Original Article

Source–message–receiver in integrated marketing communication

Received (in revised form): 26th April 2011

Sharee LeBlanc Broussard

is an assistant professor of communication arts at Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama, where she leads the Public Relations and Advertising concentration. She earned her doctorate from the University of Southern Mississippi in 2009. Her professional background includes marketing, PR and advertising positions in corporate, retail and nonprofit environments as well as service as a nonprofit executive director and director in an advancement unit.

ABSTRACT This is an abbreviation of the author's dissertation. Because integrated marketing communication (IMC) research has traditionally been problematic, this study used an existing scale to determine that higher educational institutional advancement (alumni, marketing-communications, development) is an appropriate venue to study the process model of IMC. Responses from practitioners representing every department within advancement, every regional accrediting body and each of the baccalaureate to doctoral Carnegie Classification levels indicated the IMC process model is both understood and its tenets practiced by practitioners at all sizes and levels of institution. In addition, because IMC is criticized as theoretically weak, this study demonstrates the multi-dimensional construct of IMC can be examined through a source–message–receiver lens, thereby contributing the basic underpinning of much communication theory as a possible core for studying the process model. The study collected and analyzed descriptive data regarding the function of institutional advancement within US institutions of higher education and its practitioners. Practitioners representing baccalaureate institutions agreed most to the IMC dimensions of differentiated communications and database-centered communications. Practitioners representing doctoral institutions had the highest agreement on the dimension of unified communications and those representing master's institutions had the most agreement on the relationship-fostering dimension. *Summary statement:* US baccalaureate to doctoral institutions' advancement practitioners' survey responses demonstrated an understanding of the best practice concepts inherent in the IMC model. It seems that

Correspondence: Sharee LeBlanc Broussard
Department of Communication Arts, Spring Hill College,
4000 Dauphin St, Mobile Alabama 36608, USA
E-mail: sbroussard@shc.edu

An adaptation of the 2009 University of Southern
Mississippi Dissertation and 2010 CASE Alice L. Beeman
Award Winner for Best Marketing-Communication
Dissertation prepared upon request for the International
Journal of Educational Advancement by Sharee LeBlanc
Broussard

more than 50 years of at least one professional development organization educating its members about best practices stemming from many disciplines, including advertising, marketing and public relations, overlapping with more than 20 years of various industries' trade publications espousing the benefits of IMC, have led to great interest at the practitioner level, the level where individuals focus on outputs and processes. However, the criticisms of IMC at the academic level are all too valid – there is no definitive definition nor is there a definitive measure, especially one that can easily be adapted to fit all types of industries and practitioners that may benefit from incorporating the process model. That IMC as a monolithic concept is difficult to examine is not in question. Still, the secondary and primary research in this study seems to indicate that both practitioners and scholars should continue current efforts.

International Journal of Educational Advancement (2011) 10, 139–162.
doi:10.1057/ijea.2011.1

Keywords: IMC; advancement; marketing-communication; higher ed; source-message-receiver; colleges & universities

INTRODUCTION

Though integrated marketing communication (IMC) should seem to represent a common sense approach to marketing communication activity, integration in theory is much easier than integration in practice. This study attempted to determine which types of institution and practitioner are more likely to respond positively to the various components within the model. It is of interest to university practitioners, because IMC has been much discussed in institutional advancement communities of practice for decades, yet some practitioners and institutions still do not practice in the holistic manner suggested by the literature. This study contributes to the body of knowledge by using the base of much communication theory, source–message–receiver (S–M–R), as a fundamental underpinning of the IMC process model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher education is complex and competitive. According to the US

Department of Education (2008), there are more than 8000 accredited colleges or universities in the United States as certified by the six regional accrediting organizations: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Western Association of Colleges and Schools, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges and Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. This number includes all postsecondary schools whose students are eligible for federal financial aid. It includes multiple types of institutions, from for-profit career-training schools to specialized schools like legal and medical. There are 4391 Carnegie-classified institutions of higher education in the broad categories of Associate's Colleges, Baccalaureate Colleges, Doctorate-granting Universities, Master's Colleges or Universities and Special Focus Institutions. These institutions have a combined enrollment of more than

17.5 million students (Carnegie Classifications data file, 2009).

Higher education in the United States is big business. Trade associations, such as the Big Six (American Council on Education, American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Association of American Universities, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities) represent large numbers of very different types of institutions. More than 2.7 million people were employed by colleges, universities and professional schools in 2007 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). Expenditures of postsecondary educational institutions in 2006–2007 were US\$373 billion or about 3 percent of the US gross domestic product (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007a,b). Hundreds of millions of dollars in each annual federal budget are directed toward baccalaureate to doctoral degree granting colleges and universities beyond the Department of Education's regular spending (US Department of Education, 2008). Similarly, though state funding has not kept pace with federal funding, states are supportive of higher education initiatives. The bottom line is that external funding of all sorts is a necessity because tuition revenue simply cannot support all activities of institutions of higher education. Therefore, at the most fundamental level, from endowments to annual giving to data to relationships, institutions of higher education rely on the resource-cultivating work of those who

perform the institutional advancement function.

Some in the field refer to advancement as a three-legged stool consisting of alumni relations (friendraising), marketing-communications (MarCom) and development (fundraising). Depending upon how individual institutions define the function, it may also include: advancement services (usually database support), government affairs/lobbying, community relations, the institution's Foundation and other offices.

Institutional Advancement is not a new phenomenon. It has been practiced for centuries to promote institutions and acquire resources. For example, the first known US higher education fundraising campaign, featuring both personal selling and supporting materials, is credited to Harvard when it embarked upon its 'begging mission' to England in 1641 and subsequently printed *New England's First Fruits*, a brochure for the campaign in 1643 (Cutlip, 1997, p. 17). What's more, trade associations for higher education practitioners began to appear in the first quarter of the twentieth century as organizations for those engaged in alumni relations and public relations emerged about the same time (CASE, 2004). The university functions of alumni relations, fundraising and public relations began to come together under the umbrella of Institutional Advancement in the 1950s. According to Buchanan, 'the signal event in the advancement profession' occurred in 1958. The Greenbrier Conference report 'recommended that the various functions and activities performed in the academy to develop understanding and support from all constituencies

should be directed and coordinated by a senior administrative officer reporting to the campus chief executive' (2000, p. 6).

