A campuses to 80.43 to 86.36 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special promotions for these various target groups ranged from 30.61 to 45.71 percent for Type A campuses to 78.26 to 82.50 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special course offerings for target groups ranged from 42.86 to 48.57 percent for Type A campuses to 73.91 to 77.50 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special class times or locations for target groups ranged from 55.10 to 60.00 percent for Type A campuses to 84.79 to 87.50 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special tuition for target groups ranged from 14.29 to 17.14 percent for Type A campuses to 27.50 to 31.82 percent for Type B campuses.

Additionally, the reported use of studies to determine alternative tuition amounts ranged from 0.00 to 1.43 percent for Type A campuses to 17.39 to 20.45 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of studies to determine effectiveness of promotion practices ranged from 14.29 to 22.86 percent on Type A campuses to 60.87 to 63.64 percent of Type B campuses. The reported use of studies to determine the merits of different times and locations for conducting special courses ranged from 4.08 to 18.57 for Type A campuses to 57.50 to 61.36 percent for Type B campuses. The reported practice of comparing student application rates to a pre-determined expected rate ranged from 38.78 to 42.86 percent for Type A campuses to 72.73 to 76.09 percent for Type B campuses. The reported effort to determine recruiting cost per student ranged from 2.04 to 7.14 percent for Type A campuses to 32.50 to 38.64 percent for Type B campuses. Finally, the reported use of periodic surveys of prospective students to evaluate recruiting effectiveness ranged from 20.41 to 31.43

percent for Type A campuses to 72.73 to 80.00 percent for Type B campuses.

Of the 25 retention activities listed on the survey, Type A campus administrators reported an average usage of from 7.22 to 8.91 as compared to 12.96 to 13.65 reported as being used by Type B campus administrators. Appendix E shows the percentage of retention activities being performed by each type of campus by classification. The greatest reported differences between campus types appeared in 11 activities. The reported use of research to identify target groups for retention purposes ranged from 22.45 to 30.00 percent for Type A campuses to 54.35 to 59.09 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of expanded placement services and/or job-related training programs ranged from 36.73 to 45.71 percent for Type A campuses to 75.00 to 76.09 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of studies to determine the merits of different ways to reduce attrition ranged from 18.37 to 24.29 percent for Type A campuses to 56.52 to 59.09 percent for Type B campuses. The reported practice of comparing student attrition rate to a predetermined rate ranged from 14.29 to 18.57 percent on Type A campuses to 41.30 to 45.45 percent on Type B campuses. The reported practice of comparing student attrition rates to attrition rates at other colleges ranged from 14.29 percent for Type A campuses to 25.00 to 32.50 percent on Type B campuses.

Additionally, the reported use of surveys to obtain students' opinions about the campus ranged from 57.14 to 65.71 percent for Type A campuses to 88.64 to 95.00 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of retention orientation and counseling programs ranged from 20.41 to 24.29 percent for Type A campuses to 55.00 to 57.78 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of curricular innovations in academic programs

ranged from 8.16 to 18.57 percent for Type A campuses to 38.30 to 44.44 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special assistance services for students without a declared major ranged from 28.57 to 41.43 percent for Type A campuses to 57.78 to 62.50 percent for Type B campuses. The reported use of special admissions materials/procedures to aid student/institution "fit" ranged from 16.33 to 17.14 percent for Type A campuses to 51.06 to 52.50 percent for Type B campuses. Finally, the reported use of special services to retain adult learners ranged from 22.45 to 30.00 percent for Type A campuses to 51.06 to 52.50 percent for Type B campuses.

Appendix E reveals certain demographic differences between Type A and Type B campuses. For example, from 17.02 to 22.22 percent of Type B campuses were reported as Vo Tech type institutions by AACJC as compared to 5.71 to 6.12 percent of Type A campuses. From 53.19 to 55.56 percent of Type B campuses were reported as located in the north central accrediting association in the Community, Junior and Technical College Directory as compared to 35.71 to 40.82 percent of Type A campuses. At the same time, from 26.53 to 30.00 percent of the Type A campuses were reported in the southern accrediting association as compared to 17.78 to 20.00 percent of the Type B campuses. Finally, from 30.43 to 36.36 percent of the Type B campuses were reported by the AACJC as being located within an "urban" size community as compared to 11.43 to 18.37 percent of the Type A campuses. At the same time from 65.31 to 67.14 percent of the Type A campuses were reported as located within a "rural" size community as compared to 36.36 to 41.30 percent of the Type B campuses.

Summary

In this study, the scope and nature of marketing orientations used in community, junior and technical colleges and the relations of those orientations to enrollment trends were studied; and, the results were presented in this chapter according to the three research questions. The responses from the 174 campuses involved in the study indicated a diversity in terms of marketing orientations; however, a number of institutions were characterized by two contrasting marketing orientations related to the typology presented in Appendix A. When enrollment changes were compared among campuses that differed in terms of the marketing orientations identified in this study, differences in enrollment changes were observed.

ENDNOTES

¹J. H. Goodnight, J. P. Sall, and W. S. Sarle, "GLM," SAS Users' Guide: Statistics, ed. Alice Allen Ray (Cary, N.C., 1982), p. 186.

²Ibid., p. 188.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The emphasis on the part of legislative bodies on colleges' ability to attract and retain students has placed institutions of higher education into competitive positions in the marketplace of postsecondary education. That position has become more apparent in recent years as college campuses face the prospect of declining student enrollments. For the first time, in 1979, community, junior and technical colleges experienced an enrollment decline nationally, and thus faced the same enrollment challenge as traditional higher education institutions.¹ Marketing, with all its implications for administrative and organizational change within higher education, increasingly became a visible concern for all institutions within higher education.

Many practitioners and some researchers suggested specific marketing activities and general marketing guidelines for higher education institutions. Several researchers examined the scope of recruiting and retention activities that institutions employed to affect enrollments. While a broad theoretical framework for higher education marketing was implied in the literature--along with an extensive list of practical suggestions for specific marketing activities--little research had been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of various marketing orientations in terms of student enrollments. The question arose as to whether

improvements in enrollments necessarily followed from the advice given in the marketing literature.

One obvious research focus suggested by this question was to assess the relationship of marketing orientations to student enrollments. The purpose of this study was to examine the scope and nature of marketing orientations used in community, junior and technical colleges and to relate those orientations to enrollment trends within those same institutions.

Findings

This study involved a two-part survey questionnaire sent to a random sampling of community, junior and technical colleges. Information also came from the American Association of Community, Junior and Technical Colleges and the Community, Junior and Technical College Directory. The following are some of the study's findings:

1. Of the 88 dimension combinations that resulted from a frequency program of four marketing orientation dimensions, only four represented seven or more college campuses. The largest number of campuses represented by one such dimension combination was 11. Only three of the 88 dimension combinations conformed to any of the five possible "pure" dimension combinations or stages depicted in the marketing typology in Appendix A, and these three combinations represented only three college campuses.

2. Through the use of a "high" marketing orientation vs. "low" marketing orientation dichotomy, it was possible to define six college marketing orientation classifications through various combinations of four, three and two marketing orientation dimensions. Of the six

classifications, three proved to be central to the study. In classification 3, the Type A ("low" marketing orientation) campus was characterized by a marketing organization system that involved several offices performing uncoordinated recruiting activities, and a marketing planning and control system in which marketing planners mostly were engaged in day-to-day operations required for survival. The Type B ("high" marketing orientation) campus was characterized by marketing organization systems that featured, as a minimum, a full-time staff specialist for student recruitment, and ranged upward to systems that featured a marketing vice president and a marketing commitment by all members of the institution, and a marketing planning and control system that featured, as a minimum, a planning budget for marketing efforts, and possibly included annual planning as well as strategic long-range planning, and/or contingency plans and computer simulation (see items 2a and 3a of the survey instrument in Appendix B and the summary table in Appendix A).

In classification 4, the Type A campus was characterized by a marketing information system that featured either intuition and casual observation or an internal records system, and a marketing planning and control system in which marketing planners mostly were engaged in day-to-day operations required for survival. The Type B campus was characterized by a marketing information system that included, as a minimum, a formal marketing intelligence system and, in some cases, a formal marketing research system, and/or a formal marketing management science system, and a marketing planning and control system that featured, as a minimum, a planning budget for marketing efforts, and possibly included annual planning as well as strategic long-range planning, and/or contingency plans and computer simulation (see items 1a and 3a of the survey

instrument in Appendix B, and the summary table in Appendix A).

Classification 5 involved the same two selected marketing orientation dimensions as in classification 4. In classification 5 however, the marketing planning and control system dimension for Type B campuses featured, as a minimum, annual planning.

3. Campus chief executives' perceptions of campus enrollment goal attainment success were found to differ between Type A and Type B campuses in classification 3. Comparisons indicated that 17.65 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "very high" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 34.88 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. Likewise, 38.24 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "high" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 48.84 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. Also, 39.71 percent of the Type A campus chief executives indicated a "medium" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to 16.28 percent of the Type B campus chief executives. Finally, 4.41 percent of Type A campus chief executives indicated a "low" campus enrollment goal attainment success compared to none of the Type B campus chief executives. Chi-square tests indicated a difference significant at the .05 level of probability.

4. The long-range enrollment stability expression of enrollments was found to differ between Type A and Type B campuses in classification 5. An analysis of variance revealed a difference significant at the .05 level of probability between the Type A campus mean value of 12.7038831 and the Type B campus mean value of 8.5829140, indicating that the Type A campuses experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during the nine-year period involved than did Type B campuses.

5. When the mean values of three enrollment expressions were compared by analysis of variance for each of the four marketing orientation dimensions individually by stages, no mean differences were found to be significant at the .05 level of probability.

