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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An important element of the nonprofit sector is this country’s colleges and universities. These institutions are faced with the classic marketing problems of enrollment decline, slow growth, changing buying patterns, increased competition and increased expenditures.

Despite the current need and wealth of marketing information available to universities and colleges, the literature indicates that most of these institutions have not adopted a marketing orientation.

In his 1979 dissertation, Blackburn provided data indicating the level of use of sixteen specific marketing techniques and their perceived effectiveness at 446 colleges and universities across the country. The results are rather curious--Blackburn noted that many of the techniques rated as the most effective were also rated low in popularity. Examples of broad institutional usage of marketing in 1979 were still rather isolated and incomplete.

Goldgehn (1982 and 1984) developed a procedure and instrument to utilize in conducting a marketing evaluation of a college or university. While a number of institutions have successfully utilized her "Marketing Opportunity Analysis" in pinpointing institutional strengths and weaknesses and as a precursor to developing a marketing plan, she found that upper administrative support for marketing was still rare.

In the years since these studies we’ve seen continued interest in and even acceptance of the idea of marketing in the higher educa-
tion environment. But what, if any, progress has been made in actually adopting specific marketing techniques such as publicity, advertising, advertising research, market research, program development, pricing, market segmentation, market positioning, and target marketing? How effective have these techniques been? Does their use and effectiveness differ based on institutional size, region, and institutional type? If these techniques are not being adopted, why not? What can be done to facilitate the acceptance of these marketing techniques? This research study attempted to answer the above questions.

A questionnaire was sent to the admissions directors at 2,136 higher education institutions in the U.S. and abroad who are members of AACRO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers). The members of the AACRAO represent a wide variety of academic institutions from the United States and abroad. This paper will report the results from the U.S. only.

Overall, the admissions directors who responded to the survey represent a broad spectrum of institutions of higher education. A response rate of 38.79 was achieved.

The admissions directors were asked to report their usage of fifteen marketing techniques. Users were asked to rate the perceived effectiveness of the technique on a Likert-type scale and non-users were asked to identify their reasons for not using the technique.

The results reveal a very dramatic increase in the usage of marketing techniques--and their perceived effectiveness--in the last
nine years. However, widespread acceptance of most of the marketing techniques still does not exist in 1988. For example, while publicity and target marketing ranked first and second with usage rates in the ninetieth percentile, market segmentation and advertising ranked third and fourth, and achieved usage scores no greater than 77.7%.

The key reasons marketing techniques are not adopted include: a lack of a priority for marketing, a lack of administrative leadership and a lack of implementation. While cost was also a factor, it did not figure as prominently as the above factors.

Admissions standards appear to be the biggest factor in determining usage. Typically there is an inverse relationship between the usage of the marketing techniques and the rigor of the admissions standards. A unique exception to this is the use of market segmentation which is used by the most competitive institutions at a higher rate than any other category of institutions controlled by admissions standards.

Private Four-year institutions tend to use the techniques at a slightly higher rate than public Four-year institutions. Overall, they tend to use most of the same techniques with the exception of pricing. Public institutions, as would be expected, use pricing at a lower rate. Curiously, the private non-elite colleges and universities lag in their usage of pricing and many other techniques.

The results of this study can be used as a starting point in evaluating a number of important issues. First, how can an institution's organization chart be altered so that marketing can be better
integrated throughout the organization? How can administrators
(outside the admissions office) become more familiar with the
benefits of marketing? And, finally, what can be done to improve
leadership and the ability to implement changes at our country’s
colleges and universities?
INTRODUCTION

Most organizations, whether they realize it or not, or do a particularly good job of it, engage in marketing. Unfortunately, nonprofit organizations have been slow to adopt techniques and integrate marketing planning into their organizational structures and decision making processes. As a result, most nonprofit organizations have been poor marketers.

Marketing in the nonprofit sector does not involve new marketing principles so much as new and challenging settings for the application of traditional marketing principles. This sector has some unique characteristics. First, nonprofit organizations have two major publics that demand attention: their clients and their funders. Nonprofit marketing must address client satisfaction and resource attraction. Second, nonprofit organizations pursue other objectives than making a profit. Achieving their objectives is much more difficult to measure or quantify (unlike ROI or market share). Third, most nonprofit organizations provide services, which are characterized as intangible, inseparable, variable and perishable. Thus, for example, a college offers: an intangible service called education; its delivery is inseparable from the deliverers (professors); its quality is variable with respect to who delivers it; and it is perishable, i.e., empty classrooms mean lost revenue. Finally, nonprofit organizations are subject to close public scrutiny because they provide public services, are tax exempt, and depend on public donations. [Kotler 1975]

Expanded definitions of traditional marketing principles have
been in the process of formal development at least since 1969. In the article, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," the authors discuss the applicability of marketing principles and techniques to non-business organizations. They highlighted the following specific principles for a successful marketing effort: generic product definition, target group definition, consumer behavior analysis, differential advantages, multiple marketing tools, integrated marketing planning, continuous marketing feedback, and the use of a marketing audit [Kotler and Levy 1969].

Our nation's public and private universities and colleges are an important element of the nonprofit sector. The 1970's and 80's have been difficult for our institutions of higher education. The 1990's will hold continued challenges which will include:

- Declining enrollments due to educational and cultural alternatives
- Decreasing population pool of 18-22 year olds
- Diminishing attractiveness of the traditional curriculum and degree requirements
- The buyer's market for students
- Increasing costs and declining resources

These are in fact the classic marketing problems of:

- Sales decline
- Slow growth
- Changing buying patterns
- Increased competition
- Increased sales expenditures
Despite the current need and wealth of marketing information available to universities and colleges, current research indicates that most of these institutions have not adopted a marketing orientation.

In his 1979 dissertation, Blackburn provided data indicating the level of use of sixteen specific marketing techniques and their perceived effectiveness at 446 colleges and universities across the country. The results are rather curious — Blackburn noted that many of the techniques rated as the most effective were also rated low in popularity. He stated:

"It is obvious that a few individual techniques have received reasonably wide acceptance and use, but, perhaps unfortunately, the broader scheme of marketing has not yet been put to use fully by admissions officers in their student recruitment effort." [Blackburn 1979]

Examples of broad institutional usage of marketing in 1979 were still rather isolated and incomplete.

Goldgehn (1982 and 1984) developed a procedure and instrument to utilize in conducting a marketing evaluation of a college and university. While a number of institutions have successfully utilized her "Marketing Opportunity Analysis" in pinpointing institutional strengths and weaknesses and as a precursor to developing a marketing plan, she found that upper administrative support for marketing was still rare.

Allen and Peters' 1983 study of the status of strategic marketing in higher education from a college president's viewpoint concludes that college presidents have not adopted a marketing orientation in their institutions. Although they may use some
marketing techniques in recruitment and fundraising, marketing is not used in strategic planning and decision making.

Other articles have pointed to the threatening trends we are all too familiar with such as the declining traditional student population, increasing costs, and diminishing revenue sources, all of which point to continued difficult times ahead for higher education [Neilsen 1983]. Smith and Cavussil [1984] tell us how institutions of higher education can implement strategic marketing planning. These articles and others fail to address why, despite the dismal trends and wealth of "how to" information, universities and colleges have not adopted a strategic marketing orientation for planning and decision making.

