2015

Perspectives on Organization of the Marketing Function in Higher Education

Susan Tams
stams@marshall.edu

PERSPECTIVES ON ORGANIZATION OF THE MARKETING FUNCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A dissertation submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfilment of
the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Education
in
Leadership Studies
by
Susan Tams

Approved by
Dr. Louis K. Watts, Chairperson
Dr. Charles Bethel
Dr. Michael Brookshire
Dr. Michael L. Cunningham

Marshall University
May 2015

DEDICATION

To the memory of my parents, William and Mae Tams

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my sincere thanks to the members of my doctoral committee, particularly Dr. Louis K. Watts, who served as chair. He agreed to take on this role after my previous chair retired, and I am indebted to him for his unfailing kindness and wise counsel.

I also thank the other members of my committee: Dr. Michael Cunningham, Dr. Michael Brookshire, and Dr. Charles Bethel, all of whom have been with me through the "long haul."

Thanks also to Dr. Frances Simone, who helped me by allowing me to co-teach a writing course with her in fulfillment of a portfolio requirement. She has also encouraged me throughout this long writing process and reviewed this manuscript.

Dr. Dennis M. Anderson assisted me by providing a portfolio opportunity as well.

Dr. Barbara Nicholson also reviewed this manuscript.

I also appreciated the chance to work with my two previous chairs, who are now retired: Dr. Paul A. Leary and Dr. Powell E. Toth.

Finally, I appreciate the encouragement given by my coworkers, friends, and family. You are all important to me.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The current study was initiated to assess the organization of the marketing function in institutions of higher education and to measure the perceptions of higher education marketing officials about various aspects of marketing. The study is a modified replication of a study by Michael W. Mulnix (1996) and employed the questions developed by Mulnix to measure perceptions of current practitioners. Several demographic questions were added about the respondents and their institutions. An updated study is useful because of three categories of change in higher education since 1996: a) changes in the way higher education conducts its operations; b) changes in the media and methods used in marketing and communication; and c) changes in prospective students and other stakeholders. The researcher employed an online survey, with follow-up through a paper survey to one group. The survey was sent to a group of public relations practitioners representing the American Association of Universities, a group similar to the one surveyed by Mulnix, but additional categories of institutions were included. A comparison of the means from the Likert-style questions between Mulnix (1996) and the current survey revealed some significant differences. There was a higher degree of agreement with most of the statements that indicated a broader scope of the marketing process. There was a higher level of agreement on the increased importance of marketing research and the need for the chief communications officer to have central authority for integrating communication efforts. The researcher concluded that the marketing function has a broader acceptance in the higher education community. The respondents identified greater importance on the role of marketing research, a broader scope for the marketing effort, and increased importance of integrated communication.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Since the turn of the 21st century, some observers (Bok, 2003; Gould, 2003; Kirp, 2003) have voiced their concerns about the state of higher education today. These authors have noted that the constrained resources and increased entrepreneurial activities by colleges and universities have led to new realities in higher education, not all of which will be desirable for society as a whole.

Gould (2003) observed that the university is more market-oriented than many practitioners are willing to admit.Course and degree program offerings reflect the current state of career opportunities, and less and less emphasis is placed upon the liberal arts. Therefore, the effects of the market are not simply from outside the institution; they are systemic. Indeed, as Kirp said, “No one is warring over prospective philosophy majors” (2003, p. 5). Competition in higher education is the order of the day, based upon an institution’s perceived prestige and its ability to attract faculty, students, and funds.

Clearly, higher education institutions cannot ignore the marketing aspects of their operations. The time is right to investigate further the role of the marketing function and its position in higher education organizations.

Background

Marketing meets higher education. During the late 1960s, higher education institutions and other nonprofit organizations began to investigate the use of the marketing concept, defined by Kotler and quoted by Mitchell (1988, p.2) and Striegler (1991, p. 3) as “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” (Kotler, 1975, p. 6; Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 7). This concept, already well identified with the traditional business community, differed from previous sales- or manufacturing-oriented approaches in that the process began with the consumer rather than the producer.

Beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, a number of other researchers, such as Tsai (1985) and Topping (1989), considered the marketing process and its concepts, as well as their use in the postsecondary education setting. Although these and other studies undoubtedly have been proven useful, the disciplines of marketing and higher education administration have continued to develop, including the use of the World Wide Web and social media such as Facebook and Twitter, that were unknown to some of the prior researchers.

Conditions in higher education affecting marketing. In examining the current state of affairs in the marketing of higher education, two topics need to be addressed. The first is the amount of financial resources that institutions are able to put into their marketing efforts. Second is the trend among institutions to establish an overall identity or brand, following a concept known as integrated marketing.

A limited amount of information is available regarding the actual amounts institutions spend on marketing activities. Publications such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Currents*, published by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, have come close to a figure, however. For example, Strout (2006), believed that non-profit institutions spend up to 5% of their annual budgets on marketing.

Integrated marketing is a term used to describe the coordination of strategies and communications from all sources in an organization, with the objectives of creating a unified message, eliminating duplication, and establishing position and image in the marketplace (Lauer, 2002). The concept is firmly rooted in business philosophies and theories, such as those of Kotler and Armstrong (1997).

A related concept, integrated marketing communication (IMC), is often used interchangeably with integrated marketing in higher education institutions, according to Cardona (2007) and Morris (2003). Integrated marketing communication is a method used to coordinate and define an organization’s preferred image, using multiple communications media. It is a subset of integrated marketing, because of its emphasis on communications rather than the entire marketing process of evaluating consumer needs and developing products to fill those needs.

Interest in integrated marketing and integrated marketing communication by higher education institutions has continued through the last decade. Morris (2003) and Edmiston-Strasser (2007) have addressed the use of IMC in the higher education arena. Morris interviewed presidents, vice presidents and marketing staff members in order to determine the degree of implementation of integrated marketing among three private, doctoral level institutions (2003).

Edmiston-Strasser's work considered several levels of IMC use among public institutions of higher education. Among the institutions she questioned, IMC was affected most by factors such as "leadership, formal communication mechanisms, and open systems orientation" (2007, p. 2).

Organizing the marketing function. Although a great number of researchers have considered the role of marketing in higher education, only a few have devoted much attention to the organization of that function. Wilson (1985) noted the large gap between theory and practice in the marketing of higher education institutions. This was due in large part to the characteristics of higher education that Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978) enumerated as goal ambiguity, client-serving institutions, problematic technologies, high professionalism, fragmented staffs, and environmental vulnerability. There is little evidence in the current literature to indicate that the gap has been closed or even lessened.

As colleges and universities have developed, they have added administrative structures to respond to their needs for technical expertise in areas such as student recruitment, financial aid, overall financial management, and legal affairs (Sands & Smith, 1999). Marketing is one of these, although not named specifically by Sands and Smith. These administrative structures have brought about some conflict with traditional faculty and academic affairs hierarchies. Sands and Smith argued that in order for truly integrated marketing to take place, the technical services must be restructured around the academic functions that are the core business of the university or college.

In service businesses such as higher education institutions, marketing practitioners have begun to recognize the difference between what are called the traditional functions of their area, such as public relations and advertising, and the broader responsibilities that include the management of the total student experience. For example, Brennan, Felekis, and Goldring (2003) made a strong case for what they term *interactive marketing*, meaning that the student experience is affected by people throughout the institution, not just those who are specifically charged with marketing. Therefore, a strategic alliance in the institution between human resource management and marketing is required in order to select and train those people.

A detailed study by Mulnix (1996) established four "key indicators" (p. 293) that can be used to assist marketing practitioners in higher education, who are often chief communication officers or persons reporting to them, in organizing their marketing activities. The most important indicator is the overall support given the marketing function by what Mulnix calls the *dominant coalition* (p. 294), meaning, in most cases, the institutional president and, possibly, his or her cabinet. Other indicators include the amount of background that a chief communication officer had in marketing, the value placed on research, and the culture of the organization. Using those indicators, Mulnix concluded that the marketing of higher education is more limited in focus in the public sector than in the private sector and tends to be directed toward the enrollment management arena, as a subset of the organization's overall communications function.

Much of the work on the subject of higher education marketing has been limited to one or a few selected institutions--or individual majors or departments--that are subjects of qualitative studies. Some of these studies have touched on organizational factors.

Thirty years ago, Firoz (1982) indicated that it was impossible to find an administrator with the express duty of administering the institution's marketing programs. Today, it is quite possible. A review of the titles reported by Edmiston-Strasser (2007) revealed that 15 of the 42 respondents had the word *marketing* in their titles.

However, even with the job title and a mandate, a marketing practitioner may face some of the same challenges enumerated by Firoz. These included: a) marketing activities that are directed from different vice presidential areas, b) other activities that take place at the departmental level, and c) "widely scattered and disorganized" (Firoz, p. 51) marketing activities.

A little more than 20 years later, a set of three case studies by Morris (2003) addressed, on a qualitative basis, the organization of marketing-related functions in three private higher education institutions, as part of a study of integrated marketing. Of particular interest is the list in Table 4 (p. 184) of some of the tasks associated with each institution's marketing unit. The tasks common to the marketing units in all three institutions included advertising, alumni concerns, media relations, market research, internal communications, publications and public relations/events (2003).

Morris' data (2003) described one organization that had a Vice President for Enrollment Management, whose responsibilities included (in addition to the more traditional recruitment, financial aid, and retention areas) the university relations, alumni, and career services units. The data revealed another organization that consolidated some of its public relations and fundraising activities under a Vice President for University Advancement, but allowed other units to pursue marketing activities on their own. At the time the data were collected, disagreement among staff members was apparent regarding the amount of centralization that was necessary to support the integrated marketing and integrated marketing communication goals (2003).

At about the same time, Hendricks (2002) described two models for centralized marketing functions in higher education, primarily concerning himself with the private comprehensive institution. Both are compatible with the concept of integrated marketing and connect with some of the data collected by Morris.

In Model A, the Enrollment Management Model, virtually all marketing functions are located organizationally under a Vice President for Enrollment Management. This model has the advantage of providing ultimate responsibility for both the marketing activities and enrollment results in the same place. Morris' first subject institution reflected this model to some degree, with its combination of enrollment services with university relations and other marketing tasks.

On the other hand, Hendricks described Model B, the University Relations Model, headed by a Vice President for University Relations or a similar title. This vice presidential area is responsible for the marketing, advertising, and promotion of virtually all academic programs in all media. This model has the advantage of providing a customer-focused perspective throughout the organization. Morris' second subject institution tended toward this model, but with some units that stayed outside the unit and with the additional responsibility for fundraising, which does not appear in the Hendricks model.

Although Hendricks' categorizations appear to be useful in describing organizational models, they do not seem to have been explored further in the existing literature. Among the reasons for this may be: a) a lack of understanding among marketing practitioners of the two models; b) differences in the way the two models are defined among practitioners; or c) no clear-cut relationship between the model an institution uses and its perceived success. In addition they do not completely describe real-life situations as in the examples studied by Morris.

By 2007, Cardona was able to say that institutions are "embracing more sophisticated marketing techniques than ever before" (p. 12). He based his statement on qualitative studies of nine institutions, which included private liberal arts institutions, comprehensive state institutions, and public research institutions. His study, which dealt with the leadership of the marketing process on campuses, provided useful, if anecdotal, information on how institutions conduct their marketing processes.

Even with all of the foregoing in mind, it appears that no one has undertaken a study that will create a snapshot of the marketing process in U.S. higher education today and how it is organized. A quantitative, descriptive study among today's practitioners of marketing in the higher education community established a reference point that will assist college and university leaders in determining what directions to pursue in setting up or adjusting the structure of their organizations with regard to marketing. Further, the study explored factors that affect the organization of marketing in higher education and practitioners' views on their experiences with them.

Rationale

As has been shown, the marketing concept is no longer foreign to the higher education community. Its acceptance, if not total, is now commonplace. As higher education institutions devote increasing amounts of time, money, and other resources to their marketing efforts, the organization of those efforts will become even more critical in order to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

Hendricks (2002) provided two models of organizing marketing functions, but there may be other strategies that are proving useful since his work was published. Both Morris (2003) and Cardona (2007) researched higher education institutions and their marketing activities and structures qualitatively. Mulnix provided indicators leading to specific organizational structures in 1996, but enough time has passed that these indicators should be re-evaluated in light of current conditions. This is for several reasons.

First, higher education has changed. Previous methods of organizing the marketing function may have lost favor as institutions of higher education became more comfortable with promoting themselves and developing and promoting their programs. Some factors affecting organization have been identified by Mulnix (1996) and Morris (2003), but higher education has changed enough, even since the Morris study in 2003, that additional study is needed.

Second, marketing and promotional methods have changed. The World Wide Web is now at least one of the vehicles prospective students use to select a college or university, and it is a major medium used to communicate with institutional stakeholders of all kinds. It was virtually unknown at the time of the Mulnix study, and in relative infancy at the time of the Morris study.

An important subset of the Web, social media, such as Twitter and Facebook, are now critical components of any advertiser's toolbox. Further, more traditional media such as direct mail and print advertising are undergoing increased scrutiny due to their cost and audiences reached.

Third, prospective students have changed. Observers such as Sweeney (2006) have pointed out the characteristics of what is now called the Millenial Generation (those born from approximately 1979 to 1994) and how they differ from previous generations. These differences, as enumerated by Sweeney, include the expectation of more choices being available, a preference for experiential learning, a desire for flexibility and convenience, and impatience (2006). Some of these characteristics have been integrated into society as a whole regardless of generation, and must be taken into account in structuring marketing activities aimed at Millennials and other institutional stakeholders.

Last, both the Mulnix and Morris studies concentrated on a specific classification of institution. Mulnix looked primarily at members of the American Association of Universities (AAU), while Morris concentrated on private colleges and universities. A study that includes multiple classifications of institutions was needed, so that the factors affecting organization could be compared based on the classifications.

This study addressed these issues. First, institutions of all basic Carnegie classifications were included, rather than only private institutions or AAU members. Second, the questionnaire used by Mulnix was used in order to determine if the findings of that study could still be found in 2014, 18 years later. This study replicated the questions in the Mulnix study to determine if its findings regarding the factors that influence organization are still valid today, and if so, if the findings can be expanded to other categories of institutions.

There is little else in the literature that describes the organizational strategies for the marketing of higher education. Only by questioning the current practitioners of marketing in higher education institutions regarding their current organizational practices and experiences could progress be made toward determining the best way of organizing the marketing function in higher education. This information will prove valuable in assisting institutions to reach their goals and fulfill their missions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify factors that affect the organization and role of marketing units in institutions of higher education, as they react and plan for changing environmental conditions and available resources, and changes in persepective concerning the marketing function since the Mulnix study in 1996.

Research Questions

- What is the marketing unit's position in the institutional hierarchy?
- What selected characteristicsnow influence how the unit is organized?
- What changes in perspective concerning the marketing function have taken place since the Mulnix study was conducted in 1996?

Research Methods

This study was conducted among the practitioners of marketing in higher education. To accomplish this, an e-mail list was acquired that represented higher education institutions in most categories. An online survey was conducted. Then, in an effort to increase the response rate for one of the groups, a supplemental printed-and-mailed survey was used.

Significance

As higher education organizations become increasingly comfortable with marketing concepts and functions, the organization of these functions will become more critical to the management of the entire enterprise. A study of this type will provide a baseline analysis of the state of marketing organization now, giving decision-makers, such as institutional presidents and boards, information on how their respective institutions compare to peer-level institutions. In addition, those who aspire to higher institutional classifications will get further information on the tasks and staffing levels that are found on the contemplated level.

The indicators identified by Mulnix (1996) were re-explored in view of today's higher education technologies and realities. These indicators also were studied on a broader field than in the original study, which reflected responses by fewer than 50 participants.

In addition, the two organizational models identified by Hendricks (2002) were explored further in terms of their use by the institutions represented by the respondents. Participants were asked if they believed one of the models applied to them.

By evaluating the information on structure**,** it may be possible to establish a framework for organization of the marketing function. This framework would assist institutions in managing this important activity.

Limitations

This study, since it is primarily descriptive in nature, was not designed to conclusively address the success of one particular marketing structure over another. Rather, it provides a foundation for future studies of that type by describing the structures, as seen by the respondents in their own situations.

This study concentrated on the perspectives the respondents (and practitioners) themselves have of their operations, informed by the work of Mulnix (1996), Kotler and Fox (1985), and Morris (2003).

In addition to the foregoing, the study was limited by the quality and characteristics of the mailing list used for the survey and how those characteristics may differ from the entire population of practitioners. Finally, the study was affected by the characteristics of the practitioners who chose to respond and how they may have differed from the entire population.

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will provide a review of the use of marketing in higher education. It will then address changes in the competitive arena for colleges and universities since 1996, as well as changes in marketing and media and changes in prospective students and other stakeholders since that time.

Marketing in Higher Education

Implementing the concept of marketing was a relatively late addition to the practices of higher education administration. Observers such as Mulnix (1996) and Hendricks (2006) trace its introduction to just before the 1970s, when Kotler and Levy (1969) published an article titled "Broadening the Concept of Marketing" in the *Journal of Marketing.* Significantly, they indicated that higher education institutions were already using marketing techniques at the time in admissions and recruiting. They also made a case for organizational marketing as follows: "The choice facing those who manage nonbusiness organizations is not whether to market or not to market. The choice is whether to do it well or poorly, and upon this necessity the case for organizational marketing is basically founded." (Kotler & Levy, 1969, p. 15)

Indeed, there are few scholarly works on the subject of marketing in higher education that do not refer to the work of Kotler and several of his coauthors. Often quoted in dissertations and other writings on the subject, Kotler was among the first scholars to address extending marketing concepts to other entities such as churches, performing arts organizations, and higher education institutions.

In addition to Kotler and his coauthors, authors such as Hornick , Kriegbaum, Pressley, and Lucas considered the marketing of higher education in the 1970s and very early 1980s. These works were included in an annotated bibliography created by Ryans and Shanklin (1986) that primarily introduce the concept of marketing to the higher education community, as indicated by the titles of the works: *The Successful Marketing of Schools* (Hornick, 1980), "Marketing to

Advance the Small College" (Kriegbaum, 1981), *Marketing Planning for Colleges and Universities* (Pressley, 1978), and *Developing a Total Marketing Plan* (Lucas, 1979).

The 1980s. While it appears that some higher education institutions began to consider the use of marketing as early as the 1970s, serious attention in the literature started later in that decade and in the early 1980s. As Topping (1989) stated, "Where the Seventies was the introductory period for marketing in higher education, the Eighties is proving to be the growth stage" (p. 2). In the 1980s, Goldgehn (1982), Blanton (1981), and Firoz (1982), among others, began to study the use of marketing in the higher education arena from several points of view.

Goldgehn's work resulted in a marketing audit procedure for the staff at private four-year colleges to use in evaluating their institutions' current market position and strategy and in developing plans going forward (1982). Although the initial audit instrument was concerned with private, less-selective colleges, the author stated that, with some adjustment, it could be applied to larger, more selective, or public institutions.

The audit was developed using, in part, a questionnaire developed by Kotler (1980) and materials by other authors, and consisted of eight steps to be followed in the marketing process, which are enumerated by Goldgehn (1982) as follows:

1. Define the college's mission;
2. Identify publics and markets;
3. Research the needs, wants, and perceptions of the target markets;
4. Differentiate market segments;
5. Choose which market segments to serve;
6. Define the college's market niche;
7. Evaluate product, price, place, and promotion and formulate into a marketing plan;
8. Implement and control the marketing plan. (p. 285)

At the time of this study, few institutions had formal marketing structures in place, according to Dennis Johnson, one of the panel members reviewing Goldgehn's audit instrument. The instrument was designed either to review the formal structure that was in place or assist in the development of a formal structure for those institutions with informal structures or no structures at all (Goldgehn, 1982).

Blanton (1981) illustrated a way to gather marketing information on a specific institution prior to the development of a marketing plan. Without much previous data with which to work, he developed a survey instrument that collected perspectives about his institution from four constituency groups (students, their parents, faculty and faculty from feeder schools) and compared them to an institution that those constituencies would consider ideal. By evaluating the differences between the ideal institution and the institution in question, some initial direction could be established for marketing activities or further research. This would be one method of getting the information needed in item 3 of Goldgehn's list, above: "Research the needs, wants, and perceptions of the target markets." (Goldgehn, p. 285)

Although interesting, Blanton's method does not appear to have been pursued in later literature. This was possibly because the concept of an ideal institution was problematic or because the survey instrument was tailored too specifically to the institution in question and could not be easily adapted to other institutions.

Taylor (1984) proposed a theoretical model for marketing aimed at urban universities. Steps in his simplified model included self assessment by the institution, research, analysis of the resources available, development of a marketing plan, implementation of that plan, and evaluation of the activities conducted under the plan. Although the title specifically refers to urban universities, it appears that the model can be used at other types of institutions as well. The study also provided a thorough grounding in marketing theory for the uninitiated.

During the decade of the 1980s, researchers such as Barlar (1987) investigated the use of marketing planning on a case-study basis. Although limited to the study of a single institution, Barlar's work illustrated conditions that were likely to be found in other institutions at the time: conservatism in management, disinterest in marketing among the faculty, and an inward focus of the academic community. In addition, Barlar identified five factors that she considered necessary in order for any institution to adopt a marketing orientation: "commitment, involvement, organization, information, and concentration" (p. 143). First and foremost, the chief executive of the institution needs to set the tone with regard to the necessity for marketing so that the rest of the community follows suit.

The study of Firoz (1982) among four-year, publicly controlled institutions may have been one of the first of its kind to address the actual practitioners in the marketing of higher education. The researcher surveyed representatives from more than 500 institutions across the United States, focusing on public relations and development practitioners where possible, with the idea that those practitioners were best able to comment on the marketing efforts of their institutions. At that time, Firoz concluded that "the institutional community as a whole lacks a common, coordinated approach to marketing" (p. 174). He made his conclusion based on his observations of the personnel involved and their educational backgrounds, the apparent dispersion of the marketing activities in the institutions, and the experimental nature of many of the activities described (1982).