6. Two-way analysis of variance revealed differences in mean long-range enrollment stability values for Type A and Type B campuses in classification 3 significant at the .05 level of probability when the effects of either competition, institution type, or location were controlled in the analyses. The comparisons indicated that Type A campuses, with mean values of 12.98 and 12.86, experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during the nine-year period involved than did Type B campuses, with a mean value of 8.79.

7. Two-way analysis of variance revealed differences in mean long-range enrollment stability values for Type A and Type B campuses in classification 4 significant at the .05 level of probability when the effects of either institution type or location were controlled in the analyses. The comparison indicated that Type A campuses, with a mean value of 13.06 experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during the nine-year period involved than did Type B campuses, with a mean value of 9.17.

8. Comparisons of Type A and Type B campuses within classifications 3, 4 and 5 revealed that from 60 to 65 percent (depending upon which classification was considered) of the chief executives of Type B campuses indicated a preference for the survey statement designed to portray the marketing philosophy. This compared to a rate of from 42.55 to 47.83 percent of the chief executives of Type A campuses. At the same time, from 23.40 to 26.09 percent of Type A campus chief executives indicated

a preference for the societal marketing philosophy statement as compared to from 10.00 to 22.22 percent of Type B campus chief executives.

9. Comparisons of Type A and Type B campuses within classifications 3, 4 and 5 revealed that 75.56 to 84.21 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated use of the generic product definition as compared to 46.81 to 52.94 percent of the Type A campus administrators. Also, 65.22 to 68.18 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated use of positioning "often" or "very often" as compared to 25.00 to 31.89 percent of the Type A campus administrators. Further, 21.23 to 25.00 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated that a marketing audit had been conducted on their campuses as compared to 6.25 to 7.14 percent of the Type A campus administrators, and 11.36 to 15.79 percent of the Type B campus administrators indicated such marketing audits were conducted on a regular basis on their campuses compared to none of the Type A campus administrators. Finally, from 63.83 to 65.00 percent of Type B campus administrators indicated the use of training programs to develop a service-to-students orientation in faculty and staff on their campuses as compared to 38.30 to 40.91 percent of Type A campus administrators.

10. The mean number of the 23 recruiting activities listed on the survey reported as being used by Type A campus administrators on their colleges' campuses ranged from 10.14 to 11.66 as compared to 15.68 to 16.20 reported by Type B campus administrators. Among the recruiting activities between which the greatest differences were reported were: establishment of a recruiting steering committee; use of research to identify target groups of students; use of special promotions for the various target groups; use of special course offerings for target groups;

use of special class times or locations for target groups; use of special tuition for target groups; use of studies to determine alternative tuition amounts; use of studies to determine effectiveness of promotion practices; use of studies to determine the merits of different times and locations for conducting special courses; the practice of comparing student application rates to a predetermined expected rate; the effort to determine recruiting cost per student; and the use of periodic surveys of prospective students to evaluate recruiting effectiveness.

11. The mean number of the 25 retention activities listed on the survey reported as being used by Type A campus administrators on their colleges' campuses ranged from 7.22 to 8.91 as compared to 12.96 to 13.65 reported by Type B campus administrators. Among the retention activities between which the greatest differences were reported were: the use of research to identify target groups for retention purposes; the use of expanded placement services and/or job-related training programs; the use of studies to determine the merits of different ways to reduce attrition; the practice of comparing student attrition rate to a predetermined rate; the practice of comparing student attrition rates to attrition rates at other colleges; the use of surveys to obtain students' opinions about the campus; the use of retention orientation and counseling programs; the use of curricular innovations in academic programs; the use of special assistance services for students without a declared major; the use of special admissions materials/procedures to aid student/institution "fit;" and the use of special services to retain adult learners.

12. Comparisons of Type A and Type B campuses within classifications 3, 4 and 5 revealed certain demographic differences between the

two types. From 17.02 to 22.22 percent of Type B campuses were Vo-Tech-type institutions as compared to 5.71 to 6.12 percent of Type A campuses. From 53.19 to 55.56 percent of Type B campuses were located in the north central accrediting association as compared to 35.71 to 40.82 percent of Type A campuses; and, from 26.53 to 30.00 percent of Type A campuses were located in the southern accrediting association as compared to 17.78 to 20.00 percent of the Type B campuses. Finally, from 30.43 to 36.36 percent of Type B campuses were located within "urban" size communities as compared to 11.43 to 18.37 percent of Type A campuses, and 65.31 to 67.14 percent of Type A campuses were located within "rural" size communities as compared to 36.36 to 41.03 percent of Type B campuses.

Conclusions

The following conclusions seem appropriate from the findings of this study:

1. In response to the first research question, "What marketing orientations characterize community, junior and technical colleges?," the answer would appear to be that diversity in marketing orientation characterizes these institutions. Based upon the four marketing orientation dimensions used in the study, as many as 88 marketing orientation combinations could be identified (see Appendix C). Within classifications 3, 4 and 5, which were central to the study, Type A campuses accounted for from 27.01 to 39.65 percent of the total responding campuses, and Type B campuses accounted for from 22.41 to 25.29 percent of the responding campuses. Thus, together, these two marketing orientation types characterized from 49.42 to 64.94 percent of the total 174 responding campuses.

2. In answer to the second research question, "What relationships, if any, exist between marketing orientation and enrollment changes in selected community, junior and technical colleges?," the results of this study as revealed in Table I seemed to indicate that, in the case of some marketing orientation classifications, chief executives of "high" marketing orientation campuses (Type B) perceived higher enrollment goal attainment success for their campuses than did chief executives of "low" marketing orientation campuses (Type A). Furthermore, the results of this study, as revealed in Tables II, III and IV, seemed to indicate that, in the case of some marketing orientation classifications, "low" marketing orientation campuses (Type A) experienced greater absolute variation in enrollments during the nine-year period involved in the study than did "high" marketing orientation campuses (Type B). It was assumed in this study that, while community, junior and technical colleges in the United States may seek to increase, maintain, or even decrease enrollments, these institutions seek stable enrollments. The term "stable enrollments," in this instance, referred to enrollments that do not fluctuate greatly from year to year.

Based upon these findings, the hypothesis stated in Chapter III, "Marketing orientations have no relationship to changes in enrollments in selected community, junior and technical colleges," was rejected for the marketing orientation classifications 3, 4 and 5. This conclusion was supported by the research results reported in Tables I, II, III, and IV.

3. In answer to the research question, "What effects do competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution, and enrollment goal have upon the

relationships between marketing orientations and enrollment changes?," the results of this study seemed to indicate that, in the case of some marketing orientations and some types of enrollment changes, competition, institution type and location had an intervening relationship. In this study, differences between the long-range enrollment stability means of "high" marketing orientation (Type B) and "low" marketing orientation (Type A) campuses were significant at the .05 level of probability when the effects of competition, location and institution type were controlled through two-way analysis of variance.

Based upon these findings, the hypothesis stated in Chapter III, "Marketing orientations have no relationship to changes in enrollments in selected community, junior and technical colleges when the mediating variables of competition, age of program, control or affiliation, institution type, location, community size, age of institution and enrollment goal are held constant," was rejected for the variables competition, location and institution type when utilizing the marketing orientation classifications 3 and 4 defined in this study. This conclusion was supported by results reported in Tables III and IV.

Other conclusions, less central to the stated purpose of this study, include the following:

4. The marketing philosophy dimension, as expressed by the chief executives, did not appear to be useful in this study for classifying college campuses according to marketing orientation. A majority (74.39 percent) of chief executives surveyed indicated a preference for the marketing or societal marketing philosophy statements. As Appendix E reports, from 60 to 65 percent of the chief executives of Type B campuses indicated a preference for the marketing philosophy statement, while 42.55

to 47.83 percent of the chief executives of Type A campuses indicated a preference for this philosophy. At the same time, from 23.40 to 26.09 percent of Type A campus chief executives indicated a preference for the societal marketing philosophy statement as compared to from 10.00 to 22.22 percent of Type B campus chief executives.

5. The results of this study suggested consistency within the marketing orientations identified. The reported occurrence on campuses of marketing practices not used to initially define marketing orientations in the study remained consistent with the concepts presented in the typology outlined in Appendix A. Appendix E shows that "high" marketing orientation (Type B) campuses employed generic product definition, positioning, marketing audits, and training programs to develop service-to-students orientations in faculty and staff more often than did "low" marketing orientation (Type A) campuses. For example, comparisons revealed in Appendix E for classifications 3, 4 and 5 revealed that from 75.56 to 84.21 percent of Type B campus administrators indicated use of the generic product definition as compared to 46.81 to 52.94 percent of Type A campus administrators. The results of this study also suggested that "high" marketing orientation (Type B) campuses employed more recruiting activities than did "low" marketing orientation (Type A) campuses. Appendix E shows that the mean number of the 23 recruiting activities listed on the survey reported as being used by Type A campus administrators on their campuses ranged from 10.14 to 11.66 as compared to 15.68 to 16.20 reported by Type B campus administrators. Finally, the results of this study suggested that "high" marketing orientation (Type B) campuses employed more retention activities than did "low" marketing orientation (Type A) campuses. The mean number of the 25 reten-

tion activities listed on the survey reported as being used by Type A campus administrators on their colleges' campuses ranged from 7.22 to 8.91, as compared to 12.96 to 13.65 reported by Type B campus administrators.