Institutional advancement as IMC

The term IMC was popularized by Schultz *et al*, in the late 1980s and became a buzzword in business and industry in the 1990s. A generally cited definition of IMC is

A concept of marketing communications planning that represents the added value of a comprehensive plan that evaluates the strategic roles of a variety of communications disciplines – general advertising, direct response, sales promotion and public relations and combines these disciplines to provide clarity, consistency and maximum communication impact. (Caywood, 1997, p. xiv)

By the mid- to late 1990s, university administrators were using the term IMC with great frequency and still do. In the third *Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, Buchanan compared an earlier definition of advancement to a definition of IMC and states unequivocally: 'Ironically, these definitions of different fields, developed more than a decade apart, sound similar. This leads me to believe that our field of advancement is evolving into what we call today integrated marketing' (2000, p. 67). Edmiston (2007) found IMC is practiced in higher education. What's more, whether the IMC process model is followed seems to impact the institutions of higher education. Horrigan (2007), using a case study approach, found one institution

adopted IMC and was able to improve its *US News and World Report* ranking over a 5-year period. Hobson (2008) surveyed 237 community colleges and found that those practicing IMC were more likely to improve their enrollment than those who do not, excluding negative external variables.

Growing together

The fundamental core of communication (S–M–R) and fundamental principles of marketing (Segmenting–Targeting–Positioning) seem to have grown together into the concept of IMC, which essentially comprises best practices from the disciplines of advertising, marketing and public relations. Though it can be argued that advertising and public relations are some of the tools used to fulfill the marketing tenet of promotion, each is its own function, has its own activities and is an academic discipline.

As supported by the literature existing in the various disciplines, including work by Kotler and Keller (2006) and Caywood (1997), Harris (1998), Hutton and Mulhern (2002), Belch and Belch (2005) and others, advertising, marketing and public relations draw upon persuasion and frequently use the same tactical elements, but each has its own core or essence: Advertising: creative/persuasive message delivery. Marketing: exchange/value. Public relations: media relations/crisis communication. Narrowing the complex, relationship-building functions of advertising, marketing and public relations to this degree is obviously an oversimplification, but doing so illustrates that an IMC approach is where the functions of all three intersect (Figure 1). Figure 1 is a graphic created by the researcher to

Figure 1: IMC as the intersection of advertising, marketing and public relations.

illustrate how advertising, marketing and public relations are growing together into IMC. The size and placement of the advertising triangle in the graphic illustrates that advertising is used more for marketing purposes than it is for public relations purposes – though many organizations undertake institutional/image advertising. In short, marketing will occur with or without public relations and advertising efforts; what's more, public relations can exist outside the marketing realm. As Cutlip, Center, and Broom explain, marketing is a line function, which consists of 'profit – and product-producing functions' and public relations is a staff function that exists to 'advise and assist line functions' (2006, p. 58).

IMC represents the evolution of what those, who envisioned two-way communication between an organization and its various stakeholders as the norm, were able to accomplish with technological enhancement. Interestingly, many of the principles and best practices associated with IMC were espoused by its various disciplines in the decades

preceding the term's adoption. For example, Edward Bernays distinguished strategic public relations from more tactical publicity in the early part of the twentieth century with descriptions of practitioners ranging from technician to counselor – a high-level function, not dissimilar to the institutional advancement senior manager position advocated by the Greenbrier Report. In advertising, greats such as Bill Bernbach rose to prominence by advocating the use of teams made up of people with varied individual strengths (Sivulka, 1998). In the 1970s, Bartels traced the history of marketing thought and placed emphasis on the essence of marketing as the *combination* of factors that were involved in sales and promotional activities (Hermans, 2007). Not only have the disciplines of advertising, marketing and public relations recognized the value of assuming best practices of each, they have similarly recognized high-level practice from low-level practice, placed emphasis on planning, strong leadership, participation in organizational decision making, strategic rather than tactical

practice, proactivity rather than reactivity and two-way rather than one-way communication.

While interdisciplinary encroachment is a concern academically: advertising into PR through brand-building activities, PR into marketing with marketing public relations and marketing into PR through holistic marketing and customer relationship initiatives, the movement is not new. Small to mid-size organizations with limited staffs have traditionally practiced this way out of necessity. What's more, throughout history, combined approaches using all existing media have been effective at generating results. Cutlip (1997) explains how Samuel Adams and other revolutionaries mastered the art of integration and proved six truths about effective communication: (a) the necessity of organization for the implementation of a campaign, (b) symbols are easily recognizable and arouse emotions, (c) slogans compress complex issues so they are easy to remember, (d) staged events catch public attention and crystallize public opinion, (e) the importance of getting your story to the public first so your interpretation of events is the generally accepted one and (f) the necessity of a sustained, saturation campaign using all available media.

Effectiveness in MarCom activities is important for organizational success; particularly in today's increased competitive environment and among increasingly media-savvy prospects. Institutions of higher education are not exempt from competition for students, funding and other resources. There is pressure to make lists, such as *US News and World Report*, *Forbes* and other college rankings, to offer

increasingly generous scholarships to high-achieving students, to woo and win high-dollar donors, to earn state and federal funding and much more. Uncoordinated, disjointed MarCom activity will simply not yield the resources necessary to keep colleges and universities afloat in the twenty-first century.

IMC within institutional advancement then is a blend of advertising focus on message strategy and delivery mixed with marketing focus on segmentation, targeting, positioning intertwined with the public relations processes which directly relate to institutional advancement as described by Kelly's (1998) five-step public relations process for nonprofits: research, objectives, program, evaluation and stewardship.

S-M-R in IMC

This expanded definition of IMC was developed by Northwestern University and underscores the relevance of S-M-R to IMC:

Integrated marketing communications is the process of developing and implementing various forms of persuasive communication programs with customers and prospects over time. The goal of IMC is to influence or directly affect the behavior of the selected communications audience. IMC considers all sources of brand or company contacts that a customer or prospect has with the product or service as potential delivery channels for future messages. Further, IMC makes use of all forms of communication which are relevant to the customers

and prospects, and to which they might be receptive. In sum, the IMC process starts with the customer or prospect and then works back to determine and define the forms and methods through which persuasive communication programs should be developed. (Percy, 1997, p. 2)

This definition is perhaps too long for general use, but it underscores that IMC is communication-based as does work by Duncan and Moriarity (1998). Therefore, it is possible to examine it through an S–M–R lens and break its previously identified components into either source, message or receiver.

S–M–R in IMC is shown below in Table 1, which represents a summary and adaptation of the various stages, dimensions and constructs from the IMC literature (see for example works by Caywood (1997), Kitchen and Schultz (2003), Sirgy and Rahtz (2007), Lee and Park (2007), American

Quality and Productivity Center (APQC), 1998 (in Schultz and Schultz, 2004), Nowak and Phelps (1994), Phelps and Johnson (1996), Duncan and Moriarity (1998), Kliatchko (2005), Reid (2005) and others).