The application of marketing techniques and the adoption of a marketing orientation are the means by which higher education can favorably position itself for the future.

In the years since Blackburn's study [1979] we've seen continued interest in and even acceptance of the idea of marketing in the higher education environment. But what, if any, progress has been made in actually adopting specific marketing techniques such as publicity, advertising, advertising research, market research, program development, pricing, market segmentation, market positioning, and target marketing? How effective have these techniques been? Does their use and effectiveness differ based on institutional size, region, and institutional type? If these techniques are not being adopted, why not? What can be done to facilitate the acceptance of these marketing techniques? This research study will
METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire Development

Blackburn's 1979 study and Goldgehn's 1982 study were used as starting points in the research design and questionnaire development. This research study evaluates the use and effectiveness of fifteen key marketing techniques. These techniques were updated and consolidated from the previous two studies and an extensive literature review. The effectiveness scoring was changed to a Likert-type scale utilizing specific responses ranging from "Highly Effective" to "Highly Ineffective." And, a "why not" section was added in order to query nonusers about their reasons for not using a technique.

The first draft version of the questionnaire was sent to a select group of six admissions directors in the San Francisco Bay Area. Comments from in-depth interviews with these directors were incorporated in the second draft. Copies of the second draft were then distributed to a group of ten admissions "experts" who were also members of AACRAO. Their comments were considered in the preparation of the third draft. The third draft was subjected to pre-test by twenty-five admissions officers (also AACRAO members). The results of the pretest led to the final version of the questionnaire, which can be found in the Appendix of this study. (Refer to Illustration One.)

Distribution of the Questionnaire

The final version of the questionnaire was sent to all active
members of the AACRAO. The names of the admissions directors at 2,136 higher education institutions were taken from the 1987 AACRAO Membership Directory. Each admissions director was sent a packet consisting of a copy of the questionnaire, a cover letter and a postage paid return envelope. The cover letter indicated that those respondents who wished to receive a copy of the findings of the study should send a written request under a separate cover. (Approximately two-thirds of the respondents indicated they wanted a copy of the results.)

The members of the AACRAO represent a wide variety of academic institutions from the United States and abroad. Controls were included in the demographic data inquiries to identify the types and locations of the responding institutions. While it was one of the aims of this project to gather data from colleges and universities in Canada and abroad, this paper will only be concerned with U.S. colleges and universities.

Response

The questionnaire packets were mailed on July 23, 1987. The majority of the responses were received by September 1, 1987. A total of 2,136 packets were sent to U.S. and foreign members of AACRAO. Of these, 834 were returned including 16 from Canada and 27 from other countries.

A total of 2,039 packets were sent out in the United States and 791 were returned, representing a response rate of 38.79 percent. Of the 791 questionnaires that were returned, 668 were judged as fully usable. The criteria for a questionnaire to be considered
fully usable was that all of the questions concerning the use and non-use of the fifteen marketing techniques must have been properly completed and the demographic information was either complete or lacked data that could be gleaned from Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges 1988, Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges 1988, or Barron's Profiles of American Colleges.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS-X. (SPSS-X is a trademark of SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL, for its proprietary computer software.) The version utilized was SPSS-X, RELEASE 2.1, licensed to the University of San Francisco. The analysis was done on a Data General MV/10000 computer. SPSS-X is the latest version of SPSS software and can execute many types of statistical analysis and data management tasks. (Norusis 1984)

Staff Assistants

The study was directed by Dr. Leslie A. Goldgehn, Associate Professor of Marketing at the University of San Francisco's McLaren College of Business. Assistance was provided by Meynardo Tiro, a graduate research assistant, and a team of undergraduate student assistants who provided staff support.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Geographic Distribution

The geographic breakdown of the responding institutions for this study is as follows:
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (unspecified)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates that broad geographic representation was achieved. An analysis of the numbers of responding institutions per region and state indicates that states and regions with a greater number of institutions also had a greater number of respondents.

Institutional Type and Control

The data indicate that 45.1 percent of the respondents were from Two-year and Four-year private institutions, while 46.6 percent came from Two-year and Four-year public colleges and universities. (Refer to Illustration Two in the Appendix.) The latest data compiled by the Center of Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education shows that 55.2 percent of institutions of higher education were private and 44.8 were public. (Broyles & Fernandez 1986)

There is some variance between the data, especially in the private sector, but it is believed that this may have arisen from the different methods of classifying the institutions. The Center of Statistics report had only three categories: University, Other Four-Year, and Two-Year. This study had categories for Four-Year
College/University, Two-Year College, and Upper-Division College for both public and private, plus four categories (Professional, Specialized, For-Profit, and Others) which were not segmented into public or private. Those categories which were not segmented may have contributed to the variance in institutional control. There also remains the possibility that the AACRAO membership is not representative of the national proportions in terms of institutional control.

The breakdown of the responding institutions for this study is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year Colleges</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Colleges/Univ.</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division Colleges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>668</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Universities were included in the Four-Year Colleges/Universities category. Broyles and Fernandez define universities as institutions of higher education which offers four-year degrees plus at least two First Professional Programs. The Center for Statistics study showed the following breakdown: University (3.4%), Other Four-Year (57.3%), and Two-Year (39.3%). (Broyles and Fernandez) A comparison of the figures shows that there is a significant variance in the Two-Year institutions and a lesser disparity for the Four-Year category. As previously discussed, the discrepancy may have come from the method of categorization and the difference in propor-
tions between the AACRAO membership and the national figures.

Both Two-Year and Four-Year institutional types were utilized for extensive analysis in this study. This decision was undertaken, in spite of the fact that the proportion of Two-Year institutions was lower than the national figure, because it was believed that the 178 colleges that responded provided a representative sample of these institutions.

**Student Body Profile/Make-up**

Demographic data were requested for the breakdown of males and females, out-of-state and in-state residents, proportion of minorities to the total student population, and the proportion of international students to the total student population. This data was not integrated into this paper, but will be used in subsequent analyses.

**Enrollment**

The questionnaire requested "total undergraduate enrollment." However, certain institutional types such as Professional Schools and Specialized Schools listed their "Total enrollment" because this was what was applicable. The breakdown of the institutions represented in this study is as follows:

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 or less</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-2,000</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-5,000</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or more</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows that the enrollment categories are quite evenly distributed except for the higher extreme (20,000 or more). The table also shows that almost half (46.2%) of the respondents were from schools with enrollments in the 1,000-5,000 range.

Admissions Standards

The respondents were asked to rate the "Institutional admissions standards for first-time freshmen" at their institutions. Self-assessments made by the Admissions Directors (or equivalent) about their institutions were honored unless there was a blatant discrepancy between their ratings and those of standard reference books. When this condition arose, the rating made by the standard reference book was followed. Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges 1988, Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges 1988, and Barron's Profiles of American Colleges (1984) were used for this assessment. (Refer to Illustration Three.)