6. This study further suggested that "high" marketing orientation (Type B) campuses more often were Vo-tech-type institutions and more often were located in urban centers than were "low" marketing orientation (Type A) campuses. Appendix E shows that, from 17.02 to 22.22 percent of Type B campuses were reported as Vo-Tech as compared to 5.71 to 6.12 percent of Type A campuses. From 30.43 to 36.36 percent of Type B campuses were located in "urban" communities as compared to 11.43 to 18.37 percent of Type A campuses.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based upon the findings of this study:

1. Research studies involving indepth, followup interviews should be conducted for "high" and "low" marketing orientation campuses to explore the exact nature of their marketing approaches. The results of this research could be, among other things, a refined survey instrument.

2. The marketing philosophy dimension should be examined in more detail. In developing the marketing philosophy typology, Kotler had in mind a pervasive philosophy that permeated an organization at all levels. Obviously, the stated marketing philosophy of the chief executive is something else. An examination of the marketing philosophies of individuals throughout an institution would be more useful for determining precise marketing orientation.

3. A new marketing orientation typology should be devised taking

into account the results of this study. Such a typology could help college administrators to better understand and implement marketing strategies and activities that may be useful.

4. A larger sample size for similar studies in the future is recommended due to the diversity of community, junior and technical colleges in terms of marketing orientation. In the current study, it was necessary to form classification types to allow for nearly equal numbers of campuses in comparison groups. Wider separation of groupings according to marketing orientation stages would have resulted in highly unbalanced comparison groups and/or too few campuses within a given group for proper comparison. Therefore, following refinement of the survey instrument, it is recommended a survey of all 1,197 (approximately) community, junior and technical colleges in the United States be conducted to allow for adequate numbers of campuses within groupings.

5. The concept of enrollment stability as an expression of enrollment change should be examined more closely. Campus administrators should be questioned about the desirability of enrollment stability and its critical parameters. Finally, expressions of enrollment stability, other than the one used in this study, should be devised.

6. Other expressions of enrollment change should be devised in addition to those used in this study. More sophisticated understanding of the consequences of enrollment changes would add depth to future studies.

7. Campus administrators' views of enrollment goal attainment success should be studied in more depth. Examinations of how the administrators arrive at their perceptions, how closely those perceptions relate to actual enrollment changes, and how marketing philosophy and

orientation influences administrators' perceptions would be valuable.

8. It is recognized that a danger exists for missinterpretation of marketing methods and goals--that quality in postsecondary education could be neglected in a drive to increase enrollments at all costs. It is further realized that faculty play the central role in the product offerings of community, junior and technical colleges. It is therefore recommended that studies of the role of faculty in the marketing process be conducted with emphasis on the following, among others: faculty morale in relation to marketing orientations, faculty contribution to product quality, and faculty perceptions of the marketing process and its role in postsecondary education.

ENDNOTE

¹Edmund Gleazer, Jr., Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, (Washington, D.C., 1979), p. 1.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Fred J. "Administrative Opinions Concerning Utilization of Marketing Strategies in Management of Higher Education Institutions in the United States." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Memphis State University, 1978.)
- Astin, Alexander W. Preventing Students From Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Barton, David W., Jr., and David R. Treadwell, Jr. "Marketing: A Synthesis of Institutional Soul-Searching and Aggressiveness." In David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1978), pp. 77-84.
- Bassin, William M. "A Marketing Technique for Student Recruitment." Research in Higher Education, Vol. 3 (1975), pp. 51-65.
- Beal, Philip E., and Lee Noel. What Works in Student Retention. Boulder: The American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1980.
- Breneman, David W. The Coming Enrollment Crisis: What Every Trustee Must Know. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.
- Brooks, W. D., and P. Emmert. Methods of Research in Communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Brown, John Anthony. "The Role of Academic Programs in Institutional Marketing." In David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1978), pp. 7-22.
- Buchanan, W. Wray, and H. C. Barksdale. "Marketing's Broadening Concept is Real in University Extension." Adult Education, Vol. 25 (1974), pp. 36-46.
- Carea, William L., and Frank R. Kemerer. "The Internal Dimensions of Institutional Marketing." College and University, Vol. 20 (1979), pp. 173-188.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years in Higher Education. Iowa City, Iowa, and Boulder, Colo.: American College Testing Program and National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1980.

- Chapman, David. "A Model of Student College Choice." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 52 (1981), pp. 490-505.
- Clarkson, Tom. "The Selling of Our Product." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1981), pp. 34-37.
- Compton, Paul K. "Marketing Practices of Administrators of Successful Continuing Education Programs." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1980.)
- Cope, R. G., and W. Hannah. Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stopping Out, and Transferring. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Cross, K. P. "Old Practices and New Purposes." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1979), pp. 4-8.
- Cutlip, Scott M. "Advertising Higher Education: The Early Years of College Public Relations." College and University Journal, Vol. 9 (1970), pp. 21-28.
- Dezek, John George. "Marketing Techniques Utilized by Community College Continuing Education Divisions in Michigan." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1980.)
- Erickson, Stanford. "Marketing is Only a Part of Admissions." College and University Business, Vol. 52 (1972), pp. 56-57.
- Frances, C. College Enrollment Trends: Testing the Conventional Wisdom Against the Facts. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.
- Gardiner, John J., and Ali Nazari-Robati. "Student Attrition Research: Implications for Retention Strategies." NASPA Journal, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1983), pp. 25-33.
- Geltzer, Howard, and Al Ries. "The Positioning Era: A Marketing Strategy for College Admissions in the 1980s." A Role for Marketing in College Admissions. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976.
- Gleazer, Edmund, Jr. Community, Junior and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.
- J. H. Goodnight, J. P. Sall, and W. S. Sarle. "GLM." In Alice Allen Ray (Ed.), SAS Users' Guide: Statistics, 1982 Edition. Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute Inc., 1982.
- Hoppe, Sherry Lee. "An Analysis of the Relationship of Marketing to Enrollment in Selected Community, Junior and Technical Colleges." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1981.)

- Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. Education Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, Inc., 1982.
- Huck, Schuyler W., William H. Cormier, and William G. Bounds, Jr. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Ihlanfeldt, William. "A Management Approach to the Buyer's Market." Liberal Education, Vol. 61 (1975), pp. 133-148.
- Johnson, Dennis L. "New Tools for the Creative Manager." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1980), pp. 28-32.
- Keim, William A. "Applying Good Sense to Marketing." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1979), pp. 10-13.
- Kemerer, Frank R., J. Victor Baldridge, and Kenneth C. Green. Strategies for Effective Enrollment Management. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1982.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Knight, B., and D. Johnson. "Marketing Higher Education." Education Record, Vol. 62, No. 1 (1981), pp. 28-31.
- Kranchenberg, A. R. "Bringing the Concept of Marketing to Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43 (1972), pp. 369-380.
- Kotler, Philip. Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- _____. "Applying Marketing Theory to College Admissions." A Role for Marketing in College Admissions. A paper presented at the Colloquium on College Admissions, Fontana, Wisconsin, May 16-18, 1976. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976.
- _____. Principles of Marketing. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- _____, and Leslie A. Goldgehn. "Marketing: A Definition for Community Colleges." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 36 (1981), pp. 7-11.
- _____, and Sidney J. Levy. "Broadening the Concept of Marketing." Journal of Marketing, Vol. 33 (1969), pp. 10-15.
- Leach, Ernest R. "Implementing the Marketing Process." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 48 (1977), pp. 20-24.
- Lenning, O. T., P. E. Beal, and K. Sauer. Attrition and Retention: Evidence for Action and Research. Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1980.

Levitt, Theodore. "Marketing Myopia." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 38, No. 4 (1960), pp. 45-56.

_____. "Marketing Intangible Products and Product Intangibles." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 59, No. 3 (1981), pp. 94-102.

Lindeman, Richard H., and Peter F. Merenda. Educational Measurement. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979.

Lovelock, Christopher H., and Michael L. Rothschild. "Uses, Abuses, and Misuses of Marketing in Higher Education." Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives. Papers presented at the Colloquium on Marketing, Student Admissions, and the Public Interest, Racine, Wisconsin, November 7-9, 1979. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.

Lucas, John A. Developing a Total Marketing Plan: New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979.

Mayhew, L. B. Surviving the Eighties: Strategies and Procedures for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

McCarthy, Jerome E. Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1975.

Murphy, Patrick E. "The Promises and Pitfalls of Marketing Research in Higher Education." Liberal Education, Vol. 66 (1980), pp. 102-115.

_____, and Richard McGarrity. "Marketing Universities: A Survey of Student Recruitment Activities." College and University, Vol. 53 (1978), pp. 249-261.

National Center of Education Statistics. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1984-85. Washington, D.C.: National Center of Education Statistics, 1979.

Noel, L. "First Steps in Starting a Campus Retention Program." In L. Noel (Ed.), Reducing the Dropout Rate: New Directions for Student Services. No. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Pantages, T. J., and C. F. Creedon. "Studies of College Attrition: 1950-1975." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 48 (1978), pp. 49-101.

Ramist, Leonard. College Student Attrition and Retention. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1981.

Riggs, Robert O., and Willard L. Lewis. "Applicability of Marketing Research to Student Recruitment." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 22 (1980), pp. 467-468.

Rinnander, Elizabeth. "Recruiting Adult Students." Community College Review, Vol. 5 (1977), pp. 55-60.