A series of guidelines for directing the marketing process at a higher education institution was developed by Tsai in 1986. The steps were enumerated as follows: a) institutional restructuring and preparation; b) marketing information system; c) marketing segmentation; d) marketing research; e) marketing positioning; f) marketing strategy formulation; g) marketing mix determination; and h) evaluation (Tsai, 1986). Although these concepts were not necessarily new at the time of this writing, the application of all the concepts to higher education in a single sequence represented a departure from the usual consideration of marketing in higher education or other nonprofit entities.

Ferguson (1986) chose to describe the use of marketing techniques by a group of institutions that had made changes in either the students they served (becoming co-educational), their names (from college to university, for example), or in their program offerings (from 2-year to 4-year). She concluded that marketing was "an important consideration" (p. 209) for the institutions in her study; however, it should be noted that only 12 institutions in 4 neighboring states were included. Although the data are interesting, they are not compelling.

By the close of the 1980s, Topping (1989) was convinced that, although the use of the word *marketing* was in general use in the higher education community, many, if not most, institutions were *selling* or *promoting* what they had available. As Kotler (1980), Taylor (1984) and others who have studied marketing have said, the complete marketing process involves research into the needs and wants of prospective customers and tailoring product offerings to meet those needs and wants. Promotion is only one part of the process.

Topping's research, conducted in the form of case studies on two institutions, resulted in a tool he called the Sales/Marketing Management Orientation Matrix. The matrix presented five aspects of marketing management (consumer responsiveness, institutional planning, market research, marketing organization and technologies, and institutional readiness) and allowed the user to score an institution on each aspect. When complete, the overall score was intended to reveal the institution's tendency toward marketing or sales (Topping, 1989).

As Topping analyzed his findings, however, he found it necessary to add a third type of management orientation to his matrix: *production*. The production orientation was based on the premise that if products were correct, the sales and marketing issues would take care of themselves. In the final version of the matrix, the institution's perspective ranged from production (low scores), selling (mid-range scores) or marketing (high scores) (Topping, 1989).

The work of the foregoing authors illustrates the increased interest in and study of the marketing process in higher education during the 1980s. However, very few of these authors addressed the way the marketing operation was, or would be, added to the management hierarchy of the institution. Among those that did (Firoz, 1982; Tsai, 1986), the subject was tangential to the main question.

The 1990s. Researchers continued to address the application of marketing concepts to higher education in the 1990s. It appears that although the concept was not unfamiliar among institutions, a number of those institutions had not embraced its full implementation.

Striegler (1991) used the Delphi technique to consider the role of the admissions director in higher education as it might appear in 2000. Among the conclusions reached by his panel were some that related to future marketing activities of an enrollment officer, such as working with high-level administrators to create the institution's strategic and market plans, identifying the populations that will be targeted for marketing activities, and working toward a more comprehensive system of enrollment management.

In 1990, Myers considered the subject of institutional image and how it is identified by the institutional community and its publics. Image is important to the marketing process, because it serves as a kind of shorthand that communicates the institution's structure, values, and capabilities. In addition, her work describes the concept of institutional advancement, including, in her view, the subsets of marketing and fundraising (Myers, 1990).

Although his study was limited to the province of Alberta, Canada, Michael (1991) determined that at that time, very few public and private colleges had marketing offices. Many of the respondents were interested in establishing an office of this type, however. In addition, most respondents thought that the marketing office should be represented at the director, associate vice president or vice president level (1991).

Kajcienski's work (1997) was aimed at determining the extent to which higher education institutions employed specific marketing activities and concepts, including product, price, market, strategy, and similar ideas. He concluded that most institutions were not using all of the elements, and were constrained from doing so because of a lack of resources and an unfamiliarity or resistance to the use of the term *marketing* (1997). In addition, Kajcienski determined that two-thirds of the persons responsible for marketing in their organizations were at least at the director level (1997), reflecting the opinions of the respondents to Michael (1991).

Interestingly, the concept of positioning was not among the elements that Kajcienski's work considered, although it may have been implied in some of the elements that were on the list. Positioning was considered in detail by Gerke-Newman (1998), and was defined as a way to set an institution apart from its competitors, laying the groundwork for a niche marketing strategy or establishing points of difference from other institutions. In surveying a group of enrollment managers in higher education institutions, she concluded that although a number of these administrators believe they are employing positioning, most were not using the technique to its fullest. To do so, the institution must have developed a statement regarding the benefits it offers to selected target markets, which the potential recipients will see as distinctive. Also, the number of benefits communicated should be limited, in order to avoid confusion and self-contradiction (1998).

In addition to looking at the marketing process itself, some researchers during this period narrowed their considerations to a single category of institutions. Cockrum (1995) examined the relationship of the strategic marketing orientation of institutions in the Carnegie classification of Liberal Arts College II, as well as administrators' views on the suitability of marketing for their institutions, to measures of enrollment stability and student quality. In this category, there was no real relationship among those factors. Cockrum attributed those findings to a possible tendency of institutions in this category to move toward more comprehensive offerings, moving away from programs that are strictly liberal arts. This would allow for their survival in terms of enrollment, regardless of the marketing strategies implemented (Cockrum, 1995).

During the later part of the 1990s, at least two researchers began to evaluate organizational considerations as they applied to marketing and communications in higher education. One was based on a qualitative study of a single organization (Brooks, 1998); the other was based on a mixed quantitative and qualitative study of multiple organizations (Mulnix, 1996).

The Brooks study (1998) centered on organizational change that resulted from the expectations of stakeholders. In higher education, stakeholders are not necessarily students of the institution in question. The term refers to categories of individuals who are affected by and have a stake in the institution; for example, faculty, staff, senior administration, alumni, parents of students, government officials, and the like. As Brooks said in the introduction to her study:

> Stakeholders affect and are affected by organizations in various ways. The bilateral relationships that customers, suppliers, and employees develop with organizations influence and are influenced through the exchange of money and other value for goods, services, and labor. Lenders and shareholders are affected by their financial interests in organizations in which they invest. Government affects organizations through the creation and enforcement of various operating regulations and through funding allocations for public sector enterprises. (p. 1)

This case study was conducted in the communications and publications unit of a public, land-grant institution of higher education in the U.S. Midwest. Its workload included: (a) the support of student recruiting and retention; (b) faculty, staff, and alumni relations; and (c) public and private support of the university (Brooks, p. 10). Specific tasks included "media relations, special events, and developing and/or supporting various university publications" (p. 10).

As she described her findings, Brooks indicated that, although organizational change was being studied in the case, specifically with regard to stakeholder pressure, organizational leadership proved to be the key to understanding the dynamics. The stakeholders, who in this study were primarily the internal customers of the unit, exerted pressure upon the leaders and staff members of the unit to become more strategic in their actions and in their planning. The unit not only responded to those pressures, but anticipated future challenges and planned for them. These abilities, Brooks concluded, were a result of the qualities displayed and the tactics used by the leadership (Brooks, 1998).

Mulnix (1996) studied the effect of leadership upon a university marketing organization in a different way. He identified four “key indicators” (p. 293) that would assist marketing and communication practitioners in organizing their staffs and operations: (a) the degree of support given by, in Mulnix’s term, the *dominant coalition* to the use of marketing concepts; (b) the background and qualifications of the chief communication officer; (c) the use of research in planning and evaluating activities; and (d) institutional culture (Mulnix, 1996).

Of the four indicators, Mulnix concluded that the first, the degree to which the dominant coalition supported the use of marketing concepts, was the most important: “… if the president views marketing as a positive function, then the chief communication officer is going to be utilizing marketing concepts” (Mulnix, 1996, p. 299). The remaining three indicators could, in turn, be affected by the first. For example, a chief communication officer, because of the nature of his or her work, is likely to have been hired (or retained) by the dominant coalition and would be likely to reflect the coalition’s stand on marketing. The dominant coalition would also be in a position to provide funding and other support for the use of research. Lastly, the institutional culture, even if against the use of marketing, could be circumvented by strong support from the dominant coalition, e.g., the president or campus executive officer.

An important point made in Mulnix’s work refers to the difference between marketing for-profit and nonprofit (particularly higher education) entities. In a for-profit corporation or other entity, management is likely to have control over all facets of the marketing process. Therefore, marketing can be seen as central to the organization’s purpose, establishing the principles from which all its activities flow. In higher education, on the other hand, marketing is rather more limited in scope. Even the management of the enterprise (or the dominant coalition, to use Mulnix’s term) does not have complete control over all of the facets and must put marketing practices to work where possible in an existing, historical, and tradition-based structure. It is pointed out several times that some institutions use marketing techniques, but do not identify them as such and do their best to avoid the term *marketing*, as this would not be well received by institutional stakeholders such as faculty (Mulnix, 1996).

Mulnix's work is definitive in describing the marketing climate in higher education during the late 1990s. However, much has changed in higher education and the world in which it exists today, so in order to assess the continued value of the conclusions in his work, it is necessary to consider some of the changes that higher education has undergone since 1996. First, the literature regarding marketing in higher education continued to develop after 1996, and that will be reviewed next. Second, changes in the arena in which higher education must operate have taken place, and third, the audience for the marketing efforts has changed as well. These sets of changes will be enumerated in a following section.

Literature since 1996. Researchers have continued to address the use of marketing in higher education in the period since 1996. They have studied topics as varied as organization (Sands & Smith, 1999), enrollment marketing techniques (Watson, 2000), strategic marketing techniques (Hall, 2006), integrated marketing (DePerro, 2006; Morris, 2003), integrated marketing communication (Edmiston-Strasser, 2007; Horrigan, 2007), and branding (Ramsey, 2006; Ashby, 2008).

In 1999, Sands and Smith called for restructuring of higher education organizations so that marketing and communications efforts of departments such as development, communications, alumni relations, and, most importantly, admissions speak with the same voice and make the best possible use of their resources. They recommended a task force approach among those areas, so that "opportunities identified through an integrated marketing effort" (p. 41) can best be addressed. They said, "An integrated approach requires not only full understanding, involvement and ownership of the objectives by the people involved but a similar pooling of budgets, project teams and … hierarchical structures as well" (p. 44).

At that time, they recognized the power of the "functional silos" (p. 45) that existed in colleges and universities. This was due in large part to a "technical bureaucracy" (p. 45) that sprang up so that institutions could deal with, among other things, increasingly sophisticated and complex recruiting, legal, and financial aid requirements, as well as a shortage of financial resources. However, the authors suggested that rather than organize around technical abilities, institutions should organize around their "fundamental academic purposes" (p. 45).

Similarly, Watson's study of the enrollment marketing techniques employed by four-year institutions as the 21st century dawned revealed that, although institution-wide planning is recommended for optimal results, "marketing efforts made are disjointed" (p. 109) in the institutions studied. It is of significance that most institutions were able to identify a single person in charge of marketing, in contrast to the statement by Firoz (1982) that, at the time of his study, there were no administrators charged with marketing tasks. However, even with 18 years intervening between their studies, both Watson (2000) and Firoz (1982) identified problems with coordination of marketing activities in institutions of higher education. This would indicate a continuing degree of discomfort with the idea of marketing institution-wide.

Ramsey's qualitative study on branding (2006) as it applied to a single higher education institution offered ways of mitigating discomfort with the idea of marketing. In the current parlance of marketing practitioners, the word *brand* encompasses more than graphic standards. The brand explains what makes the institution unique, memorable, or distinctive, and includes statements that cue prospective students and other audiences about what to expect at the institution.

As she tracked the institution's approach to the then-new concept of a college brand, Ramsey discovered that the reason for the apparent success of the brand was that it was developed based on strengths already existent in the institution's faculty and curriculum. In this particular example, global education was considered a significant part of the brand (Ramsey, 2006). She also noted that the president of the institution was an outstanding champion of the brand and played an important part in its development (2006).

That last statement reflected some of the findings of Mulnix (1996). Mulnix indicated that the structure and activities of the marketing and communications unit of an institution are functions of the attitudes of the campus CEO or, in Mulnix's term, the dominant coalition.

Integrated marketing communication is a term that has come to be used regularly in the corporate environment and has reached a degree of familiarity in the higher education community as well. Edmiston-Strasser (2007) indicated that the term refers to a strategic use of multiple methods of communication throughout the entire institution in support of its brand and brand statements. In addition, she further indicated that the integration and coordination of the institution's messages can assist in student recruiting and retention: "Ultimately, the intent of [integrated marketing communication] is to deliver the best institutional information possible by leveraging communication resources and developing consistent, targeted messaging that attracts a larger, more qualified student population" (2007, p. 7).

In developing her study, Edmiston-Strasser used as a framework the Four Stages of Integrated Marketing Communication described by McGoon (1998). Stage 1 is the entry point for most organizations, which includes a great deal of tactical coordination among the organization's units. Stage 2 adds a market research component to the organization's activities, so that more is known about the organization's publics and target markets, and customer feedback is utilized in establishing the communication efforts. Stage 3 adds information technology to the available tools for the organization's marketing staff. Finally, Stage 4 reflects a strategic integration of the organization's entire external and internal communications (Edmiston-Strasser, 2007; McGoon, 1998).

Edmiston-Strasser administered a survey based on the four stages to a purposive sample of marketing and communication practitioners in higher education, and then selected some of them for qualitative interviews based on the answers and other factors (2007). Since the results of the survey did not demonstrate a completely linear progression through the stages, she developed a categorization system that indicated whether the institution could be considered in the beginning, intermediate, or advanced stage of implementing integrated marketing communication. These categories were among the criteria used to select institutions for the qualitative interviews (Edmiston-Strasser, 2007).

A review of the conclusions of the study revealed several that can be applied to the study of marketing organization in higher education. First, as Mulnix (1996) and others have said, the support of the highest level of leadership is necessary for success in implementation of a strong brand. As Edmiston-Strasser put it:

> The support of institutional leadership was revealed to be the single most powerful determinant of whether an IMC strategy was successful. Not only does leadership need to mandate the coordination of marketing communication efforts but they also need to visibly support the institution's marketing communication objectives. (p. 90)

Additional factors revealed in her research led to the development of a strong brand using integrated marketing communication. These factors included: (a) coordinated, but not necessarily centralized, communication; (b) consistent understanding of the concept of branding; and (c) use of integrated marketing communication to increase and support selectivity in recruiting students (Edmiston-Strasser, 2007). Edmiston-Strasser's conclusion supported Mulnix's (1996) conclusion that "the structure of the marketing effort on a college or university campus is determined by such 'key indicators' as institutional culture, support given by top administrators (the dominant coalition), and the role played by the chief communication practitioner" (p. 291).

Morris' (2003) study of integrated marketing revealed similar conclusions, arrived at through case studies of three private institutions. First, similar to the findings of Mulnix (1996) and Edmiston-Strasser (2007), Morris concluded that "[a] university wishing to implement integrated marketing needs to have a clear mandate from the president" (p. 191). In addition, she concluded that the institution's vision and strategic plan need to be in place before integrated marketing can take place, and that integrated marketing communication is more likely to be established at a college or university than complete integrated marketing, of which it is a subset (2003).

Since virtually all of the foregoing researchers have observed that the support of the chief executive officer is critical to the establishment and success of a marketing program, regardless of what it is called at the institution, the work of Hall (2006) is worth examining. His study considered the perspectives of presidents of Master's I institutions (using a Carnegie Commission classification) with regard to specific marketing strategies, both regional and national. The regional strategies identified most often by presidents as effective were as follows: "(a) building landmark facilities, (b) hiring better qualified faculty, (c) increasing the academic program offerings, and (d) marketing for name recognition" (p. 34). The presidents reported that hiring better qualified faculty and raising the academic level of students were the most effective national strategies (Hall, 2006).

Of the regional strategies deemed effective, marketing for name recognition reflects the research presented here on branding and integrated marketing communication. Echoing some of the previous researchers, Hall recommended that "[i]nstitutions must continue traditional marketing and public relations efforts, while exploring new and creative ways to expose more potential students, donors, and supporters to effective institutional messages" (p. 56). The term *traditional marketing and public relations efforts* can be seen as integrated marketing communication, while *marketing for name recognition* can be seen as support for the institution's brand. Some of Hall's work, therefore, supported the conclusions of Edmiston-Strasser (2007) and Ramsey (2006).

DePerro (2006) produced a qualitative study of a group of three Master's I institutions' experiences with integrated marketing at about the same time as Hall. DePerro's conclusions foreshadowed some of those of Edmiston-Strasser, including the need for management support at the highest level, the idea that integrated marketing works best when combined with strategic planning, and the fact that "integrated marketing increases national and regional recognition as well as visibility in the marketplace." (DePerro, 2006, p. 91) He also drew some additional conclusions, among them the idea that refers to "distinctive attributes and perceived value" (p. 91), which can certainly be seen as a brand. He also concluded that the morale of faculty, staff, students, and alumni would be improved through the use of integrated marketing and would turn them into ambassadors for the institution's brand (2006).

In his study on integrated marketing communication, centered on a single institution, Horrigan (2007) traced the establishment of that institution's branding and integrated marketing communication initiatives over a six-year period. This study emphasized the complex nature of the development of these initiatives, using a framework developed by Schultz and Kitchen (2000) that other institutions might consider in establishing these initiatives for themselves. The framework is similar to the one described by McGoon (1998) and employed by Edmiston-Strasser (2007).

The study by Ashby (2008) considered a single institution in another way. Given an institution's brand as identified by representatives of the university community (in this case, the University of Virginia), he asked if that identity was perceived by potential students. Ashby discovered some differences among the 9th graders he studied based on their plans to attend college or whether they had visited the university's campus. Regardless of the answer, colleges and universities need to know what their brand conveys to the students they are trying to recruit.

Conclusion: marketing and higher education. The subject of marketing in higher education is a broad one, and during the last decade, researchers have added concepts such as branding, integrated marketing, and integrated marketing communication to the knowledge base in the subject. Much of this specialized work has taken place after the Mulnix (1996) study. This study was conducted, in part, to see if the conclusions he reached would be equally valid for higher education in 2014.

Changes Affecting Higher Education Since 1996

Three major categories of change have affected higher education since 1996. There have been changes in the way higher education conducts its operations, changes in the media used in marketing and communication, changes in the students that higher education must recruit and teach. Each of these changes will be considered in the following sections.

Changes in the way higher education conducts its operations. Higher education organizations have experienced, as well as instituted, a number of changes in the way they conduct their operations. Some of these changes will be discussed in later sections as the way marketing in general is conducted today and the types of prospective students and other stakeholders are considered. However, one of the most significant changes since 1996 is the amount of resources devoted to the marketing and promotion of the institution.

It is difficult to establish a dollar amount for marketing activities in higher education, as indicated by Scarborough (2012). She reviewed some of the standard business "prescriptions" for marketing spending outside of colleges and universities, including percentages that ranged from 2% of gross revenues to a high of 11%. In addition, she quoted another source for 1% of net revenues for hospitals, a category often compared to higher education (2012).

Even more significantly, Scarborough believed that marketing spending was on the increase for higher education, even in the face of budget cuts and other constraints. She noted that this is due to the fact that spending has become more visible, since institutions were not spending much previously. Also, she believed that many institutions were working to centralize their operations in a more sophisticated way and were gathering funds that previously were distributed across their organizations (2012).

The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and the consulting firm LipmanHearne conducted a survey of selected higher education institutions in 2010. Since a similar survey had been conducted every year since 2001, they were able to conclude the following:

> By far, the most outstanding trend shows up when comparing overall marketing spending across a decade: In the year 2001, the median marketing spending for a midsized college or university (2,000–5,999 students) was $259,400 (or $321,900, adjusted for inflation). A decade later, that figure balloons to $800,000, an increase of 100 percent. (CASE & LipmanHearne, 2010, p. 1)

It is clear that researchers report that overall spending on marketing has increased at colleges and universities. In addition to increasing the amounts that they spend, higher education institutions have changed the ways that they allocate their marketing budgets among media and other activities, and the leaders among them dedicate a significant portion (at least 6% of the marketing budget) to research. The CASE/Lipman-Hearne study enumerated findings that illustrate changes over the decade of their study, and by extension, since 1996:

- Those institutions who have committed to market research on a greater level employ more and varied types of marketing projects, including social media tactics, admissions viewbooks, and institution-wide marketing committees.
- The allocation of marketing dollars reflects an increase in the use of social and other interactive media. This possibly has come at the expense of more traditional advertising venues (CASE & LipmanHearne, 2010).

More recently, a survey of higher education marketing practitioners described by Gauthier (2012) revealed the following themes:

- Traditional marketing methods are no longer enough;
- There is room for growth in online programs;
- It’s [sic] status quo for offline marketing methods;
- Increased investment in online marketing tactics;
- Top priority is getting students into seats, and keeping them there (2012).

The last point regarding retention is a relatively new part of the tasks assigned to the marketing aspect of higher education institutions. As institutions deal with applicant pools that are, in many cases, shrinking, they have turned their attention to keeping the students they do have. This can be seen as a shared responsibility of the marketing and academic affairs units of institutions, and as one that has become more apparent since 1996.

Another aspect of higher education that has taken increased prominence since 1996 comprises ranking systems such as the *U.S. News and World Report's* "America's Best Colleges," which was first published in 1983 (Myers & Robe, 2009). Although a few schools have decided not to participate, most do, and the rankings, when positive, are an important part of a school's promotion of itself.

Changes in the media and methods used in marketing and communication. The following sections will consider the changes that higher education institutions have experienced with regard to the media available to them and the methods of using those media.

Media. Since 1996, higher education institutions, as well as other types of businesses and organizations, have found it necessary to use new and emerging marketing and communication technologies. Two of the primary categories are the World Wide Web and social media.

Although the World Wide Web (commonly called just the Internet today) was in existence in 1996, it did not have a major place in marketing and communication strategies at that time. However, that situation changed over the next decade, as signaled by researchers such as Hendricks (2006). He considered the use of the Internet in students' college choice, finding that the college or university website was of primary importance in students' initial choices of institutions.

With regard to social media, however, Hendricks did not find that the students in his study were influenced by "chat rooms, social networking Web sites and instant messaging" (p. 105). This seems unlikely now, nine years later, as the use of social media has undoubtedly increased in the intervening years.

The same might be said for streaming video, which was not found by Hendricks to be as influential as text and still pictures (2006). With the increased use of streaming video now, and the technological advances that have made the usage possible, this seems less likely today. Given that Hendricks limited his study to one institution, and given the current realities in technology, Hendricks' work serves as a bridge between 1996 and 2013, but does not provide extensive information on today's information.