The following definitions were gleaned from Peterson's and Barron's Guides:

Most Competitive: This category includes colleges such as Bowdoin College, Columbia University, Harvard University, Stanford University and Yale University, where even superior students (upper 10%) encounter a great deal of competition for admissions. It also includes colleges that accept students in the upper 20-35% of the high school class and have a B+ average, such as: Brandeis University, Carlton College, the Claremont Colleges, Northwestern University, Oberlin, the University of Chicago, the University of California, Berkeley,
and the University of Michigan. (Barrens)

**Very Competitive**: The colleges in this category admit students whose averages are no less than B- and who rank in the top 35-50% of their graduating class. Examples include: George Washington University, Boston College, the University of California, Davis, Wheaton College, and the University of Denver. (Barrens)

**Competitive**: These colleges accept students in the top 50% to 65% of the graduating class and accept between 75% and 85% of their applicants. This category includes the following colleges: Arizona State University, California State University, Bakersfield, Colorado State University, Gonzaga University, Loyola University of Chicago, St. Mary's College of California, University of Georgia, and the University of Wisconsin. (Barrens)

**Less Competitive**: This category includes colleges that admit students with averages below C and who rank in the top 65% of the graduating class. These colleges usually admit 85% or more of their applicants. This category includes the following colleges: Ball State University, Barat College, Eastern Michigan University, Marymount College, Northeastern Illinois University, and the University of Hawaii at Hilo. (Barrens)

**Non-competitive**: These colleges generally only require evidence of graduation from an accredited high school. Examples include: De Lourdes College, Lincoln University, Northern Montana College, Wayne State College, and community
colleges. (Barrons)

Special: This category includes colleges whose admissions standards are not based primarily on academic criteria, but on evidence of talent or special interest in the field. Examples include: Cleveland Institute of Art, Gallandet College, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, and the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music. (Barrons)

The breakdown for the responding institutions according to admissions standards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Competitive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Competitive</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Competitive</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Competitive</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition and Fees

Another factor that was considered important for evaluating the impact of specific marketing techniques was Tuition & Fees. The questionnaire requested respondents to indicate the "Annual undergraduate (in-state) tuition and fees (excluding room and board)" of their schools in five ranges.

An additional category of "Varies by program" was added during the evaluation to accommodate a small number of schools which indicated this response.

The breakdown of the responding institutions is as follows:
TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 or more</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000-$9,999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-$6,999</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$3,999</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$999 or less</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies by program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>668</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Overall, the Admissions Directors who responded to the survey represent a broad spectrum of institutions of higher education. The favorable response rate by Two-year colleges and Four-year colleges/universities provide a solid basis for extensive analysis on the integration of marketing in colleges and universities in the United States.

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**Data Concerning Various Techniques**

This section is devoted to reporting the detailed results of the survey.

The tables and descriptions which follow detail the responding institutions' use or non-use of the 15 marketing techniques on the basis of their institution's:

- Institutional control and type
- Enrollment
- Admissions standards, and
- Tuition

This discussion will be limited to United States public and private, Two- and Four-year institutions. Other types of institutions and Canadian and foreign institutions will be discussed in a subsequent paper. The definitions of the techniques can be found in...
Comparability of the Two Studies

This section will also report on the changes in the usage and perceived effectiveness of marketing techniques that have occurred in the last nine years. This will be accomplished by comparing usage levels and mean effectiveness levels between this study and the Blackburn Study. However, there are a number of caveats. First, the definitions of a number of the techniques have been updated and improved. Second, a number of techniques have been deleted, others added and still others consolidated. Third, Blackburn's questionnaire asked the respondent to rate each of the techniques used on a five-point semantic differential scale with the following bipolar descriptions: "fails to satisfy my expectations of effectiveness" and "greatly exceeds my expectations of effectiveness," thus allowing the respondents to select the point that represented the intensity of their feelings. In the 1988 questionnaire the effectiveness scoring was changed to a Likert-type scale, utilizing the following specific responses: "Highly Effective," "Somewhat Effective," "Neither Effective nor Ineffective," "Somewhat Ineffective," and "Highly Ineffective," thus allowing the respondents to more accurately express their feelings of effectiveness.

Overall usage and mean comparisons between 1979 and 1988 will only be reported when the definitions of the techniques are essentially the same. Furthermore, while "mean" comparisons will be made, it is important to remember that there are differences in the effectiveness rating scales. For both studies, the lower the mean
score, the more highly effective the technique was rated.

Illustrations 4-10 (found in the Appendix) provide summary data and will be helpful to the reader as he/she reads the detailed findings.

Please note that where the marketing techniques are referred to by number, that number refers to the order in which the technique appears in the questionnaire and is discussed in this paper.

The following table summarizes the reported use and non-use of all of the marketing techniques, presented in their usage order from most used to least used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Market Research

Market research ranked seventh in overall usage among the fifteen techniques with 71.1% of all responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Its mean effectiveness rating was a 1.844. It is not possible to compare this directly to the results
of Blackburn's 1979 study since he asked about the use of a market-
ing information system as opposed to marketing research.

While 83.3% of the Four-year private institutions report using
market research, only 73.9% of the Four-year public institutions,
66.7% of Two-year private and 52.6% of the Two-year public institu-
tions reported that they used market research. As we will see with
many of the marketing techniques, the private institutions use the
techniques at a higher rate than the public institutions.

While we do not find much variation in usage on the basis of
undergraduate enrollment, institutions with enrollments between 501
and 1,000 are the greatest users (79%) of market research.

Of the very competitive schools, 86.9% report using market
research while only 68.2% of the most competitive (the top category)
schools use this same technique. One can only conjecture that the
most competitive schools feel they do not need to use market
research while the very competitive schools are striving to reach
that next bracket of excellence and competitiveness. Competitive
and less competitive schools report usage of 79.7% and 70.4% re-
spectively while only 54.3% of non-competitive schools report using
market research. This is curious as many of the non-competitive
schools are community or junior colleges that strive to meet the
needs of their constituents. How are they able to assess these
needs and changing desires if they do not use market research?

There is little variation (82.0-89.8%) in the reported usage
of market research based on tuition for those schools whose tuition
is above $4,000. However, only 64.6% of the schools with tuition
ranging from $1,000 to $3,999 and only 50% of the schools with
tuition of $1,000 or less reported using market research. Once
again this points out that the low tuition community colleges are
not using market research. But why are so few of the schools with
tuition between $1,000 and $3,999 not using this particular tech-
nique? A closer look at the data indicates that more of the public
institutions (73.7%) than the private institutions (63.6%) in this
tuition bracket are utilizing market research.

When we examine the reasons that so few schools use market
research, and particularly the schools charging between $1,000 and
$3,999, we find the main reasons to be that many of these institu-
tions feel that market research is not a priority on their campus.
Admissions directors also blame the high cost of marketing and a
general lack of implementation on their campus. Unfortunately this
technique, as well as many others, is not utilized because of a
general lack of administrative leadership.

Marketing research was assessed to be highly effective by
24.4% and somewhat effective by 68.7% of the institutions that
utilize this technique. There is little difference in the effec-
tiveness rating based on institution type or admissions standards.
It is interesting to note that while few of the non-competitive
schools use market research, 90% of those that do use this technique
report it to be either somewhat effective or highly effective.

2. Publicity

Publicity ranked first in overall usage with 95.1 percent of
all of the responding institutions reporting they used publicity and
among those users it rated a mean effectiveness score of 1.962. It was rated to be either highly effective (22.7%) or somewhat effective (63.6%) by the majority of institutions. Publicity also ranked first in Blackburn's 1979 study with 74.2% reporting usage and a mean effectiveness score of 2.477. It is significant to note the dramatic increase in the use of publicity in the last 10 years.