- Spiro, Louis M. "The Uses of Student Market Segmentation Techniques in College Recruitment." A paper presented at the annual Association for Institutional Research Forum, Houston, Texas, May, 1978.
- Sullivan, Daniel F., and Larry H. Litten. "Using Research in Analyzing Student Markets: A Case Study." A Role for Marketing in College Admissions. Papers presented at the Colloquium on College Admissions, Fontana, Wisconsin, May 16-18, 1976. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976.
- Sutton, David S. "Marketing Tactics Put Into Recruiting." College and University Business, Vol. 52 (1972), pp. 52-53.
- Tatham, Elaine L. "Community Response to Direct Mail From a Community College, Including an Evaluation of a Credit Card Plan." An unpublished paper, Overland Park, Kansas, January, 1976.
- Tinto, Vincent. "Dropout From Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 54 (1975), pp. 89-129.
- _____. "Student Disengagement Revisited: Some Thoughts on the Limits of Theory and Practices in Dropout." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 3-5, 1981.
- Uehling, Barbara S. "Marketing and the Future of Institutions." Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives. Papers presented at the Colloquium on Marketing, Student Admissions, and the Public Interest, Racine, Wisconsin, November 7-9, 1979. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.
- Veysey, Lawrence. "Undergraduate Admissions: Past and Future." Marketing in College Admissions: A Broadening of Perspectives. Papers presented at the Colloquium on Marketing, Student Admissions, and the Public Interest, Racine, Wisconsin, November 7-9, 1979. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.
- Weirich, Margaret C. "A Marketing Case History Profile." In David W. Barton, Jr. (Ed.), Marketing Higher Education: New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.
- White, Edward T. "The Development of a Handbook for Marketing the Community College." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1980.)

APPENDIX A

A FIVE-STAGE MARKETING TYPOLOGY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The following typology is based upon a review of pertinent marketing literature and observation of how select colleges go about the marketing effort. It should be assumed that a given college may not be operating in the same stage (or level) for each of the various marketing-orientation dimensions. The typology is intended as a comparative guide and an aid to achieving quicker insight into the marketing process in community colleges.

A summary table is provided to guide the reader.

Stage One: The Traditional College

Two marketing philosophies are typically found in the traditional college which has operated in a seller's market. In the first philosophy, which emphasizes the production concept, administrators assume that prospective students prefer those educational offerings that are available and that they can afford. Making production and distribution more efficient, through, for example, larger classes or lower paid faculty, becomes very important.

A philosophy more common in higher education, which emphasizes the product concept, is that prospective students desire educational products that offer the greatest quality for the price. This philosophy includes the idea that students buy educational products rather than solutions to meet needs, and that students understand the feature and quality differences of competing academic programs. It is assumed that prospective students will continue to want a college's product, despite increasing alternatives.

In terms of a formal marketing administrative effort, marketing information, organization, and planning and control are practically non-

existent, as a result of the above philosophies. No organized effort to gather or retain market information is evident. Marketing decisions are thus based on intuition, casual observations, or statements made by admissions personnel or prospective students. When a college and its service area is small and its representatives are close to prospective students and to those enrolled in the college, the institution appears to be quite successful without a formal marketing information system.

Additionally, no formal marketing organization will exist, with the admissions, registrar, alumni, financial aids, and other offices performing essentially uncoordinated recruiting activities and few, if any, retention activities. In terms of planning, administrators in the traditional college are usually so busy with day-to-day activities, they have little time for formal planning. Engrossed in operations required for survival, they do not allow for a planning staff.

Specific marketing activities in a stage-one college will be limited to a few traditional recruiting activities such as newspaper news stories, college catalogs, course schedules for the college term, information flyers, high school visits, and campus visitation days. Retention activities are typically limited to advising, usually by faculty on a part-time basis.

Stage Two: The Selling-Oriented College

Usually motivated by increased competition or declining enrollments, the college in the second stage becomes more sophisticated in some aspects of promotion. The administration's philosophy assumes that prospective students will not enroll in sufficient numbers unless a strong effort is made to overcome their lack of interest in the college's

offerings. Committed to an established curriculum and having hired a faculty and built a physical plant, administration in the selling-oriented college may spend a great deal of money for promotional activities, especially if the college has experienced a sudden drop in enrollments. The college's offerings are portrayed as being tremendous for all students, and any shortcomings of the college are simply not mentioned since the aim is to attract more students, not to worry about retention.

Due to these new pressures and marketing philosophy, the marketing administrative effort is improved. Usually, as the college begins to grow, and college representatives become removed from their clients, the need for more refined methods of understanding what is taking place in terms of the college's marketing efforts is realized. An internal records system may then be established, consisting of data on enrollments, drop-outs, class sizes, faculty workloads, student records and characteristics, alumni records and the like.

In terms of marketing organization, recruiting activities are still mainly uncoordinated except that promotional activities are examined and planned more carefully. Individual departments, however, still often produce messages which conflict with a total institutional image. Some "specialists" may be added to the staff to enhance selling of the product. In planning, a marketing budgeting system may be instituted in which administration, for example, estimates total enrollments for the coming year and the expected costs and revenues associated with this enrollment level.

The only marketing activities employed, in addition to those mentioned in stage one, are recruiting such as newspaper and television advertisements, television news stories, posters, billboards, or word of

mouth promotion. In stage-two colleges, retention is not yet recognized as a useful avenue for affecting enrollments.

Stage Three: The Marketing-Oriented College

As an institution becomes more complex, primarily through increased size, and due to greater competition, there is an awareness within the college of the necessity to begin to pay attention to student needs and demands. For the first time, administration attends to the marketing concept which holds that "the key to achieving organizational goals consists of determining the needs and wants of target markets and adapting the organization to delivering the desired satisfactions more effectively and efficiently than its competitors."

In terms of marketing administration, college managers may realize a need to obtain data about what is happening in the environment in order to interpret recruiting and retention results and to become aware of new problems and opportunities. At this point, a formal marketing intelligence system begins to take shape. While managers before relied mainly on publications as well as associates for outside information, more emphasis is placed on having admissions and recruiting personnel pass on information about prospective students and drop-outs. Special marketing intelligence services may be utilized such as lists of foundations and the grants they offer, student scores and profiles from ACT.

The most visible change within the marketing organization is the appointment of what is essentially a marketing director with a limited role oriented to promotion and recruitment, fund raising and alumni. The college will enter a stage of annual planning and a crude marketing plan may develop. The identification of prospective students in terms of

different homogenous groups with unique needs (market segmentation) and subsequent variation of appeals (differentiated marketing) may be initiated. Much more attention is given to coordination of the promotion effort.

New recruitment activities may include offering programs at locations other than campus, additional new credit and noncredit program offerings, and offering courses through television, radio, or newspapers. For the first time, retention is considered important and new strategies may include the improvement or redevelopment of academic advising programs, establishment of early warning systems for identification and communicating with potential dropouts or stopouts, new or revitalized extracurricular activities, expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services, expanded placement services, faculty/instructional development programs, and student exit interviews.

Stage Four: The Total-Marketing College

Often, in stage-three colleges, the marketing concept is professed, but not practiced, or even understood, fully. Either through declining enrollments or exposure to more sophisticated marketing concepts, a college will move from a short-run to a long-run marketing orientation (stage four). The broader implications of marketing are recognized, and institutional leaders become more desirous of the substance as well as the form of marketing in the institution's programs. Leaders are increasingly savy in terms of marketing concepts, and are concerned about creating value in the college's products, but encounter problems of change within the college.

Concerning marketing administration, the college eventually arrives

at a point where the demand for marketing information requires the institution to initiate specific studies of problem and opportunity areas. A formal marketing research system is implemented during this stage. Marketing Director Miles Eckert reports that at Odessa (Texas) Junior College, a series of committees first analyze a wide range of enrollment influences including economic markets, cultural markets, recruitment, retention, foundation and resources, future programming, promotion, and image. These committees collect data from various campus surveys, community surveys, federal reports, department of labor statistics, regional planning commission research studies, and chamber of commerce research studies. After analysis of the data, the committees make marketing recommendations which are designed to help the colleges achieve a better match with the potential student population.

Throughout the organization, the marketing vice president gains control, or at least influence, over a wider range of recruiting, retention, placement and alumni and development activities. A retention coordinator and a retention steering committee may appear. The college enters a strategic-planning phase in which the planning system is enhanced to improve overall marketing effectiveness. Long-range planning is implemented, for example, with the introduction of a rolling five-year plan from which the annual marketing plan is derived.

The plans move from a simpler stage in which they contain mostly statistics and specific tactical actions to a more advanced planning system in which the plans contain a section on strategy. Prince George's Community College (Maryland) Dean of Students Ernest Leach, in his capacity as marketing director, develops a marketing plan which, among other things, outlines market trends such as an increase in older and minority

clients, an analysis of the competition, and high school students' perceptions of the college. In addition to identifying target groups of prospective students and marketing activities aimed at each group, the plan presents an overall long-range strategy for Prince George's role within the community. Strategies and tactics are designed to meet 16 long-range institutional goals. With such a perspective, notes Leach, the marketing process becomes a means of achieving organizational objectives and of designing the organization's offerings in terms of the target markets' needs and desires.

Also in stage four, an attempt is made to standardize the plan formats so that the efforts of similar units can be compared. Customer behavior analyses are consulted, an audit of the marketing operation is conducted, the college's offerings are more broadly defined (generic product definition), and the college strives to fill needs unmet by other institutions (marketing positioning).

New recruiting activities include periodic improvement of and elimination of some programs, and offering special group tuition rates. Retention activities attempted include special orientation activities, curricular innovations in credit programs, special counseling programs, special or required services for students who have not declared a major, special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institutional fit, use of students as peer advisers and counselors, and special services designed to retain adult learners.

Stage Five: The Integrated Marketing College

Institutions of higher education which enter the stage-five marketing orientation realize their obligations to society's interests as well

as to consumer wants and the college's own interests. Administrators recognize that, in earlier marketing orientations, they may have ignored the frequent conflicts between immediate consumer wants and long-run societal welfare. In this stage, educators have no doubt that they are responsible for a major deciding role in such issues as strictly career and pragmatic education versus a liberal or life-enhancing education. While profit companies may not be expected to absorb losses in the pursuit of societal marketing, institutions of higher education may well have an obligation to accept such setbacks when societal interests are at issue. Though this marketing philosophy may be present in earlier marketing orientations, it is a necessary condition in stage five.