Practitioners who incorporate the best practice tenets of the IMC process model should plan for and practice coordinated encoding on behalf of the source (S); plan, implement and appropriately distribute message content (M); and actively solicit feedback from receivers of the messages (R) through multiple channels using technological support such as databases and interactivity for two-way communication. This corresponds to the hierarchical stages of IMC established by the APQC, thought leaders and other sources, including Lee and Park (2007), whose 18-item scale examines the four IMC dimensions of:

1. unified communications for consistent message and image (SOURCE);

Table 1: S-M-R in IMC

<i>Stages</i>		<i>Dimensions</i>
Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness/need for integration • Image integration • Coordinated tactical efforts • Financial integration • Integration on the Tactical/strategic/mission/organization/education and training/interpersonal levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unified communications • Consistency (one voice) • Coordination • Organizational infrastructure • Cross-functional strategic planning (planning/evaluation)
Message	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functional integration • Stakeholder integration • Redefinition of the scope of marketing • Integration on theoretical/process levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results-driven • Differentiated communications • Mission marketing • Targeted message • Channel-centered
Receiver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer-based integration • Relationship management • Application of technology • Integration on the consumer level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Database-centered and relationship fostering communications • Increased responsiveness

2. differentiated communications to multiple customer groups (MESSAGE);
3. database-centered communications for tangible results, and;
4. relationship fostering communications with existing customers (RECEIVER).

While controlling all controllable contacts/touchpoints is important and should be a practitioner's goal, the IMC tenet of a shift in locus of control from the source's to the receiver's communication needs is important because it underscores the shift away from mass marketing and mass communication to the individual (see for example Schultz *et al*, 1994). 'It is critical at this juncture that ... organizations accept the cultural change and transfer of power. This is the era of the individual and even the wealthiest and most successful marketers must negotiate unusual waters' (Shiffman, 2008, p. 137).

Note that the best practice information in IMC literature is echoed and duplicated in advancement literature – see for example, the second and third *Handbooks of Institutional Advancement* edited by Rowland (1986) and Buchanan (2000), respectively, as well as works by Warwick (2000), Lippincott (2006, 2009) and Burdenski (2003). In institutional advancement, the SOURCE is the staff, volunteers and others working to fulfill alumni relations, MarCom, development and other advancement functions through the consistent application of strategy. The MESSAGE, though created by multiple individuals representing different departments or functions within the institution, should be clear

and targeted to the constituency with whom the institution is communicating (alumni, current or prospective students, parents, friends, elected officials, media, donors, community and so on) and it should be delivered through multiple channels (print, broadcast, Web, social media, events and so on) to the RECEIVERS who provide feedback to the institution (face-to-face, online, mailed response vehicles, donations, event attendance, commentary, membership, volunteering and so on) in order to advance the enterprise.

METHODOLOGY

A sample of 10 percent of the 1713 Carnegie-classified baccalaureate to doctoral institutions was drawn by selecting every tenth institution from a random start point within the Carnegie data file (Carnegie Foundation, 2009). Each of these institutions was found on the Internet and their websites were combed for organizational charts and/or the names and email addresses of the directors of alumni relations, MarCom and development or similarly titled individuals. If no personnel data could be collected from an institution's site, it was skipped and the next institution on the Carnegie data file was used. Data was collected with a 37-question survey distributed via e-mail and administered using the SurveyMonkey™ electronic data collection tool. The instrument was arranged in seven electronic pages and used a combination of scrolling and paging. It contained the adapted 18-item Lee and Park scale as well as other questions that attempted to ascertain organizational complexity, practitioner engagement in professional

development/comparative activity and commonly collected success data.

RESULTS

Q-Sort is a qualitative method for determining construct validity. Two IMC experts and a marketing expert were asked to sort the Lee and Park IMC scale. Though all the Q-Sort judges accepted the adapted 18-item Lee and Park scale, repurposing an existing four-dimension scale (1: unified communications for consistent message and image, 2: differentiated communications for multiple consumer groups, 3: database-centered communications for tangible results and 4: relationship fostering communications with existing customers) into three new categories (Source: coordinated encoding, Message: targeted messaging and Receiver: feedback loop between source and receiver) generated less inter-judge agreement than was anticipated. Though a Q-Sort seeks high inter-judge agreement among two judges, it is noteworthy that the two IMC expert judges agreed with the researcher on S–M–R question sorting for 12 of the 18 items (Q#2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16) or 67 percent simple agreement between three people. The highest percentage of agreement regarding sorting the questions into S–M–R was between the two IMC expert judges whose simple percent agreement was 78 percent (14 of 18 questions). Two-thirds of the questions were correctly repurposed to the three S–M–R constructs by the two IMC expert judges, indicating support for a basic communication underpinning for the complex IMC process model. As Nahm *et al* (2002)

explain, when using Q-Sort, researchers should examine how many items were placed by the judges into the target constructs with the overall frequency of agreement measured using Cohen's κ .

$$\text{Cohen's } \kappa = \frac{PA_0 - PA_E}{1 - PA_E}$$

Where $PA_E = (1/n^2)(\sum pm_i)$, n is the number of units coded in common by coders and pm_i is the each product of marginals.

$$\begin{aligned} PA_E &= (1/n^2)(\sum pm_i) \\ &= (1/18^2)(20 + 42 + 49) \\ &= (1/324)(111) \\ &= 0.34 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cohen's } \kappa &= \frac{PA_0 - PA_E}{1 - PA_E} \\ &= \frac{0.78 - 0.34}{1 - 0.34} \\ &= \frac{0.44}{0.56} = 0.67 \end{aligned}$$

'Scales based on categories which have a high degree of correct placement of items within them can be considered to have a high degree of construct validity with a high potential for good reliability scores' (Nahm *et al*, 2002, p. 3). They caution against use of constructs with inter-judge agreements below 60 percent. At 67 percent, agreement is not high, but it is not unacceptable, indicating moderate support for repurposing a four-dimension IMC scale into a three-dimension scale.

The adapted Lee and Park IMC scale, as a whole, demonstrated internal consistency reliability as a measure of the constructs comprising the IMC process model with an α coefficient of 0.899 for the 18 items. Hair *et al* (2003) state that an α coefficient of 0.7–<0.8 is good, 0.8–<0.9 is very good and an α of 0.9 is excellent. When the constructs within the scale are examined individually, less internal consistency reliability is exhibited, yet the α coefficients are still within the acceptable range, again indicating support for an S–M–R underpinning for the IMC model. The five questions the researcher labeled SOURCE and which Lee and Park define as measuring *unified communications for consistent message and image* yielded an α coefficient of 0.79. The five questions the researcher labeled MESSAGE and Lee and Park define as measuring *differentiated communications for multiple customer groups* reached an α of 0.75. The eight questions the researcher labeled RECEIVER and Lee and Park define as *database-centered communications for tangible results and relationship fostering communications with existing customers* together earned an α coefficient of 0.80. Interestingly, the final two dimensions of the Lee and Park scale had lower α coefficients when examined separately: *database-centered communications for tangible results* was 0.635 and *relationship fostering communications with existing customers* was 0.70. It is important to note that Lee and Park reference the ‘overall measure used as a dependent variable’ in their 2007 article (p. 231).