Colonna (2012) developed a University Website Evaluation Scale to be used in assessing the user experience on a university website. Her scale is based on clinical and social psychology constructs that evaluate how users perceive a university's website. Colonna's model included evaluations of the website user's attitude toward the institution and its brand reputation. The model is an interesting one, but its usefulness has yet to be proven. Limitations included: a) the study was about a single institution; b) the purposive sample used included more than half of the respondents who were from the subject institution; and c) the geographic and demographic characteristics of the purposive sample would be difficult to reconcile to the general population or to a specific audience (prospective students, for example) of a college or university.

Possibly the most important development with regard to media since 1996 is the use of social media, defined by Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) as a group of Internet-based applications that make use of the higher technological capabilities found in Web 2.0 and that feature user-generated content. Quite possibly, the latter is the more important of the two portions of the definition, as it demonstrates a difference between most other media, in which the user is merely a consumer, and social media, in which the user actively participates and contributes.

Among the social media, the most well known are Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, Pinterest and LinkedIn, although tastes in social media are subject to rapid change. Because of the popularity of social media among the prospective students that colleges and universities are trying to attract, institutions of higher education have been among the leaders in implementing their use in their marketing efforts. The latest publication of an ongoing longitudinal study by Barnes and Lescault (2013) indicated that a number of admissions directors believe that their social media presence has directly affected their enrollments, and that the usage of other, more traditional media, is being reduced as a result.

Methods. Paraphrasing McLuhan (1964), the media are the methods. The differences between traditional media, such as newspapers, magazines, television and radio; and the so-called "new media," are the amount of user interactions and the almost-constant need to update the content. Both seem to be expected by modern users.

In recruiting students, colleges and universities often make use of blogs written by students in order to connect with prospective students. Barnes and Lescault (2011) indicated that the use of blogs has continued in colleges and universities and is on the increase. In a later study (2013), the same researchers noted an increase in the number of institutions that allowed comments and two-way conversations on their blog sites, perhaps making it even more meaningful to their audiences. In addition to blogs, in their latest study, Barnes and Lescault (2013) listed the following social media in order of usage, from the largest percentage to the smallest, as reported by the institutions surveyed : Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn, Foursquare, Pinterest, Google+, and Instagram.

The sheer number of available social media forums, and the possibility for more, indicates that this area will continue to be of primary interest for colleges and universities. As the most common users, the Millenial Generation, move on and become the alumni and other stakeholders of an institution, strategic use of these media will become even more important.

Changes in prospective students and other stakeholders since 1996. Much has been made of the Millenial Generation and their effects on the way business, including education, is transacted in the 21st Century. Authors Howe and Strauss (2000) said they coined the name to refer to the fact that the first members of that generation would graduate from high school at the turn of the 21st Century. Although the book is now more than 13 years old, it is still considered a beginning point for the study of people who were born between 1982 and approximately 1994.

More pertinent for higher education, Howe and Strauss (2003) focused upon the Millennials' impact on higher education institutions, restating the seven characteristics identified in their previous work and adding suggestions for colleges and universities. The suggestions were further defined for recruiting and admissions, campus life, and the classroom. The following section provides a review of those characteristics and the suggestions for recruiting and admissions.

Advice from Howe and Strauss (2003) can be summarized as follows:

1. Both the collegians themselves and their parents regard the members of this generation as special, meaning that they are "collectively vital to the national and individually vital to their parents' sense of purpose" (2003, p. 69).
2. Recruiting materials should acknowledge the joint nature of a college decision and provide materials that are specifically geared toward the parents. In addition, the institution's history and traditions should be highlighted (2003).
3. The members of this generation have been kept safe and sheltered their entire lives, to which items such as the Baby on Board sign and bicycle helmets gave witness. For the purposes of recruiting and admissions, campus safety is an important feature to promote (2003).
4. Confidence is another trait identified for the Millenial generation. These students believe in themselves and other members of their peer group and are prone to analyze the consequences of their decisions. Consequently, stress is a factor for these people. In recruiting them, Howe and Strauss suggest that institutions position themselves as places where the potential they believe they have can be developed (2003).
5. The members of the Millenial generation have studied in groups during their academic careers prior to college, so the term *team-oriented* describes them very well. To recruit them effectively, colleges and universities must evaluate the role

of peer pressure and tendency toward conformity among these students, Howe and Strauss say (2003).

6. Millenial students are far more conventional than the Generation X or Baby Boomer generations before them, according to Howe and Strauss. They tend to "go with the group" (p. 107), are interested in well-known brands and have some mixed feelings about individualism. For colleges and universities, the authors suggest that their recruiting techniques emphasize the fact that students who are within generational norms are welcome at their institutions (2003).
7. This generation of students is feeling pressured about college admission as well as other facets of their lives. Their academic careers to date have reflected more homework and less recreation than those of their predecessors, and for those seeking employment, employers are looking at high school transcripts, attendance records, and the like. Howe and Strauss suggest that institutions promote themselves to this generation as a "place of refuge" (2003, p. 116) from some of the pressure and a way to prepare for a balanced adulthood (2003).

Howe and Strauss have indicated that the Millennials are "probably the most all-around capable teenage generation this nation, and perhaps the world, has ever seen" (2003, p. 123). Many have achieved good grades and high college entrance exam scores, but the authors caution that academics are not the only thing of interest to these prospective students. Suggestions for recruiting include an emphasis on student activities, particularly for freshmen and sophomores, and up-to-date digital capabilities (2003).

Sweeney (2006) built upon the work of Howe and Strauss by considering some of the behavioral characteristics of the Millenial generation. As indicated in the preceding chapter, these include the expectation of more choices being available, a preference for experiential learning, a desire for flexibility and convenience, and impatience (2006).

However, other researchers, such as Alexander Agati (2012) have rejected the notion that all members of a generation reflect all of the characteristics enumerated by Howe and Strauss. Based on a survey of Millennial generation students, Alexander Agati concluded that a person's outlook is dependent on the influence of family upon his or her personal attributes and that the homogeneity of a particular generation, such as the Millenial, is largely overstated. The students surveyed believed that they were not that different from previous generations, and that those previous generations would have behaved in much the same ways given similar societal conditions (2012).

In considering the effect of the Millennials upon higher education, Alexander Agati made the following suggestions:

- Avoid generational or student generalizations and recognize diversity;
- Consider family and family background as central to the individual;
- Develop an awareness of the technological infrastructure salient to the students. (2012, pp. 193-194)

Fromm and Garton (2013) further refined the approach to the Millennial generation by defining six distinct segments:

- "Hip-ennial" (p. 40): characterized as cautious consumer, global-thinking and charitable, with a great deal of social media use and hunger for information;
- "Old-School Millenial" (p. 41): characterized by disconnection, caution, and charity; often Hispanics;
- "Gadget Guru" (p. 42): characterized as "successful, wired, and free-spirited" (p.42);
- "Clean and Green Millenial" (p. 43): characterized as "impressionable, cause driven, healthy, and green" (p. 43);
- "Millennial 'Mom'" (p. 44): characterized as "wealthy, family-oriented, and digitally savvy" (p. 44); and

- “Anti-Millennial” (p. 46): characterized as ”locally minded and conservative” (p. 46).

In addition to these differing segments, Fromm and Garton (2013) pointed out that differences exist between the sexes with regard to spending and consumption habits. Women spend disproportionately more on apparel and men more on automotive products. In general, the authors suggest that marketers (including, of course, higher education institutions) evaluate the specific segments of the Millennial generation that are of most importance to them.

Fromm and Garton (2013) also indicated that other generations are likely to follow the Millennials’ lead with regard to media consumption, advocacy, and social media usage. Therefore, it stands to reason that some of these characteristics are common to higher education stakeholders other than prospective students.

Conclusion

Higher education institutions are facing many of the same marketing challenges they did at the time of Mulnix’s study in 1996, among them a lack of resources and organizational cultures that can make collaboration difficult (Sands & Smith, 1999). Mulnix (1996) found that a major factor that affected the organization of marketing efforts included the perspective of the leadership (or dominant coalition) regarding the use of marketing in an overt way. Since his study, the study of marketing in higher education has continued to progress, the practice of marketing has changed, and the audiences for marketing efforts (prospective students and other stakeholders) have changed. With all that in view, it appears that a re-examination of the conclusions in Mulnix’s work is in order.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that affect the organization and role of marketing units in institutions of higher education, as they react and plan for changing environmental conditions and available resources and to see if the perspectives of practitioners in marketing have changed since an earlier study by Mulnix in 1996. Mulnix identified factors affecting the organization of marketing in higher education. This study used the same instrument (by permission of the author) to determine if the factors or their significance have changed since the time of the original study, in light of changes that have affected higher education and the field of marketing.

The study also added demographic information regarding the institutions to the instrument. This was done to allow further study of specific sectors of the population, in order to determine if differences exist among those sectors.

Hypotheses

This study was not an absolute replication of the Mulnix study, since demographic questions were added and the population being sampled was somewhat different. However, since the purpose is to re-examine the conclusions drawn by Mulnix (1996), the hypotheses in his study will serve as the basis for the hypotheses in this study.

Mulnix's study addressed six hypotheses:

- "H1: The focus and scope of marketing in higher education remains limited and is related primarily toward enrollment management" (1996, p. 197).
- "H2: The use of sophisticated research methodology [sic] in support of marketing in higher education is limited, at best" (1996, p. 212) .

- "H3: The culture of the institution will influence the structure and goals of the communication/public relations subsystem, including the use (or lack thereof) of marketing strategies" (1996, p. 222).
- "H4: Colleges and universities that are more open-system oriented are more likely to have fully integrated communication/public relations subsystems that employ principles of marketing. In other words, more open institutions have expanded the public relations paradigm to include tools of marketing" (1996, p. 224).
- "H5: Marketing strategies are more likely to be utilized when the college or university leadership (dominant coalition) takes an active role in planning overall communication/public relations structure and strategy. In other words, the dominant coalition is instrumental in defining marketing objectives" (1996, p. 231).
- "H6: The role played by the chief communication/public relations officer is instrumental in defining the use of marketing strategies. Without adequate authority (power), this practitioner is likely not going to utilize marketing objectives in his/her overall communication plan" (1996, p. 242).

Although he did not specifically word the topic as a hypothesis, Mulnix also examined models of higher education marketing and the opinions of practitioners as to the "best structural model" (1996, p. 251) for the marketing function. By re-evaluating all of Mulnix's hypotheses, this researcher developed an overall impression of the perspectives held by practitioners in 2014.

Study Design

In the quantitative portion of his original study, Mulnix (1996) used a set of 37 questions, most of them Likert-style, grouped by the hypothesis to which they applied. These also were used in the current study, with the addition of some demographic questions about each respondent's institution and his or her background. Quantitative analysis was employed for the current study results.

The complete text of the survey may be found in Appendix B. Appendix C contains Mulnix's agreement, via e-mail, to the use of his instrument.

Instrumentation

This study utilized the original questionnaire developed by Mulnix (1996) with the addition of demographic questions developed by this author. Mulnix indicated that his Likert-style survey questions were based on preliminary interviews with senior-level communications and public relations practitioners at colleges and universities (1996).

Reliability and Validity

Useful definitions of the concepts of reliability and validity may be found in Fink (2003). She defined a reliable survey instrument as one that "is relatively free from 'measurement error,'" (p. 48), meaning that the language in the instrument is clear to the respondent and that the respondent, to the extent possible, is able to provide answers that reflect the actual state of affairs.

Validity, on the other hand, is defined by Fink (2003) as "the degree to which a survey instrument assesses what it purports to measure" (p. 165). To establish the validity of his survey, Mulnix (1996) conducted interviews with potential members of the population being studied in order to "understand the basic questions surrounding the use of marketing in higher education" (p. 191). He then used the themes that emerged to develop the written survey instrument and subsequently, the framework for the qualitative portion of his study.

In considering the reliability of the data and conclusions generated by a study, some consideration needs to be made of the method of collecting the data (either online or in writing via mail) and if differences exist between the methods. The initial, written portion of Mulnix's survey was conducted completely by mail (1996).

An early consideration of online surveys was performed by Yun and Trumbo (2000). At the time, they cautioned researchers that online respondents might vary from the respondents to traditional postal services with regard to traits such as "level of connectedness" and educational attainment (2000).

Some articles in the literature indicate that the results from mail surveys differ from the results from online surveys, particularly with regard to response rates. For example, Marra and Bogue (2006) indicated that, in the case of on-campus undergraduate students, an in-person, written survey, delivered face to face and collected immediately after in-class time was given to complete the survey, could out-perform an online or e-mailed survey sent after the class ended (2006) .

Resnick (2012) considered the issues of cost, speed, response rates, and reliability in an analysis of survey materials sent to classroom teachers, reading teachers, and curriculum specialists by mail and by online methods. He concluded that the postal survey was actually less expensive when the cost per usable response is considered, produced a greater response rate, and appeared to be more reliable. However, the online surveys out-performed the postal surveys in terms of speed of response (2012). Resnick also noted that shorter surveys (10 or fewer questions) affected the response rate on online surveys.

Although these opinions are worth considering, the population in the current study was somewhat different in that there was little doubt that persons receiving it would have access to a high-speed Internet connection as they read and could go to the survey immediately. Therefore, it was assumed that the results of this survey would be comparable to that of Mulnix.

Population and Sample

In his study, Mulnix chose 60 institutions that were members of the American Association of Universities and received responses from 63%. He then added 20 institutions chosen at random from the 1995 Higher Education Directory and received responses from half of them. In all, 48 institutions were represented in the results.

Since one of the objectives of the current study was to extend the scope of the Mulnix study, the population was expanded to include representation of the additional categories in the Carnegie Classification of Higher Education. These categories are as follows:

- RU/VH: Research Universities (very high research activity);

- RU/H: Research Universities (high research activity);
- DRU: Doctoral/Research Universities;
- Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs);
- Master's M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs);
- Master's S: Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs);
- Bac/A&S: Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences;
- Bac/Diverse: Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields; and
- Bac/Assoc: Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges.

The categories were available in the 2013 edition of the *Higher Education Directory*, which was available online as well as in print.

To allow for the possibility of the most meaningful comparison to Mulnix's data, the members of the American Association of Universities were treated as a separate group. As can be seen in Appendix D, only four members were added between the time that the Mulnix study was conducted in 1996 and just before the current study in 2014. Therefore, the preponderance of these institutions were included in the population addressed by Mulnix.

As the study progessed, however, there was a relatively small number of responses in this group. This researcher decided to treat all of the responses to the current survey as a single group.

Procedures

The online service Survey Monkey was used to conduct the survey. The *Higher Education Directory* was used as a source of the institutions to be surveyed. The online directory estimated that approximately 1300 institutions were available in the Carnegie classifications to be studied.

The members of the Association of American Universities were identified and treated as a separate category. All of those institutions for which e-mail addresses were available were sent the survey. The institutions in this category were also sent a printed-and-mailed survey after the online survey ended, in an attempt to increase the number of responses for this group. For the remaining institutions, which were not identified as members of the Association of American Universities, a sample of every other record for which e-mail addresses were available, 618 in total, was sent the survey.

Analysis of the Data

Similar statistical procedures to those used by Mulnix (1996) were employed in this study, including correlation analysis and frequency distribution of the results of the survey. His method of using a correlation coefficient of .0.5 to indicate the strength of a relationship was followed. Mulnix chose not to use extremely complex statistical measures in his analysis of the quantitative portion of his study, believing that the small sample size would be unlikely to yield a significant finding (1996).

For the Likert-style questions, this researcher compared the results of Mulnix to the current study by comparing the means calculated for each question. The answers to those questions were scored as 4 for Strongly Agree, 3 for Agree, 2 for Disagree, 1 for Strongly Disagree, and 0 for Not Applicable.

Next, the Levene's Test for Equality of Variance was employed by computing an F-score and its significance. In the case of Levene's Test, significance of equal or less than .05 indicates that equal variance of the two sets of results cannot be assumed, and this fact must be taken into consideration when performing the independent samples t-test (Somekh & Lewin, 2005).

An independent samples t-test, for two groups that are unrelated, was then used. The t-test is designed to determine if differences in the means could be considered signficant, or could be attributed only to chance (Somekh & Lewin, 2005). The null hypothesis is that there is no difference, but a significance calculation of $p \leq .05$ would indicate that the difference in means is due to factors other than chance. In this instance, significance on the t-test would indicate if the difference in means indicates a change in the perspectives of the respondents.

As indicated, the analyses were performed on all of the responses as well as on a subset that most closely resembled the population addressed by Mulnix. Because the number of responses in the subset was small (10), this researcher chose to focus on the overall results in comparing the results of the 2014 survey to Mulnix.

Summary of the Chapter

While not a complete replication of the Mulnix study, this study was designed to provide information on how the marketing organization of colleges and universities may have changed in the time since that study was done. The changes in the way marketing is conducted, the audience for the messages generated, and the way colleges and universities work have combined to set the stage for this new study, which used the Mulnix study (1996) as a basis for comparison.

CHAPTER FOUR
REPORT OF SURVEY RESULTS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that affect the organization and role of marketing units in institutions of higher education, as they react and plan for changing environmental conditions and available resources, and to determine if changes in marketing perspective have occurred since an earlier study by Mulnix in 1996. Mulnix identified factors concerning the organization of marketing in higher education and asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement to those statements. This study used the same instrument (by permission of the author) to determine if the perceptions of the factors or their significance have changed since the time of the original study, in light of changes that have affected higher education and the field of marketing. The study also added demographic questions to allow further study of specific sectors of the population.

Three research questions were addressed:

- What is the marketing unit's position in the institutional hierarchy?
- What selected characteristics now influence how the unit is organized?
- What changes in perspective have taken place since the Mulnix study was conducted in 1996?

The public relations practitioners who received the survey were divided into two groups. Survey Group A consisted of those employed at institutional members of the American Association of Universities (AAU), which was the group used by Mulnix (1996). In the current study, the researcher supplemented the Higher Education directory list with a few additional AAU members found online and removed any that were outside of the United States. Although a small list (58), this group is the most comparable to Mulnix's population.

Survey Group B consisted of a sample of 50% of the rest of the Higher Education directory list, numbering 618. This group was added to the project in order to provide a broader base of respondents for the study.

Both groups were sent a link the survey in Survey Monkey using e-mail addresses provided by the Higher Education Directory, on March 24, 2014. Reminder e-mails were sent on April 24 and May 13, 2014. Due to the small size of Survey Group A, after the two e-mailed reminders, a paper cover letter and survey were sent to that group on June 2, 2014, to attempt to get additional responses. Although the paper mailing did result in a few more responses for Survey Group A, the overall response numbers remained small. Therefore, the two groups were combined for most analysis purposes and will be referred to as "Current" throughout this chapter.

The results from the analysis of the survey data will be considered in this chapter. The chapter will be organized around the research questions.

Research Question 1: What is the marketing unit's position in the institutional hierarchy?

In order to answer the research question about the marketing unit's position in the organizational hierarchy, four demographic questions were evaluated. Respondents were asked to identify their own job titles, the job titles of their immediate superiors, the department or division in which the respondents were housed, and the organizational model that the respondents believe applied to their institution. Table 1 shows the respondents' identification of their own job titles.

Table 1

Consolidated list of respondents' job titles

Respondent's Job Title	Frequency	Percent
Director	28	29.2
Vice President	22	22.9
Associate Vice President	12	12.5
Executive Director	12	12.5
Assistant Vice President	4	4.2
Associate or Vice Chancellor	3	3.1
Assistant Director	2	2.1
Chief Marketing Officer	2	2.1
Assistant Dean	1	1.0
Associate Chancellor	1	1.0
Chief Communications Officer	1	1.0
Manager	1	1.0
Managing Director	1	1.0
Senior Director	1	1.0
Senior Vice President	1	1.0
Special Assistant to the Chancellor	1	1.0
Vice Chancellor	1	1.0
No Response	2	2.1
Total	96	100.0

The most frequent titles of the respondents were director, vice president, associate vice president and executive director. These four titles accounted for 77.1% of the total responses and indicate a moderately high position in the organizational framework. In order to simplify the table above, the titles were grouped by the first word or several words in the respondents' titles. For example, the response of "Assistant Vice President for University Relations" is included in "Assistant Vice President" above. A complete list of the full titles reported is found in Appendix E.

The next question considered in answering this research question pertained to the job titles of the immediate supervisors of the respondents. These responses are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Job titles of respondents' immediate supervisors

Supervisor's Job Title	Frequency	Percent
Chancellor or President	43	44.8
Vice President or Vice Chancellor	35	36.5
Associate Vice President	5	5.2
Provost	3	3.1
Senior or Executive Vice President	3	3.1
Chief Executive Officer	1	1.0
Chief Marketing Officer	1	1.0
Dean	1	1.0
Director	1	1.0
Executive Director	1	1.0
Vice Provost	1	1.0
No Response	1	1.0
Total	96	100.0

These titles are indicative of a moderately high position in the organization for the marketing function. A total of 44.8% of the respondents report to the chancellor or president of their organizations; another 39.6% report to a vice president or vice chancellor. The results were consolidated using a similar process as in Table 1. A complete list of the actual responses is in Appendix F.

Respondents were asked to indicate the unit of the institution in which the marketing function was housed. The results for this question are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Units in which marketing is housed

Unit's Name	Frequency	Percent
Advancement	21	21.9
President or Chancellor's Office	16	16.7
Communications or University Communications	13	13.5
Enrollment or Enrollment Management	10	10.4
College or University Relations	6	6.3
Marketing	5	5.2
Marketing and Communications	5	5.2
Public Affairs	4	4.2
Communications and Marketing	3	3.1
Strategic Communications	3	3.1
Development and University Relations	2	2.1
Administration	1	1.0
Admissions	1	1.0
External Affairs	1	1.0
Planning and Research	1	1.0
University Affairs	1	1.0
University Services	1	1.0
No Response	2	2.1
Total	96	100.0

There is a great deal of disparity among the responses to this item, as only one answer represented more than 20% of the responses. Most common were advancement (21.9%), president or chancellor's office (16.7%), communications or university communications (13.5%) and enrollment or enrollment management (10.4%). It should be noted that some of the unit names contained more than one of the keywords (for example, one is called "Development and University Relations"); in those cases (11 of the total responses) the first word in the unit name was tabulated. A complete list of the unit names may be found in Appendix G.