There is very little variation in the usage of publicity if we control for institutional type or undergraduate enrollment.

If we control for admissions standards, the only variation and score below 94.1% is for the most competitive schools (86.4% usage). In fact, publicity ranked as the most used technique across all categories of admissions standards except for the most competitive institutions. (Market segmentation was the highest used technique among the most competitive institutions.) A number of the most competitive institutions commented that their positive images were so firmly entrenched that very often "publicity took care of itself."

While tuition per se does not seem to be a factor in the usage of publicity, tuition coupled with institutional type is a factor. Four-year private institutions with tuition of $10,000 or more tend to rely less on publicity than less expensive private institutions and all public institutions. By their own admission, many of the private, expensive elite colleges have not fully incorporated publicity into a marketing approach.

3. Advertising

Advertising ranked fourth in overall usage with 76.9% of all
of the responding institutions reporting they used advertising. It was rated as highly effective by 24.9% of the users and somewhat effective by 64.8% of the users. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.922.

In the 1979 study, advertising ranked second in overall usage with a 60.8% usage rate and a mean effectiveness score of 2.531. While we see an increase in the numbers and percentages of institutions successfully using advertising in the last nine years, the increase isn't quite as dramatic as the increase in the use of publicity. We can surmise that in the past, advertising was overused by institutions who felt that advertising represented a marketing orientation. And now we are seeing institutions who also see the value of publicity and the use of target marketing as key ingredients in a marketing strategy. It is also important to note that while publicity and target marketing (to be discussed) ranked first and second with usage rates in the ninetieth percentile, market segmentation (to be discussed) and advertising, ranked third and fourth, usage scores achieved no greater than 77.7%. It appears that while publicity and target marketing are highly accepted and utilized, the rest of the marketing techniques are not as widely used or accepted.

When we examine the usage of advertising controlling for institutional type we find some interesting variations. Two-year private institutions and Two-year public institutions report 91.7% and 93.5% usage consecutively. Only 62.7% of Four-year public institutions report using advertising. This is not surprising in
that many public Four-year institutions are not allowed to advertise while community colleges do not have the same limitations. But surprisingly, only 74.9% of all Four-year private institutions report using advertising. Are they missing an opportunity or are many of these schools the private elites who feel they do not need to advertise? A look at this data reveals that there is an inverse relationship between the usage of advertising and the rigor of admissions standards. The more selective an institution, the less likely it is to use advertising. While 90.3% of all non-competitive schools use advertising, only 31.8% of the most competitive schools use this technique. (Refer to Illustration Eleven.)

Enrollment was only a factor at the high end where the large schools (10,000 and above) tend to use advertising at a lower rate. Again, many of these institutions are the larger public institutions who cannot advertise and the larger private elites who choose not to in order not to "taint their image."

A closer examination bears this out. Only 36.5% of the institutions charging $10,000 or more utilize advertising whereas 70.5% of all schools charging $7,000-$9,999 and 84.3% of all schools charging $4,000 to $6,999 use advertising. Interestingly, 84.5% of the schools charging $1,000 or less (the community colleges) use advertising. This is in sharp contrast to the community colleges' very low usage of market research.

A further breakdown reveals that only 36.7% of the Four-year private institutions who charge $10,000 or more use advertising, while 86.4% of the private institutions charging between $1,000 and
$3,999 utilize advertising. We can surmise that the latter are struggling with declining enrollments and resources and thus are relying heavily (and not always appropriately) on advertising.

4. Advertising Research

Advertising research ranked twelfth in overall usage. While 76.9% of all institutions use advertising, only 40.7% attempt to evaluate its effectiveness through advertising research. Advertising research was rated to be highly effective by 24.6% of its users and somewhat effective by 61% of its users. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.923.

Blackburn (1979) evaluated the usage of advertising/pretesting (61% usage) and advertising/post testing (21.7% usage). Their mean effectiveness rating was 2.233 and 2.371 respectively. It appears that, while the use of advertising research has become more accepted in the last nine years, its usage is still in its infancy.

When we examine the use of advertising research controlling for institutional type we see that significantly less of the Four-year public institutions utilize advertising research just as fewer of these institutions utilize advertising.

Enrollment does not appear to be a significant factor in the use of advertising research. The most competitive schools used advertising research at a lower rate just as they used advertising at a lower rate.

5. Program Development

Program development, a key factor in developing and maintaining courses, programs and services that are in touch with the needs
of students, ranked fifth in overall usage with 75.9% of all of the responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Thirty-one percent of the users rated program development as highly effective and 52.9% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.925.

In 1979, program development ranked seventh in overall usage with a 62% usage rate and a mean effectiveness score of 2.818. The use of this important tool has increased by 13.9 percentage points in the last nine years.

When we examine the usage of program development controlling for institutional type we find the Two-year public institutions (89% usage) significantly ahead of Four-year private (74.9%), Two-year private (70.8%) and Four-year public institutions (68.6%). (Refer to Illustration Twelve.) It appears that the community colleges have seriously adopted the marketing concept of evaluating new product ideas to stay in touch with the needs and wants of their constituents. Many Four-year public institutions are either disinterested or lack the mechanisms to evaluate new program ideas or are "set in their ways."

Institutions with enrollments between 2,001 and 5,000 and 5,001-10,000 are the most likely to use program development (81.2% and 81.6% usage). A majority (86.6%) of the non-competitive schools use product development strategies. Only 60% of the very competitive and 63.6% of the most competitive schools utilize this technique. While this is to be expected to some extent, one can only wonder at the continued vitality of our more competitive and pres-
igious institutions if they fail to evaluate new program ideas in a systematic and ongoing manner. Despite the enrollment and budget problems the non-competitive community colleges have faced, they continue to be an arena for educational innovation.

Schools charging $10,000 or more use program development at a rate of 55.8% while 84% of those schools charging $1,000 or less use program development. In fact, only 55.1% of the Four-year private institutions charging $10,000 or more use program development. Interestingly, 85.7% of the private institutions charging $7,000-$9,999 use program development. These schools, perhaps in an attempt to "catch up" to the more expensive and more prestigious private institutions, appear to be more interested in new program ideas.

6. Pricing

Pricing ranked tenth out of fifteen in overall usage with only 47.2% of all institutions reporting its use. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.775, with 36.2% of the users rating it as highly effective and 52.7% of the users rating it as somewhat effective.

In 1979 only 29% of the responding institutions used pricing strategies and its mean effectiveness score was 2.481. Once again, we can be encouraged by the increase in overall usage and perceived effectiveness.

Only 35.9% of all Four-year public institutions and 37% of all Two-year public institutions utilize pricing strategies compared to 60.7% of all Four-year private and 54.2% of all Two-year private institutions who use pricing strategies. We would expect public
institutions to have a lower usage rate than private institutions as state or local governments may mandate tuition charges at many institutions. However, public institutions should note the increasing importance of evaluating cost, along with competition and demand, in determining educational price. Public institutions, as well as private institutions, have a number of pricing incentives that can be used to strategically position their tuition. These include scholarships, work study, grants, loans, etc. This is also an area of important need for private institutions as the cost of private higher education continues to rise, pricing many schools out of the market.