Offering more basic support to the research question of whether IMC is

practiced in institutional advancement as found by both Edmiston and Hobson, practitioners either agreed or strongly agreed with 17 of the 18 questions comprising Lee and Park’s IMC scale as majority responses. Only one question (Q5: My institution sees to it that the information generated in the course of marketing-communication activities is compiled) received majority neutral responses from the advancement practitioners with 61 (38 percent). Practitioners did not disagree to scale items very frequently as indicated above. The highest percentage of strongly disagree response was to question Q7 (visual consistency) at 3.1 percent. Table 2 provides the means and standard deviations generated by advancement practitioners for each of the 18 items in Lee and Park’s IMC scale. The means are generally low on the 18-item scale, which indicates a high propensity for practitioners to report they understand and use the IMC model within the advancement function because the scale was arranged with 1 as strongly agree and 5 as strongly disagree.

Note that across the 18-item scale, the average frequency of negative response was 18 and 110 for positive response. For the unified communications dimension assessed by questions 4, 7, 10, 12, 13 – the average frequency of negative response was 17 with 115 for positive response. For the five questions representing differing communications, 3, 14, 11, 16, 17, the average frequency of negative response was 19 with 104 for positive response. Average frequencies of response were similar for the final two dimensions: (Q 1, 5, 8, 18) database-centered communications,

Table 2: Responses to 18-item IMC scale

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q1: Collected info/unified database	2.33	1.14
Q2: Flow of resources – solid relationships	2.08	0.87
Q3: MarCom strategy differentiates	1.82	0.96
Q4: Message consistently delivered	2.30	0.98
Q5: Information is compiled	2.61	0.96
Q6: Maintaining relationships – important as recruiting	1.99	0.93
Q7: Visual consistency	2.04	1.01
Q8: Follows up MarCom responses	2.34	0.96
Q9: MarCom activity – strengthen relationships	1.93	0.85
Q10: Linguistic consistency	2.24	0.95
Q11: Single-multiple brand images	2.15	1.02
Q12: Goal – consistent brand image	1.65	0.88
Q13: Maintains consistency – long term	2.33	1.05
Q14: Targets multiple groups	2.38	0.97
Q15: Generate resources – existing constituencies	2.45	0.94
Q16: MarCom strategy – stages decision-making process	2.41	0.96
Q17: MarCom tools – each stage of decision-making process	2.51	0.98
Q18: MarCom designed to induce action	1.94	0.88

Note: Scale=strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

22 negative, 104 positive, and relationship fostering communications (Q2, 6, 9, 15) with an average of 12 negative and 115 positive responses.

General descriptive information

This study succeeded in collecting data from advancement practitioners representing colleges and universities throughout the United States (Table 3) as 154 respondents identified their regional accrediting body. Though the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools yielded the most respondents (35 percent), each of the six regional accrediting bodies were represented, in descending order of frequency: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Western Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges and Northwest

Table 3: Respondents by regional accrediting body

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Middle States ACS	24	14.5
New England ASC	12	7.3
North Central ACS	39	23.6
Northwest CCU	4	2.4
Southern ACS	57	34.5
Western ACS	18	10.9

Commission on Colleges and Universities.

Every level of Carnegie Classification was represented (Table 4) among the practitioners who identified their classification. Institutions at the Master's level were represented most at 70 or 42 percent (10-larger, 30-medium, 30-smaller) with 26 percent of the respondents or 42 each representing doctoral (13-very high research, 10-high research,

Table 4: Respondents by primary Carnegie Classification levels

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Doctoral	42	25.5
Master's	70	42.4
Baccalaureate	42	25.5

19-doctoral/research) and baccalaureate (32-arts and sciences, 8-diverse, 2-associate) institutions. Eleven respondents (6 percent) did not self-identify by Carnegie Classification level. Baccalaureate/arts and sciences was the most frequently selected category (mode) at 19.4 percent (32). The percentages of respondents did not match the actual stratification which exists within the Carnegie Classifications Data File as the largest pool of potential respondents (baccalaureate) was under-represented.

For analysis, Carnegie classifications were grouped by the three main levels: doctoral, master's and baccalaureate (Table 4).

Practitioners representing every type and size of institution responded to the survey with 160 identifying the size of their institution as measured by student enrollment. The majority of institutions represented in this study, 57 percent, self-reported student enrollment of less than 6000 students and most of those respondents, 23 percent, indicated they represented schools with less than 2000 students. Nineteen percent of respondents identified themselves as practitioners representing colleges and universities with enrollments between 6000 and 19999. Finally, 14 percent of the respondents indicated they represented institutions with enrollments above 20000 students with 11 (7 percent) of

those reporting enrollments of more than 30000 students. Institutions with enrollments between 18000 and 20000 were the least represented in this study at only 0.6 percent. The most frequently selected number (mode) of students was 'Less than 2000'. Respondents also represented a good mix of both private (57 percent) and public (38 percent) institutions as well.

Of the 118 practitioners who identified their department, most, 48 (29 percent), represented the alumni relations function of advancement, followed by development at 39 (24 percent) and MarCom at 13 (8 percent). Ten respondents indicated they represented Advancement Services, five represented their institution's Foundation and four indicated they were in the President's Office. Interestingly, 53 respondents selected the 'other' option and entered a department title, an action that supports the assertion of tremendous variability within institutions of higher education. Most of the responses provided were advancement (18) and several (9) listed dual function departments, such as alumni/development or communications/media relations. Some departmental titles were somewhat unexpected, such as leadership relations or church relations and two respondents provided their department title as Stewardship.

Most of the respondents, 48 percent, had 10 years or less in institutional advancement. Practitioners' reported years in advancement, were in descending order: less than 5 years (26 percent), 6–10 years (21 percent), 21–25 years (14 percent), 16–20 years (13 percent), 11–15 years (12 percent),

26–30 years (10 percent) and more than 30 years (1 percent).

The most frequently reported title among the 126 respondents who answered this question was director at 35 percent followed by VP at 30 percent and then executive director at 10 percent. Associate and assistant director combined were only 6 percent, indicating the respondents represented the desired level because the sample sought senior managers and those responsible for each leg of the three-legged stool (alumni, development, MarCom).