Respondents were asked to identify their institution's organizational model: Enrollment Management, University Relations, or some other. The tabulation of the answers to this question is found in Table 4.

Table 4

Respondents' identification of organizational model

Model	Frequency	Percent
A: Enrollment Management	10	10.4
B: University Relations	65	67.7
Both A and B	1	1.0
Other	20	20.8
Total	96	100.0

The enrollment management model was identified by 10.4% of the respondents as the organizational model followed in their institutions. This model has the following attributes, as described by Hendricks (2002):

- Direct enrollment, planning and promotion of all university programs with responsibility for enrollment;
- Marketing and promotion are part of the overall management of enrollments;
- Formal authority for everything related to enrollment.

More than two-thirds of the respondents indicated that their institutions employ the University Relations model, which as described by Hendricks (2002) has the following attributes:

- Provides assistance to all university departments with promotion of their programs; responsibility for enrollment remains with department;
- Views marketing and promotion as separate entities with service provided to all units;
- Has authority for all marketing, promotion, and communications that affect the "customer," and, by extension, all stakeholders.

In summary, four questions were asked to gain the perspectives of marketing practitioners concerning the marketing unit's position in the organizational hierarchy. The data show that respondents to this survey (public relations/marketing practitioners) tended to hold positions at the level of director or executive director and reported most often to a president or chancellor or a vice president. The units in which they were housed tended to be identified with the labels of advancement, communications, president/chancellor's office, enrollment management, or college/university relations. Over two-thirds of the respondents identified their organizational model as University Relations, in which the unit provides service to the entire institution and is responsible for communications to all stakeholders.

Research Question 2: Effect of Selected Characteristics on the Way the Unit is Organized

Three questions that were asked that concerned selected characteristics of the institution: (a) the size of the institution, (b) its marketing budget, and (c) the institution's classification (as reported by the respondent). Each set of responses was related to the organizational model the institution uses and how the unit is organized, as reported by the respondent. Model A is the Enrollment Management Model, and Model B is the University Relations Model. Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide these data.

Table 5

Organizational model used, by size of organization in headcount

Institution's headcount	Model A	Model B	Both/Other	Total
Below 5,000	3 (6%)	39 (78%)	8 (16%)	50 (100%)
5,000+, but < 10,000	5 (23%)	11 (50%)	6 (27%)	22 (100%)
10,000+, but < 15,000	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	5 (100%)
15,000+, but < 20,000	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
20,000+, but < 25,000	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	6 (100%)
25,000+, but < 30,000	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (0%)	2 (100%)
30,000+	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	7 (100%)
Totals	10 (10%)	65 (68%)	21 (21%)	96 (100%)

Table 6

Organizational model used, by size of marketing budget

Institution's marketing budget	Model A	Model B	Both/Other	Total
Below $100,000	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10 (100%)
$100,000+ but < $150,000	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)
$150,000+ but < $250,000	2 (18%)	8 (73%)	1 (9%)	11 (100%)
$250,000+ but < $500,000	2 (9%)	18 (78%)	3 (13%)	23 (100%)
$500,000+ but < $1,000,000	3 (12%)	15 (60%)	7 (28%)	25 (100%)
$1,000,000+ but < $3,000,000	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	4 (29%)	14 (100%)
$3,000,000+	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
No response to budget	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Totals	10 (10%)	65 (68%)	21 (21%)	96 (100%)

Table 7

Organizational model used, by type of institution

Type of Institution	Model A	Model B	Both/Other	Total
Associate	0 (0%)	0 (60%)	0 (40%)	0 (100%)
Bachelor's	2 (7%)	21 (56%)	5 (18%)	28 (100%)
Master's	7 (28%)	14 (73%)	4 (16%)	25 (100%)
Doctorate-Granting	1 (6%)	13 (72%)	4 (22%)	18 (100%)
Research	0 (0%)	12 (63%)	7 (37%)	19 (100%)
Branch Campus or Division	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No Response to type	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Totals	10 (10%)	65 (68%)	21 (21%)	96 (100%)

In relation to the size of the institutions, institutions with headcounts of fewer than 10,000 were more likely to have a Model A (Enrollment Management) structure than other sizes of institutions, as 8 of the 10 Model A responses were found in such institutions. Only two institutions with enrollments greater than 10,000 students reported using Model A.

In considering the reported marketing budget of the responding institutions, those with budgets greater than $150,000 but less than $3,000,000 were the only institutions that employed Model A. However, only 10 of the 83 institutions with such budgets used Model A; nearly 88%

of such institutions used the University Relations Model (Model B), both of the models, or indicated that they used another model.

When institutions were classified based on their type, Model A was employed primarily by bachelor's and master's degree institutions. These institutions made up 90% of the respondents selecting that model.

In summary, Model A (Enrollment Management) was only found in 10% of all the institutions in the survey as the identified marketing model. Since Mulnix (1996) did not include this question, no comparison can be made on any change in the organizational model being used. Most respondents to the study viewed the model of marketing being used at their institutions as University Relations, a combination of Enrollment Management and University Relations, or another model (though these were not identified). While the Enrollment Management approach (Model A) did seem to be found more often in smaller institutions, institutions with marketing budgets between $150,000 and $3,000,0000, and institutions offering only bachelor’s and master’s degrees, the predominant marketing approach employed by all institutions in the study was that of University Relations (Model B) regardless of size, budget, or classification. Therefore, no statistical analyses were conducted to see if any significant difference existed in these areas.

Research Question 3: What Changes in Perspective Have Taken Place Since the Mulnix Study?

The Mulnix (1996) survey sought to find out the perspectives that were held on the organization of the marketing unit in a number of higher education institutions. Most were Likert-style questions, with the exception of three questions that asked respondents to name traits that applied to their organizations. The survey consisted of 37 questions which were grouped into 7 different groups with an overall theme for each:

- Six relate to the respondents’ perceptions of marketing use in their institutions.

- Five relate to the respondents' personal viewpoints about marketing uses in their institutions.
- Six questions relate to the respondents' perceptions of research on marketing in their institutions.
- Three relate to the respondents' perceptions regarding the culture of their organizations and the personality traits exhibited by top management. As these were not Likert-style questions, they will be considered in a later section.
- Five relate to the respondents' perceptions regarding the dominant coalition's role in the marketing effort of their institutions.
- Seven relate to the respondents' perceptions of the role of the chief communications officer in determining the marketing direction of their institutions.
- Five questions relate to the respondents' perceptions of the models of marketing as used in their institutions.

In order to duplicate as closely as possible the methods that Mulnix used to analyze his data, the Likert-style questions were scored in the same way: 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree, 1 for strongly disagree, and 0 for not applicable. These data will be compared to the Mulnix results as each section is considered.

Mulnix calculated means for each of the Likert-style questions in his survey, although this researcher found it necessary to recalculate them. (See Appendix H for details on the need for recalculation and the procedures followed.) The recalculated means are compared to the means from the current survey for each question. In order to determine if significant differences in perspective exist between the results found by Mulnix and those from the current study, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances and the T-test for Equality of Means were run for each question. The first statistic gives an indication of whether equal variances can be assumed between the two samples being studied. The independent t-test is an inferential statistical test that determines whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means in two unrelated groups. The t-test value is chosen based on whether equal variances do or do not exist, based on the Levene's Test. The t-test results indicate whether the differences in the means for the two groups are significantly different.

Mulnix did not calculate an overall mean for each group of questions. The current study did not do so, either.

Question Group 1: Focus and scope of marketing in higher education. The first group of questions asked the participants about the focus and scope of marketing as it exists in their own institutions. The results are contained in Table 8.

Table 8

Significance of mean differences in focus and scope of marketing questions (Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t t-statistic	t Sig.
Marketing is an integral part of the overall institutional advancement function	2.81	3.26	.-448	10.839	.001*	-2.938	.004*
One of the main priorities for the marketing function is an enrollment management (admissions) function.	2.81	3.17	-.358	.432	.512	-2.428	.016 *
A main priority for marketing function is to attract best and brightest students.	2.98	3.22	-.244	.063	.803	-1.986	.049 *
One of primary purposes of marketing function is to develop mutual understanding between university/college and various publics it serves.	2.98	3.24	-.266	.494	.483	-1.863	.065
Marketing is being strategically managed.	2.46	3.20	-.746	1.426	.234	-5.790	.001*
Marketing has been assimilated into overall mission of a strategically managed communication program.	2.48	3.05	-.575	11.304	.001*	-3.484	.001*
Marketing tactics are used to shape overall communication strategy.	2.60	3.11	-.503	11.522	.001*	-3.245	.002*

*Significant at $p \leq .05$.

Respondents' answers to the question of whether marketing is considered an integral part of the advancement function of their institutions in the current study showed a significantly higher level of agreement when compared to the Mulnix study. The Levene's test was significant at $p \leq .05$, meaning that equal variances could not be assumed. The independent samples t-test indicated a significant difference in the means at $p \leq .05$.

When asked if one of the main priorities of the marketing function was an enrollment management (or admissions) function in their institutions, more respondents in the current survey agreed to this statement than in the Mulnix study. The Levene's test indicated that equal variances of the two groups could be assumed, but the t-test showed a significance of .016 for the differences in the means. The results of the t-test would indicate that respondents to the current survey did agree to this statement to a significantly higher level than the Mulnix participants.

When asked if the main priority in their institution's marketing approach was to attract the brightest and best students, both groups (Mulnix and Current) responded with high levels of agreement. The Mulnix group had a mean of 2.98 for this question, while the current yielded 3.22. The mean difference of -.244 was the smallest difference in this group of questions. Levene's Test indicated that equal variance could be assumed. The value of the t-test was 0.49 at the $p \leq .05$ level. It would be questionable to infer any significant differences between the means for this question.

The same was true for the question about one of the primary purposes of marketing being the development of mutual understanding between the university or college and the various publics it served. In the Mulnix survey (1996), the mean score was 2.98, while respondents to the current survey (2014) had a mean of 3.24. Levene's Test indicated that equal variance could be assumed and the t-test did not yield a significant difference in the perspectives of the two groups.

There were significant differences in the means for the two groups when asked if marketing is being strategically managed in their institutions. The mean score of 2.46 for the Mulnix group was the lowest mean for them in this group of questions. The difference in means between Mulnix and Current indicated that equal variances could be assumed based on the Levene's test (.234). The differences in means for the two groups was significant at less than a .001 level ($p \leq .05$) on the t-test. This indicates that the marketing officials surveyed in 2014 believed that their institutions were using strategically managed marketing to a greater degree.

This changed view of marketing is also suggested by the 2014 responses to the question of the assimilation of marketing into the overall mission of a strategically managed communication program. The mean of 3.05 for the current group was .575 higher than the mean of 2.48 for Mulnix. This difference in means was significant in Levene's, indicating that equality of variance could not be assumed; the t-test showed a strong significance of .001 at the $p \leq .05$ level.

For the final question in this group, there was a significant difference in means found for the question about the use of marketing tactics to shape the overall institutional communication strategy. The current group had a mean response of 3.11 compared to a mean response of 2.60 in the Mulnix group (1996). This difference was significant both in Levene's, indicating that equality of variance could not be assumed, and the t-test. The latter yielded a significant value of .002 at the $p \leq .05$ level of significance.

In summarizing the perceptions of marketing officials on the focus and scope of marketing in their institutions, the data indicate that current practitioners perceive that that marketing is an integral part of the overall advancement function, that enrollment management should be one of the main priorities, that marketing is being strategically managed and assimilated into the overall mission of the institution, and that marketing tactics are used to shape the overall institutional communication strategy to a significantly greater degree than those surveyed in 1996. However, no significant changes have occurred in the view of marketing officials about the priority of attracting the best and brightest students or the need to develop mutual understanding between the institution and it publics. These statements show several important shifts in the perceptions of marketing officials since the work of Mulnix in 1996. The causes of the changes in perception are not, in this study, identified or assessed.

Question Group 2: Respondents' personal viewpoints of marketing uses. The second group of questions, (19 through 23 in the current survey) asked for practitioners' personal viewpoints of marketing uses in postsecondary institutions. The questions were designed to determine the respondents' perceptions of marketing as it should be in their organizations, rather than their perceptions of conditions as they existed at the time of the study. The results are contained in Table 9.

Table 9

Respondents' own perceptions regarding the organization of marketing
(Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t t-statistic	t Sig.
Marketing should be considered along with fund raising, public relations, and alumni relations as an integral part of the overall institutional advancement function.	3.40	3.59	-.196	.625	.431	-1.551	.123
Marketing has a valid place in the overall institutional advancement/ communication mix	3.54	3.64	-.100	.428	.514	-1.080	.282
It is important for the marketing function to be organized as a stand-alone, independent unit, separate from other communication functions.	2.04	2.14	-.098	6.814	.010*	-.680	.497
It is important for marketing to be integrated into the overall communication/public relations unit.	3.25	3.49	-.245	.537	.465	-2.126	.035*
This institution would be better served if more resources were included in the marketing effort.	3.29	3.48	-.192	.051	.821	-1.533	.127

*Significant at $p \leq .05$.

When respondents were asked if marketing should be considered as an integral part of the overall institutional advancement function, along with fund raising, public relations, and alumni relations, the Current mean of 3.59 was somewhat higher than the Mulnix mean of 3.40. However, neither the Levene's test nor the t-test revealed significant differences in the means.

Similarly, when respondents were asked if marketing had a valid place in the overall institutional advancement/communication mix, the Current mean of 3.64 was higher than the Mulnix mean of 3.54. The Levene's test was not significant at $p \leq .05$, indicating that equal variances could be assumed, and the independent samples t-test yielded no signficant differences in the means.

For the statement about the marketing function being organized as a stand-alone, independent unit, the Current mean was 2.14 as compared to the Mulnix mean of 2.04. The difference of -.098 was found to be significant in the Levene's test, meaning that equal variances could not be assumed, but the independent samples t-test did not reveal a significant difference. It should be noted that in both the Mulnix and the current studies, respondents' level of agreement with the two statements was relatively low.

Looking at the opposite side of the question, the importance of marketing being integrated into the overall communication/public relations unit, the mean for the current group was 3.49. This mean was .245 greater than the Mulnix mean of 3.25 for this question. The Levene' s test indicated that equal variances could be assumed. The t-test indicated that the difference was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level with a .035 significance.

In the last question in this group, the mean was 3.48 in the current survey related to the statement that the institution would be better served if more resources were devoted to the marketing effort, as compared to the Mulnix mean of 3.29. The Levene's test indicated that equal variances could be assumed, and the t-test did not reveal significance (a value of .127 at $p \leq .05$).

Overall in this group of questions, higher means were seen for each question in the current survey as opposed to the Mulnix survey. However, only one of the differences in means could be considered significant using the independent samples t-test-- the importance of marketing being integrated into the overall communication/public relations unit. Thus, it appears that perceptions have not generally changed regarding the views of the respondents about how the marketing function should be conducted.

Question Group 3: Respondents' perceptions of research as used in postsecondary institutions. Mulnix's third group of questions related to the use of marketing research in higher education and the qualifications of the practitioners regarding research. The results are contained in Table 10.

Table 10

Responses to third group of perception questions regarding research use as related to marketing in postsecondary institutions (Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t t-statistic	t Sig.
Formal research is an integral part of the planning process for any advancement/communication plan.	2.77	3.03	-.262	.001	.990	-1.725	.087
It is seen as important to conduct formal research before a major new advancement/communication program is initiated.	2.79	2.84	-.045	.404	.526	-.321	.748
It is considered important to employ outside consultants to conduct research or to provide advice on certain aspects of the advancement/communication program.	2.52	2.59	-.073	.080	.777	-.502	.616
It is considered important to conduct regular focus group studies and attitude surveys to monitor public opinion about the institution.	2.50	2.80	-.304	.024	.877	-2.427	.017*
It is considered important to have a formal review process in place for judging the success/failure of specific aspects of an advancement/communication program or campaign.	2.46	2.83	-.368	.006	.939	-3.210	.002*
It is seen as important that the chief advancement practitioner have training in marketing research and methodology.	2.02	2.26	-.243	6.628	.011*	-1.754	.082

*Significant at $p \leq .05$.

When asked about formal research, a mean of 3.03 in the current study and a mean of 2.77 in the Mulnix study indicated that it is an integral part of the planning process for any advancement/communication plan. The difference in the means was not significant using the Levene's test, indicating that equal variances could be assumed. The difference also was not significant using the independent samples t-test. Thus, the views of respondents about the need to conduct formal research in planning remain unchanged from 1996 to 2014.

With regard to conducting formal research before beginning a major new advancement/communication program, the Current mean was 2.84 and the Mulnix mean was 2.79. This difference was not significant using the Levene's test, which indicated that equal variance could be assumed. The independent samples t-test did not reveal a significant difference either. Respondents' perceptions about the need for formal research prior to beginning a new advancement/communication initiative have not significantly changed.

Respondents were asked if their institutions considered it important to employ outside consultants to conduct research or provide advice. The current survey revealed a 2.59 mean as compared to a mean of 2.52 in the Mulnix survey. Neither the Levene's test nor the independent t-test was significant for the difference of .073. Respondents in both studies did not indicate this to be an highly important need.

Participants were then asked if it was considered important to have a formal review process in place for judging the success or failure of aspects of a program or campaign. The current survey yielded a mean of 2.83 compared to the Mulnix mean of 2.46. The difference of -.368 (Mulnix mean less the Current mean) was significant in the Levene's test, indicating that equal variances could not be assumed. The independent samples t-test indicated that the difference was significant. Respondents in the 2014 survey saw the formal review process as being more important than the respondents in 1996.

The next question asked respondents if it was considered important at their institutions to conduct regular focus group studies and attitude surveys in order to monitor public opinion about the institution. The current survey yielded a mean of 2.80 as opposed to the Mulnix mean of 2.50. The difference of -.304 (Mulnix less the Current mean) was not significant in the Levene's test, indicating that equal variances could be assumed; the independent samples t-test revealed that the difference in means was significant with a .017 level at the $p \leq .05$ level. The need to monitor public opinion was seen as more important by the 2014 respondents.

In the last question in this group, participants were asked if it was seen as important that the chief advancement practitioner have training in marketing research and methods. The Current mean was 2.26, which was .243 higher than the 2.02 mean in the Mulnix survey. The difference was significant in the Levene's test, which indicated that equal variances could not be assumed. However, the independent samples t-test did not indicate significance for the mean difference (a significance of .082 at the $p \leq .05$ level).

In summary, the group of questions about research showed higher means in the current overall study, but only two of the differences in means could be considered significant using the independent samples t-test. These were the statements about the importance of a formal review process for programs or campaigns and the need to conduct regular focus group studies and attitude surveys.

Question Group 4: Respondents' perceptions of the dominant coalition's role in the marketing effort of their institutions. Mulnix's fourth group of Likert-style questions asked respondents to indicate the amount of involvement senior management had in determining the role of marketing in the organization's infrastructure. The results are contained in Table 11.

Table 11

Responses to fourth group of perception questions regarding the dominant coalition's role in the marketing effort of their institutions (Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t t-statistic	t Sig.
There is a strong correlation between a president's leadership style and overall success in institutional advancement.	2.79	2.84	-.051	.049	.825	-.400	.690
Institutional advancement ranks as one of the highest priorities of the president and his or her leadership team.	2.52	2.50	-.002	.341	.560	-.014	.989
The president and his or her leadership team take a direct and personal interest in formulating institutional advancement strategy.	3.15	3.03	.111	.490	.485	.794	.429
The president and his or her leadership team take an active role in defining/ establishing marketing objectives and priorities.	2.50	2.80	.023	.107	.744	.191	.849
The president and his or her leadership team give the chief institutional advancement officer the power to formulate marketing strategy as he or she sees fit. In other words, decisions to use or not use strategic marketing concepts rest with the chief communication/ advancement officer.	2.02	2.26	.085	3.761	.055	.493	.623

The first statement asked the respondents about their agreement that there is a strong correlation between a president's leadership style and overall success in institutional advancement. The current survey yielded a mean of 2.84 as opposed to the mean of 2.79 in the Mulnix survey. The difference of .051 was not significant using the Levene's test, indicating that equal variances could be assumed. The independent samples t-test also was not significant.

Respondent' perceptions of the influence of the president's leadership style on success in institutional advancement remain relatively the same.

The next question asked participants to indicate their degree of agreement to the statement that institutional advancement was one of the highest priorities of the president and his or her leadership team. The Current mean was 2.50, and the Mulnix mean was 2.52. The Levene's test was not significant, indicating that equal variances could be assumed, and the independent samples t-test also did not reveal significance in differences in the means. Both survey groups indicated only moderate agreement that institutional advancement was a chief priority of the president and leadership teams with no significant change in this perception.

Respondents were then asked to indicate the degree to which the president and leadership team take a direct and personal interest in formulating institutional advancement strategy. The current survey's mean was 3.03, and the Mulnix mean was greater by .111 at 3.15. Neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test revealed significance. The view of the interest of the president and leadership team has not significantly changed from 1996.

Taking that statement a step further, the respondents were asked to what degree the president and leadership team take an active role in defining and establishing marketing objectives and priorities. The difference in means was .300, with the Mulnix mean being 2.50 and the Current mean being 2.80. The Levene's test was not significant, meaning that equal variances could be assumed. The independent samples t-test, however, indicated that the difference in means was significant. The 2014 respondents perceived that the president and leadership team take a more active role in defining and establishing the institution's marketing objectives and priorities.

In the last item in this group, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with the statement that the chief institutional advancement officer is given the power to formulate marketing strategy as he or she sees fit. The mean of the current survey was 2.26 and the mean in the Mulnix survey was 2.02. The Levene's test was significant, indicating that equal variances could not be assumed. The independent samples t-test did not reveal that the difference in means was significant. Both means were relatively low, and no significant change in perception of this role of the chief institutional advancement officer took place between 1996 and 2014.

In reviewing this group of questions, none of the differences, either higher or lower, could be considered significant. It appears that the perceptions regarding the dominant coalition's role in the marketing of their institutions have not changed appreciably.

Question Group 5: Respondents' perceptions of the role of the chief communications officer in determining the marketing direction. The next group of questions, numbers. 38 through 43, asked participants about the role of the chief communications officer in establishing the marketing priorities and campaigns of the institution. The results are contained in Table 12.