If we control for admissions standards, we find that the most competitive schools are the least likely to utilize pricing strategies. The schools who charge the least ($1,000 or less) use pricing strategies at the lowest rate (35.8%). While 55.8% of the schools charging $10,000 or more utilize pricing strategies. Closer evaluation reveals that all but one of the $10,000 and above schools are private institutions.

These findings are consistent with what we know about these types of institutions. First, the institutions that charge $1,000 or less are for the most part community colleges who have little or no control over their tuition charges. The institutions which charge $10,000 and above are typically private and in many cases elite institutions (very competitive to most competitive) who tend to use all marketing techniques at a lower rate.

7. Market Segmentation
Market segmentation ranked third in overall usage among the 15 techniques with 77.7% of all of the responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.703. In 1979, 66% of the schools reported usage and gave it a mean effectiveness score of 2.915.

Four-year public and private schools reported using this technique at a much higher rate (83.7 and 84.7) than Two-year public and private institutions (66.9% and 62.5%). Medium-sized institutions (5,001-10,000 students) tended to use this technique more than other institutions. Surprisingly, the most competitive institutions use this technique at a higher rate than less competitive institutions. In fact, the more competitive the institution, the more likely it is to use market segmentation. This is the only technique that has the highest usage rate by the most competitive institutions. (Refer to Illustration 13.)

In terms of effectiveness, 39% of the institutions rated market segmentation as highly effective and 53% rated it as somewhat effective. The most competitive institutions (the greatest users) rated market segmentation as highly effective or somewhat effective at a much higher rate than other institutions.

8. Target Marketing

Target marketing ranked second in overall usage among the fifteen techniques with 90.7% of all responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.576.

Its effectiveness scores were very high with 48.3% and 46.7%
rating it as either highly effective or somewhat effective. Blackburn (1979) did not include target marketing as one of his marketing techniques.

Market segmentation is the key precursor to target marketing and yet market segmentation (ranking third among the techniques) was reportedly used by only 77.7% of all institutions while target marketing was reported to be used by 90.7%. It is possible that institutions are confused by the terms, or more likely, that target marketing is just the most visible and measurable aspect of the segmentation process.

Two-year public institutions utilized this technique at a lower rate (81.2%) than Two-year private institutions (95.8%), Four-year public institutions (92.8%) and Four-year private institutions (94.2%). Institutions who charge $1,000 or less use target marketing at a significantly lower rate than more expensive institutions. We can surmise that community colleges have much less need for target marketing since they are established to serve the needs of the entire community (a mass marketing approach). And, in fact, non-competitive institutions utilize target marketing at a lower rate than institutions with more competitive admissions standards. Interestingly, the most competitive institutions utilize this technique at an only slightly higher rate (86.4) than non-competitive institutions (84.4).

Enrollment does not appear to be a factor except when we look at institutions with enrollments above 20,000. They use target marketing at a significantly lower rate (76.2%) than institutions of
all other size ranges.

Institutional type, admissions standards, enrollment and tuition were not key factors in the perceived level of effectiveness for this technique.

9. Market Positioning

Market positioning ranked sixth in overall usage among the 15 techniques, with 75.3% of all responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Its mean effectiveness rating score was a 1.771, compared with a mean effectiveness of 2.979 in 1979. Of the schools that use market positioning, 35.6% rated it as highly effective and 53.7% rated it as somewhat effective. Blackburn reported that 65% of all institutions utilized market positioning in 1979.

As might be expected, Two-year public institutions (62.3% usage) and Four-year public institutions (74.5% usage) used positioning at a lower rate than Four-year private institutions (82.2%) and Two-year private institutions (83.3). While these results are not surprising, market positioning or finding a niche in the marketplace, is equally important for public institutions, many of whom are struggling to maintain or build enrollments, as it is for private institutions. The most competitive of the public institutions (Michigan and U.C. Berkeley are two good examples) have, in many cases, positioned themselves against the private elites. Usage by all institutions of this technique has increased since 1979 but there are still opportunities for growth. Interestingly, the most competitive and the non-competitive schools show the least amount of usage. Enrollment is a factor in that schools with enrollments of
501-1,000 are the greatest users of market positioning (84.8% usage) while schools with enrollments of 10,001-20,000 use this the least (58.5%).

Tuition also appears to be a factor. The least expensive schools ($1,000 or less) tend to use market positioning at a lower rate than more expensive institutions. Institutions that charge $7,000-$9,999 appear to be the greatest users (87.5% usage). A closer look reveals that most of these institutions are private institutions.

10. Access

Access, or making educational programs and services conveniently available to students, ranked eighth in overall usage among the fifteen techniques with 68.6% of all responding institutions reporting they used market research. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.749. Of the users, 38.6% rated this technique as highly effective and 50.4% rated it as somewhat effective. This technique was not evaluated in 1979.

The most dramatic differentiation in usage occurs when we control for institutional type. Two-year public institutions (community colleges) are the greatest users (90.9%) of this technique while only 69.3% of all Four-year publics, 59.6% of all Four-year private institutions and 45.8% of all Two-year private institutions utilize an access strategy. This is confirmed when we control for admissions standards and find the non-competitive institutions utilize this technique at a significantly higher rate (89.2% usage) than other institutions, while the most competitive
institutions have the lowest usage score (31.8%). In fact, the less competitive the school, the more likely it is to use access. (Refer to Illustration 14.) In addition, when we control for tuition, the least expensive schools are the greatest users while the most expensive schools use this technique at a very low rate. Enrollment does not play a major role in determining use of this technique.

The non-competitive Two-year public institutions are in the lead in the usage of this technique. The Two-year public institutions have taken advantage of creative scheduling and off-site locations to attract additional traditional and nontraditional students. But why have other institutions been so slow to adapt? In some cases these other institutions utilize access without considering it a marketing technique. For example, public university systems like Indiana University and University of California maintain campuses all over their respective states, making their educational products available to students in a variety of locations. Private institutions such as Harvard and Radcliffe have a cooperative relationship and allow students to take classes at either campus and apply credits to their degrees at either institution. The success of extension and satellite programs points out the success that can be achieved by going out to the customer/student. This technique can be used with traditional programs, however, the less prestigious private institutions have been reluctant to "go out to the customer," believing the students should "come to them."
11. Marketing Plan

The use of a marketing plan ranked ninth overall usage among the 15 techniques with 63.5% of all responding institutions reporting they used this technique. Of the users 34.4% rated this technique as highly effective and 51.7% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness score was 1.814. In 1979 this technique was used by 45.7% of the respondents and had a mean effectiveness score of 2.951. This represents a major improvement in usage and perceived effectiveness.

Four-year private institutions tend to use this technique at a higher rate (68%) than Four-year public institutions (64.7%), Two-year public institutions (55.2%) and Two-year private institutions (50%). The competitive institutions use marketing plans at a higher rate (70.5%) than the most competitive (63.6%), very competitive (66.3%), and less competitive (65.2%) institutions. Interestingly, only 52.2% of all non-competitive institutions utilize a marketing plan. This is confirmed when we control for tuition and we find that schools in the $7,000-$9,999 range are the greatest users (77.3%) and only 49.3% of the least expensive schools, those charging $1,000 or less, use a marketing plan.