Of course, due to the variable nature of higher education, respondents provided 29 other titles including 18 with some version of vice president or vice chancellor (that is, assistant, associate, senior VP or VC) and two with dual-title positions such as VP and executive director, which is not uncommon in institutions of higher education. Three of the respondents indicated their titles to be president and each indicated they were, in fact, in the president's office at private institutions with less than 4000 students. Note that if an institution's president was solicited for participation in this study, it was because the organizational chart posted on the institution's website indicated that he or she was responsible for acting as the senior manager for the advancement function. This lends some support to the expectation that executive officers at smaller schools personally oversee multiple functions.

Organizational complexity

Complexity can be defined in many ways, internally, externally or in combination. This study sought internal information such as

advancement unit size as well as horizontal, vertical, spatial and functional complexity. Regarding unit size, of the 163 practitioners who responded, overwhelmingly, 42 percent (70), expressed there were more than 20 people responsible for the advancement function within their institutions. This finding is interesting because most respondents represent smaller, private, master's level institutions. Also, respondents representing units of less than 10 and between 11 and 20 people were almost 29 and 28 percent, respectively.

In describing horizontal complexity, the 160 practitioners who responded said most often (27 percent) that there were three departments within their advancement unit. The larger numbers of departments were each selected as descriptors quite frequently by the advancement practitioners: four (18 percent), five (15 percent) and six or more (18 percent). One (7 percent) or two (13 percent) departments within the unit received the least responses.

Vertical complexity was assessed by asking how many reporting levels there were from CEO to staff responsible for implementation within the unit and secured 162 respondents. The most frequent response was three levels (CEO → VP → Director → staff) at 38 percent (62). The second most frequent response was two levels (CEO → VP → staff responsible) at 22 percent (37). One level, CEO → staff, was selected least at 3.6 percent (6) and more than five levels, CEO → VP → Director → Associate → Assistant Director → staff was second least with 7.4 percent (12).

The questionnaire also assessed spatial complexity as 162 practitioners

indicated spatial arrangement of their unit. Almost all respondents 91 percent (150) indicated their workspace was either all in one building (49 percent) or in multiple buildings on the same campus (42 percent). Only 12 respondents (7 percent) indicated the advancement function for their institution was physically housed in multiple buildings on multiple campuses.

Practitioners were asked how many advancement functions their own departments perform and were given the examples of alumni relations, communication and fundraising and 161 responded. A full 50 percent indicated their departments perform four or more advancement functions. An additional 29 percent reported their departments perform three or more advancement functions. Only 7 percent of respondents (11) stated one advancement function was performed within their department.

Interestingly, crosstabulations indicate that advancement practitioners at institutions with student enrollments of less than 6000 perform the most varied functions with 49 indicating they perform four or more functions and 30 indicating they perform three

functions, lending some credence to the anecdotal assumption that practitioners at smaller schools are more generalized in their activity. To provide further information on the type of work performed, practitioners were asked to indicate which constituencies their department interacted with regularly (Figure 2).

As anticipated, because of the nature of the work and the propensity for the advancement structure to mirror the IMC model, there was an overlap in constituency interaction. In descending order, respondents selected each of the following: alumni 159 (96 percent), faculty/staff 148 (90 percent), donors 147 (89 percent), students and volunteers were both selected by 129 respondents (78 percent), parents 107 (65 percent), other funders – for example, grantmakers 92 (56 percent) and elected officials 76 (46 percent). Sixteen respondents offered additional constituencies, such as board of trustees, friends of the institution, community, business leaders, prospective students and state system. Multiple constituency selection and the number and variety of ‘Other’ responses help to underscore the boundary-spanning role of advancement practitioners in general.

Figure 2: Functional complexity (constituencies with whom practitioners interact).

Practitioner engagement

One indicator of practitioner engagement in professional development and comparative activity is their participation in communities of practice. According to Wenger (2004) these are groups that have their own domain, interact and develop relationships that help them address problems and share knowledge. These also include a body of knowledge, methods, tools, stories and so on that help define the practice. The study sought to determine which professional development organizations advancement practitioners join (Figure 3). The assumption is that holding membership in a professional development organization increases the likelihood that a practitioner will be engaged in the profession and in comparative activity. Not surprisingly, the majority of practitioners 131 (80 percent) indicated they were members of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and 43 (26 percent) indicated they were members of the Association of Fundraising Professionals. Fourteen respondents (9 percent) indicated they were members of the Public Relations

Society of America and 11 (7 percent) said they were members of some other PR Universal Accreditation Board member organization. Eight respondents indicated they held membership in the American Marketing Association (5 percent) and four respondents selected the Association of Prospect Researchers for Advancement (2 percent). Only two respondents indicated they were members of the American Advertising Federation. Interestingly, 30 respondents typed in one or more other organizations in which they hold memberships, most notably: Partnership for Philanthropic Planning (6), Religiously affiliated groups such as the Baptist Communicators Association (6), Council of Alumni Association Executives (4), Association of Governing Boards (2), other marketing organizations (3), other state/local/college public relations groups (4).

Another indicator of engagement in professional development and comparative activity via participation in communities of practice is how active the practitioners are within the group(s) to which they hold membership(s). All professional

Figure 3: Memberships in professional development organizations.

development organizations listed as a choice on the questionnaire and most of the ones typed in by respondents host conferences or other training opportunities, publish magazines or newsletters, host award competitions and other activities that could enhance knowledge distribution via the community of practice and allow for comparative activity.

The practitioners who responded appear to be engaged with their community of practice because they participate in their professional development organization(s) in some way. Most of the respondents 143 (87 percent) indicated they read publications of their professional development organization. Similarly, 73 percent (121) respondents reported they attend conferences of their professional development organization. Fewer practitioners reported participation in leadership roles: 21 percent (35) participate in conference planning and 10 percent (18) serve as an officer. The knowledge sharing within communities of practice was demonstrated as 44 of the respondents (27 percent) stated they mentor newer advancement professionals. However, as anticipated, very few practitioners, only five (3 percent), indicated they contribute to the body of knowledge within their industry by writing for their professional development organization's publications. Only 8 (5 percent) of the respondents said they do none of these. In browsing these practitioners' responses, it was found that three who reported 'None of these' also reported holding no membership a professional development organization.