Table 12

Responses to fourth group of perception questions regarding the chief communication officer's role in determining the marketing direction of their institutions (Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t-Test t-statistic	t-Test Sig.
It is considered essential that the chief institutional advancement officer be an active member of the president's executive committee or cabinet.	3.38	3.53	-.160	.125	.724	-1.150	.252
It is considered essential that the chief institutional advancement practitioner has direct and immediate input into decisions made by the president's executive committee or cabinet.	3.10	3.36	-.252	.306	.581	-1.568	.119
The chief communication/ advancement practitioner has total freedom to develop, adjust, and allocate his or her departmental budget each year.	2.54	2.67	-.123	.479	.490	-.735	.464
The chief communication/ advancement officer has the discretion to allocate his or her time — and that of the staff— entirely as he or she sees fit.	2.63	2.78	-.157	.093	.761	-1.025	.307
It is seen as important that the communication/ advancement office has central authority for integrating communications efforts campuswide.	2.35	2.91	-.554	.087	.769	-3.384	.001*
The chief communication officer has the freedom to start a major marketing campaign at his or her discretion.	2.69	2.52	.164	1.978	.162	1.203	.231

* Significant at $p \leq .05$.

Respondents in both the 1996 and 2014 studies indicated a high level of agreement to the statement that it is essential that the chief institutional advancement officer be an active member of the president's executive committee or cabinet, with means of 3.38 and 3.53 respectively. The Levene's test did not reveal significance, indicating that equal variance could be assumed. The difference in means was not significant using the independent samples t-test.

Next, participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement to the statement that it is considered essential that the chief institutional advancement officer have direct and immediate input into decisions made by the executive committee or cabinet. Again, the means were high at 3.36 for the current survey and 3.10 for the Mulnix survey. Neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test showed significant differences in the means at $p \leq .05$.

In the third question in the group, respondents indicated their degree of agreement to the statement that the chief communication/advancement practitioner has total freedom to develop, adjust, and allocate his or her departmental budget each year. The means for this question were somewhat lower, at 2.67 for the current survey and 2.54 for the Mulnix survey. Again, neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test revealed significant differences in the means at $p \leq .05$.

When asked concerning their degree of agreement with a statement that the chief communication/advancement officer has the discretion to allocate his or her time, as well as that of the staff, as he or she sees fit, a slightly higher mean was found for the current survey at 2.78 as opposed to the Mulnix mean of 2.63. However, the Levene's test did not yield significance, meaning that equal variance could be assumed, and the independent samples t-test did not yield significance differences in the means, either.

Participants were asked for their response to a statement regarding the importance of the communication/advancement office having central authority for integrating communications efforts across the institution. This question produced means of 2.91 for the Current survey and 2.35 for the Mulnix survey. The Levene's test did not indicate significance, meaning that equal variances could be assumed, but the independent samples t-test did reveal significance (.001 at $p \leq .05$).

Lastly, for this group of questions, respondents were asked for their assessment of the chief communication officer's freedom to initiate a major campaign at his or her discretion. The means were similar, with 2.69 for the Mulnix survey and 2.62 for the Current survey. Neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test showed significance.

To summarize the findings in this group of questions, the perceptions of respondents regarding the chief communication officer's role in determining the marketing direction of the institution appear to be similar in the current survey to the results obtained by Mulnix. The only significant difference in means was the higher mean in the current survey for the importance of the communication/advancement office having central authority for integrated communications.

Question Group 6: Respondents' perceptions of models of marketing as used in their organizations. The final group of Likert-style questions in Mulnix's survey asked respondents about the overall position of the marketing function in their institutions. The results are contained in Table 13.

Table 13

Responses to fourth group of perception questions regarding the position of marketing in their institutions (Likert scale response with 1 meaning strongly disagree and 4 meaning strongly agree)

Question	Mulnix Mean	Current Mean	Difference (Mulnix-Current)	Levene's Test F-Score	Levene's Test Sig.	t t-statistic	t Sig.
Marketing is considered an equal "partner" in the communications infrastructure.	2.10	3.15	-1.044	.001	.979	-7.548	.001*
An integrated communication model is much more effective in meeting organizational goals than a system with separate alumni, fund raising, PR, and marketing units.	3.02	3.16	-.138	.357	.551	-.792	.430
It is important to include marketing as part of an integrated communication function.	3.23	3.40	-.169	.421	.518	-1.235	.219
The public relations unit is likely the best place to house the marketing department in any college or university.	2.92	2.73	-.189	3.939	.049*	1.161	.248
The marketing unit would operate best as an independent unit, reporting to its own director or vice president.	2.10	2.64	-.532	33.471	.001*	-3.416	.001*

*Significant at $p \leq .05$.

The first question in this final group of Likert-style questions asked respondents for their degree of agreement to the statement that marketing is considered an equal "partner" in the communications infrastructure. The difference between the means was quite large, with 3.15 for the current survey and 2.10 for the Mulnix survey. The Levene's test indicated non-significance, meaning that equal variances could be assumed. The independent t-test, however, indicated that the difference in the means was significant (.001 at the $p \leq .05$ level).

Next, participants were asked to respond to the statement that an integrated communication model is much more effective in meeting organizational goals. Although the mean for the current survey is higher, at 3.16, than the Mulnix survey mean of 3.02, neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test yielded significance .

Similarly, the statement about the importance of including marketing as part of an integrated communication function yielded a slightly higher mean for the current survey (3.40) as opposed to the Mulnix survey (3.23). Neither the Levene's test nor the independent samples t-test indicated significance.

The next question, indicating the degree of agreement with the statement about the public relations unit being the best place to house the marketing department, shows a slightly lower mean (2.73) in the current survey as opposed to Mulnix (2.92). The Levene's test was just under the standard ($p \leq .05$) for significance, meaning that equal variances could not be assumed. The differences in means could not be considered as significant using the independent samples t-test.

In the last question, respondents were asked for their degree of agreement with the statement that the marketing unit would operate best as an independent unit, reporting to its own director or vice president. The current survey produced a mean of 2.64, as compared to the Mulnix mean of 2.10. The Levene's test indicated significance, meaning that equal variances could not be assumed. In addition, the independent samples t-test indicated that the difference in the means was significant. However, in neither case were the mean scores high.

To review of this group of questions, the 2014 respondents indicated significantly higher degrees of agreement with the statements that marketing is considered an equal partner in the communications infrastructure and that the marketing unit would operate best as an independent unit. Other differences in means could not be considered significant by the application of the Levene's test and the independent samples t-test.

Correlations among Likert question responses. Following the procedures used by Mulnix (1996), a Pearson correlation analysis was performed among all of the Likert questions in the current survey to investigate whether responses to various questions were related. The complete tables are contained in Appendix I, grouped by subject as in the previous sections.

As was done by Mulnix, this researcher selected only strong correlation coefficients of more than .5. All were significant at the .01 level. The highlights of this analysis were as follows:

- Question 16, a statement about marketing being strategically managed, was positively correlated with question 17, a statement about marketing being assimilated into a strategic communication program and question 18, a statement about marketing tactics shaping overall communication strategy. Question 17 also positively correlated with question 18. This indicated that respondents who saw marketing as being strategically managed also believed it was being assimilated into a strategic communication program in their institutions. They also believed marketing tactics were shaping the institution's overall communication strategy.
- Question 19, a statement about marketing being considered an integral part of the advancement function, positively correlated with question 20, a statement about marketing having a valid place in the overall communications/advancement function. The two statements suggest that marketing is central both in advancement and in the overall institution communication strategy.
- Question 24, a statement about the formal research being part of the planning process, positively correlated with question 25, a statement about the importance of conducting research before beginning a major campaign, and with question 28, a statement about conducting regular focus group studies. All three point to the need to gather data that will inform the planning and implementation of the institution's marketing strategy.
- Question 33, a statement about the president's leadership style and the success of institutional advancement, positively correlated with question 34, a question about institutional advancement ranking high among institutional priorities. Therefore, the

role of the president continues to be of the highest significance in promoting institutional advancement..

- Question 35, a statement about the president and his or her leadership team taking a personal interest in institutional advancement strategy, also positively correlated with question 34 and with question 36, a statement about the president and his or her leadership team taking an active role in establishing marketing priorities and strategies. Again, the role of the president is tied to institutional advancement and the importance of his or her active leadership in marketing.
- Question 38, a statement about the importance of the chief communications/advancement officer being a member of the president's cabinet or similar group, positively correlated with Question 39, a statement about the chief institutional advancement officer having direct input into decisions made by the cabinet. Respondents saw these two factors as closely related.
- Question 40, a statement about the freedom of the chief communications/advancement officer to allocate the marketing budget, positively correlated with question 41, a statement about the freedom to allocate his or her time and that of his or her staff, and question 43, a statement about that person's ability to begin a campaign on his or her own. All of these questions relate to the amount of power that the chief communications officer has in the organization with regard to marketing.
- Question 45, a statement about an integrated communication model being the most effective, positively correlated with question 46, a statement about the importance of including marketing as part of the integrated communication function. These two questions indicate the current attitudes toward marketing being a part of integrated communications and the importance of both.

Institutional culture questions: Respondents' perceptions of the role of the dominant coalition in determining marketing direction. One additional group of questions in the Mulnix survey, nos. 30 through 32, asked respondents to select words that indicated their perceptions of the personality of their institutions, the top management groups, and the presidents. For this group of questions, multiple answers were permitted. Also, it should be noted that Mulnix apparently had the word "staid" in the survey he used. It was not, however, in the copy of his survey in the dissertation (Mulnix, 1996), so the word was not included in the current survey. Any responses of "staid" in Mulnix's survey were listed as "other" in Tables 14 and 15.

In evaluating the answers to these questions, Mulnix categorized the responses as part of either a "closed system" (conservative, pragmatic, staid, and traditional) (p.223) or an "open system" (innovative, risk-taking, visionary, and liberal) (p. 223). Comparisons are shown in Tables 14 and 15. They were not evaluated for statistical significance because multiple responses were permitted in both Mulnix and the Current surveys.

Table 14

"Closed System" responses to institutional culture questions, nos. 30 through 32

Question Topic/Trait	Current (%)	Mulnix (%) (p. 223)
Personality of Institution		
Conservative	35 (36.5%)	10 (20.8%)
Traditional	40 (41.7%)	23 (47.9%)
Pragmatic	26 (27.1%)	19 (39.6%)
Top Management		
Conservative	27 (28.1%)	7 (14.6%)
Traditional	29 (30.2%)	15 (31.3%)
Pragmatic	38 (39.6%)	21 (43.8%)
President's Leadership		
Conservative	21 (21.9%)	6 (12.5%)
Traditional	22 (22.9%)	4 (8.3%)
Pragmatic	28 (29.2%)	24 (50.0%)
n=	96	48

Table 15

"Open System" responses to institutional culture questions, nos. 30 through 32

Question Topic/ Trait	Current (%)	Mulnix (%) (p. 223)
Personality of Institution		
Innovative	33 (34.4%)	20 (41.7%)
Visionary	26 (27.1%)	12 (25.0%)
Risk-Taking	14 (14.6%)	16 (33.3%)
Liberal	16 (16.7%)	9 (18.8%)
Top Management		
Innovative	29 (30.2%)	24 (50.0%)
Visionary	44 (45.8%)	17 (35.4%)
Risk-Taking	20 (20.8%)	9 (18.8%)
Liberal	7 (7.3%)	7 (14.6%)
President's Leadership		
Innovative	30 (31.3%)	19 (39.6%)
Visionary	53 (55.2%)	26 (54.2%)
Risk-Taking	20 (20.8%)	13 (27.1%)
Liberal	3 (3.1%)	6 (12.5%)
n=	96	48

The following discussion refers to the information in Tables 14 and 15. First, for question 30 (personality of the institution) the largest increase was found in "conservative" in the current study, with 36.5% choosing this categorization in 2014 compared to 20.8% in 1996. For the same question, the largest decrease from the Mulnix survey to the current survey was for "risk-taking, " with 33.3% in 1996 and 14.6% in 2014. Respondents viewed the personality of their institutions as being more conservative and less-risking-taking in 2014 as compared to respondents in 1996..

In addition, a decrease in percentage for the current survey as opposed to Mulnix was found for "pragmatic," with 27.1% in 2014 and 39.6% in 1996. Therefore, "pragmatic" does not follow the direction of the "conservative" selection.

Similarly, for question 31, regarding the top management traits, a large percentage of increase was seen in the current survey compared to Mulnix for the choice of "conservative, " with 36.5% in 2014 categorizing top management as conservative compared to 20.8% in 1996.

Decreases in the current study, as compared to Mulnix, were found for “pragmatic,” with 27.1% in 2014 and 39.6% in 1996 and, and “risk-taking,” with 14.6% in 2014 and 33.3% in 1996.

Finally, for question 32, which was about the president's leadership, increases in percentages in the current survey were seen for “conservative,” with 21.9% in 2014 and 12.5% in 1996, and “traditional,” with 22.9% in 2014 and 8.3% in 1996. Decreases in percentages were seen for “pragmatic,” with 29.2% in 2014 and 50.0% in 1996; “risk-taking,” with 20.8% in 2014 and 27.1% in 1996; and “liberal,” with 3.1% in 2014 and 12.5% in 1996.

The data from the current survey have been evaluated and, to the extent possible, compared to the data of Mulnix (1996). These results and the conclusions from this study will be discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This chapter includes a summary, discussion, and conclusions of a study on marketing in higher education institutions that sought to determine how the marketing function in higher education is organized today and how that may differ from the conditions found in a similar study by Mulnix nearly two decades ago (1996). The chapter begins with a summary of the study's purpose, research questions, methods, and populations.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that affect the organization and role of marketing units in institutions of higher education, as they react and plan for changing environmental conditions and available resources, and to determine if changes in perspectives about marketing have occurred since an earlier study by Mulnix in 1996. The study partially replicated the Mulnix study, but was expanded both in the institutions included and by the addition of demographic questions to determine the organizational structure of the marketing unit.

The research questions addressed by the current study were:

- What is the marketing unit's position in the institutional hierarchy?
- What selected characteristics now influence how the unit is organized?
- What changes in perspective have taken place since the Mulnix study was conducted in 1996?

A survey with the 37 questions from the Mulnix study and 11 demographic questions added by this researcher was sent to 676 individuals addressed as the chief public relations officials of the institutions included. Ninety-six responses were received, a return rate of 14.2%. This response rate will be addressed in a later section. Surveys were initially sent to potential respondents by Survey Monkey on March 24, 2014, with follow-up emails on April 24 and May 13, 2014. In addition, paper surveys were sent to one group of potential respondents.

The findings for the study will be discussed in terms of each of the research questions. The findings will also be considered in relation to the hypotheses that guided the Mulnix study (1996).

Research Question 1: What is the marketing unit's position in the institutional hierarchy?

The respondents to the current survey tended to have titles at the director, vice president, associate vice president, and executive director levels. They occupied moderately high levels in their organizations, with more than 40% reporting to a president or chancellor and nearly another 40% reporting to a vice president or vice chancellor. The moderately high level of the marketing officials indicates that marketing is viewed as an important function for higher education institutions.

Results showed that the marketing functions were housed most frequently in advancement, president's or chancellor's offices, or communications, although a little over 10% of the respondents reported being a part of enrollment or enrollment management units. The location of the marketing functions in higher-level offices also demonstrates the value assigned to the marketing of the institution.

Mulnix did not report any demographic data in his research. As a result, comparisons on these points are not possible.

Research Question 2: What Selected Factors Now Influence How the Unit is Organized?

Another way used to evaluate the marketing function's position in the institutional hierarchy was to examine the organizational model the respondents identified for their institutions. In the survey, the respondents were asked to identify their institutions as using one of the following based on the work of Hendricks (2002):

- The Enrollment Management model, in which the marketing unit has formal authority for everything related to enrollment, including promotion of programs; as well as responsibility for enrollment;

- The University Relations model, in which the marketing unit provides service to all units, but responsibility for enrollment remains with individual academic units;.
- Another model that might be in use at their organizations.

Since 68% of the respondents reported using the University Relations model, little information can be gleaned from the small number who reported using the enrollment management model, which was 10.4% of the respondents. In fact, Enrollment Management was the third choice among respondents, as 20.8% reported using a model that was not described as either University Relations or Enrollment Management. This study did not attempt to gather further information about the alternate models respondents believed to be in place in their institutions.

Even though this researcher examined three demographic characteristics to determine if they related to the organizational model used (the approximate headcount enrollment of the institution, the size of the organization's marketing budget, and the type of institution, in terms of the degrees granted), the data did not provide a sound basis for conclusions.

Institutions with headcounts of fewer than 10,000 were most likely to have enrollment management structures, although this model was still the minority choice for all respondents from organizations of this size. Further, respondents that reported using an enrollment management structure had marketing budgets from $150,000 to $3,000,000 and were primarily bachelor's and master's-degree-granting institutions. Once again, these responses were in the minority for each category.

To conclude, the preponderance of institutions of all headcount sizes, marketing budgets, and degree-granting types employed the University Relations organizational model. This model views marketing in a broader perspective as the marketing office works with and through all of the units of the institution, while leaving enrollment to the individual units. The results, therefore, do not provide any clear connection between any of the factors considered and the choice of the organizational model employed.

Research Question 3: What Changes in Perspective Have Taken Place Since the Mulnix Study?

The third research question is this study was concerned with the degree to which the hypotheses stated by Mulnix concerning the perspectives that practitioners of public relations/marketing compared to the perspectives of current practitioners. The data obtained in 2014 were compared to those obtained by Mulnix in 1996. Each section will be examined with regard to the results from both surveys and their application to Mulnix's hypotheses.

When Mulnix did his study in 1996, he identified six hypotheses to be addressed by his survey:

- "H1: The focus and scope of marketing in higher education remains limited and is related primarily toward enrollment management" (1996, p. 197).
- "H2: The use of sophisticated research methodology in support of marketing in higher education is limited, at best" (1996, p. 212) .
- "H3: The culture of the institution will influence the structure and goals of the communication/public relations subsystem, including the use (or lack thereof) of marketing strategies" (1996, p. 222).
- "H4: Colleges and universities that are more open-system oriented are more likely to have fully integrated communication/public relations subsystems that employ principles of marketing. In other words, more open institutions have expanded the public relations paradigm to include tools of marketing" (1996, p. 224).
- "H5: Marketing strategies are more likely to be utilized when the college or university leadership (dominant coalition) takes an active role in planning overall

communication/public relations structure and strategy. In other words, the dominant coalition is instrumental in defining marketing objectives" (1996, p. 231) .

- "H6: The role played by the chief communication/public relations officer is instrumental in defining the use of marketing strategies. Without adequate authority (power), this practitioner is likely not going to utilize marketing objectives in his/her overall communication plan" (1996, p. 242) .

It needs to be noted that Mulnix's data were compared to the overall data from the 2014 survey. Although the results were divided into groups representing the American Association of Universities and a cross-section of the other institutions available, this researcher concluded that the number of responses in the first group (n =10) was unlikely to result in significance for that group alone.

Mulnix's H1 statement: focus and scope of marketing. Mulnix's evaluation of his H1 statement, which states that the focus and scope of marketing remains limited in higher education, is based on the responses to the first two groups of questions. The first concerns the way marketing is used in the respondents' institutions; the second asks the respondents for their own opinions on how marketing should be used.

Question Group 1: Marketing use in postsecondary institutions. The higher means throughout this section (questions 12 through 18) are significant for all questions except number 15, which is a statement concerning the development of mutual understanding among the university and its publics.

At the time of his study Mulnix concluded that marketing, although considered important by the respondents, was considered primarily an admissions or enrollment management function (1996). He based this on the answers to the statements about the priority of marketing being enrollment management and the purpose of developing mutual understanding.

Based on significant differences in the 2014 respondents' perceptions of marketing use, officials now see marketing as an integral part of the advancement function of their institutions.

The respondents in the current study see marketing as both being strategically managed and assimilated into the overall mission of a strategically-managed communication program. Marketing is no longer viewed in a limited fashion or as a primarily enrollment management function.

Question Group 2: Respondents' personal viewpoints of marketing uses. All of the 2014 results showed a higher mean for each question in the group evaluating personal viewpoints of marketing uses. Most of the differences in means were not significant, but the higher mean for question 22, regarding marketing being integrated into the communications/public relations unit, was significant. Respondents in the 2014 study see marketing as extending beyond the more narrow view of enrollment management.

The key to interpreting the differences in this group may be found by examining the responses to the statement in question 16, “Marketing is being strategically managed.” Mulnix concluded that a lower mean for that question meant that marketing was limited in scope to admissions and enrollment management and was of lesser significance to the overall communications infrastructure (1996).

If that is true, the significantly higher mean for this question in the current survey (3.20 compared to the 2.46 found by Mulnix) would seem to indicate that the marketing function has increased in stature at many institutions and is of greater significance to the overall communications infrastructure. This also would seem to reflect an increased reliance on integrated marketing in higher education institutions. In conclusion, Mulnix's H1 statement, “The focus and scope of marketing in higher education remains limited and is related primarily toward enrollment management” (1996, p. 197), may be rejected based on the 2014 data.

Mulnix's H2 statement: Research. Mulnix's second hypothesis, which concerned the use of research in higher education marketing, is based on the third group of questions, numbers 24 through 28 in the survey. Mulnix's overall impression is that “very few communication practitioners on college and university campuses believe strongly in the value of research as part of the overall communication/public relations subsystem" (1996, p. 212). He mainly based this statement on the question that concerned respondents' views of the importance of a formal review process and the question about the need to monitor public opinion. Interestingly, those two questions had the only significant increases in means in this group when the 2014 survey responses were compiled.

Those two significant increases in the means would indicate that the attention paid to research has increased, particularly with regard to a formal review process for completed projects and the continued monitoring of public opinion. However, despite the significant differences found for the questions about the need to monitor public opinion and the need for a formal evaluation process, there is not sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis of Mulnix about the use of research in marketing initiatives: "The use of sophisticated research methodology in support of marketing in higher education is limited, at best" (Mulnix, 1996, p. 212). Four of the six questions in this group did not show a significant change in perspective. Thus, H2 is retained.

Mulnix's H3 and H4 statements: Organizational culture's effect on marketing. Mulnix evaluated the third and fourth hypotheses primarily by using sections of the qualitative interviews that related to questions 30, 31, and 32. He indicated that a quantitative evaluation of the survey answers would be difficult because multiple answers were permitted (1996). These questions asked the respondents to select certain traits that describe the personality of the organization (question 30), the top management (question 31), and the president (question 32).