Although we see an important increase in the usage of marketing plans since 1979, overall acceptance of the use of a marketing plan is still fairly low. Unfortunately, the use of a marketing plan was considered not to be a priority at many institutions. Other non-users blamed the lack of implementation and/or the lack of administrative leadership. The competitive Four-year private
institutions are ahead perhaps because they have faced such stiff competition in the last few years. The use of a marketing plan is pivotal to a successful marketing strategy. Otherwise an institution is simply applying techniques without a clear direction or goal. While we might hypothesize that the effectiveness of the other marketing techniques would improve if they were used in the context of a marketing plan, this research indicates that users and nonusers of marketing plans do not significantly differ in their perceptions of the effectiveness of the other techniques. Perhaps this is due to the fact that many of the schools who do have marketing plans are in the early stages of development and implementation.

12. Marketing Audit

The use of a marketing audit ranked fourteenth in overall usage with only 31% of all responding institutions reporting they use this technique. Of the users, 26.1% rated this technique as highly effective and 57% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness score was 1,918. This technique was not evaluated in 1979.

While overall usage was low, more Four-year private institutions (38.5%) used this technique than Four-year public institutions (30.1) or Two-year public institutions (24.0) or Two-year private institutions (20.8). The Four-year private institutions have struggled the most with declining resources and students. It is interesting to note that a greater percentage (42.1 usage) of the very competitive institutions use this than the other categories of schools classified by admissions standards. It is the very competi-
tive schools (usually private) that are struggling to maintain and improve their niche in the marketplace. A look at tuition classifications reveals that schools charging more than $4,000 per year tend to be the greatest users of marketing audits and most of these tend to be private institutions. Schools with enrollments between 501 and 1,000 are also the greatest users.

While most of the users rated this technique as at least somewhat effective, it is important to remember that most institutions still do not conduct marketing audits.

13. Consultants

The use of consultants is not widespread, ranking thirteenth, with only 34.1% of the responding institutions using this technique. Of the users, 22.4% rated it as highly effective and 43.4% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness score was 2.311.

Four-year private institutions were far more likely (47.3%) to utilize consultants than any other type of institution. Four-year public institutions were the least likely (22.9%) to use consultants.

The most competitive institutions were the least likely (18.2% usage) and the very competitive schools were the most likely (41.1%) to use consultants. If we control for tuition, schools in the $7,000 to $9,999 range are the greatest users (48.9%) of consultants (and all of the schools in that tuition range are Four-year private institutions).

Enrollment also appears to be a factor. The schools with enrollments below 2,000 students tend to use consultants more than
the larger schools.

Once again, it is the very competitive private institutions who are willing (or perhaps feel forced) to utilize marketing.

14. Marketing Committee

The use of a marketing committee ranked eleventh with 44.9% of the schools reporting they used this technique. Of the users, 15.7% rated it as highly effective and 48.3% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness rating was 2.377.

The 1979 study evaluated the use of free marketing expertise which can include a marketing committee, along with marketing advice from alumni and local businesses. In 1979, free marketing expertise was used by 31% of the institutions and rated a 2.400 for mean effectiveness. While more institutions are using free marketing expertise than in the past, the perceptions of its effectiveness have not significantly increased. Most institutions lack the necessary in-house expertise to create a successful marketing committee. When in-house expertise is found, it is difficult to overcome the obstacles of time availability, objectivity, each of the resources, and political pressures.

Institutional type is a key determinant in the use of this technique. Of the Two-year public institutions, 70.8% utilize marketing committees, compared to 29.2% of Two-year private, 36% of Four-year private, and 45.8% of Four-year public institutions. It is the community colleges that are the leaders in this area and do not feel there is any stigma attached to utilizing a marketing committee. It is interesting to note that the Four-year public
institutions use this at a greater rate than the Four-year private institutions. We can only conjecture that since more of the Four-year private institutions use marketing consultants, they have less need for a marketing committee. Is this because many of the Four-year private institutions need immediate action to remedy their problems and thus turn to consultants in the hope they can act more quickly? Public Four-year institutions may also have a more difficult time in getting funding to pay a consultant and thus must rely more on marketing committees. Private institutions may not have as difficult a time allocating resources to a consultant. While Four-year public institutions do use this technique at a higher rate than Four-year private institutions, their usage rates are relatively small compared to the Two-year public institutions. A look at admissions standards reveals an inverse relationship between how competitive an institution is and its use of a marketing committee. (Refer to Illustration 15.) While 59.1% of the non-competitive institutions use marketing committees, only 22.7% of the most competitive institutions use them. This pattern is duplicated among many of the techniques, i.e., the more competitive the institution, the less likely they are to use marketing techniques. It is interesting that the very competitive schools use this technique at a low rate, whereas they are the most likely to use marketing audits and marketing consultants.

When we control for tuition, something interesting is revealed. In addition to the less expensive schools (many of the community colleges), schools in the $7,000-$9,999 range utilize
marketing committees at a higher rate than the other two tuition categories. And a closer look reveals that most of these are Four-year private institutions. Again, it is these schools that, in many cases, are struggling for survival who are willing to try techniques which have long been considered innovative, if not taboo. In terms of size, schools between 2,001 and 10,000 are the greatest users of marketing committees.

15. **Marketing Director**

The use of a marketing director ranked last with only 16.9% of the schools reporting the use of this technique. Of the users, 33.6% rated it as highly effective and 45.1% rated it as somewhat effective. Its mean effectiveness rating was 1.929. The 1979 study did not evaluate this technique.

While one might expect the Two-year public schools to use this at a higher rate than other institutions, it is, in fact, the Two-year private institutions (37.4% usage) who lead in the use of a marketing director (others range in usage between 11.1% and 18.8% usage).

Not surprisingly, it is the less competitive (20.9% usage) and non-competitive institutions (20.4% usage) who use this technique at a higher rate (although certainly not a high rate) than the competitive (16% usage), very competitive (9.5%) and most competitive (9.1%) institutions.

Institutions in the $4,000 to $6,999 tuition range use marketing directors at a higher rate (24.2%) than other institutions. Most of these institutions are private. Only 5.8% of the institu-
tions who charge $10,000 or more utilize marketing directors. However, it is interesting to note that those institutions who charge $10,000 or more, who do use marketing directors, find them to be "highly effective" at a much higher rate than institutions with lower tuition rates. (Refer to Illustration 16.) Enrollment appears to be only a minor factor, with schools in the 1,000 to 5,000 student range being the greatest users.

PROFILES

Overall Usage by Institutional Types

No one institutional type dominated in the usage of marketing techniques. Some techniques, such as market research, target marketing, publicity and program development were generally used at relatively high rates across all institutional categories. Others, such as marketing audits, advertising research and marketing plans, were used at relatively low rates across the categories.

Four-year private institutions recorded a significantly higher usage of a consultant than any other type, but still more than half of the respondents reported non-usage. Two-year private schools showed use of a marketing director at higher levels than other institutional types. Again, however, non-usage was much greater than actual use.

Two-year public institutions recorded use of techniques like program accessibility and marketing committees at significantly greater levels than other types. These higher usage levels were reported by a large majority of the respondents of the Two-year public type institutions for many of the marketing techniques.
Two techniques, pricing and market positioning, were used at a higher rate by the private institutions than by the public institutions. Market segmentation was used more by the Four-year institutions than by the Two-year. And, finally, advertising was used at a greater level by the Two-year institutions.