The second 5-point scale in the instrument assessed engagement in

Table 5: Participation in comparative activity

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Regularly review industry information	1.81	0.66
Incorporate industry information	1.67	0.59
Compare programs	1.84	0.71
Compare policies	2.23	0.82

Note: Scale=strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

comparative activity (Table 5). Eighty-nine percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (142) that they regularly review 'best practice' industry information. Similarly, 94 percent either agreed or strongly agreed (149) that they attempt to incorporate 'best practice' industry information into their work. Eighty-five percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (136) that they actively compare their institutions' programs to other similar institutions' programs and a majority 62 percent (99) indicated they actively compared their institutions' policies to other similar institutions' policies. This question had the most neutral responses in the scale with 54 (38 percent). The α coefficient for this scale was 0.724, which is an acceptable indication of internal consistency reliability. Again, means and standard deviations indicate high agreement to participation in comparative activity.

Additional indicators of practitioner engagement in professional development are accreditation and highest degree held. Only three of 165 respondents indicated they hold accreditation in public relations. Nine respondents indicated they hold the Certified Fund Raising Executive designation. Only one person indicated

that he or she was a Certified Meeting Planner. Certifications/accreditations expressed through the Other option in the instrument were: one Chartered Adviser in Philanthropy designation via the International Association of Advisors in Philanthropy, one Certified in Management of Nonprofit Organizations and one practitioner indicated that he or she was NIMS certified (National Incident Management System) through the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The most frequently held degree level among the 160 respondents who identified their highest degree earned was master's level 44 percent (73), which should indicate some degree of personal engagement in professional development as master's degrees are typically considered professional degrees. This is appropriate and expected among professional staff in higher education. The next most common degree held was baccalaureate 38 percent (63). Three practitioners indicated they held a law degree, five indicated they held an EdD and 15 practitioners (9 percent) hold PhDs.

Success data

Figure 4 illustrates practitioners' responses regarding commonly collected success data. Note that some respondents did not report success data. In addition to responding to the IMC scale affirmatively, respondents generally indicated their institutions' success variables: enrollment, event attendance, good addresses, number of donors, number of gifts, number of members and number of volunteers had increased over the five years preceding the study.

The range of respondents for success indicators was between 157 and 165 practitioners. One hundred eighteen practitioners who responded to the survey overwhelmingly indicated enrollment at their institutions has increased (72 percent) and 33 indicated it has remained about the same (20 percent) over the preceding five years. Only eight of the 158 (5 percent) respondents indicated enrollment at their institution has declined. Most practitioners indicated that attendance at special events has increased (96 responses or 58 percent) or remained about the same (60 responses or 36 percent). Only three of the respondents (2 percent) indicated attendance at

Figure 4: Practitioners' reported success data.

events has declined. The variable 'number of donors' received eight non-responses, however, 92 (56 percent) indicated an increase, 49 (30 percent) indicated remained about the same and 16 (10 percent) indicated a decrease. Similarly, seven respondents did not supply information on number of gifts, though 104 (76 percent) reported an increase, 46 (18 percent) indicated these have remained about the same and eight (2 percent) indicated a decrease. One hundred twenty five respondents (76 percent) indicated that the number of good addresses has increased at their institution and 30 (18 percent) reported it has remained about the same. Only three (2 percent) reported a decrease. The greatest number of non-responses was for the variable requesting data on number of members with 19 practitioners declining to provide data; however, 102 respondents (62 percent) indicated an increase, 40 respondents (24 percent) indicated remained about the same and only four respondents (2 percent) indicating a decrease. Finally, number of volunteers received eight non-responses and 81 respondents (49 percent) indicated an increase, 75 respondents (46 percent) indicated remained about the same and only one respondent (0.6 percent) reported a decrease.

Research questions and results

This study began with two informal research questions: *Is IMC practiced in US Institutional Advancement?* and *Can IMC metrics be examined through a source-message-receiver lens?* Through primary and secondary research, these were answered positively and yielded four formal research questions which were analyzed as four constructs rather than

three (S-M-R) to preserve the integrity of the Lee and Park scale. This study was a completely exploratory effort which sought to determine if organizational complexity and practitioner engagement in professional development and comparative activity increased the propensity of practitioners to follow the IMC model and whether that led to increases in commonly collected success data. While results seem to indicate this may be the case, statistically significant correlations could not be detected between the potential moderators, the model and success indicators. Only RQ 1 is reported below because of space considerations.

RQ1: Which carnegie classifications of institution are more likely to have lower mean scores (higher agreement) on the dimensions of the IMC model?

Doctoral institutions have the highest agreement to the five-question Lee and Park construct of unified communications for consistent message and image ($M=2.07$, $SD=0.60$). Master's institutions have the highest agreement on the four-question Lee and Park 4-item relationship fostering communications with existing consumers construct ($M=2.27$, $SD=0.70$). Baccalaureate institutions have the highest agreement on both the five-question differentiated communications for multiple customer groups construct ($M=2.21$, $SD=0.65$) and on the construct of database-centered communications for tangible results ($M=2.01$, $SD=0.69$) indicating a slight propensity of practitioners at that level to agree more to the items in the IMC scale (Table 6).

Table 6: Carnegie classifications & IMC factors

		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Unified communications for consistent message and image (SOURCE)	Doctoral	2.07	0.60
	Master's	2.13	0.79
	Baccalaureate	2.13	0.68
	Total	2.11	0.71
Differentiated communications for multiple groups (MESSAGE)	Doctoral	2.25	0.69
	Master's	2.29	0.70
	Baccalaureate	2.21	0.65
	Total	2.25	0.68
Databased-centered communications for tangible results (RECEIVER)	Doctoral	2.18	0.64
	Master's	2.16	0.65
	Baccalaureate	2.01	0.69
	Total	2.13	0.66
Relationship fostering communications with existing customers (RECEIVER)	Doctoral	2.37	0.66
	Master's	2.27	0.69
	Baccalaureate	2.31	0.71
	Total	2.31	0.68

Note: Scale=strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

This study did not find statistical significance between the three primary Carnegie Classification levels and mean scores for the four Lee and Park IMC factors $F(8, 298) = 0.623$, $P = 0.758$. The means for all three Carnegie Classification levels indicated high levels of agreement, based upon the scale 1: Strongly Agree to 5: Strongly Disagree, and standard deviations in responses were below 1 on every measure tested here, indicating there is little variance in responses among the three groups indicating support for Edmiston's finding of no difference in IMC orientation by Carnegie Classification levels in her 2007 study. It seems likely that the null hypothesis of no difference is supported.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The IMC process model represents the disciplines of advertising, marketing and public relations growing together

through the cross-pollination of best practices from each (as well as other fields) into one comprehensive framework. Primary tenets of IMC are that it is inherent to the organization; a senior manager who participates in the dominant coalition of the organization should have oversight of the function; close communication between all individuals who gather and use information to plan, execute and evaluate their MarCom activities is necessary; messages should be strategic and targeted; relationships should be built with multiple constituencies; multiple data sources and feedback channels should be cultivated and success should be measured. Institutional advancement demonstrates all of these. These best practices are easy to express and difficult to practice, particularly because so many highly educated professionals are responsible for the resource-building functions necessary in higher

education's competitive environment (mode = 20 or more per institution).

