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Abstract

EVERETT, TODD A., Ph.D., December 2012, Higher Education

Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Enrollment Management Models at Four-year Private and Public Colleges

Director of Dissertation: David Horton, Jr.

The purpose of this study was to determine any differences between financial aid directors’ perceived effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management organizational structure. The study was national in scope and included a sample of public and private four-year institutions granting baccalaureate degrees. This study used the conceptual framework of Resource Dependency Theory for understanding the ways in which organizations respond to threats through reorganization and allocation of resources.

Quantitative methods were used to conduct this study. A survey with a 4-point Likert-type scale was used to gauge levels of financial aid directors’ perceived effectiveness of their enrollment management structure. The survey was administered to financial aid directors at 716 institutions with responsibility for the delivery of financial aid related services. An overall response rate of 41% was realized. The degree of reliability was assessed by using a Cronbach's Alpha test on financial aid directors’ perceived effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model. ANOVA were used to test whether any differences were discovered between enrollment management models, between public and private institutions, and between institutions of different enrollment sizes.
There was a significant interaction effect found when comparing public and private institutions by enrollment management model, as identified by the financial aid directors. There was not significant interaction effect based on institutional size and enrollment management model based on survey respondents’ overall effectiveness score. When comparing enrollment management model employed at the institutional level, a statistically significant difference did exist between the perceived effectiveness scores based on the model employed. The financial aid directors representing the divisional enrollment management model demonstrated higher perceived effectiveness scores than other enrollment management models. Finally, no differences were found on either subscale at institutions of different enrollment sizes based on the overall effectiveness score reported by the financial aid directors.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Because of both fluctuations in enrollment and decreasing support from state and federal government, higher education has experienced some turbulent times in the last 30 years (Coomes, 2000). These fluctuations have forced leaders at many colleges and universities to examine ways to improve managing enrollment changes (Kemerer, Baldridge, & Green, 1982). This process is called “enrollment management,” a term that was created in the early 1970s by Jack Maguire, a physicist from Boston College (Hossler & Bean, 1990). Enrollment management is an administrative process that brings together functions pertaining to recruiting, funding, tracking, and retaining students at their institution (Hossler, 1984). The goal of enrollment management is to improve the efficiencies of these various areas and prevent losses in student revenues that would negatively affect the institution (Black, 2005).

The concept of enrollment management began in the early 1970s to better recruit, retain, and graduate incoming students. Enrollment management involves many aspects of the college community, from the admissions office to the faculty to the grounds and maintenance personnel (Hossler & College Entrance Examination Board, 1984). Enrollment management can be an endeavor highly driven by research because it involves evaluating why students enroll or why they do not enroll, why they withdraw and why they stay and graduate, and more recently, whether they will become good stewards of the institution as alumni (Kalsbeek, 2006).

In the early 1980s, university leaders realized that enrollment management affected the entire institution, not only specific areas such as admissions, financial aid
and retention. Leaders soon recognized that the entire institution should be involved in enrollment management activities (Keller, 1984). It became clear to these leaders that enrollment management did not signify a separation of administrative duties, but rather a global approach involving how, why, and when students enter, stay, and graduate from an institution (Black, 2005). However, not all institutions may dedicate adequate resources, time, and/or efforts toward developing an effective, comprehensive enrollment management model (Dolence & American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1993).

Because enrollment forecasts are used as the basis for most college and university budgets from year-to-year, institutions often devote much time and resources recruiting high school graduates. However, effective enrollment management involves more than the enrollment of first-time full-time students (Bontrager, 2007). The perceived or actual threat of decreased enrollment or decreasing retention rates stimulates the need to organize to react to the specific enrollment-related situation (Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997; Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2005; Pollock & Wolf, 1989).

Based on these ever-changing enrollment forecasts, various organizational models have been developed to address enrollment-related issues across campus, from recruitment to retention. Some models involve only functional designations while others involve the entire institution in managing enrollment. For instance, at the lowest level of structural change, an enrollment management committee may be formed to address enrollment-related issues. The next organizational change could be creating a staff coordinator or director of enrollment management position to address enrollment-related
issues. This change is a slight structural change that will designate a member of the campus community to coordinate enrollment-related activities and communicate concerns to the next level. Beyond the committee and coordinator organizations, the next level, defined as the Matrix Model, is a more centralized and tightly coupled organizational structure used to address enrollment-related issues. The final and most structured organizational model is the Divisional Enrollment Management Model. This model typically has a designated Vice President/Provost at the top of the enrollment management division. It attempts to align the resources necessary to address any enrollment-related concerns for those areas that are directly impacted by enrollment issues. These models will be detailed later in this discussion.