As for administration of the marketing program, the ultimate state-of-the-art stage in a college's marketing information system is achieved when computer simulation models are used to predict the consequences of various product, pricing, distribution, retention or promotion strategies. College administrators now seek to develop a sound mix of marketing activities, and deal with the great uncertainty caused by the separate and joint effects of various activities. For example, in allocating recruiting funds, a university may need to decide if it should concentrate in the proven area in which it is already successful or in contested or new areas. A formal marketing management science system is thus established, completing all the components of a marketing information system. Continuous marketing information feedback occurs through several channels in the institution.

In earlier stages, a college may develop sophisticated marketing apparatus employing advanced marketing strategies, yet only the administrators and certain staff highly involved in marketing activities may be

fully committed to the total marketing concept. Until essentially all faculty and staff members within the institution see themselves as part of the marketing organization--and not a selling effort--the college cannot fully operate in an effective marketing posture.

Institutional leaders must succeed in implementing change within the college and initiate a long-run orientation in terms of products offered. Kathleen Orozco was recently appointed to the newly created position of associate vice president of marketing at Moraine Valley Community College (Illinois). Orozco, who often consults with educational institutions that desire to initiate a marketing orientation, came to Moraine Valley because the new position offered the type of control she knew was necessary for a total marketing program. Nevertheless, the new vice president sees marketing as a long-range process in which faculty and staff will be educated through marketing seminars and activities of such offices as admissions, publications, alumni and the work of marketing committees will be gradually integrated through her office.

As the planning culture matures in the college, marketing managers justify their recommendations not only in total enrollment terms, but in terms of such considerations as the optimum institution size, a student socio-economic mix to enhance educational experiences, and the college's contribution to community wellbeing. Contingency plans are created for response to major threats or opportunities. Integrated market planning, in which all members of the organization recognize they are a part of the marketing process, takes place.

Marketing audits are conducted periodically and upon special occasions as when expansion is anticipated. Bud Weidenthal, vice president for public affairs and information at Cuyahoga community College (Ohio),

notes that Cuyahoga has traditionally conducted well-planned marketing audits, especially to help launch a new venture. When Cuyahoga's eastern campus was to be established, the college made an extensive audit of the marketing environment seeking to establish the status of the markets, the customers, the competitors, the macroenvironment, and of the college's marketing organization and programs.

In terms of marketing activities, training programs to develop a client orientation in staff and faculty members are developed, formal inclusion of advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions occurs, new and innovative action programs in both retention and recruitment, placement and volunteerism, may arise.

Summary of College Marketing Typology

	DIMENSION A MARKETING PHILOSOPHY	DIMENSION B MARKETING INFORMATION SYSTEM	DIMENSION C MARKETING ORGANIZATION SYSTEM	DIMENSION D MARKETING PLANNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	DIMENSION E MARKETING ACTIVITIES
STAGE 1 TRADITIONAL COLLEGE	Production Concept and/or Product Concept	Intuition or Casual Observation	Several offices performing uncoordinated recruiting activities.	Engrossed in day-to-day operations required for survival.	Traditional recruiting such as news releases, catalogues, flyers, high school visits.
STAGE 2 SELLING-ORIENTED COLLEGE	Selling Concept	Internal Records System	Specialists added to staff, and more attention to promotion.	Budgeting System	Newspaper and TV advertisements, billboards, added.
STAGE 3 MARKETING- ORIENTED COLLEGE	Marketing Concept	Formal Marketing Intelligence System Added	Marketing vice-president added with limited role— coordinates recruitment.	Annual planning, market segmentation and differentiation added.	New courses added and offered at new locations, offered through new media, and some retention activities begun.
STAGE 4 TOTAL-MARKETING COLLEGE	Total-Marketing Concept	Formal Marketing Research System Added	Marketing vice-president increases influence over college activities. Retention coordinator and/or steering committee added.	Strategic-planning phase with long-range planning through five-year plan.	Improvement and/or elimination of courses and special tuition rates, attempts to improve retention through counsel- ing, better student-college fit, etc.
STAGE 5 INTEGRATED- MARKETING COLLEGE	Societal-Marketing Concept	Formal Marketing Management Science System Added Modeling and Simulation	All members of institution committed to marketing concept.	Marketing results measured by rate of return. Contingency Plans Integrated Marketing Planning.	Client centered training programs for staff and faculty, advising effort considered for promotion, more new and innovative activities.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL*
(405) 624-7244

February 9, 1983

Dear Mr. President:

Tightening state appropriations combined with nationwide predictions of declining enrollments now point to the need for reevaluation of the approach to enrollments and marketing (recruitment and retention) by community, junior and technical colleges. As a doctoral candidate in higher education administration at OSU, I am conducting a nationwide study of public and private community, junior and technical colleges to determine the scope and effectiveness of their marketing activities.

I would appreciate your help in this study. First, I would ask you to complete the brief attached questionnaire dealing with your views on marketing. Next, I would ask you to supply the name of an individual within your institution who could complete a 20-minute questionnaire about the recruitment and retention activities within your college.

As indicated on the last page of the attached questionnaire, I will send you a copy of the survey results, and I will provide an extensive bibliography pertaining to marketing in higher education.

Thank you for your cooperation. A return envelope is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Douglas Dollar

Project coordinated by: Dr. John J. Gardiner
Dissertation Adviser and
Director of Graduate Studies

Dr. Thomas A. Karman
Committee Chairman and Head, Higher
Education Administration

CJ&TCMA

COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE MARKETING ANALYSIS

There are many views among community, junior and technical college administrators about what constitutes marketing and the role marketing should play in higher education. Please provide us with your views by answering the following:

1a. The following five statements represent different views of marketing. Please check the ONE statement that BEST describes the view you hold as president.

- ☐ Prospective students are mainly concerned about the quality of our academic programs. They generally know the differences in quality of our programs and those of other colleges. Students try to obtain the most quality for their money when choosing among various college programs. Therefore, the solution to recruiting and retaining students is to continue improving academic programs and course quality.
- ☐ The total population of prospective students can be divided into separate segments according to their different educational needs and wants. The prospective students in any such market segment will prefer the college with academic programs which best satisfy their special needs and wants. Therefore, the solution to recruiting and retaining students is to identify through research target groups of prospective students for which we can develop the most effective academic programs and marketing strategies.
- ☐ Under current constraints, unless we make a major effort to create interest in our academic programs, too few students will enroll. Prospective students can be persuaded to enroll through effective advertising, publicity, publications and personal solicitation. Therefore, the solution to recruiting and retaining students is to organize a strong promotional effort.

- ☐ Based upon their current wants, prospective students may desire academic programs that are not necessarily conducive to their long-run interests or to society's long-run interests. Colleges which attend to individuals' and society's long-run welfare as well as to immediate wants, will increasingly gain the patronage of students. Therefore, the solution to recruiting and retaining students is to provide academic programs that not only satisfy the current wants of target groups of students, but also protect and serve long-run individual and social benefits.
- ☐ Prospective students are mainly concerned about the availability of the educational programs we offer and low tuition and fees. While these students are generally aware of the differences in cost of attending different colleges, they are either unaware of or do not care about other differences among institutions such as course quality. Therefore, the solution to recruiting and retaining students is to increase classroom efficiency in order to lower tuition and fees.

1b. As president of this college, approximately how long have you held this view?

Number of years: _____

(Continue on page 2.)

2a. Please check the statement which best describes your college's goal in terms of full- and part-time, for-credit headcount enrollments.

- ☐ Increase our enrollments.
- ☐ Maintain our enrollments at their present level.
- ☐ Decrease our enrollments.
- ☐ Alter our enrollments to achieve a specified "mix" of certain types of students. (This response may be checked in combination with one of the above responses.)

2b. Approximately how long has this been your college's enrollment goal?

Number of years: _____

2c. Please check below the degree of success your college has achieved in reaching this enrollment goal.

☐ very high ☐ high ☐ medium ☐ low ☐ very low

2d. What is your target enrollment goal in terms of full- and part-time, for-credit headcount enrollments?

Number of students: _____

☐ undetermined

Thank you for your help. Would you also please provide us with the name and address of the individual best qualified to complete a 20-minute survey about the recruitment and retention activities at your college?

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. You will receive a summary report of the results of this survey. Again, thank you for your help.

CJ&TCMA

COMMUNITY, JUNIOR AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE MARKETING ANALYSIS

Many community, junior and technical college administrators are becoming increasingly concerned with the problem of declining enrollments and are looking to marketing to improve enrollments. We have sent this questionnaire to you because your president has designated you as the person best able to help us identify the activities and parameters of your institution's marketing effort. All responses will be treated confidentially.

Your president will receive a summary of our nationwide study and an extensive marketing bibliography, as will each institution that completes this questionnaire. Thank you for your help.

Respondent _____

Your Phone (_____) _____
Area Code

How long have you worked at this institution?

Number of years: _____

PART A

GENERAL MARKETING ACTIVITIES

Many writers in higher education have advocated various information and analyses, organization, and planning and control activities for community, junior and technical colleges. In this section, we would like to find out whether your institution has engaged in certain activities.

1a. Please check EACH statement that applies to how your college gathers and retains marketing information.

- ☐ Our college has no organized effort to gather or retain marketing information. Generally speaking, we are close enough to the community and our students to know what we need to know to make marketing decisions.
- ☐ We have started compiling data on such things as total enrollments, total drop-outs, class sizes, faculty workloads, student characteristics, and the like. We study

these data when making marketing decisions.