Some comparisons are possible by employing the percentages of the responses to the questions. The highest increase in percentage for the question regarding the personality of the institution was found for "conservative." The highest decrease in percentage for the same question was for "risk-taking." In addition, a decrease in percentage was found for "pragmatic." Similarly, for question 31, regarding the top management traits, a large percentage increase was found for "conservative" and decreases were found for "pragmatic" and "risk-taking."

Finally, for question 32, which was about the president's leadership, increases in percentages were seen for “conservative” and “traditional.” Decreases in percentages were seen for “pragmatic,” “risk-taking,” and “liberal.”

By looking at the direction of the changes in these percentages, it appears that the practitioners who responded to the 2014 survey saw their institutions, top management, and presidents as conservative and, in the case of presidents, traditional, to a greater extent that the respondents to Mulnix's survey (1996). Fewer saw these groups as risk-takers or pragmatic.

Using the qualitative portion of his research, Mulnix concluded that the president and/or the senior management team who were considered “open” in their orientation were more likely to support the use of marketing in their institutions (1996). Further, he concluded that the personality and support of the chief executive was the most important factor in determining an organization's use of marketing--more than either the personality of the rest of the senior management team or the personality of the institution overall (1996).

Mulnix employed his qualitative interviews in considering these two hypotheses. The 2014 study did not use interviews as a follow-up, but upon reviewing the responses to the trait questions that related to H3 and H4, both were retained.

Mulnix's H5 statement: Dominant coalition's involvement in marketing. Mulnix reported a great level of interest by the president and/or the senior executives in setting institutional advancement as a high priority and in setting overarching advancement strategy. However, he found that fewer of the presidents were involved with setting marketing objectives and strategies, seeing these as a subset of institutional advancement and primarily related to admissions and enrollment management (1996).

In the current study, all of the differences in means were found to be non-significant using the independent samples t-test. Therefore, it appears that the perceptions in this section of the survey (questions 33 through 37) were no different than those in 2014.

Mulnix also reported several correlations between question 35, regarding the president's involvement with institutional advancement strategy, and several other questions. They are as follows, beginning with the strongest:

- Marketing has been assimilated into the overall communications strategy [question 17]
- Institutional advancement is one of the highest priorities of the president [question 34]
- Marketing is being strategically managed [question 16]
- Marketing tactics are being used as part of the overall communications strategy [question 18]
- It is important to have a formal review process in place to assess the advancement function [question 27]
- The president takes an active role in defining marketing objectives and priorities [question 36]
- It is important to conduct formal research before initiating a major new advancement program [question 25] (Mulnix, p. 233).

In the current survey, question 35 correlated positively at .5 or higher using the Pearson's coefficient, with significance at $p \leq .01$ with questions 34 and 36 only. (Note: Complete tables of the correlations in the Current study are in Appendix I.) This indicates that the higher the priority for "institutional advancement," the term used by Mulnix, the more active a president/leadership team's involvement is in formulating the strategy and defining marketing objectives and priorities.

Mulnix differentiated between institutional advancement strategy and marketing objectives and priorities (1996). He interpreted the latter as primarily for enrollment recruitment and as being a subset of institutional advancement strategy. The correlations from the current survey do not seem to indicate that respondents considered the two terms to be very different.

Further, the fact that most of the other statements did not strongly correlate with the statement about the president and leadership team taking a direct interest in formulating institutional advancement strategy may indicate that these items, such as formal research, are happening regardless of the president and leadership team's involvement.

Based on the correlations in this group of questions, it appears that respondents do not view the terms “institutional advancement strategy” and “marketing objectives and priorities” as greatly different. Many of the activities that were initiated by presidential fiat in 1996 appeared to be taking place in 2014 regardless of the level of interest of the chief executive. Therefore, this researcher rejects the H5 hypothesis.

Mulnix's H6 statement: Role of Chief Communications Officer. This hypothesis addressed the need for the chief communications officer to have access to the institution's chief executive and dominant coalition, to participate in the decisions made by that group, and to have freedom of movement in establishing budgets, priorities for self and staff, and creating new initiatives. All of these components were considered to indicate the amount of power the chief communications officer possessed in the organization.

Mulnix hypothesized that the role of the chief communication officer was instrumental in determining the extent of marketing strategy use, and, without sufficient organizational power, the chief communications officer would not be able to implement marketing techniques in his or her activities. He concluded that both parts of the hypothesis were supported by his research, with the support for the first part being largely dependent on the amount of power delegated by the chief executive officer.

The results from the current survey showed overall increases in means for the questions in this group, but only one difference was significant. That was for the necessity for the chief communications officer to have institution-wide responsibility for integrating communication efforts. It appears, then, that the current survey also supports the two parts of the hypothesis.

Respondents' views of organization of marketing. Mulnix also hypothesized that marketing would rarely be established as a separate unit in institutions of higher education. It would be more likely to be a subset of the public relations function or other communications unit. His research supported that hypothesis by an evaluation of the last group of questions in the quantitative portion of his study and related responses in his qualitative interviews.

The statement about marketing being an equal partner in the communications infrastructure showed a relatively low mean of 2.10 in the responses to Mulnix's survey. The responses to the statement about marketing operating best as a separate unit showed a mean of 2.10 as well.

In the current survey, significant increases in the means for each of those questions were seen, with a 3.15 mean for the “equal partner” statement and a mean of 2.64 for the “separate unit” question. The difference in the responses to those two statements, between the Mulnix survey and the current survey, would seem to indicate that the marketing function is much more widely accepted in higher education today. The implication that integrated communications are far more important, as seen in the previous group of questions, would tend to explain the lower mean for the “separate unit” question in the current survey. Therefore, the hypotheses regarding the marketing function's position in the organizational structure are supported by the current survey as well.

Further Discussion of Findings

When Mulnix conducted his research in the mid-1990s, the concept of marketing higher education was just beginning to gain widespread acceptance. The concept was not completely new, as it had been introduced in the 1970s, but at the time, a number of institutions had not completely accepted it.

Since that time, institutions have continued to increase their understanding and use of marketing concepts in order to promote and represent themselves. In the decade since 2000, the concepts of branding, integrated marketing, and integrated marketing communications have been studied by researchers such as Ramsey (2006), Morris (2003), and Edmiston-Strasser (2007).

In addition, higher education institutions faced a very different operating environment in 2014, as seen in Chapter 2, as compared to 1996. Changes in the way higher education conducts its operations include increased budgets for marketing and communications and an increased emphasis on retention in addition to recruiting. Changes in the media used in marketing and communication include a new category of social media and increased emphasis on online promotion and teaching. Changes in the students that higher education must recruit and teach include a number of differences enumerated for the Millenial generation of students and those that will follow.

With all that in mind, it is somewhat surprising that the comparison of the responses to the current study to those reported by Mulnix do not reflect even more differences. The differences have been considered for each of the question groups in Mulnix's survey. The following section will examine some overall trends based on these data.

In the group of questions regarding the focus and scope of marketing, the current survey yielded significant increases in mean for all of the statements proposed by Mulnix (1996) except one. This would seem to indicate that the concept of marketing has been accepted to a much greater degree by the higher education community and that its overall scope is broader.

One aspect to consider is what the respondents may perceive is meant by the term *marketing*. In the past decade, the emphasis on branding and integrated marketing have become well known to the kind of practitioners who responded to the survey. Therefore, their perception of marketing is more likely to be as an overall concept rather than a single component of an institutional advancement program. In summary, the language and terminology may have changed enough to have affected the answers to these questions. Also, the term *institutional advancement*, although still in use, may be used differently now to represent the alumni and fundraising aspects of the organization more than communications.

The group of questions regarding the respondents' personal viewpoints about marketing organization as it should be, rather than as it is at their institutions revealed little difference between the current survey and that of Mulnix. This would lead one to conclude that practitioners who were part of the population being surveyed had not changed their perspectives on organization very much, but that the organizations they worked for had changed with regard to marketing.

In considering the importance of research in the marketing function, the respondents to the current survey reported an increased recognition of the importance of regular research to monitor public opinion about their institutions, as well as the importance of research to determine the success or failure of campaign components. This would seem to indicate that institutions are becoming more sophisticated with regard to their evaluation processes, although all of the research may not be conducted in house.

No significant differences were found between the responses to the current survey and Mulnix with regard to the presidential involvement in establishing institutional advancement strategy. This may be for different reasons, however. In 1996, Mulnix determined that the marketing function would need to be championed by the chief executive in order for marketing strategies to be used.(1996) In addition, some of the respondents surveyed in the qualitative portion of Mulnix (1996) indicated that marketing techniques needed to be implemented without using the term marketing, which was seen by stakeholders such as faculty as too commercially oriented for a higher education institution. However, in 2014, it was more likely that marketing was generally accepted by the institution. Presidential activity could be restricted to providing the necessary tools to the professionals in the field with only occasional oversight.

Regarding the chief communication officer's role, only one major difference surfaced in the responses to the current survey when compared to Mulnix. This difference involved the importance of the communication/advancement office having central authority for integrating communication efforts throughout the institution. This can be interpreted to mean that with the increased emphasis on branding and integrated marketing, centralized authority has become much more important to the institution.

Finally, in the group of questions regarding the place of marketing in the organization, significantly more respondents in the current survey indicated that they believed that marketing is considered an equal partner in the communications infrastructure. Most of the other perspectives did not change to a significant degree, although somewhat more respondents did indicate that the marketing unit would operate best as a separate unit with its own director or vice president.

The low response rate (14.2%) to the 2014 study limits the ability to generalize the results.   However, the respondents to the survey represented a cross-section of the higher education community with different sizes, budgets, levels of degree-offerings, and geographical locations.

In addition, some research suggests that a lower response rate does not necessarily mean the data are not representative. Holbrook, Krosnick, and Pfent (2008) studied response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey firms and concluded that "…lower response rates to not notably reduce the quality of survey demographic efforts" (p. 527).

Also, Massey and Tourangeau (2013) and Bethlehem (2002) and indicated that a relationship between response rates and the amount of bias may not exist. Massey and Tourangeau summarized as follows:

> Historically, researchers have mostly relied on the size of the response rate itself as a rough gauge of the risk of bias, to the point where many scientific journals and statistical agencies required the reporting of response rates and sometimes specified a minimum acceptable value. More recently, however, a statistical formula derived by Bethlehem (2002) revealed that there is no necessary relationship between response rate and degree of bias. Consistent with this theoretical insight, in his article for this volume Peytchev reports that a meta-analysis of studies

done on nonresponse bias yields scatterplots that show virtually no relationship between response rates and degree of bias across studies. (pp. 227-228)

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was performed in order to assess the perspectives of marketing/public relations professionals about the organization of their units within the organizational hierarchies. This researcher also added a group of demographic questions with the purpose of adding some information about the respondents and their institutions. With enough responses, the data could have been compared by the two groups that had been established: membership in the American Association of College and Universities, which is similar to the group studied by Mulnix (1996), and a group of additional practitioners from the Higher Education Directory who represented other categories of institutions.

However, by using the entire Mulnix set of questions (37 in number) and the 11 demographic questions, the length of the survey may have been increased to a point that made it difficult or unattractive for potential respondents to complete . A look at some of the individual response records shows that the last questions in the survey were not completed, perhaps indicating a certain amount of fatigue with the survey.

To remedy this, a future researcher could choose several of the most significant groups of questions from the Mulnix survey for further use along with the demographic information. Question groups that could be repeated could include those that showed some significant differences from Mulnix to the current survey in their responses: question group 1, which considered the organization's use of marketing; question group 3, which considered the use of research as part of the marketing and communications process; and question group 6, which considered the position of marketing in the respondents' organizations.

The demographic information obtained in this study could be included in future surveys and compared to the results in the current survey. This information could be used as an overall barometer of the position of marketing in higher education organizations, with the opportunity to make some comparisons that were not possible in the current survey.

Another extension of this study could be to duplicate the qualitative interview portions of Mulnix's work (1996). This work was the outgrowth of his initial written questionnaire, which was the source of the perception questions used in 2014. A duplicate qualitative study could be constructed in a way to compare as directly as possible with Mulnix's work by contacting representatives of the same ten institutions used in his qualitative study. It could be taken further by interviewing representatives of different types of institutions that were represented in the current study, but not in Mulnix (1996).

Some further consideration also needs to be given to the terminology used in the field today. Higher education marketing techniques have increased in both acceptance and sophistication since the time of Mulnix's work, and the usage of some of the terms may have changed. This could have affected the results of the current study.

For example, the term "institutional advancement" in higher education has historically meant fundraising and the communications efforts that support that process (Slinker, 1988). Similarly, Mulnix appeared to view the marketing process as a part of institutional advancement along with functions such as alumni relations, communications, and public relations.

However, the demographic information collected about "tasks included in the marketing function" in the current study (a full list is in Appendix J) indicates that a majority of the marketing units studied did not include fundraising as part of their services. In fact, just over 30% of the respondents identified fundraising, and none of them were in Group A, the one that most closely resembled the group that Mulnix studied. This is further reflected by the greater percentage of units that employ the University Relations model identified by Hendricks (2003).

So rather than being subsets of the institutional advancement function, marketing functions such as advertising, publications, public/media relations, and photography are primarily separate from institutional advancement in current organizations. This difference may have affected answers to some of the Likert-style questions in the current study. Future studies will need to establish definitions of the terms under consideration and, perhaps, reword some of the questions.

Conclusion

In 1996, Mulnix said, concerning his findings:

> The use of marketing principles and techniques in higher education is, without question, a relatively new phenomenon .... there is basically strong support for the concept among a majority of practitioners, although there is an underlying sense of concern that being too obvious about the utilization of marketing may be resisted, particularly by faculty members who may view the practice as overly commercial and not in the best long-term interests of the academy. However, particularly at those institutions where enrollment was in decline, practitioners said that use of marketing was generally well accepted. (p. 297)

Now, midway through the second decade of the 21st century, institutions have placed the marketing function at a moderately high level in their organizational structures. They have increased their activities regarding marketing research, and they have demonstrated other perspectives that reflect the increased importance of the marketing function in their situations. There is no doubt among the higher education community that the art and science of marketing has a place in its infrastructure.

References

Alexander Agati, H. (2012). *The Millennials: Howe and Strauss disputed* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3492308)

Ashby, B. (2008). *Meaning-making, branding and perceptions about postsecondary education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3312136)

Baldridge, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. L. (1978). *Policy making and effective leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barlar, A.D. (1987). *Planning for the formalization of marketing in higher education: a case study of the development of a strategic marketing plan*(doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(8721831)

Barnes, N., & Lescault, A. (2013) College presidents out-blog and out-tweet corporate CEO's as higher ed delves deeper into social media to recruit students. Retrieved from http://www.umassd.edu/cmr/socialmediaresearch/collegepresidentsoutblog/.

Barnes, N.G. & Lescault, A.M. (2011). Social media soars as higher-ed experiments and reevaluates its use of new communications tools. Retrieved from http://www.umassd.edu/media/umassdartmouth/cmr/studiesandresearch/higherEd.pdf.

Bethlehem, Jelke G. (2002). Weighting nonresponse adjustments based on auxiliary information. In Groves, R., Dillman, D. , Eltinge, J. & Little, R. (Eds) *Survey nonresponse*, pp. 275–88. New York, NY: Wiley.

Blanton, R.K. (1981). *The market position of a university relative to an "ideal": a study of constituent and faculty perceptions* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8205567)

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brennan, R., Felekis, G., & Goldring, D. (2003). Strategic management of marketing and human resources in further education colleges. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 2*, 143-156.

Brooks, C. (1998). *The influence of stakeholder assessment on change within a public institution of higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9838276)

Cardona, J. (2007). *The emergence of the educational marketer as a campus leader* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(3283912)

Cockrum, J. (1995). *A study of strategic marketing in Liberal Arts II colleges* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(9538185)

Colonna, J. (2012). *Development and validation of the University Website Evaluation Scale (UWES): A tool for assessing website user experience on a university website* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3541260)

Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) and LipmanHearne (2010). Wondering what works? The changing marketing mix in higher education. Retrieved from http://lhi-cdn-dev.lipmanhearne-services.com.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/2010_LHI-CASE_Marketing_Spend_Report.pdf.

DePerro, D. (2006). *The visibility is clear: integrated marketing makes a difference in higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3210007)

Edmiston-Strasser, D. (2007). *An examination of integrated marketing communication in U.S. public institutions of higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3315993)

Ferguson, L.A. (1986). *Introducing – new and improved: the marketing of changed institutions of higher learning* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8710848)

Fink, A. (2003). *The survey handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Firoz, M. (1982). *Marketing in non-profit higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8217624)

Fromm, J., & Garton, C. (2013). *Marketing to Millennials: Reach the Largest and Most Influential Generation of Consumers Ever.* New York, American Management Association.

Gauthier, C. (2012, September 19). The 2012 higher education marketing benchmarking report for not-for-profit schools is here! [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://sparkroom.com/blog/2012/09/the-2012-higher-education-marketing-benchmarking-report-for-not-for-profit-schools-is-here/.

Gerke-Newman, C. (1998). *An evaluation of marketing positioning in four year colleges and universities* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(9829962)

Goldgehn, L.A. (1982). *A marketing opportunity analysis of a strategic marketing audit to higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8225922)

Gould, E. (2003). *The university in a corporate culture.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hall, D. (2006). *Marketing perceptionsof presidents and chief marketing and communications professionals at public master's and baccalaureate colleges and universities* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3202387)

Hendricks, W. M. (2002). *Centralized marketing functions in higher education: an examination of two models.* Retrieved from http://www.newfoundations.com/OrgTheory/Hendricks721.html.

Hendricks,W.M. (2006). *The influence of the Internet on the choice set of prospective college students during the search and choice stages of the college selection process* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3255642)

Holbrook, A., Krosnick, J., & Frent, A. (2008). The causes and consequences of response rates in surveys by the news media and government contractor survey research firms. In Lepkowski, J., et al. (Eds), *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology* (pp. 499-527). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Horrigan, D. (2007). *Integrated marketing communications in higher education* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3265778)

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: the next great generation.* New York: Vintage Books.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2003). *Millennials go to college*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and Life Course Associates.

Kajcienski, C. (1997). *The utilization of selected marketing elements by higher education institutions* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9734766)

Kaplan, A. & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons(53)*, 1, 59-68.

Kirp, D. L. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the bottom line*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kotler, P. (1975). *Marketing for nonprofit organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. (1980). *Marketing management.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. and Armstrong, G. (1997). *Principles of Marketing*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kotler, P. & Fox, K. (1985). *Marketing for higher education institutions.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kotler, P. & Levy, S. (1969). Broadening the Concept of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing(13)*, 10-15.

Lauer, L. (2002). *Competing for students, money, and reputation.* Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Education.

Marra, R. M., & Bogue, B. (2006). A critical assessment of online survey tools. Women in Engineering ProActive Network. Accessed 9/29/2013 from https://ojs.libraries.psu.edu/index.php/wepan/article/download/58473/58161.

Massey, D. & Tourangeau, R. (2013). Where do we go from here? Nonresponse and social measurement. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,645* (1), 222-236. doi: 10.1177/000271621246419.

McGoon, C. (1998). Cutting-edge companies use integrated marketing communication. *Communication World,(16),* No. 1.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: the extensions of man.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Michael, S. (1991). *Marketing higher education: Responding to a changing environment* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (NN66726)

Mitchell, K. (1988). *The usage and perceived effectiveness of marketing strategies by undergraduate admissions officers* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(8815574)

Morris, L.M. (2003). *Integrated marketing: the process and challenge in implementing this evolving concept at three private universities* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(3108718)

Mulnix, M.W. (1996). *The focus and scope of marketing in higher education: key indicators of organizational structure* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9719794)

Myers, K. (1990). *Through the looking glass: principles of image management for college and university administrators* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9033722)

Myers, L., & Robe, J. (2009). *College rankings: history, criticism and reform.* Washington, D.C.: Center for College Affordability and Productivity.

Ramsey, J. (2006). *"Distinctively Dickinson:" the evolution of brand at a liberal arts college* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(3209982)

Resnick, R. (2012). Comparison of postal and online surveys: cost, speed, response rates and reliability. Education Market Research and MCH Strategic Data. Retrieved from http://www.mchdata.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Comparison_of_Postal_and_Online_Surveys.pdf.

Ryans, C., & Shanklin, W. (1986). *Strategic planning, marketing & public relations, and fund-raising in higher education: perspectives, readings, and annotated bibliography.* Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Sands, G. C., & Smith, R.J. (1999). Organizing for effective marketing communications in higher education: restructuring for your competitive edge in marketing. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 9(2)*, 41-58.

Scarborough, E. (2012) How much are other colleges spending on marketing? Retrieved from http://www.marketingpower.com/ResourceLibrary/Documents/Content%20Partner%20Documents/SimpsonScarborough/2012/how_much_colleges_spend_on_marketing.pdf.

Schultz, D., & Kitchen, P. (2000). *Communicating globally: an integrated marketing approach.* London: Macmillian Press Ltd.

Slinker, J. (1988). *The role of the college or university president in university advancement* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8907818)

Somekh, B., & Lewin, C. (2004). *Research methods in the social sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.

Striegler, H. (1991). *The role of the admissions office in marketing higher education in the year 2000* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9134007)

Strout, E. (2006). Breaking through the noise of a crowded field. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 19, 2006.

Sweeney, R. (2006). Millenial behaviors and demographics. Retrieved from http://certi.mst.edu/media/administrative/certi/documents/Article-Millennial-Behaviors.pdf.

Taylor, T. (1984). *A theoretical model for urban university marketing* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(8429360)

Topping, P. (1989). *Distinguishing between marketing and selling in private college administration: a managerial perspective* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9002445)

Tsai, M. (1985). *A proposal for marketing guidelines for higher education institutions* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8525530)

Watson, B. (2000). *A descriptive study of enrollment management strategies for four-year public colleges and universities* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (9989910)

Wilson, H. (1985). *Marketing in higher education: Analysis of failure, chance for success* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8602080)

Yun, G. W. & Trumbo, C. (2000). Comparative response to a survey executed by post, e-mail and web form. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6(1).* Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2000.tb00112.x/full.