A key part of organizational effectiveness is to have buy-in from all parties affected by the organizational structure. When an institution realigns resources and personnel to address enrollment concerns, it is important to assess whether or not this change in structure results in the perceived benefits of instituting the changes in reporting lines and operational processes. As part of Resource Dependency Theory developed by Hossler and Hoezee (2001), the evaluation of an organizational structure change is important from a continuous process improvement perspective. This evaluation should not only occur at the top of the organization but from deep within at the functional manager level to improve overall organizational effectiveness. This internal evaluation should occur annually as part of an ongoing assessment program to determine if the structure continues to add value to enrollment management related activities.
Statement of Problem

There has been little evaluation done to assess the effectiveness of enrollment management organizational models (Pollock & Wolf, 1989). Less is known about how effective these enrollment management models are at institutions of different sizes and different control (public or private). Public institutions are typically governed by the state in which they reside and private institutions are governed by a charter and do not directly receive subsidies from the state in which they exist. The effectiveness of these models can determine the success in enrollment-related activities such as recruitment and retention rates. A previous researcher (Smith, 1997) recommended the importance of further research on the effectiveness of these models from the perspective of those working at the middle and lower levels of the organization versus those at the top. The four enrollment management models Smith’s study measured were: a) enrollment management committee, b) enrollment management coordinator, c) enrollment management matrix, and d) enrollment management division. Chapter Two includes an in-depth description of all four management models.

Even less research has been conducted on the effectiveness of enrollment management models from the perspective of the functional manager leading to the questions: Do the functional managers believe that these enrollment management structures are effective in meeting institutional goals? Do they believe their organization structure is fulfilling the intent of the creators of their current enrollment management structure?
The reason financial aid directors were used in this study as opposed to other functions of enrollment management is financial aid directors exist in over ninety percent of the enrollment management models surveyed in the Noel-Levitz National Study of Enrollment Managers (2005). This is the greatest percentage represented out of all of the functional areas that interact or reside in any enrollment management-related structure. Also, access to the institution’s funds by financial aid directors is more readily available based on the biographical information supplied to the Department of Education for Administration of Federal Financial Assistance, which represents a revenue stream for each institution.

Financial aid directors are involved with students from the beginning to the end of the students’ careers in higher education. They are involved with assisting students in enrolling and determining the options they have to finance their education. They will also intervene at different levels with retention issues and provide requisite options for students. In addition, they will also assist students after they have graduated with the options available for loan repayment or continuance on to graduate school or some other academic pursuit. Financial aid directors have to understand the entire academic process in order to help students to succeed. Also, as a supplement to his study based on perceptions of enrollment management effectiveness, Smith (1997) recommended that literature could be expanded if other areas that interact directly with enrollment management processes were included in the research. Since financial aid directors are typically part of most enrollment management models, they might be a group to survey about perceptions of model effectiveness to broaden the research literature.
Research Questions

Today, enrollment management on most campuses encompasses recruitment and retention activities. These are important areas that determine the livelihood of most higher education institutions. If the institution is able to recruit qualified students and enroll them, but not retain them until graduation, it becomes problematic. As retention numbers begin to dwindle, recruitment is slowly impacted because students typically want to finish their education where they start. As a result, the ability to sustain strong retention rates positively impacts recruitment activities for institutions of higher education. Retention rates also tie well to how effective the institution is in meeting its students’ needs.

Organizational effectiveness in enrollment management is paramount to ensure that the right people are in the right positions and they are doing the right things. Enrollment management organizations are only as good as the people that operate within them. If those serving in enrollment management roles do not feel that the enrollment management structure is effective in meeting the needs of the institution, they are the first line of defense to improve the organization.

Due to limited research, not enough is known about the perceptions concerning general effectiveness of enrollment management models in meeting institutional goals from the perspective of the functional managers. Based on the gaps that exist in the research, this problem stimulates the following six research questions. These questions are an attempt to determine where financial aid directors believe the most effective
enrollment management models reside and which specific model is most effective at meeting institutional goals.

1. What do directors of financial aid perceive to be the overall effectiveness of the enrollment management models used at their colleges and universities?
2. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional control?
3. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional size?
4. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the organizational model employed?
5. Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on institutional control?
6. Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on institutional size?