- ☐ We have started compiling data about the community and the high schools in our service area. The methods we use include getting reports from our recruiters, high school counselor interviews, student ACT or SAT scores, etc. We study these data to make marketing decisions.
- ☐ We have initiated specific studies of problem areas and opportunity areas, and are now conducting marketing research in a fairly systematic manner in order to help us make marketing decisions.
- ☐ We are using computer simulation models in order to study the effects of different marketing strategies upon student enrollments.

1b. Approximately how long has your college operated in this manner?

Number of years: _____

(Continue on page 2.)

2a. Please check the ONE statement below which BEST describes your college in terms of marketing organization.

- ☐ We have directors for admissions, development, alumni, public relations, a dean of students, department heads and a registrar who share recruiting functions. There is no marketing executive assigned to coordinate or oversee these activities.
- ☐ We have directors for various activities as described above, plus we have hired a staff specialist(s) for purposes of student recruitment. This person devotes his or her full time to this effort.
- ☐ We have a director of marketing who coordinates such things as promotion and recruitment, fund raising or development, alumni relations and public information. Some of these offices do not report directly to the director of marketing.
- ☐ We have a marketing vice president (a top level executive) who controls and coordinates all marketing efforts such as recruiting, retention, placement, alumni affairs, development activities, and public relations. All such departments report directly to the vice president.
- ☐ We have a marketing vice president as described above, plus we have taken steps to insure that all faculty and staff in the college see themselves as part of our marketing effort and that they contribute to the effort through their particular role in the college. Our marketing vice president offers guidance concerning the activities of all divisions of the college to include academic programs, faculty development, and long-range planning.

2b. Approximately how long has your college been organized in this manner?

Number of years: _____

3a. Please check the ONE statement below which BEST describes your college in terms of marketing planning and control.

- ☐ Time constraints force us to deal with most marketing problems as they arise. We have, as of yet, been too busy to prepare either a detailed budget for our marketing expenditures or a marketing plan.
- ☐ We have instituted a detailed planning budget for our marketing efforts. The budget may compare the cost-effectiveness of various promotional methods in terms of inquiries or admissions. It may predict enrollments based on marketing expenditures.
- ☐ Our college has initiated annual planning for marketing in which goals and objectives and the plans to meet them are either set by top administration, by the departments involved, or by both. We also have an annual marketing plan which contains enrollment and retention statistics and specific actions to be taken by departments, among other things.
- ☐ Our college has initiated a five-year (long-range) ongoing marketing plan from which the annual plan is derived. The annual plan, in addition to citing statistics and offering specific action programs, contains a

presentation of alternate marketing strategies and specific checks to be made at designated times to insure objectives are being met. We have standardized the plan formats within the college for all departments.

- ☐ In addition to a five-year (long-range) and an annual marketing plan, we make recommendations for marketing strategies based upon a consideration of the rate of return on our investment of resources on the basis of such factors as the types of students we are attracting and cash flow. We have developed computer programs to help examine the impact of alternative marketing plans and market assumptions on recruitment, retention, optimal enrollments, and faculty workloads.

3b. Approximately how long has your college operated in this manner?

Number of years: _____

4. Please check below the degree of competition in terms of student recruitment you feel your college faces.

☐ very high ☐ high ☐ medium ☐ low ☐ very low

5. Which ONE of the two following items BEST describes your college's approach to marketing decisions?

- ☐ Our academic mission is mostly defined by our established curriculum and/or by our resources. We sometimes borrow program ideas from other colleges.
- ☐ We define our academic mission broadly to emphasize the basic consumer needs being served in an effort to not overlook potential opportunities or problems.

6. How often has your college administration studied the program offerings of other colleges in your area and consequently designed offerings which address unmet needs and which cause your college's curriculum to be unique in the area?

☐ very often ☐ often ☐ sometimes ☐ rarely ☐ never

7a. Has an independent examination of the entire marketing effort of your college ever been conducted by an outside agent covering objectives, programs, organization and control for the purpose of determining and appraising what is being done and recommending what should be done in the future?

☐ yes ☐ no

7b. If yes, is such an independent examination done on a regular basis for your college?

☐ yes ☐ no

8. Does your college use training programs to develop a service-to-students orientation in your faculty and staff?

☐ yes ☐ no

(Continue on page 3.)

PART B

RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES

What specific attempts does your college make to provide programs—new or modified services—to improve recruitment on your campus? Check only those activities that are currently being performed.

- ☐ a. We distribute news releases to the print media.
- ☐ b. We use brochures, posters, catalogs and other publications.
- ☐ c. We make visits to high schools and arrange visits to our campus for prospective students.
- ☐ d. We use paid advertisements in newspapers, TV or radio.
- ☐ e. We use news releases to TV and radio stations.
- ☐ f. We use signs and billboards for promotions.
- ☐ g. We use direct mail promotions to individual prospective students.
- ☐ h. We have established a recruitment steering committee.
- ☐ i. We conduct research and identify different target socio-economic groups of students within our total number of prospective students.
- ☐ j. We develop special promotions for one or more of these groups.
- ☐ k. We develop special course offerings for one or more of these groups.
- ☐ l. We offer courses at special times and/or locations for certain of the above groups.
- ☐ m. We offer special tuition rates for one or more of these groups.
- ☐ n. We are not allowed to vary from our established tuition rate due to state law or other requirement.
- ☐ o. We conduct studies to determine possible new academic course or program offerings.
- ☐ p. We conduct studies to determine alternative tuitions or course charges.
- ☐ q. We conduct studies to determine the effectiveness of recruiting promotional materials used by our college.
- ☐ r. We conduct studies to determine the merits of different times and locations for conducting special courses.
- ☐ s. We compare the rate of student applications to our college with a predetermined expected rate of applications on specified dates.
- ☐ t. We compare the rate of student applications to our college to the rate of student applications to one or more competing colleges.
- ☐ u. We make an effort to determine recruiting-cost-per-student for each student enrolled.
- ☐ v. We periodically survey prospective students to evaluate our recruiting effort.

- ☐ w. At times we eliminate unproductive programs.

Approximately how long have most of the above recruiting activities been employed by your college?

Number of years: _____

PART C

RETENTION ACTIVITIES

What specific attempts does your college make to provide programs—new or modified services—to improve retention on your campus? Check only those activities that are currently being performed.

- ☐ a. We offer academic advisement by faculty who advise on a part-time basis.
- ☐ b. We have assigned a staff or faculty member to coordinate retention activities.
- ☐ c. We conduct research to identify different target groups of students within our total number of full- or part-time credit-course students for purposes of retention.
- ☐ d. We develop special printed materials or course offerings for one or more of these groups.
- ☐ e. We are working for improvement or redevelopment of our academic advising program.
- ☐ f. We have an early-warning system for identification and communication with potential dropouts or stopouts.
- ☐ g. We have new or revitalized extracurricular activities for retention purposes.
- ☐ h. We have expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services for retention purposes.
- ☐ i. We have expanded our placement services and/or introduced job-related training programs.
- ☐ j. We have introduced faculty instructional development programs.
- ☐ k. We conduct exit interviews with students.
- ☐ l. We conduct studies to determine causes of student attrition on our campus.
- ☐ m. We conduct studies to evaluate or determine the merits of different ways to reduce attrition on our campus.
- ☐ n. We have created a part- or full-time position to coordinate retention.
- ☐ o. We have a retention steering committee.
- ☐ p. We compare the rate of student attrition in our college to a predetermined rate on specified dates.
- ☐ q. We compare the rate of attrition at our college to the rate of attrition at one or more competing colleges.
- ☐ r. We periodically survey our students to determine their opinions about the college.

(Continue on page 4.)

- ☐ s. We have retention orientation activities and/or retention counseling programs.
- ☐ t. We introduce curricular innovation in for-credit academic programs to aid retention.
- ☐ u. We offer special assistance services for students who have not declared a major.
- ☐ v. We have developed special admissions materials and procedures designed to improve student-institutional "fit."
- ☐ w. We use students as peer advisers and counselors and/or involve students in administration, curricular design, and other traditionally "nonstudent" activities.
- ☐ x. We have special services to retain adult learners.
- ☐ y. We have formally included advising effectiveness in faculty promotion and tenure decisions.

Approximately how long have most of the above retention activities been employed by your college?

Number of years: _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH for responding to this survey. We know the demand on your time was significant. Please feel free to share with us any general comments you might have on the survey or on the topic of recruitment and retention.

You will receive a summary report of the results of this study.

Return completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope to:

CJ&TCMA

Douglas Dollar, Editor
Room 313 Public Information Bldg.
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

STUDY DIRECTORS

John J. Gardiner
Professor
Oklahoma State University

Douglas O. Dollar
Doctoral Candidate
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY OF POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS OF FOUR MARKETING ORIENTATION DIMENSIONS

The first code column represents the marketing philosophy dimension. The second code column represents the marketing information system dimension. The third code column represents the marketing organization dimension. The fourth code column represents the marketing planning and control dimension.