Appendix A

Stamped Letter of Consent from Marshall University's Instituional Review Board (IRB)

Marshall University IRB

Approved on:	1/9/15
Expires on:	1/10/16
Study number:	547428

Anonymous Online Survey Consent

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Perspectives on Organization of the Marketing Function in Higher Education" designed to identify factors that affect the organization and role of marketing units in institutions of higher education, as they react and plan for changing environmental conditions and available resources. The study is being conducted by Louis K. Watts and Susan Tams from Marshall University and has been approved by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Susan Tams.

This survey is composed of *11 demographic questions and 37 statements about which you will indicate your level of agreement*. It will take about 20-30 minutes of your time. Your replies will be anonymous, so do not type your name anywhere on the form. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose to not participate in this research study or to withdraw. If you choose not to participate you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it. You may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Once you complete the survey you can delete your browsing history for added security. Completing the on-line survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions about the study or in the event of a research related injury, you may contact Louis Watts at 304-746-1933, or Susan Tams at 304-746-2038.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

By completing this survey you are also confirming that you are **18** years of age or older.

Please print this page for your records.

If you choose to participate in the study you will find the survey at www.xxxxxxx.com

Appendix B
Survey Instrument

This survey is designed for the chief marketing administrator of a higher education institution, in order to assess how marketing is organized at his or her institution.

Your Job and Department

1. What is your job title? ____

(for example, Director of Marketing, Vice President of Marketing, Vice President for Communications and Marketing, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, etc.)

2. What is your highest academic degree?

__ Associate
__ Bachelor's
__ Master's
__ Professional (such as J.D. or M.D.)
__ Doctoral
__ Other, please specify ____

3. What is the job title of the person to whom you report?
____

4. What is that person's highest academic degree?

__ Associate
__ Bachelor's
__ Master's
__ Professional (such as J.D. or M.D.)
__ Doctoral
__ Other, please specify ____

5. In what division (headed by a vice president or other senior officer) is your operation housed?
____

Your Institution

6. What is the approximate total student headcount of your institution on all campuses?

__ Below 5,000
__ 5,000 and over, but under 10,000
__ 10,000 and over, but under 15,000
__ 15,000 and over, but under 20,000
__ 20,000 and over, but under 25,000
__ 25,000 and over, but under 30,000
__ 30,000 and over

7. How would you classify your institution?

__ Associate
__ Bachelor's
__ Master's
__ Doctorate-Granting
__ Research
__ Branch Campus or Division
__ Other

8. What is the approximate, total marketing budget for your organization, excluding salaries and other personnel costs?

__ Below $100,000
__ $100,000 and over, but under $150,000
__ $150,000 and over, but under $250,000
__ $250,000 and over, but under $500,000
__ $500,000 and over, but under $1,000,000
__ $1,000,000 and over, but under $3,000,000
__ $3,000,000 and over

9. What is the size of your institution's marketing staff?

__ Fewer than 5
__ 5 to 10
__ 11 to 15
__ 16 to 20
__ 21 to 25
__ More than 25

10. Does one of the following organizational models describe the marketing process at your institution? (If so, please check the one that applies; if not, please check "other.")

Enrollment Management Model (A)	University Relations Model (B)
Direct enrollment, planning and promotion of all university programs with responsibility for enrollment	Assist all university departments with promotion of their programs; responsibility for enrollment remains with department
Marketing and promotion are part of the overall management of enrollments	Marketing and promotion are a separate entity; a service provided to all units
Formal authority for everything related to enrollment	Authority for all marketing, promotion, and communications that affect the "customer," and, by extension, all stakeholders

_____ Model A (Enrollment Management)
_____ Model B (University Relations)
_____ Other

Assignments

11. What tasks are included in the marketing function of your institution? (Please check as many as apply.)

__ Public relations (press releases, questions from the press, news conferences, etc.)
__ Events (commencement, homecoming, etc.)
__ Publication Management/Design
__ Advertising
__ Admissions
__ Fundraising
__ Photography
__ Other ____
__ Other ____
__ Other ____

This section asks questions relating to the focus and scope of marketing in higher education. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your institution.

12. Marketing is considered an integral part of the overall institutional advancement function.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

13. One of the main priorities for the marketing function is as an enrollment management (admissions) function.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

14. One of the main priorities for the marketing function is to attract the best and brightest students to campus.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

15. One of the primary purposes of the marketing effort is to develop mutual understanding between the college/university and the various publics the institution serves.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

16. Marketing is being strategically managed.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

17. Marketing has been assimilated into the overall mission of a strategically managed communication program.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

18. Marketing tactics are being used to shape overall communication strategy.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

Please answer the following questions as they apply to your personal viewpoint.

19. Marketing should be considered along with fund raising, public relations, and alumni relations as an integral part of the overall institutional advancement function.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

20. Marketing has a valid place in the overall institutional advancement/communication mix.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

21. It is important for the marketing function to be organized as a stand-alone, independent unit, separate from other communication functions.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

22. It is important for marketing to be integrated into the overall communication/public relations unit.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

23. This institution would be better served if more resources were included in the marketing effort.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

This section relates to the use of research in formulating marketing strategies. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your institution.

24. Formal research is an integral part of the planning process for any advancement/communication plan.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

25. It is seen as important to conduct formal research before a major new advancement/communication program is initiated.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

26. It is considered important to employ outside consultants to conduct research or to provide advice on certain aspects of the advancement/communication program.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Not Applicable

27. It is considered important to have a formal review process in place for judging the success/failure of specific aspects of an advancement/communication program or campaign.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Not Applicable

28. It is considered important to conduct regular focus group studies and attitude surveys to monitor public opinion about the institution.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Not Applicable

29. It is seen as important that the chief advancement practitioner have training in marketing research and methodology.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Not Applicable

This section attempts to determine if there is a relationship between institutional culture and marketing in higher education. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your personal viewpoint.

30. How would you characterize the personality of your institution? (You may circle more than one answer.)

Conservative	Innovative	Visionary	Traditional
Pragmatic	Risk-Taking	Liberal	Other ________

31. How would you characterize the top management at your institution. (You may circle more than one answer.)

Conservative	Innovative	Visionary	Traditional
Pragmatic	Risk-Taking	Liberal	Other ________

32. How would you characterize the president’s leadership or managerial style? (You may circle more than one answer.)

Conservative	Innovative	Visionary	Traditional
Pragmatic	Risk-Taking	Liberal	Other ________

The following section relates to the importance of top administrators (dominant coalition) in defining the objectives of marketing and determining its role in the overall communication infrastructure. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your institution.

33. There is a strong correlation between a president's leadership style and overall success in institutional advancement.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

34. Institutional advancement ranks as one of the highest priorities of the president and his or her leadership team.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

35. The president and his or her leadership team take a direct and personal interest in formulating institutional advancement strategy.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

36. The president and his or her leadership team take an active role in defining/establishing marketing objectives and priorities.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

37. The president and his or her leadership team give the chief institutional advancement officer the power to formulate marketing strategy as he or she sees fit. In other words, decisions to use or not use strategic marketing concepts rest with the chief communication/advancement officer.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

This section relates to the role of the chief institutional communication/advancement officer in defining communication objectives and setting marketing priorities. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your institution.

38. It is considered essential that the chief institutional advancement officer be an active member of the president's executive committee or cabinet.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

39. It is considered essential that the chief institutional advancement practitioner has direct and immediate input into decisions made by the president's executive committee or cabinet.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

40. The chief communication/advancement practitioner has total freedom to develop, adjust, and allocate his or her departmental budget each year.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

41. The chief communication/advancement officer has the discretion to allocate his or her time — and that of the staff— entirely as he or she sees fit.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

42. It is seen as important that the communication/advancement office has central authority for integrating communications efforts campuswide.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

43. The chief communication officer has the freedom to start a major marketing campaign at his or her discretion.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

This section attempts to determine if there is a commonality among communication models in institutions of higher education. Please answer the following questions as they apply to your institution.

44. Marketing is considered an equal "partner" in the communications infrastructure.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

45. An integrated communication model is much more effective in meeting organizational goals than a system with separate alumni, fund raising, PR, and marketing units.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

46. It is important to include marketing as part of an integrated communication function.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

47. The public relations unit is likely the best place to house the marketing department in any college or university.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

48. The marketing unit would operate best as an independent unit, reporting to its own director or vice president.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Not Applicable

Note: Questions 12-48 are the work of Mulnix(1996). Questions 1-11 were developed by this researcher.

Appendix C
Permission to Use Survey

From: Michael Mulnix [mailto:mmulnix@kaplan.edu]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Tams, Susan
Subject: Re: Request to use survey instrument

Sure thing, Susan. Just please give me credit for building the instrument in the first place, okay? And send me your research once it's done.....could be very interesting indeed! Let me know if you need my help in any way.

On Mon, Feb 11, 2013 at 7:46 AM, Tams, Susan <STams@marshall.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. Mulnix:

I have found your dissertation, "Focus and Scope of Marketing in Higher Education," extremely valuable in my own dissertation research on the topic of marketing in higher education. I'd like to request your permission to use your survey instrument's questions as I conduct a study of how the answers to those questions may have changed in the time since you received your doctorate.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Susan Tams, M.B.A., Ed.S. (and doctoral student pursuing Ed.D.)
Director of Editorial Services and Executive Editor, Marshall Magazine
Marshall University - South Charleston Campus
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303-1600

Voice: (304) 746-2038
Fax: (304) 746-8944
E-Mail: stams@marshall.edu<mailto:stams@marshall.edu>

--
Michael William Mulnix, PhD
Professor of Marketing
Strategic Management and Marketing Department
School of Business
Kaplan University
mmulnix@kaplan.edu

Appendix D
Membership of the American Association of Universities,
with year admitted to membership

Boston University (2012)
Brandeis University (1985)
Brown University (1933)
California Institute of Technology (1934)
Carnegie Mellon University (1982)
Case Western Reserve University (1969)
Columbia University (1900)
Cornell University (1900)
Duke University (1938)
Emory University (1995)
Georgia Institute of Technology (2010)
Harvard University (1900)
Indiana University (1909)
Iowa State University (1958)
The Johns Hopkins University (1900)
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1934)
McGill University (1926)
Michigan State University (1964)
New York University (1950)
Northwestern University (1917)
The Ohio State University (1916)
The Pennsylvania State University (1958)
Princeton University (1900)
Purdue University (1958)
Rice University (1985)
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey (1989)
Stanford University (1900)
Stony Brook University-State University of New York (2001)
Texas A&M University (2001)
Tulane University (1958)
The University of Arizona (1985)
University at Buffalo, The State University of New York (1989)
University of California, Berkeley (1900)
University of California, Davis (1996)
University of California, Irvine (1996)
University of California, Los Angeles (1974)
University of California, San Diego (1982)
University of California, Santa Barbara (1995)
The University of Chicago (1900)
University of Colorado Boulder (1966)
University of Florida (1985)
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1908)
The University of Iowa (1909)

(continued)

The University of Kansas (1909)
University of Maryland, College Park (1969)
University of Michigan (1900)
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities (1908)
University of Missouri-Columbia (1908)
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1922)
University of Oregon (1969)
University of Pennsylvania (1900)
University of Pittsburgh (1974)
University of Rochester (1941)
University of Southern California (1969)
The University of Texas at Austin (1929)
University of Toronto (1926)
University of Virginia (1904)
University of Washington (1950)
The University of Wisconsin-Madison (1900)
Vanderbilt University (1950)
Washington University in St. Louis (1923)
Yale University (1900)

Appendix E

Complete List of Respondent Job Titles, Alphabetical Order

Assistant Dean, Office of Communications
Assistant Director for Research and Planning
Assistant Vice President for Communications
Assistant Vice President for Marketing
Assistant Vice President for University Relations
Assistant Vice President of Marketing and Web Administration
Assistant Vice President, College Communications
Associate Vice President for University Relations
Associate Vice President
Associate Chancellor (2)
Associate Chancellor, Strategic Communications
Associate Vice President for Marketing and Communications
Associate Vice President for Public Affairs and Director of Marketing
Associate Vice President for Public Relations
Associate Vice President for Strategic Communications
Associate Vice President for Strategic Communications and Chief Marketing Officer
Associate Vice President for University Relations
Associate Vice President, Marketing Communications
Associate Vice President, University Marketing
Associate Vice President for Marketing & Communication
Associate Vice President of communications and marketing
Chief Communications Officer
Chief Marketing and Communications Officer
Chief Marketing, Public Relations Officer
Director - Marketing & Communications
Director for Research Communications
Director of Communications (3)
Director of Communications and Marketing
Director of Communications and Public Relations
Director of Marketing (4)
Director of Marketing and Branding
Director of Marketing and Communication (2)
Director of Marketing and Communications (2)
Director of Marketing and Public Relations
Director of Marketing Communications (2)
Director of Media Relations
Director of Public Relations (2)
Director of Public Relations and Marketing
Director of University Communications
Director of University Marketing
Director, Market Research and Assessment
Director, Office of Public Relations
Director, University Relations

(continued)

Executive Director Institutional Marketing Communications
Executive Director Marketing/Communications
Executive Director of Enrollment Strategies
Executive Director of Integrated Marketing Communications
Executive Director of Marketing
Executive Director of Marketing and Communications (2)
Executive Director of Marketing and Public Relations
Executive Director, Communications
Executive Director, Marketing and Communication
Executive Director, University Communication
Executive Director, University Communications and Marketing
Manager of Communications & Marketing
Managing Director of Communications
Senior Director of Communications and Marketing
Senior Vice President for Communication
Special Assistant to the Chancellor
Vice Chancellor for Advancement
Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs
Vice President (2)
Vice President Communication & Marketing
Vice President for College Relations and Advancement
Vice President for Communications (4)
Vice President for Communications and Marketing
Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing
Vice President for Marketing
Vice President for Marketing and Communication
Vice President for Public Relations
Vice President for University Marketing
Vice President for University Relations
Vice President of Public Affairs
Vice President, University Communications
Vice President, University Relations
Vice President of Marketing and Communications
Vice President of Marketing Communications
Vice President, Marketing and Communication
Vice President--Communications and Integrated Marketing

No response (2)

Appendix F

Complete List of Job Titles of Supervisors in Alphabetical Order

Associate Vice President - Marketing & Communications
Associate Vice President for Strategic Communications and Chief Marketing Officer
Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management
Associate Vice President of Marketing and Communication
Associate Vice President of University Relations
Chancellor (6)
Chancellor and President
Chief Executive Officer for External Affairs
Chief Marketing Officer
Dean of College Advancement
Director of Community Relations & Development
Executive Director for University Relations
Executive Vice President
President (33)
Provost (2)
Provost/Executive Vice President for Campus Life
Senior Vice President, Advancement
Senior Vice President of Marketing Communications and Institutional Advancement
University President (3)
Vice Chancellor for University Advancement
Vice Chancellor of Advancement
Vice President (4)
Vice President and Secretary
Vice President Enrollment, Financial Aid and Marketing
Vice President for Advancement (4)
Vice President for Advancement and External Relations
Vice President for College Advancement
Vice President for College Relations
Vice President for Communications
Vice President for Communications and Marketing (2)
Vice President for Development and University Relations (2)
Vice President for Enrollment Management
Vice President for Public Affairs
Vice President for Strategic Communications
Vice President for University Advancement
Vice President for University Communications
Vice President, Institutional Advancement
Vice President, University Advancement
Vice President of Communications & Marketing
Vice President of Enrollment
Vice President of Enrollment Management
Vice President, Enrollment and Communication
Vice President, Enrollment and Marketing Communications
Vice President for Enrollment Management & Marketing
Vice President of Admissions

Vice President of University Affairs
Vice Provost of Enrollment and Communications

No response (1)

Appendix G

Complete List of Unit Names in Alphabetical Order

Administration
Admissions
Advancement (10)
Advancement and Development
Advancement and External Relations
Advancement and University Relations
Chancellor (3)
College Advancement (2)
College Relations
College Relations and Advancement
Communication and Integrated Marketing
Communication, Marketing, and Public Affairs
Communications (7)
Communications and Marketing (4)
Communications and Public Affairs
Development and University Relations (2)
Enrollment and Communication
Enrollment and Communications
Enrollment and Marketing
Enrollment Management (6)
Enrollment, Financial Aid and Marketing
Executive
External Affairs
Institutional Advancement
Marketing (3)
Marketing and Communication
Marketing and Communications (4)
Marketing/PR
Office of the President (12)
Planning and Research
Public Affairs (4)
Strategic Communications (3)
University Advancement (5)
University Affairs
University Communications (2)
University Marketing
University Relations (4)
University Services

No answer (2)

Appendix H
Recalculation of Means in Mulnix Data

In evaluating the calculations in Mulnix (1996), a discrepancy was noted between the results shown in table in the narrative (Mulnix, p. 198) and those in Appendix B (Mulnix, pp. 314-315). In the narrative table, the raw scores are shown with the identifications Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree, and Not Applicable. The means are calculated by assigning values of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 0, respectively. However, in Appendix B, the results are shown in the same order, but with the identifications of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Not Applicable. Means calculated by assigning values of 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0, respectively, are not the same as those shown in both the narrative (Mulnix, p. 198) and Appendix B (Mulnix, pp. 314-315).

For example, for the first question, Mulnix indicates a mean of 2.188, based on the calculations shown in Table G1.

Table H1

Example of Mulnix's Calculations of Means for the first Likert-style question (No. 1 in his survey and No. 12 in the current survey.)

Response	Raw Score	Total Score
Strongly Disagree	14	14 (14 x 1)
Disagree	14	28 (14 x 2)
Agree	17	51 (17 x 3)
Strongly Agree	3	12 (3 x 4)
Not Applicable	0	0 (0 x 0)
Grand Total Score		105
Mean		2.188 (105/48)

In Appendix B (Mulnix, 1996), however, the results are given in the opposite way, but the mean shown is the same as in the narrative. For the same question and with the data as presented in Appendix B, the mean should have been calculated as shown in Table G2.

Table H2

Recalculations of means for the first Likert-style question (No. 1 in the Mulnix survey and No. 12 in the current survey)

Response	Raw Score	Total Score
Strongly Agree	14	56 (14 x 4)
Agree	14	42 (14 x 3)
Disagree	17	34 (17 x 2)
Strongly Disagree	3	3 (3 x 1)
Not Applicable	0	0 (0 x 0)
Grand Total Score		135
Mean		2.813 (135/48)

This discrepancy continued in a similar fashion through all of the Likert-style questions in Mulnix's tables. Because the survey showed the answers beginning with Strongly Agree, and based on some of the evaluative statements in Mulnix's narrative, this researcher stipulated that the order contained in Appendix B (Mulnix, pp. 314-322) was correct. The means were recalculated and are shown for each question for the purposes of comparison to the current study.

Appendix I

Pearson Correlations of Likert Questions in Current Study

Table I1

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 12-18 in Current Survey

Question	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18
12	1.000	.191	.007	.185	.121	.102	.372
13	.191	1.000	.343	-.069	.013	.055	.046
14	.007	.343	1.000	.231	.265	.247	.145
15	.185	-.069	.231	1.000	.353	.281	.307
16	.121	.013	.265	.353	1.000	.710*	.627*
17	.102	.055	.247	.281	.710*	1.000	.669*
18	.372	.046	.145	.307	.627*	.669*	1.000
19	.239	.066	-.010	.076	.019	.087	.121
20	.201	.107	.006	.106	.040	.078	.196
21	-.073	-.042	-.137	-.081	-.027	.004	-.178
22	.220	.002	.017	.091	.454	.354	.435
23	-.150	-.014	-.078	-.113	-.047	.013	.005
24	.070	.246	.204	.112	.335	.221	.223
25	.037	.076	.097	.098	.305	.244	.225
26	.107	.134	.045	.034	.110	.055	.182
27	.166	.033	.065	.116	.325	.382	.375
28	-.039	.037	.142	.227	.443	.405	.246
29	.299	-.017	.028	.218	.177	.142	.207

*Correlation higher than .5000, with $p \leq .01$.

(continued)

Table I1, continued

Question	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18
33	.173	-.039	.150	.279	.254	.192	.334
34	.166	.012	.159	.118	.205	.158	.241
35	.155	.091	.280	.025	.192	.128	.247
36	.227	.049	.252	.043	.156	.205	.348
37	.095	-.097	.036	.053	.056	.079	.082
38	.039	-.129	.231	.352	.269	.069	.204
39	-.032	-.115	.172	.333	.290	.094	.198
40	.276	.062	-.006	.068	.193	.049	.178
41	-.007	-.183	-.114	.142	.175	.096	.090
42	.180	-.110	.109	.222	.170	.092	.167
43	.049	-.092	-.043	.183	.165	.095	.138
44	.451	-.046	.024	.342	.352	.455	.447
45	.140	-.074	.158	.124	.206	.235	.209
46	.251	-.103	.138	.436	.350	.222	.408
47	.087	-.247	-.044	.155	.056	.174	.182
48	-.094	-.057	-.056	-.005	.042	.079	-.108

Table I2

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 19-23 in Current Survey

Question	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23
12	.239	.201	-.073	.220	-.150
13	.066	.107	-.042	.002	-.014
14	-.010	.006	-.137	.017	-.078
15	.076	.106	-.081	.091	-.113
16	.019	.040	-.027	.454	-.047
17	.087	.078	.004	.354	.013
18	.121	.196	-.178	.435	.005
19	1.000	.594*	-.011	.314	.172
20	.594*	1.000	-.029	.330	-.007
21	-.011	-.029	1.000	-.324	.142
22	.314	.330	-.324	1.000	.020
23	.172	-.007	.142	.020	1.000
24	-.071	.042	.021	.054	-.102
25	-.004	.210	.087	.149	-.100
26	.110	.211	-.029	.074	-.010
27	.103	.134	-.048	.207	-.124
28	-.076	.106	.098	.045	-.052
29	.176	.046	.023	.166	.078

(continued)

Table I2, continued

Question	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23
33	.228	.398	-.040	.258	-.072
34	.025	.320	-.110	.315	-.062
35	.066	.323	-.134	.336	-.029
36	.048	.015	-.041	.202	.018
37	.220	.164	-.190	.073	-.012
38	-.049	.217	-.054	.242	-.028
39	-.017	.297	-.014	.206	-.041
40	.012	.289	-.091	.325	-.104
41	.118	.055	-.118	.097	.023
42	-.060	.135	-.101	.039	-.126
43	-.055	.164	.078	.084	-.051
44	.166	.207	-.045	.243	-.093
45	.247	.067	-.028	.178	.120
46	.233	.290	-.185	.418	.006
47	.163	-.077	-.143	.313	.122
48	.181	.087	.409	-.088	.219

Table I3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 24-29 in Current Survey

Question	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29
12	.070	.037	.107	.166	-.039	.299
13	.246	.076	.134	.033	.037	-.017
14	.204	.097	.045	.065	.142	.028
15	.112	.098	.034	.116	.227	.218
16	.335	.305	.110	.325	.443	.177
17	.221	.244	.055	.382	.405	.142
18	.223	.225	.182	.375	.246	.207
19	-.071	-.004	.110	.103	-.076	.176
20	.042	.210	.211	.134	.106	.046
21	.021	.087	-.029	-.048	.098	.023
22	.054	.149	.074	.207	.045	.166
23	-.102	-.100	-.010	-.124	-.052	.078
24	1.000	.562*	.293	.294	.573*	.095
25	.562*	1.000	.401	.399	.526*	.259
26	.293	.401	1.000	.128	.076	.294
27	.294	.399	.128	1.000	.434.	.110
28	.573*	.526*	.076	.434	1.000	.063
29	.095	.259	.294	.110	.063	1.000

(continued)

*Correlation higher than .5000, with p<.01.