To evaluate the results of this national study of enrollment management effectiveness by financial aid directors, several ANOVAs were used to compare the results of the study. These statistical tests were used to compare the financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness based on the size of the institution in which they are employed, the institutional control (public versus private), and the enrollment management structure they operate within. This analysis provided information that
highlights which enrollment management model is more effective in meeting organizational goals and at what institutional models is most effective.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to assess financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management models nationally. This purpose was accomplished by surveying 716 financial aid directors (500 from private institutions and 216 from public institutions). The purpose of evaluating institutional control and institutional size is based on the different organizational structures that exist that may affect how the institution operates. A private institution does not receive state subsidies and may not have to follow similar guidelines that public institutions do. The size of the institution may have an impact on the potential for a higher level of bureaucracy that may influence the effectiveness of a specific enrollment management model. Based on the perceptions of financial aid directors who were working within enrollment management systems at their respective institutions, the effectiveness of particular organizational models at four-year public and private colleges and universities across the nation were examined.

**Significance of the Study**

Delivery of financial assistance and other enrollment management-related activities are critical on today’s college campuses. With limited resources available, it is important to evaluate organizational structures and processes for their relative merit and continued purpose. Higher education is a human capital intensive operation and the enrollment management organization is no different (Binder, 1995). The nature of
enrollment management organizations heightens the need for assessment of organizational effectiveness. If an enrollment management organizational structure is not enhancing or stabilizing the institution’s position, necessary steps may need to be taken to redirect resources accordingly.

The importance of most institutions is long-term sustainability. It is important for an enrollment management organization to produce positive, predictable results year after year. This study evaluates the perception of enrollment management effectiveness from one function of most enrollment management organizations, the financial aid office, to determine the perceived effectiveness of the enrollment management organizational structure in which the financial aid director operates.

Institutional effectiveness can be a significant driver for institutional success. Enrollment management organizations have been evaluated at length from a theoretical construct (Hossler, 1984). Due to the relative age of enrollment management in higher education, limited research of long-term effectiveness from the functional manager level perspective exists from a practical application (Coomes, 2000). Some of the structures have been evaluated by the top levels of the organization, but not from within the organization. Doing so will add significant benefits for senior administrators to evaluate their enrollment management organizations and make potential improvements to enhance their effectiveness.

Limitations of the Study

The study has several limitations. First, the survey questionnaires were emailed to directors of financial aid at the four-year public and private institutions using
information collected from the U.S. Department of Education through a freedom of information request. This database is updated every two weeks on the Department of Education website. However, there is a possibility of some variance based on changes in personnel at the selected institutions that may have occurred two weeks prior to the data extraction.

Second, an assumption of the study is that the participants understood the survey questions. The possibility exists, however, that respondents interpreted the survey questions based on their own experiences, which may have resulted in interpretations different from the original intent of the questions.

**Delimitations of the Study**

Two-year community colleges and two-year for-profit institutions were not included in this study. Due to the limited duration of the typical enrollment pattern and transient nature of their students, students attending two-year institutions typically have little effect on the institution’s academic profile. The two-year community colleges’ tuition and fee structures are such that enrollment fluctuations tend to have less of an effect on operations than the physical plant, faculty and staff of most four-year public and private institutions (Kemerer et al., 1982).

**Definition of Terms**

1) *Academic benefits* - the strengthening of the academic profile of students, and increased graduation and retention rates (Henderson, 2005).

2) *Administrative benefits* - improvements to work processes such as administrative efficiencies of scale, improved planning, and greater management flexibility, and
others (Coomes, 2000). These benefits may also improve students’ academic success by the integration of key administrative units (Huddleston, 2000).

3) **Director of financial aid** - the individual with overall responsibility to assist students in paying their college tuition through a variety of sources such as federal, state, and institutional aid programs.

4) **Divisional enrollment management model** - Typically, the institutions that use this model identify a vice president (VP) for institutional advancement, a VP for student enrollment, or a VP of enrollment management. This position, whether the VP for institutional advancement, student enrollment or enrollment management, is the authority on enrollment related functions and policy decisions (Hossler, 1986).

5) **Enrollment management committee** - Typically, the enrollment management committee involves the director of admissions, director of financial aid, dean of students, and faculty members. Since this committee is advisory, it typically contains members within each of those departments in order to supplement the knowledge spectrum.