Table Seven summarizes the top five used techniques by institutional type and control:

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Yr. Public</th>
<th>4 Yr. Private</th>
<th>2 Yr. Public</th>
<th>2 Yr. Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Four Year Public Institutions**

Institutions in this category used most of the 15 marketing techniques to a considerable extent. The top five techniques (publicity, target marketing, market segmentation, market positioning, and market research) had usage rate of 79% or more. Publicity ranked first with 97% of Four-year public institutions using this technique. Accessibility, program development, marketing plan and advertising were also used by a majority of these institutions (62.7% or more).

As expected, Price was the least used technique in this category, since tuition and fees for public institutions are determined at the state and local government levels. There is a big gap between the use of advertising (62.7%) and advertising research.
(24.8%). This indicates that although a considerable amount of money is allocated for advertising, very little is done to analyze its effectiveness.

Four-Year Private Institutions

The most used marketing techniques by Four-year private institutions were the same as those most used by Four-year public institutions. These include: publicity, target marketing, market segmentation, market research and market positioning. Four-year private institutions tended to use marketing techniques at a higher rate than Four-year public institutions.

Two-Year Private Institutions

Two-year private institutions are unique in their use of marketing techniques. Target Marketing, Publicity, Advertising, Market Positioning and Program Development were cited as the most used techniques. It is interesting that the most used technique for Two-year private institutions was target marketing, while publicity was the most used marketing technique for the other institutional types. Program accessibility was one of the least used marketing techniques by this type of institution.

Two-Year Public Institutions

Two-year public institutions tended to be quite different from the other types of institutions. These Two-year public institutions have deemed to be of greatest aid techniques such as publicity, advertising and program accessibility. Program development and target marketing were also highly used. Techniques such as market research, pricing, market plans and market positioning tended not to
be fully utilized.

**Overall View of Usage by Admissions Standards**

With the exception of market segmentation, the more competitive an institution, the less likely it is to utilize most of the marketing techniques.

Advertising is a very important element in the marketing mix of competitive, less competitive and non-competitive institutions. It is not utilized by the majority of most competitive and very competitive institutions.

Non-competitive institutions are the only types of institutions in this classification that use accessibility at a high rate.

Table Eight summarizes the top five techniques used by admissions standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Competitive</th>
<th>Very Competitive</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mkt. Segmentation</td>
<td>1. Publicity</td>
<td>1. Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Target Market</td>
<td>2. Target Market</td>
<td>2. Target Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Competitive</th>
<th>Non-Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Publicity</td>
<td>1. Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Target Market</td>
<td>2. Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advertising</td>
<td>3. Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mkt. Segmentation</td>
<td>5. Target Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Competitive**

It is apparent that the institutions who define themselves as "Most Competitive" have not extensively utilized most of the fifteen
marketing techniques. These schools are highly regarded, with an ample supply of prospective students. For many of these institutions marketing is perceived as being unnecessary.

There are only three techniques that are used by the majority of the "Most Competitive" institutions. They are: market segmentation, target marketing, and market positioning. From the comments of the respondents, it was learned that a significant percentage of these schools consider marketing (particularly advertising) as inappropriate in their "elite" environment. Many admissions officers from these institutions expressed disdain over considering the needs of the market when designing their institution's programs, policies and strategies.

**Very Competitive**

The "Very Competitive" institutions have also not extensively utilized the majority of the fifteen marketing techniques. Their reasons are similar to those of the "Most Competitive" schools.

An exception to this is their use of publicity. Ninety-eight percent of other "Very Competitive" schools report using publicity. Their comments reveal that these institutions think of themselves as academically superior and "want the world to know" about them. However, the use of advertising is considered "inappropriate."

While market segmentation is used by the "Very Competitive" institutions, it is not used at as high a rate as by the "Most Competitive" institutions. (In fact, it ranks fifth in usage by the "Very Competitive" institutions and first by the "Most Competitive" institutions.)
The "Very Competitive" institutions also report using target marketing, market positioning and market research.

**Competitive**

Competitive institutions' use of marketing techniques tended to be the same as those used by Four-year public and Four-year private institutions. Publicity, target marketing, market segmentation, market research and advertising were reported as the most used techniques for these institutions. As was typical across all levels of admissions standards, the use of marketing techniques such as using marketing directors, consultants, advertising research, market committees and market audits was uniformly low.

**Less Competitive**

Institutions with "Less Competitive" admissions standards did not differ greatly from those with "Competitive" and "Very Competitive" admissions standards. Publicity, target marketing, advertising, market positioning and market segmentation comprised the five most used marketing techniques for these institutions. The use of a marketing audit, marketing committees and advertising research were not used at a high rate by these institutions.

**Non-Competitive**

The "Non-Competitive" institutions' use of marketing techniques is very similar to the usage patterns of Two-year public institutions. The most used techniques were publicity, advertising, program accessibility, program development and target marketing. Least used techniques included pricing, advertising research, and market audits. The focus appears to be on finding a target market,
developing programs to fill the needs of their target, making the programs accessible and making the target audience aware of these programs. As with Two-year public institutions, the most used techniques were publicity and advertising, indicating their main emphasis is on making the public aware of their programs and services.
CONCLUSIONS

- The use of marketing techniques has increased significantly in the last nine years, however, publicity and target marketing were the only techniques used by 90% or more of the responding institutions.
- The perceived effectiveness of marketing techniques has also increased significantly in the last nine years.
- The effectiveness ratings of all techniques tended to be quite high, even for those techniques with low reported usage.
- Overall, the more competitive the admissions standards of an institution, the less likely it is to use marketing techniques.
- Market segmentation is an exception to the above statement. The most competitive institutions use this technique at the highest rate.
- Four-year private institutions use marketing techniques at a higher rate than Four-year public institutions.
- Four-year competitive institutions have begun to embrace marketing and report positive results.
- While marketing has become more accepted, many of the respondents indicated that marketing is still in its infancy in their institutions.
- While marketing is viewed as a great way to "get students," it is not commonly viewed as a way to increase student satisfaction and lower attrition.
- Marketing is still viewed by many academic leaders as being in
the domain of the admissions office.

- The key reasons marketing techniques are not used include:
  lack of a priority for marketing, lack of administrative leadership, and a lack of implementation.

- Cost was also a factor in the lack of adoption but was not considered as important a consideration as the aforementioned reasons.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Disseminate information about the effectiveness of marketing techniques.
- Continue to educate higher education administrators about the lesser-known marketing techniques.
- Study leadership and the lack of implementation as key problems in higher education.
- Look at alternative organizational structures so that marketing can be better integrated throughout a college or university's organizational structure.
- Evaluate the cost/benefit relationship between the use of marketing techniques and strategies as a whole and the benefits to an institution.
- Evaluate the creative marketing approaches that the non-competitive institutions have utilized.
- Continue to support the efforts of Four-year private institutions (particularly the competitive institutions) in their attempt to be marketing oriented.
- Financially support the marketing activities of colleges and universities.
APPENDIX
ILLUSTRATION ONE
The information collected from this questionnaire will be used for research purposes only and will be kept strictly confidential. Please mark (X) the appropriate responses for your institution and "fill in" the blanks as indicated. Please return by August 14, 1987. Thank you for your cooperation.