There is no one-size-fits-all way to practice IMC and as a result, there is both great commonality and great variability. The commonality exists in the similar notions of what constitutes a good MarCom program. The variability exists within both the organizations and the individuals. Gould's notion of a multi-term, multi-meaning view of IMC (2004) may be the best way to explain its existence, particularly within the institutional advancement function of US baccalaureate to doctoral institutions.

IMC studies are frequently designed to determine who is practicing, who leads the effort and whether they understand the principles of coordination, strategy, message and relationships that are inherent to the model. This exploratory study examined both institutional- and practitioner-specific variables to assess whether there might be relationships between these variables and the tenets espoused by the IMC model. Both can be examined in many ways. Regarding institutions, from the organizational sciences, metrics for complexity, often considered an extension of systems research, can include size, scope, task, structure, spatial arrangement, decision-making, control, programs, functions, environment, hierarchy and more. Regarding practitioners, from education, leadership and other literature, metrics for engagement include work-life factors, identity, personal investments in professionalism via formal and informal learning, participation in communities of practice (explained as Wenger's mutual engagement, joint enterprise, shared

repertoire or Hoadley and Kilner's, 2005 C4P model: Conversation, Connections, Content, Context and Purpose), benchmarking and other factors that must be cultivated by the individuals working together in a domain to enhance its body of knowledge – to enhance knowledge derived from practice.

Professionals generally have great interest in perfecting their crafts and IMC tends to generate much interest among professionals, less among academics. Why study a model? Examinations of models like IMC are important because the pace at which the MarCom/media landscape and audiences/publics themselves are changing necessitates an understanding of normative rules that contribute to effective practice. As Macnamara (2007) explains, there is a fork in the road between communication theory and practice and practitioners and scholars should work toward a better understanding of one another's efforts. Basic and applied research should help inform practice, not exist apart from it. Not necessarily a case for selecting better or worse, understanding a process model built from multi-discipline best practices helps everyone from teachers to researchers to practitioners have a better understanding of what works and why.

IMC research has traditionally been problematic, its weaknesses in definition and measurement are evident and it is criticized for having little theoretical core. This study demonstrates some of the difficulties in examining IMC holistically and quantitatively. It was appropriate to conduct this study at this level because as a concluding student work, it

allowed the researcher to take risks via a completely exploratory effort.

This study succeeded in securing practitioners representing every Carnegie Classification level and all six regional accrediting bodies. Most respondents indicated theirs were institutions with enrollments of less than 6000 students, but all sizes of institution were represented. All departments within institutional advancement were represented, however, most respondents were either in alumni (friendraising) or development (fundraising). Both private and public institutions were well represented. Practitioners who responded represented all ranges of years in the field and held mostly director-level titles or above. Organizationally, all sizes of advancement units were represented, though most respondents said '20 or more' people performed the function at their institution. Similarly, most respondents said their advancement unit was comprised of six or more departments. All types of hierarchical structures were represented, but most institutions indicated three hierarchical levels (CEO → VP → staff responsible). Most practitioners said their advancement function operated in one building on their campus, though other spatial arrangements were represented as well. Most practitioners said their department performs four or more advancement functions (alumni, development, MarCom, support functions like prospect research and database management). Individually, almost all respondents hold membership in at least one professional development organization and seem to be active within these organizations. Almost all expressed

they were members of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, which defines itself as a community of practice and enables sharing behavior. Most practitioners hold an advanced degree but very few held professional accreditations. Most practitioners reported five-year increases in success metrics commonly collected within the advancement function of US institutions of higher education.

Through secondary research and high agreement to the IMC scale items, it was determined that advancement practitioners understand the concept of IMC and have generally embraced the model to varying degrees. Baccalaureate institutions had the highest agreement overall (and on differing communications and relationship fostering communications). Doctoral institutions had the highest agreement on the unified communications dimension and Master's institutions had the highest agreement on database-centered communications.

The study respondents' overwhelming agreement to the items in the adapted Lee and Park scale lends quantitative support to IMC practice in institutional advancement, indicating it is an appropriate venue through which to examine IMC in action. However, variability within the field manifested itself because an average of 18 practitioners disagreed with each question on the IMC scale.

Additional support for using institutional advancement as a venue for studying IMC is the pretesting practitioners' acceptance of the questionnaire in its entirety and the interest the survey itself generated among advancement practitioners with 55 percent requesting a copy of the

results. A final measure of support for using institutional advancement as a venue in which to study IMC is the academic sophistication of the professionals responsible for the function. Ninety-three of 165 respondents hold advanced degrees. The presence of so many seems to indicate that the employees themselves possess complex, practice-based skill sets that may help them negotiate the multi-function, multi-constituent arena of institutional advancement. Academic sophistication and personal/professional growth possibly indicate that IMC studies among institutional advancement practitioners may be able to test more complex ideas and that the questions may need to be more discreet than the scale used in this study as respondents may have provided socially desirable answers to the questions in the Lee and Park IMC scale.

Because IMC metrics and IMC study have traditionally proven problematic, this study used a scale that had been repeatedly tested before it was published in the *Journal of Advertising Research* and was subsequently used by Hobson. Through qualitative Q-Sort of the IMC scale questions by experts and subsequent internal consistency reliability checks on the scale using data generated from advancement practitioners, this study has made a contribution to the body of knowledge by offering the base of much communication theory, S-M-R, as a potential lens with which to examine the IMC process model. The Q-Sort score on three factors rather than four was 0.67, demonstrating modest support. The α coefficients on the adapted Lee and Park dimensions

actually scored higher as three than as four on internal consistency reliability checks: unified communications (source) $\alpha=0.79$, differing communications (message) $\alpha=0.75$ and database-centered communications/relationship fostering communications (receiver) $\alpha=0.80$. When the final two were considered separately, α s were 0.635 and 0.70, respectively.

The number of respondents was good considering the type of data collection device used, the time of year in which data collection occurred and the type of professionals solicited for participation, but 165 responses did not allow for techniques that could have perhaps better demonstrated the proposed interaction of the variables, investigated by the research questions. The minimum number of items in each cell must generally be greater than the number of dependent variables when multivariate techniques are used (Hair *et al*, 2006) and many of the cells had minimum responses of less than 18. Where possible, data was grouped for analysis (for example nine Carnegie Classifications to three). Still, the analysis on the data generated by this study seems to indicate the null hypothesis is generally supported. However, it cannot generally be accepted or rejected via this study at this time.