The first entry in the frequency list indicates that 10 college campus marketing orientations could not be classified due to missing items.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Cumulative Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
.	10	.	.	.
1111	1	1	0.610	0.610
1211	1	2	0.610	1.220
1343	1	3	0.610	1.829
1421	1	4	0.610	2.439
1621	1	5	0.610	3.049
1631	1	6	0.610	3.659
2111	1	7	0.610	4.268
2211	5	12	3.049	7.317
2222	1	13	0.610	7.927
2231	1	14	0.610	8.537
2311	2	16	1.220	9.756
2313	1	17	0.610	10.366
2321	1	18	0.610	10.976
2323	3	21	1.829	12.805
2333	1	22	0.610	13.415
2411	1	23	0.610	14.024
2413	1	24	0.610	14.634
2421	1	25	0.610	15.244
2511	1	26	0.610	15.854
2612	1	27	0.610	16.463
2613	1	28	0.610	17.073
3111	2	30	1.220	18.293
3211	3	33	1.829	20.122
3221	2	35	1.220	21.341
3311	1	36	0.610	21.951
3313	1	37	0.610	22.561
3314	1	38	0.610	23.171
3321	1	39	0.610	23.780
3523	1	40	0.610	24.390
3612	1	41	0.610	25.000
3621	1	42	0.610	25.610
3654	1	43	0.610	26.220
4111	7	50	4.268	30.488
4112	2	52	1.220	31.707
4211	11	63	6.707	38.415
4212	3	66	1.829	40.244
4213	2	68	1.220	41.463
4214	1	69	0.610	42.073
4222	1	70	0.610	42.683
4232	1	71	0.610	43.293
4251	1	72	0.610	43.902
4311	10	82	6.098	50.000
4313	2	84	1.220	51.220
4321	3	87	1.829	53.049
4322	1	88	0.610	53.659
4323	2	90	1.220	54.878
4332	2	92	1.220	56.098
4333	1	93	0.610	56.707
4343	1	94	0.610	57.317
4411	4	98	2.439	59.756

<u>Code</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Cumulative Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
4413	3	101	1.829	61.585
4414	1	102	0.610	62.195
4422	1	103	0.610	62.805
4423	4	107	2.439	65.244
4424	1	108	0.610	65.854
4433	3	111	1.829	67.683
4434	2	113	1.220	68.902
4435	1	114	0.610	69.512
4443	1	115	0.610	70.122
4453	2	117	1.220	71.341
4543	1	118	0.610	71.951
4553	1	119	0.610	72.561
4611	1	120	0.610	73.171
4612	3	123	1.829	75.000
4613	2	125	1.220	76.220
4621	3	128	1.829	78.049
4624	1	129	0.610	78.659
5211	8	137	4.878	83.537
5213	1	138	0.610	84.146
5221	1	139	0.610	84.756
5222	1	140	0.610	85.366
5232	1	141	0.610	85.976
5251	1	142	0.610	86.585
5311	3	145	1.829	88.415
5313	1	146	0.610	89.024
5322	2	148	1.220	90.244
5323	1	149	0.610	90.854
5331	1	150	0.610	91.463
5351	1	151	0.610	92.073
5411	3	154	1.829	93.902
5412	1	155	0.610	94.512
5423	1	156	0.610	95.122
5433	1	157	0.610	95.732
5611	3	160	1.829	97.561
5612	1	161	0.610	98.171
5614	1	162	0.610	98.780
5623	1	163	0.610	99.390
5634	1	164	0.610	100.000

APPENDIX D

TABLES OF ANALYSIS

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 1

		Type A N = 15	Type B N = 14
very low	Row %	0	0
	Col %	0	0
low	Row %	0	0
	Col %	0	0
medium	Row %	77.78	22.22
	Col %	46.67	14.29
high	Row %	46.15	53.85
	Col %	40.00	50.00
very high	Row %	28.57	71.43
	Col %	13.33	35.71

CHI-SQUARE 4.111, DF = 2, PROB = 0.1280

TABLE VI
 COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
 OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
 SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 2

		Type A N = 39	Type B N = 34
very low	Row %	0	0
	Col %	0	0
low	Row %	100.00	0.00
	Col %	2.56	0.00
medium	Row %	72.22	27.78
	Col %	33.33	14.71
high	Row %	50.00	50.00
	Col %	43.59	50.00
very high	Row %	40.00	60.00
	Col %	20.51	35.29

CHI-SQUARE 5.037, DF = 3, PROB = 0.1691

TABLE VII
COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 4

		Type A N = 44	Type B N = 46
very low	Row %	0.00	0.00
	Col %	0.00	0.00
low	Row %	50.00	50.00
	Col %	2.27	2.17
medium	Row %	60.00	40.00
	Col %	34.09	21.74
high	Row %	47.62	52.38
	Col %	45.45	47.83
very high	Row %	38.10	61.90
	Col %	18.18	28.26

CHI-SQUARE 2.242, DF = 3, PROB = 0.5236

TABLE VIII
COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 5

		Type A N = 44	Type B N = 40
very low	Row %	0.00	0.00
	Col %	0.00	0.00
low	Row %	50.00	50.00
	Col %	2.27	2.50
medium	Row %	65.22	34.78
	Col %	34.09	20.00
high	Row %	51.28	48.72
	Col %	45.45	47.50
very high	Row %	40.00	60.00
	Col %	18.18	30.00

CHI-SQUARE 2.772, DF = 3, PROB = 0.4281

TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES' PERCEPTIONS
OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOAL ATTAINMENT
SUCCESS FOR CLASSIFICATION 6

		Type A N = 48	Type B N = 43
very low	Row %	0.00	0.00
	Col %	0.00	0.00
low	Row %	50.00	50.00
	Col %	2.08	2.33
medium	Row %	66.67	33.33
	Col %	29.17	16.28
high	Row %	51.11	48.89
	Col %	47.92	51.16
very high	Row %	43.48	56.52
	Col %	20.83	30.23

CHI-SQUARE 2.480, DF = 3, PROB = 0.4790

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 1

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	105.820854	17	106.483226	13	0.06	0.8017
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	102.243378	17	106.861974	12	1.58	0.2202
Long-range enrollment stability	13.2629416	17	8.4996305	13	2.32	0.1387

DF = 1

TABLE XI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 2

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	107.5	40	105.54	33	0.50	0.4826
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	103.38	40	102.49	31	0.12	0.7325
Long-range enrollment stability	13.105	40	9.204	32	2.64	0.1086

DF = 1

TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 3

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	107.152194	69	105.577002	43	0.82	0.3681
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	102.062108	69	102.485807	41	0.04	0.8359
Long-range enrollment stability	12.8935873	69	8.8313139	42	3.55	0.0621

DF = 1

TABLE XIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 4

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	106.889132	47	106.060847	45	0.22	0.6383
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	103.166139	47	102.402408	43	0.12	0.7262
Long-range enrollment stability	12.7038831	47	9.2136799	44	3.19	0.0774

DF = 1

TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF
THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES FOR
CLASSIFICATION 6

	Type A		Type B		F Value	Probability
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	107.360512	49	104.59205	43	2.28	0.1346
Near short-range average percent of enrollment change	104.469067	49	102.830929	41	0.53	0.4703
Long-range enrollment stability	12.3071546	49	9.2544890	42	2.34	0.1299

DF = 1

TABLE XV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF THREE ENROLLMENT
MEASURES FOR MARKETING PHILOSOPHY STAGES

	Stage 1 Mean N	Stage 2 Mean N	Stage 3 Mean N	Stage 4 Mean N	Stage 5 Mean N	F Value	Probability
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	106.75 31	105.39 15	108.01 86	*	104.55 38	1.26	0.2890
Near short- range average percent of enrollment change	102.53 31	99.43 15	104.20 84	*	102.19 38	1.19	0.3137
Long-range enrollment stability	11.595	13.058	11.050	*	9.038	0.70	0.5559

DF = 3

* No distinction was made between the Stage 3 and the Stage 4 marketing philosophy dimension in the survey instrument.

TABLE XVI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF THREE ENROLLMENT MEASURES
FOR MARKETING INFORMATION SYSTEM STAGES

	Stage 1 Mean N	Stage 2 Mean N	Stage 3 Mean N	Stage 4 Mean N	Stage 5 Mean N	Other Mean N	F Value	Probability
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	108.97 15	106.43 46	106.34 45	105.44 33	104.87 4	108.85 25	0.56	0.7306
Near short- range average percent of enrollment change	105.11 15	103.83 46	99.87 45	103.75 31	103.31 4	104.87 25	1.34	0.2480
Long-range enrollment stability	12.725 15	11.213 46	11.895 45	9.028 32	4.481 4	10.512 25	0.72	0.6092

DF = 5

TABLE XVII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF THREE ENROLLMENT
MEASURES FOR MARKETING ORGANIZATION SYSTEM STAGES

	Stage 1 Mean N	Stage 2 Mean N	Stage 3 Mean N	Stage 4 Mean N	Stage 5 Mean N	F Value	Probability
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	107.58 101	105.40 37	103.56 19	109.37 4	108.39 6	1.04	0.3887
Near short- range average percent of enrollment change	102.80 101	102.84 36	103.29 18	103.90 6	107.20 4	0.21	0.9344
Long-range enrollment stability	11.836 101	8.294 36	11.278 19	12.772 4	6.661 6	1.11	0.3518

DF = 4

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MEAN SCORES OF THREE ENROLLMENT
MEASURES FOR MARKETING PLANNING AND CONTROL SYSTEMS STAGES

	Stage 1 Mean N	Stage 2 Mean N	Stage 3 Mean N	Stage 4 Mean N	Stage 5 Mean N	F Value	Probability
Average nine-year percent of enrollment change	106.55 93	106.15 23	108.39 42	104.60 10	96.55 1	0.73	0.5704
Near short- range average percent of enrollment change	102.80 93	104.37 22	103.25 41	103.28 10	86.41 1	0.83	0.5050
Long-range enrollment stability	12.128 93	11.352 22	8.931 42	8.931 10	9.924 1	1.09	0.3644

DF = 4

TABLE XIX
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON LONG-RANGE ENROLLMENT STABILITY
SCORES FOR CLASSIFICATION 3

Covariate	Type A LS Mean (N=69)	Type B LS Mean (N=42)	F Value	Probability
Prog. Age	12.4922725	8.9837047	2.40	0.1241
Inst. Age	12.8812276	8.7626426	3.75	0.0553

DF = 1

TABLE XX
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON LONG-RANGE ENROLLMENT STABILITY
SCORES FOR CLASSIFICATION 4