Leslie Goldgehn
Associate Professor

The following are descriptions of 15 marketing techniques or strategies which might be used in the recruitment of prospective students.

1. MARKETING RESEARCH: the systematic design, collection, analysis, and reporting of data and findings relevant to the recruitment of students for the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

   - Not appropriate for our school
   - No qualified personnel on campus
   - Lack of knowledge of this technique
   - Lack of administrative leadership
   - Too expensive
   - Not considered
   - We believe it would not be effective
   - Lack of implementation
   - Not a priority
   - Other (please list)

2. PUBLICITY: news or promotional material placed without payment to the media and designed to bring favorable attention to an institution or its services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. ADVERTISING: the placing of paid advertisements in the mass media which are aimed at prospective students.

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school
- No qualified personnel on campus
- Lack of knowledge of this technique
- Lack of administrative leadership
- Too expensive
- Not considered

We believe it would not be effective
Lack of implementation
Not a priority
Other (please list)

4. ADVERTISING RESEARCH: systematic analysis and evaluation of different advertising methods to determine which strategies will most effectively reach and influence prospective students.

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school
- No qualified personnel on campus
- Lack of knowledge of this technique
- Lack of administrative leadership
- Too expensive
- Not considered

We believe it would not be effective
Lack of implementation
Not a priority
Other (please list)
5. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: the process of identifying new educational programs and services and converting them into institutional offerings.

**If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If not used, why not?** (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐

6. PRICING: the mixing of cost, competition and demand to arrive at prices to be charged for an institution's offerings i.e. Does the institution use pricing as a marketing tool to attract prospective students.

**If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If not used, why not?** (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐

7. MARKET SEGMENTATION: the dividing of populations of prospective students into groups based on geography, academic fields of interest, financial need and/or racial background, to be addressed by specific recruitment strategies.

**If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If not used, why not?** (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐
8. TARGET MARKETING: concentrating recruitment efforts towards those populations which provide the best opportunities.

USED ☐ NOT USED ☐

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐

9. MARKET POSITIONING: developing a strategy to clearly and positively differentiate an institution from its competitors.

USED ☐ NOT USED ☐

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐

10. PROGRAM AND SERVICE ACCESSIBILITY: the process by which an institution makes its programs and services available to its students. (For example, using scheduling and location to make programs/courses more convenient to students.)

USED ☐ NOT USED ☐

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school ☐
- No qualified personnel on campus ☐
- Lack of knowledge of this technique ☐
- Lack of administrative leadership ☐
- Too expensive ☐
- Not considered ☐
11. DEVELOPMENT OF A MARKETING PLAN: a written document including diagnoses, prognoses, objectives, strategies, tactics and controls considered appropriate to an institution's marketing and recruiting for a given period of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school
- No qualified personnel on campus
- Lack of knowledge of this technique
- Lack of administrative leadership
- Too expensive
- Not considered

We believe it would not be effective - Lack of implementation - Not a priority - Other (please list)

12. MARKETING AUDIT: conducting a full scale analysis of an institution's markets, publics, programs, services, program accessibility, price, promotional activities and marketing activities and strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school
- No qualified personnel on campus
- Lack of knowledge of this technique
- Lack of administrative leadership
- Too expensive
- Not considered

We believe it would not be effective - Lack of implementation - Not a priority - Other (please list)

13. THE USE OF A MARKETING CONSULTANT: hiring a marketing consultant to evaluate the effectiveness of current marketing activities and make recommendations on where improvements could be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED</th>
<th>NOT USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)

- Not appropriate for our school
- No qualified personnel on campus
- Lack of knowledge of this technique
- Lack of administrative leadership
- Too expensive
- Not considered

We believe it would not be effective - Lack of implementation - Not a priority - Other (please list)
14. THE USE OF A MARKETING COMMITTEE: creating an institution wide marketing committee to evaluate the effectiveness of current marketing activities and make recommendations on where improvements can be made.

    USED □     NOT USED □

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)
- Not appropriate for our school □
- We believe it would not be effective □
- No qualified personnel on campus □
- Lack of implementation □
- Lack of knowledge of this technique □
- Not a priority □
- Lack of administrative leadership □
- Other (please list) _______________ □
- Too expensive □
- Not considered □

15. THE USE OF A MARKETING DIRECTOR: hiring a director of marketing to monitor the effectiveness of current marketing activities and to implement strategies to better market your institution.

    USED □     NOT USED □

If used, how would you rate its effectiveness at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Highly Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If not used, why not? (Check all that apply)
- Not appropriate for our school □
- We believe it would not be effective □
- No qualified personnel on campus □
- Lack of implementation □
- Lack of knowledge of this technique □
- Not a priority □
- Lack of administrative leadership □
- Other (please list) _______________ □
- Too expensive □
- Not considered □

Please provide the following information about your institution. It will be kept confidential.

a. Name and Title of respondent: ________________________________

b. Respondent's telephone number: ________________________________

c. Institution name and address: ________________________________

   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

   ________________________________
   ________________________________

d. Location: U.S. □ Canada □ Other □

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

   ________________________________

e. Institution type:
   Two year private college ( )
   Two year public college ( )
   Four year private college/university ( )
   Four year public college/university ( )
   Professional School (such as Law, Medicine, Engineering, etc.) ( )
   Specialized School (such as School of Art, Music and Design) ( )
   Corporate college or for profit institution ( )
   Other __________________________ ( )
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f. Student body profile (percentage):
Male ________
Female ________

g. Student body make-up (percentage):
Out-of-state ________
In-state ________
Minority ________
International ________

h. Total undergraduate enrollment:
500 or less ( )
501-1,000 ( )
1,001-2,000 ( )
2,001-5,000 ( )
5,001-10,000 ( )
10,001-20,000 ( )
20,001 or more ( )

i. Institutional admissions standards for first-time freshmen: (in general)
Most Competitive ( )
Very Competitive ( )
Competitive ( )
Less Competitive ( )
Non Competitive ( )
Special ( )

j. Annual undergraduate (in-state) tuition and fees:
(Excluding room and board)
$10,000 or more ( )
$7,000-$9,999 ( )
$4,000-$6,999 ( )
$1,000-$3,999 ( )
$1,000 or less ( )

Do you have any comments on how marketing is utilized in your institution?
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Mean Effectiveness Rating for All Techniques in 1988 *

* The lower the effectiveness rating, the higher the perceived effectiveness
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Use of Marketing Techniques by Institutional Type in 1988
Use of Marketing Techniques by Admissions Standards in 1988
Goldgehn (1988) and Blackburn (1979) have compared several techniques in their respective works. This bar chart illustrates the usage of various techniques such as Market Committee, Market Plan, Market Positioning, Market Segmentation, Pricing, Program Development, Advertising, and Publicity. The chart shows the percentage usage of these techniques as reported by Goldgehn and Blackburn, with Goldgehn data represented by black bars and Blackburn data represented by dotted bars. The chart indicates the relative popularity or implementation of these techniques in their respective studies.
Mean Effectiveness Scores
Goldgehn (1988) and Blackburn (1979) *
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* The lower the effectiveness rating, the higher the perceived effectiveness.
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Program and Service Accessibility by Admissions Standards in 1988
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