Table I3, continued

Question	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29
33	-.047	.119	.169	.081	.150	-.043
34	-.015	.079	.099	.032	.115	.020
35	-.087	.045	.066	.032	.012	-.061
36	-.129	.050	.013	.118	.069	.038
37	-.013	.018	-.267	.037	.130	.083
38	.197	.168	.112	-.043	.301	.135
39	.043	.093	.059	-.084	.195	.021
40	-.052	.177	.064	.131	.095	.193
41	.093	.206	-.088	.124	.275	.129
42	.107	.075	-.122	.080	.191	.046
43	-.138	.174	-.138	.083	.130	.206
44	-.013	.116	.004	.351	.119	.243
45	-.124	-.067	.090	-.123	-.093	.221
46	.071	.195	.129	.106	.065	.226
47	-.024	.021	.124	.056	.001	.314
48	.080	.067	.195	-.076	.033	.124

Table I4

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 33-37 in Current Survey

Question	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37
12	.173	.166	.155	.227	.095
13	-.039	.012	.091	.049	-.097
14	.150	.159	.280	.252	.036
15	.279	.118	.025	.043	.053
16	.254	.205	.192	.156	.056
17	.192	.158	.128	.205	.079
18	.334	.241	.247	.348	.082
19	.228	.025	.066	.048	.220
20	.398	.320	.323	.015	.164
21	-.040	-.110	-.134	-.041	-.190
22	.258	.315	.336	.202	.073
23	-.072	-.062	-.029	.018	-.012
24	-.047	-.015	-.087	-.129	-.013
25	.119	.079	.045	.050	.018
26	.169	.099	.066	.013	-.267
27	.081	.032	.032	.118	.037
28	.150	.115	.012	.069	.130
29	-.043	.020	-.061	.038	.083

(continued)

Table I4, continued

Question	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37
33	1.000	.617*	.439	.146	.090
34	.617*	1.000	.738*	.304	.047
35	.439	.738*	1.000	.575*	.021
36	.146	.304	.575*	1.000	-.073
37	.090	.047	.021	-.073	1.000
38	.418	.419	.317	.020	.116
39	.359	.366	.295	.034	.075
40	.127	.200	.190	.184	.208
41	-.017	-.032	.-086	-.147	.256
42	.124	.037	.034	-.004	.406
43	.112	.059	.017	-.010	.294
44	.206	.242	.196	.201	.141
45	.122	.030	.107	.030	.110
46	.268	.236	.179	.015	.092
47	.121	.113	.038	.122	.163
48	.022	.015	-.096	-.002	-.135

*Correlation higher than .5000, with p<.01.

Table I5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 38-43 in Current Survey

Question	Q38	Q39	Q40	Q41	Q42	Q43
12	.039	-.032	.276	-.007	.180	.049
13	-.129	-.115	.062	-.183	-.110	-.092
14	.231	.172	-.006	-.114	.109	-.043
15	.352	.333	.068	.142	.222	.183
16	.269	.290	.193	.175	.170	.165
17	.069	.094	.049	.096	.092	.095
18	.204	.198	.178	.090	.167	.138
19	-.049	-.017	.012	-.118	-.060	-.055
20	.217	.297	.289	.055	.135	.164
21	-.054	-.014	-.091	-.118	-.101	.078
22	.242	.206	.325	.097	.039	.084
23	-.028	-.041	-.104	.023	-.126	-.051
24	.197	.043	-.052	.093	.107	-.138
25	.168	.093	.177	.206	.075	.174
26	.112	.059	.064	-.088	-.122	-.138
27	-.043	-.084	.131	.124	.080	.083
28	.301	.195	.095	.275	.191	.130
29	.135	.021	.193	.129	.046	.206

(continued)

Table I5, continued

Question	Q38	Q39	Q40	Q41	Q42	Q43
33	.418	.359	.127	-.017	.124	.112
34	.419	.366	.200	-.032	.037	.059
35	.317	.295	.190	-.086	.034	.017
36	.020	.034	.184	-.147	-.004	-.010
37	.116	.075	.208	.256	.406	.294
38	1.000	.782*	.280	.260	.199	.205
39	.782*	1.000	.215	.162	.241	.169
40	.280	.215	1.000	.553*	.413	.539*
41	.260	.162	.553*	1.000	.484	.516*
42	.199	.241	.413	.484	1.000	.354
43	.205	.169	.539*	.516*	.354	1.000
44	.114	.160	.342	.121	.133	.157
45	.183	.193	.148	.056	.138	.097
46	.437	.422	.278	.255	.338	.220
47	.226	.098	.129	.176	-.013	.088
48	.014	-.016	-.073	-.176	-.032	-.022

*Correlation higher than .5000, with $p \leq .01$.

Table I6

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 44-48 in Current Survey

Question	Q44	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48
12	.451	.140	.251	.087	-.094
13	-.046	-.074	-.103	-.247	-.057
14	.024	.158	.138	-.044	-.056
15	.342	.124	.436	.155	-.005
16	.352	.206	.350	.056	.042
17	.455	.235	.222	.174	.079
18	.447	.209	.408	.182	-.108
19	.166	.247	.233	.163	.181
20	.207	.067	.290	-.077	.087
21	-.045	-.028	-.185	-.143	.409
22	.243	.178	.418	.313	-.088
23	-.093	.120	.006	.122	.219
24	-.013	-.124	.071	-.024	.080
25	.116	-.067	.195	.021	.067
26	.004	.090	.129	.124	.195
27	.351	-.123	.106	.056	-.076
28	.119	-.093	.065	.001	.033
29	.243	.221	.226	.314	.124

(continued)

Table I6, continued

Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Likert Questions 44-48 in Current Survey

Question	Q44	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48
33	.206	.122	.268	.121	.022
34	.242	.030	.236	.113	.015
35	.196	.107	.179	.038	-.096
36	.201	.030	.015	.122	-.022
37	.141	.110	.092	.163	-.135
38	.114	.183	.437	.226	.014
39	.160	.193	.422	.098	-.016
40	.342	.148	.278	.129	-.073
41	.121	.056	.255	.176	-.176
42	.133	.138	.338	-.013	-.032
43	.157	.097	.220	.088	-.022
44	1.000	.192	.256	.189	-.070
45	.192	1.000	.577*	.193	.230
46	.256	.577*	1.000	.245	.022
47	.189	.193	.245	1.000	-.135
48	-.070	.230	.022	-.135	1.000

*Correlation higher than .5000, with p<.01.

Appendix J:
Tasks Included in Marketing Function (multiple answers given)

Marketing Task	*Group A (%)*	*Group B (%)*	*Overall (%)*
Advertising	9 (90.00%)	85 (98.84%)	94 (97.92%)
Publications	7 (70.00%)	80 (93.02%)	87 (90.63%)
Public Relations/Media Relations	7 (70.00%)	79 (91.86%)	86 (89.58%)
Photography	9 (90.00%)	75 (87.21%)	84 (87.50%)
Events	1 (10.00%)	32 (37.21%)	33 (34.38%)
Admissions	2 (20.00%)	26 (30.23%)	28 (29.17%)
Fundraising	0 (0.00%)	27 (31.40%)	27 (28.13%)
Website	8 (80.00%)	17 (19.77%)	25 (26.04%)
Social Media	2 (20.00%)	16 (18.60%)	18 (18.75%)
Video Production/Videography	5 (50.00%)	8 (9.30%)	13 (13.54%)
Community Relations		6 (6.98%)	6 (6.25%)
Internal Communications	2 (20.00%)	4 (4.65%)	6 (6.25%)
Web Design/Services		5 (5.81%)	5 (5.21%)
Graphic Design	2 (20.00%)	2 (2.33%)	4 (4.17%)
Market Research	2 (20.00%)	2 (2.33%)	4 (4.17%)
Branding/Brand Marketing	2 (20.00%)	2 (2.33%)	4 (4.17%)
Speech Writing/Exec. Communications	2 (20.00%)	1 (1.16%)	3 (3.13%)
Legislatative/Government Relations		3 (3.49%)	3 (3.13%)
Public Radio		3 (3.49%)	3 (3.13%)
Athletic Communication/Media Relations		3 (3.49%)	3 (3.13%)
Digital strategy	2 (20.00%)	1 (1.16%)	3 (3.13%)
Crisis Communications/Management		3 (3.49%)	3 (3.13%)

(continued)

Marketing Task	*Group A (%)*	*Group B (%)*	*Overall (%)*
Specific tasks/advice for Admissions		2 (2.33%)	2 (2.08%)
Advise other areas		2 (2.33%)	2 (2.08%)
Licensing and Trademarks		2 (2.33%)	2 (2.08%)
Marketing Strategy	1 (10.00%)	1 (1.16%)	2 (2.08%)
Community Sponsorships		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Retail Sales		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Sports Information		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Client Marketing Relations		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Advancement Communications		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Scripting		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Blogging		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Mobile App		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Digital signage		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Sponsorships		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Coordinate with Enrollment Management		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Video Mail and print		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Conferences		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Web and digital content deployment		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Interactive Media		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Enrollment Marketing		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Campaign Communications		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Print Shop		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Alumni Magazine		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Direct Mail		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)

(continued)

Marketing Task	*Group A (%)*	*Group B (%)*	*Overall (%)*
E-Mail Marketing		1 (1.16%)	1 (1.04%)
Institutional Identity	1 (10.00%)		1 (1.04%)
Strategy and Planning	1 (10.00%)		1 (1.04%)
Marketing Campaigns	1 (10.00%)		1 (1.04%)
Health Systems - all PR and marketing	1 (10.00%)		1 (1.04%)

Appendix K:
Raw Scores and Means for Likert-Style Questions

Table K1

Responses to first group of perception questions regarding marketing uses in postsecondary institutions, nos. 12 through 18 in the current study

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Integral part of advancement function (Question 12)								
Survey Group A	4	3	1	1	0	1	10	3.111
Survey Group B	31	44	8	0	0	3	86	3.277
Overall	35	47	9	1	0	4	96	3.261
Mulnix (1996, p.314)	14	14	17	3	0	0	48	2.813
Main priority as enrollment management (Question 13)								
Survey Group A	2	5	2	1	0	0	10	2.800
Survey Group B	35	36	10	2	1	2	86	3.214
Overall	37	41	12	3	1	2	96	3.170
Mulnix (1996, p. 314)	8	25	14	0	1	0	48	2.813
Attract best and brightest students to campus (Question 14)								
Survey Group A	2	6	1	1	0	0	10	2.900
Survey Group B	29	48	7	0	0	2	86	3.262
Overall	31	54	8	1	0	2	96	3.223
Mulnix (1996, p. 314)	11	27	9	0	1	0	48	2.979
Develop mutual understanding (Question 15)								
Survey Group A	5	4	0	1	0	0	10	3.300
Survey Group B	29	48	6	1	1	2	86	3.238
Overall	34	52	6	1	1	2	96	3.245
Mulnix (1996, p.315)	14	24	7	1	2	0	48	2.979

(continued)

Table K1, continued

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Strategically managed (Question 16)								
Survey Group A	5	5	0	0	0	0	10	3.500
Survey Group B	29	39	15	0	0	3	86	3.169
Overall	34	44	15	0	0	3	96	3.204
Mulnix (1996, p. 315)	4	18	22	4	0	0	48	2.458
Assimilated into overall communications mission (Question 17)								
Survey Group A	2	6	2	0	0	0	10	3.000
Survey Group B	23	44	15	0	1	3	86	3.060
Overall	25	50	17	0	1	3	96	3.054
Mulnix (1996, p.315)	7	18	16	5	2	0	48	2.479
Tactics used for overall communications strategy (Question 18)								
Survey Group A	4	3	3	0	0	0	10	3.100
Survey Group B	22	48	13	0	0	3	86	3.108
Overall	26	51	60	0	0	3	96	3.108
Mulnix (1996, p.315)	7	23	11	6	1	0	48	2.604

Table K2

Responses to second group of perception questions, nos. 19 through 23

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Integral part of overall advancement function (Question 19)								
Survey Group A	5	3	0	2	0	0	10	3.100
Survey Group B	57	24	1	1	0	3	86	3.651
Overall	62	27	1	3	0	3	96	3.591
Mulnix (1996, p. 315)	24	21	2	0	1	0	48	3.396
Valid place in overall Institutional advancement/communication mix (Question 20)								
Survey Group A	6	4	0	0	0	0	10	3.600
Survey Group B	55	25	2	0	0	4	86	3.646
Overall	61	29	2	0	0	4	96	3.641
Mulnix (1996, p. 316)	26	22	0	0	0	0	48	3.541

(continued)

Table K2, continued

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Organized as a stand-alone unit (Question 21)								
Survey Group A	2	1	2	5	0	0	10	2.000
Survey Group B	12	8	44	19	0	3	86	2.157
Overall	14	9	46	24	0	3	96	2.140
Mulnix (1996, p. 316)	1	9	30	7	1	0	48	2.042
Integrated into overall Communications/public Relations unit								
Survey Group A	6	3	1	0	0	0	10	3.500
Survey Group B	45	34	4	0	0	3	86	3.494
Overall	51	37	5	0	0	3	96	3.495
Mulnix (1996, p. 316)	19	23	5	1	0	0	48	3.250
More resources needed in marketing effort								
Survey Group A	4	4	2	0	0	0	10	3.200
Survey Group B	48	32	2	0	1	3	86	3.518
Overall	52	36	4	0	1	3	96	3.484
Mulnix (1996, p. 316)	19	26	2	0	1	0	48	3.292

Table K3

Responses to third group of perception questions regarding research use as related to marketing in postsecondary institutions, nos. 24 through 29

Question Topic	SA	A	SD	D	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Formal research is integral part of planning (Question 24)								
Survey Group A	7	1	2	0	0	0	10	3.500
Survey Group B	23	37	18	2	1	5	86	2.975
Overall	26	51	60	0	0	3	96	3.033
Mulnix (1996, pp. 316-7)*	8	24	14	3	1	0	48	2.813

(continued)

Table K3, continued

Question Topic	SA	A	SD	D	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Formal research before new advancement program initiated (Question 25)								
Survey Group A	5	3	2	0	0	0	10	3.300
Survey Group B	14	38	28	2	0	4	86	2.780
Overall	19	41	30	2	0	4	96	2.837
Mulnix (1996, pp. 317)	10	20	16	2	0	0	48	2.792
Important to employ consultants for research (Question 26)								
Survey Group A	0	4	4	2	0	0	10	2.200
Survey Group B	10	38	28	4	1	5	86	2.642
Overall	10	42	32	6	1	5	96	2.593
Mulnix (1996, p. 317)	2	27	14	4	1	0	48	2.521
Important to have formal review process for advancement program (Question 27)								
Survey Group A	3	5	2	0	0	0	10	3.100
Survey Group B	9	49	23	0	1	4	86	2.793
Overall	12	54	25	0	1	4	96	2.826
Mulnix (1996, p. 317)	1	20	27	0	0	0	48	2.458
Important to monitor public opinion (Question 28)								
Survey Group A	4	5	1	0	0	0	10	3.300
Survey Group B	10	44	25	3	0	4	86	2.744
Overall	14	49	26	3	0	4	96	2.804
Mulnix (1996, p. 317)	3	19	25	1	0	0	48	2.500
Important for chief advancement practitioner to be trained in research (Question 29)								
Survey Group A	2	1	4	2	1	0	10	2.100
Survey Group B	6	22	46	3	4	5	86	2.284
Overall	8	23	50	5	5	5	96	2.264
Mulnix (1996, p. 318)	1	8	31	7	1	0	48	2.021

*Note: These results do not add up to 48. Mean is based on 50.

Table K4

Responses to fourth group of perception questions regarding the dominant coalition, nos. 33 through 37

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Correlation between president's leadership and advancement (Question 33)								
Survey Group A	1	7	1	0	0	1	10	3.000
Survey Group B	33	42	2	0	1	8	86	3.359
Overall	34	49	3	0	1	9	96	3.322
Mulnix (1996, p. 319)	18	27	2	0	1	0	48	3.271
Advancement ranks as highest priorities of president (Question 34)								
Survey Group A	3	5	1	0	0	1	10	3.222
Survey Group B	31	42	4	1	1	7	86	3.278
Overall	34	47	5	1	1	8	96	3.273
Mulnix (1996, p. 319)	20	22	5	1	0	0	48	3.271
President takes a direct and personal interest in formulating strategy (Question 35)								
Survey Group A	2	3	3	0	0	2	10	2.875
Survey Group B	25	36	16	1	1	7	86	3.051
Overall	27	39	19	1	1	9	96	3.034
Mulnix (1996, p. 319)	15	25	8	0	0	0	48	3.146
President takes active role in establishing marketing objectives and priorities (Question 36)								
Survey Group A	1	5	2	1	0	1	10	2.667
Survey Group B	7	45	26	1	0	7	86	2.734
Overall	8	50	28	2	0	8	96	2.727
Mulnix (1996, pp. 319-20)	6	24	18	0	0	0	48	2.750
President gives power to chief advancement officer (Question 37)								
Survey Group A	2	5	1	0	1	1	10	2.778
Survey Group B	16	36	15	4	6	9	86	2.675
Overall	18	41	16	4	7	10	96	2.686
Mulnix (1996, p. 320)	7	27	12	0	2	0	48	2.771

Table K5

Responses to fifth group of perception questions regarding practitioner roles, nos. 38 through 43

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
A member of executive committee (Question 38)								
Survey Group A	8	1	0	0	0	1	10	3.889
Survey Group B	47	25	2	2	1	9	86	3.494
Overall	55	26	2	2	1	10	96	3.535
Mulnix (1996, p. 320)	24	20	3	0	1	0	48	3.375
Has direct input into decisions (Question 39)								
Survey Group A	7	2	0	0	0	1	10	3.778
Survey Group B	37	32	6	21	1	8	86	3.308
Overall	44	34	6	2	1	9	96	3.356
Mulnix (1996, p. 320)	19	21	5	0	3	0	48	3.104
Has freedom of budget (Question 40)								
Survey Group A	3	3	3	0	0	1	10	3.000
Survey Group B	12	36	23	3	4	8	86	2.628
Overall	15	39	26	3	4	9	96	2.667
Mulnix (1996, p. 320)*	4	22	16	3	1	0	48	2.543
Allocates own time (Question 41)								
Survey Group A	5	4	0	0	0	1	10	3.556
Survey Group B	8	47	17	3	3	8	86	2.692
Overall	13	51	17	3	3	9	96	2.782
Mulnix (1996, p. 321)	4	27	13	3	1	0	48	2.625
Authority for integrating campuswide efforts (Question 42)								
Survey Group A	3	3	2	1	0	1	10	2.889
Survey Group B	18	44	11	1	4	8	86	2.910
Overall	21	47	13	2	4	9	96	2.908
Mulnix (1996, p. 321)	1	22	21	1	3	0	48	2.354
Freedom to start marketing campaign (Question 43)								
Survey Group A	2	3	3	1	0	1	10	2.667
Survey Group B	6	33	34	2	2	9	86	2.506
Overall	8	36	37	3	2	10	96	2.523
Mulnix (1996, p. 321)	5	23	20	0	0	0	48	2.688

*Note: These results do not add up to 48. Mean is based on 46 responses.

Table K6

Responses to sixth group of perception questions regarding models of marketing, nos. 44 through 48

Question Topic	SA	A	D	SD	N/A	NR	Total	Mean
Marketing is equal in communication infrastructure (Question 44)								
Survey Group A	4	4	1	1	0	0	10	3.100
Survey Group B	25	42	9	2	0	8	86	3.154
Overall	29	46	10	3	0	8	96	3.148
Mulnix (1996, p. 321)	1	13	26	6	2	0	48	2.104
Integrated communication model more effective than separate units (Question 45)								
Survey Group A	3	1	3	3	0	0	10	2.400
Survey Group B	34	31	12	1	0	8	86	3.256
Overall	37	32	15	4	0	8	96	3.159
Mulnix (1996, pp. 321-2)	19	20	3	3	3	0	48	3.021
Marketing included as part of integrated communication function (Question 46)								
Survey Group A	4	5	1	0	0	0	10	3.300
Survey Group B	40	34	2	0	2	8	86	3.410
Overall	44	39	3	0	2	8	96	3.398
Mulnix (1996, p. 322)	17	27	3	0	1	0	48	3.229
Public relations unit best place to house marketing (Question 47)								
Survey Group A	4	1	2	2	1	0	10	2.500
Survey Group B	17	34	19	7	1	8	86	2.756
Overall	21	35	21	9	2	8	96	2.727
Mulnix (1996, p. 322)	12	22	13	0	1	0	48	2.917
Marketing unit would operate best as independent unit (Question 48)								
Survey Group A	3	1	2	3	1	0	10	2.200
Survey Group B	24	18	27	6	3	8	86	2.692
Overall	27	19	29	9	4	8	96	2.636
Mulnix (1996, p. 322)	1	9	33	4	1	0	48	2.104