Covariate	Type A LS Mean (N-47)	Type B LS Mean (N-44)	F Value	Probability
Prog. Age	12.4375777	9.0123773	2.86	0.0945
Inst. Age	13.0389121	9.1842811	3.89	0.0518

DF = 1

APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVE COMPARISON OF MARKETING ORIENTATION
CAMPUS TYPES BY CLASSIFICATION

DESCRIPTIVE COMPARISON OF MARKETING ORIENTATION
CAMPUS TYPES BY CLASSIFICATION*

Category	Classification					
	3		4		5	
	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B
<u>Marketing Philosophy</u>						
Production	2.90	2.22	4.26	2.13	4.26	2.50
Product	14.49	11.11	14.89	12.77	14.89	15.00
Selling	8.70	4.44	14.89	6.38	14.89	7.50
Marketing	47.83	60.00	42.55	63.83	42.55	65.00
Societal Marketing	26.09	22.22	23.40	14.89	23.40	10.00
<u>Competition</u>						
Very Low	4.41	0.00	6.12	0.00	6.12	0.00
Low	10.29	11.11	14.29	10.64	14.29	12.50
Medium	35.29	48.89	46.94	40.43	46.94	45.00
High	38.24	24.44	28.57	27.66	28.57	22.50
Very High	11.76	15.56	4.08	21.28	4.08	20.00
<u>Generic Product Def.</u>						
Yes	52.94	84.09	46.81	75.56	46.81	84.21
<u>Positioning</u>						
Never	2.90	0.00	4.17	0.00	4.17	0.00
Rarely	20.29	9.09	20.83	8.70	20.83	7.69
Sometime	44.93	22.73	50.00	26.09	50.00	25.64
Often	27.54	45.45	22.92	45.65	22.92	48.72
Very Often	4.35	22.73	2.08	19.57	2.08	17.95
<u>Marketing Audit</u>						
Yes	7.14	22.22	6.25	19.57	6.25	17.95
<u>Audit on Regular Basis</u>						
Yes	0.00	11.36	0.00	13.33	0.00	15.79
No	8.57	11.36	8.16	6.67	0.00	7.89
Not Applicable	91.43	77.27	91.84	80.00	91.84	76.32
<u>Marketing Orientation</u>						
<u>Training Program</u>						
Yes	40.91	64.44	38.30	63.83	38.30	65.00

* Figures represent percentages. Refer to survey questionnaire in Appendix A for exact wording of categories.

Category	Classification					
	3		4		5	
	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B
<u>Recruiting Activities</u>						
a. News releases to print media	95.71	100.00	91.84	100.00	91.84	100.00
b. Brochures, catalogs, publications	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
c. High School and Campus Visits	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
d. Paid Advertise	81.43	81.82	77.55	80.43	77.55	80.00
e. News releases to TV, radio	87.14	86.36	83.67	91.30	83.67	92.50
f. Signs & Billboards	34.29	47.73	32.65	52.17	32.65	57.50
g. Direct Mail	80.00	95.45	73.47	91.30	73.47	92.50
h. Recruitment Steering Committee	25.71	52.57	16.33	60.87	16.33	62.50
i. Research to identify target groups	40.00	86.36	24.49	80.43	24.49	82.50
j. Promotions for target groups	45.71	79.55	30.61	78.26	30.61	82.50
k. Course offerings for target groups	48.57	77.27	42.86	73.91	42.86	77.50
l. Times or locations for target groups	60.00	86.36	55.10	84.79	55.10	87.50
m. Special tuition for target groups	17.14	31.82	14.29	28.26	14.29	27.50
n. Not allowed to vary tuition	62.86	68.18	57.14	71.74	57.14	72.50
o. Studies for new programs	71.43	88.64	53.06	86.96	53.06	85.00
p. Studies for alternate tuition	1.43	20.45	0.00	17.39	0.00	17.50
q. Studies of promotion effectiveness	22.86	63.64	14.29	60.87	14.29	62.50
r. Studies for better time/locations	18.57	61.36	4.08	58.70	4.08	57.50
s. Compare application rate to set rate	42.86	72.73	38.78	76.09	38.78	75.00
t. Compare application rate to other colleges	12.86	13.64	8.16	10.87	8.16	12.50
u. Determine recruiting cost per student	7.14	38.64	2.04	34.78	2.04	32.50
v. Survey to evaluate recruiting	31.43	72.73	20.41	78.26	20.41	80.00
w. Eliminate unproductive programs	78.57	84.09	73.47	84.78	73.47	82.50

Category	Classification					
	3		4		5	
	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B
Mean number of activities performed**	11.66	15.73	10.14	15.68	10.14	16.20
<u>Retention Activities</u>						
a. Part-time academic advisement by faculty	80.00	75.00	75.51	80.43	75.51	80.00
b. Staff assigned to coordinate retention	35.71	38.64	30.61	39.13	30.61	42.50
c. Research of target groups for retention	30.00	59.09	22.45	54.35	22.45	55.00
d. Special materials for target groups	30.00	45.45	26.53	41.30	26.53	42.50
e. Improvement of academic advisement	67.14	81.82	61.22	78.26	61.22	82.50
f. Early-warning of dropouts system	50.00	61.36	34.69	50.00	34.69	52.50
g. New retention extracurricular activities	27.14	38.64	18.37	43.38	18.37	47.50
h. Expanded academic support/enrichment/learning services	52.86	77.27	38.78	73.91	38.78	77.50
i. Expanded placement services or job-related tng. programs	45.71	75.00	36.73	76.09	36.73	75.00
j. Faculty instruction development	32.86	54.55	22.45	58.70	22.45	60.00
k. Exit interviews with Students	50.00	75.00	46.94	67.49	46.94	72.50
l. Studies for causes student attrition	58.57	79.55	48.98	82.61	48.98	85.00
m. Studies of ways to reduce attrition	24.29	59.09	18.37	56.52	18.37	57.50
n. Position to coordinate retention	10.00	20.45	12.24	10.87	12.24	12.50
o. Retention steering committee	24.29	29.55	24.49	36.96	24.49	42.50

** Numbers presented are means and not percentages.

Category	Classification					
	3		4		5	
	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B
p. Compare attrition rate to set rate	18.57	45.45	14.29	41.30	14.29	42.50
q. Compare attrition rate to other colleges	14.29	25.00	14.29	30.42	14.29	32.50
r. Survey student opinions of college	65.71	88.64	57.14	93.48	57.14	95.00
s. Retention orientation and counseling programs	24.29	57.78	20.41	55.32	20.41	55.00
t. Curricular innovations in academic programs	18.57	44.44	8.16	38.30	8.16	40.00
u. Assistance for students without declared major	41.43	57.78	28.57	61.70	28.57	62.50
v. Admissions materials to aid student/institution "fit"	17.14	51.11	16.33	51.06	16.33	52.50
w. Student peer advisers, etc.	32.86	35.56	26.53	36.17	26.53	37.50
x. Services to retain adult learners	30.00	51.11	22.45	51.06	22.45	52.50
y. Include advising effectiveness in promotion decisions	10.00	13.33	8.16	8.51	8.16	10.00
Mean Number of activities performed**	8.91	13.18	7.22	12.96	7.35	13.65
<u>Control or Affiliation</u>						
Public	90.00	93.33	85.71	93.62	85.71	95.00
Private Church	7.14	0.00	8.16	2.13	8.16	2.50
Independent, nonprofit	2.86	6.67	6.12	4.26	6.12	2.50
<u>Institution Type</u>						
Community/Junior	70.00	53.33	67.35	63.83	67.35	62.50
Vo Tech	5.71	22.22	6.12	20.00	6.12	17.02
Two-year Branch of Four-year college	5.71	6.67	6.12	4.26	6.12	5.00
One campus of multi-campus	18.57	17.78	20.41	14.89	20.41	12.50

Category	Classification					
	3		4		5	
	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B	Type A	Type B
<u>Region by Accrediting Agency</u>						
Middle States	10.00	13.33	6.12	10.64	6.12	10.00
North Central	35.71	55.56	40.82	53.19	40.82	55.00
New England	2.86	4.44	4.08	4.26	4.08	5.00
Northwest	8.57	2.22	8.16	6.38	8.16	5.00
Southern	30.00	17.78	26.53	19.15	26.53	20.00
Western	12.86	6.67	14.29	6.38	14.29	5.00
<u>Community Size</u>						
Rural	67.14	36.36	65.31	41.30	65.31	41.03
Suburban	21.43	27.27	16.33	28.26	16.33	28.21
Urban	11.43	36.36	18.37	30.43	18.37	30.77

Numbers presented are means and not percentages.

VITA 2

Douglas Owen Dollar

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARKETING ORIENTATIONS
AND ENROLLMENTS AT SELECTED COMMUNITY, JUNIOR, AND
TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Sallisaw, Oklahoma, November 23, 1944, the
son of Mr. and Mrs. Joel L. Dollar.

Education: Graduated from Tahlequah Senior High School, Tahlequah,
Oklahoma, in 1963; attended Northeastern Oklahoma State Univer-
sity, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, from 1963 until 1964; received Bach-
elor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, with a
major in advertising, in 1967; received Master of Science de-
gree from Oklahoma State University, with a major in mass com-
munication, in 1974; completed requirements for the Doctor of
Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1983.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant, School of
Journalism, Oklahoma State University, 1967-1968; Captain,
United States Army, 1968-1972; Assistant Editor, Oklahoma State
University Outreach, 1972-1974; Publications Editor, Oklahoma
State University, 1974-1977; Senior Publications Editor, Okla-
homa State University, 1977 to present; Publisher, Journal of
Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 1982 to present.