6) **Enrollment management model** - how institutions may organize operationally to address concerns related to matriculation, retention, and graduation issues it is facing. This model may potentially be created based on a perceived threat, such as decrease in federal or state funding or changing demographics (decrease in high school graduates) (Kemerer et al., 1982).
7) *Four-year private college or university* - for the purpose of this study, an institution granting four-year baccalaureate degrees that is funded by endowments, private donors, and tuition and fee revenues charged to students.

8) *Four-year public college or university* - for the purpose of this study, an institution granting four-year baccalaureate degrees, excluding branch campuses. They are supported by state tax dollars and tuition and mandatory fee revenues charged to students.

9) *Institutional benefits* - gains in the ability to maintain and stabilize enrollment, which improves the institutional position in the marketplace (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2008).

10) *Institutional Control* – how an institution is governed, be it by a state government or a private entity.

11) *Institutional Size* – the size of an institution of higher education is typically measured in terms of the amount of full-time equivalent (FTE) students to calculate the population it serves.

12) *Market position* - the relative proportion of students that a university attracts from a certain geographic or demographic population (Bok, 2003).

13) *Matrix enrollment management model* - This model is typically the third level in enrollment organization structures, leading towards a more centralized and tightly coupled system with structure (Kemerer et al., 1982). The matrix model typically does not require major changes in institutional structure. It places existing functions under the jurisdiction of a senior administrator who functions similarly
to the “staff coordinator,” but with authority and responsibility (Kreutner & Godfrey, 1980).

14) **Organizational benefits** - improvements in the delivery of service to the student and improvements to the morale and professionalism of enrollment management operations (Bontrager, 2004).

15) **Staff coordinator or Director of Enrollment Management** - This person is employed to coordinate campus marketing activities (Fram, 1975). According to Fram, the staff coordinator works with nine areas: admissions, public relations, retention, counseling, academic program development, alumni relations, career placement, institutional research, and development. However, the coordinator has little authority over the activities of these areas.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One includes an introduction to the research topic, statement of the problem, research questions, purpose statement, and a list of terms and definitions that are used throughout this document. Chapter Two contains a review of the relevant literature, and highlights previous research dealing with enrollment management models, their structure, and focus at academic institutions. Chapter Three discusses the statistical methods that were used in this study, and includes a discussion of the survey population, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques. Chapter Four provides an analysis of the collected data. Additionally, a summary of the descriptive statistics of the surveyed population, followed by a detailed discussion of the findings in relation to the research questions are included. Chapter Five
contains a summary of the research findings, conclusions, and recommendations for additional research. References and appendices follow the final chapter of the study.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

This chapter provides a review of relevant research about enrollment management models and their perceived effectiveness. Specifically, this review includes a discussion of the structure, orientation, membership, and strengths and weaknesses of the four versions enrollment management organizational models. This chapter also provides background information about the use of various enrollment management models at four-year public and private institutions.

Private and public institutions have used enrollment management to respond to swings in enrollment and changes in the academic profile and socioeconomic status of entering students (Hossler & Bean, 1990). Public and private institutions are also categorized by the control that exists at the institution. More definitively a public institution is typically governed by the state in which it resides and the private institution is governed by the President or Chancellor and the Board of Trustees of that institution. Also, an institutions’ size will be discussed as it relates to the amount students it enrolls to arrive at a full-time equivalent value for comparison purposes from year to year and from institution to institution.

This literature review begins with the historical framework of four-year public and private institutions to provide a basis for understanding how enrollment issues impact them. Then I will briefly describe why institutions typically develop an enrollment management structure and the theoretical framework that supports that change. An in-depth description of the four enrollment management models will follow, along with their affiliated strengths and weaknesses and with their typical structure defined. Each
enrollment management structure contains functional areas which I will define both historically and in the scope of how they impact enrollment management activities.

Finally, previous research is discussed on the area of enrollment management effectiveness and the study of these structures in general. It is a reminder that enrollment management is a relatively new area in higher education since its inception within the last thirty years.

Various research studies were reviewed as part of this literature review that provided a framework for understanding the challenges within enrollment management but did not directly meet the needs of the research conducted. These studies by the following individuals provided the most relevant information on enrollment management effectiveness (Pollock & Wolf, 1989; Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997; Smith, 1997; and Robinson, 2006).