REFERENCES

- APQC 1998 in Schultz, D.E. & Schultz, H.F. (2004) *IMC – The Next Generation: Five Steps for Delivering Value and Measuring Returns Using Marketing Communication*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, pages 20–38.
- Belch, G.E. and Belch, M.A. (2005) *Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective*, 6th edn. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill Irwin.
- Buchanan, P.M. (2000) *The Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, 3rd edn.

- Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.
- Burdenski, R.A. (2003) *Innovations in Annual Giving: Ten Departures That Worked*. New York: Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (12 May 2008) May 2007 national industry-specific occupational employment and wage estimates – NAICS 611300 – colleges, universities, professional schools, http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_61130.htm#b27-0000, accessed 2 August 2008.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2009) Carnegie classifications data file. 19 June, <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/>.
- CASE. (2004) About: Timeline, <http://www.case.org/Content/AboutCASE/Display.cfm?CONTENTITEMID=421>, accessed 26 July 2008.
- Caywood, C.L. (ed.) (1997) *The Handbook of Strategic Public Relations and Integrated Communication*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Cutlip, S.M. (1997) The unseen power: A brief history of public relations. In: C.L. Caywood (ed.) *The Handbook of Strategic Public Relations and Integrated Communication*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H. and Broom, G.M. (2006) *Effective Public Relations*, 9th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Duncan, T. and Moriarity, S.E. (1998) A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *Journal of Marketing* 62(2): 1–13.
- Edmiston, D. (2007) An Examination of Integrated Marketing Communication in US Public Institutions of Higher Education. Dissertation, University of Maryland University College, Adelphi, MD.
- Gould, S. (2004) IMC as theory and as poststructural set of practices and discourses: A continuously evolving paradigm shift. *Journal of Advertising Research* 44(1): 66–70.
- Hair, J.F., Babin, B., Money, A.H. and Samouel, P. (2003) *Essentials of Business Research Methods*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 6th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Harris, T.L. (1998) *Value-Added Public Relations: The Secret Weapon of Integrated Marketing*. Chicago, IL: NTC Business Books.
- Hermans, C. (2007, 11 12) Summary: The history of marketing thought. 2nd edn., <http://www.faculty.missouristate.edu/c/ChuckHermans/Bartels.htm>, accessed 4 August 2008.
- Hoadley, C.M. and Kilner, P.G. (2005) Using technology to transform communities of practice into knowledge-building communities. *SIG Group Bulletin* 25(1): 31–40.
- Hobson, P.L. (2008) Integrated marketing communication at community colleges. MSc thesis, University of Nevada, Reno, NV.
- Horrigan, D.W. (2007) Integrated Marketing Communications in Higher Education. Dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Hutton, J.G. and Mulhern, F.J. (2002) *Marketing Communications: Integrated Theory, Strategy and Tactics*. West Paterson, NJ: Pentagram Publishing.
- Kelly, K. (1998) *Effective Fund-Raising Management*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kitchen, P. and Schultz, D.E. (2003) Integrated corporate and product brand communication. *Advances in Competitiveness Research* 11(1): 66–86.
- Kliatchko, J. (2005) Towards a new definition of integrated marketing communications (IMC). *International Journal of Advertising* 24(1): 7–34.
- Kotler, P. and Keller, K.L. (2006) *Marketing Management*, 12th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Lee, D.H. and Park, C.W. (2007) Conceptualization and measurement of multidimensionality of integrated marketing communications. *Journal of Advertising Research* 47(3): 222–236.
- Lippincott, J. (2006) Council for the advancement and support of education, http://www.case.org/Documents/Presentations/President/Lippincott_Singapore_2006.pdf, accessed 30 May 2008.
- Lippincott, J. (9 March 2009) CASE district i emerging leaders session, [www.CASE.org: http://www.case.org/files/Newsroom/PDF/DistrictI_EmergingLeaderssession3-09.pdf](http://www.case.org/files/Newsroom/PDF/DistrictI_EmergingLeaderssession3-09.pdf), accessed 15 June 2009.
- Macnamara, J. (2007) *The Fork in the Road of Media and Communication Theory and Practice*. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.
- Nahm, A., Soliz-Galvan, L.E., Rao, S.S. and Ragun-Nathan, T.S. (2002) The Q-sort method: Assessing reliability and construct validity of questionnaire items at a pre-testing stage, http://latienda.ie.edu/working_papers_economia/WP02-08.pdf, accessed 16 June 2008.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007a) Digest of education statistics, http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d07/tables/dt07_025.asp?referrer=report, accessed 2 August 2008.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007b) Fast facts, <http://www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=73>, accessed 2 August 2008.
- Nowak, G. and Phelps, J. (1994) Conceptualizing the integrated marketing communications phenomenon: An examination of its impact on advertising practices and its implications for advertising research. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising* 16(1): 49–67.

- Percy, L. (1997) *Strategies for Implenting Integrated Marketing Communications*. Chicago, IL: NTC Business Books.
- Phelps, J. and Johnson, E. (1996) Entering the quagmire: Examining the 'meaning' of integrated marketing communications. *Journal of Marketing Communicaitons* 2(3): 159–172.
- Reid, M. (2005) Performance auditing of integrated marketing communication (IMC) actions and outcomes. *Journal of Advertising* 34(4): 41–54.
- Rowland, A.W. (ed.) (1986) *The Handbook of Institutional Advancement*, 2nd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schultz, D. and Schultz, H.F. (2004) *IMC – The Next Generation: Five Steps For Delivering Value and Measuring Returns Using Marketing Communication*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Schultz, D., Tannenbaum, S.I. and Lauterborn, R.F. (1994) *The New Marketing Paradigm: Integrated Marketing Communications*. Chicago, IL: NTC Business Books.
- Shiffman, D. (2008) *The Age of Engage: Reinventing Marketing for Today's Connected, Collaborative and Hyperinteractive Culture*. Ladera Ranch, CA: Hunt Street Press.
- Sirgy, M. and Rahtz, D.R. (2007) *Strategic Marketing Communication: A Systems Approach to IMC*. Mason, OH: Thomson Custom Solutions.
- Sivulka, J. (1998) *Soap, Sex And Cigarettes: A Cultural History of American Advertising*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- US Department of Education. (2008) US Department of Education database of accredited postsecondary institutions and programs, <http://www.ope.ed.gov/accreditation/Search.asp>, accessed 10 July 2008.
- US Government. (2008) Grants, <http://www07.grants.gov/search/basic.do>, accessed 27 September 2008.
- Warwick, M. (2000) *The Five Strategies for Fundraising Success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wenger, E. (2004) Knowledge management as a doughnut: Shaping your knowledge strategy through communities of practice. *Ivey Business Journal* 68(3): 1–8.