**Four-Year Private and Public Institutions in the U.S.**

Today, four-year public and private colleges and universities employ various methods to sustain their market position despite enrollment fluctuations and economic turmoil. An institution’s market position is defined as the amount of students enrolled from a certain geographic region or the demographic makeup of those students attending the institution (Kotler, 1975). Over the past eight decades various events in history have impacted students’ participation in higher education, including The Great Depression and World War II. Prior to World War II, most private colleges and universities enrolled students who paid their way without government financial aid. The situation changed with the passage of the Government Issue (G.I.) Bill in 1944 and the eventual creation of
government financial aid in a non-repayable form in 1965 that assisted students who did not have the resources to attend post-secondary education (Coomes, 2000). The following section chronicles the summary of events that may have impacted student participation in higher education.

Following the 1960s, private institutions struggled more financially than their public counterparts did (Coomes, 2000). Economic turmoil faced the nation in the 1970s with high interest rates and inflation. The creation of federal student aid programs such as the National Defense Student Loan (1958) and the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (1965) programs helped students who wanted to attend private and public colleges and universities (Breneman, 1994). The economic and racial diversity of students enrolling at both public and private institutions increased because of the influx of veterans and students receiving financial aid during this period. These two programs had a greater impact on the lower portion of the socioeconomic strata because financial aid eligibility was based on income and most of the students receiving the G.I. Bill represented those individuals who did not typically have the resources to attend post-secondary education after high school.

In the 1980s many four-year private colleges and universities made steep tuition increases to offset their expenses for providing unfunded financial aid (Coomes, 2000). Tuition costs grew faster than inflation (Kirshstein, 1990). This created a need for more financial aid, either funded or unfunded, to assist students in enrolling. This situation represented a perceived need for institutions to look more closely at enrollment
management activities and potentially revisit their organizational structures to meet the 
changing landscape.

Also during the 1980s, projections of high school graduates were decreasing 
(Johnson, 2000) and thus private and public colleges and universities became highly 
competitive for the enrollment of students during this period. The need to stabilize 
enrollment and attract students was essential. This was another perceived threat for four-
year public and private colleges and universities to reorganize or restructure to potentially 
meet the needs of the institution with decreased demand (students) for their basic 
operation.

During the 1980s four-year public and private colleges and universities developed 
marketing strategies to enroll students. These marketing campaigns attempted to 
communicate higher quality and prestige in order to stimulate enrollment (Kirp, 2004). 
Colleges and universities began to create multi-color and graphically designed marketing 
materials containing information about what each institution had to offer students in 
terms of majors and student life in order to help attract students.

In the 1990s public institutions began enrollment management activities that were 
parallel to those at private institutions (Lapovsky, 1999). Using endowed and 
unrestricted institutional funding, public four-year institutions began discounting tuition 
to attract student populations (Lapovsky, 1999). Baum and Lapovsky (2006) presented 
information on how four-year public institutions had become similar to four-year private 
institutions.
Institutional grant aid has become more common at public colleges and universities in recent years, with the percentage of full-time undergraduates in public four-year colleges and universities receiving institutional grant aid increasing from 16 percent in 1992–93 to 23 percent in 1999–2000 and to 28 percent in 2003-04. (p.4)

Today, institutions are extremely sensitive to swings in enrollment and the related budgetary implications. To illustrate, if a small college has a total undergraduate enrollment of 1,200 students and first-year freshman enrollment decreases by five percent, the institution might suffer this percentage loss of students for the next four years, not just the initial year of decreased class size. The loss of revenue can reduce class offerings, student services, and revenue projections (Pattillo, 1990). The institution is likely to offset this loss by recruiting transfer students, but the success of this strategy is contingent upon getting those additional students to enroll (Russo & Coomes, 2000).

An enrollment boom has implications for institutional offerings, too, and not all of them are positive. A larger than expected freshman class may cramp residence halls, require new class offerings and perhaps require adjunct faculty to teach these courses, which creates scheduling and financial issues. Increased overhead by enrolling more than the expected amount of students may be offset by increased revenues gained from a larger than expected class size, depending on the additional services the extra students require (Kalsbeek, 2007). Effective enrollment management structures and planning may help overcome the downsides of under or over enrollment. The need for effective enrollment planning and forecasting becomes critical for any institution.
As identified earlier, student enrollment has broad implications on the institution’s financial position. The overall forecasting of enrollment has non-financial implications too; it may affect the perception of the institution in its inability to enroll the proper number of students that optimize students’ curricular and co-curricular experiences. For instance, if an institution over-enrolls and course sections become full, the possibility exists that students will take longer to graduate than they otherwise would. As a result, prospective students may rule out that institution because of the implications of taking longer to graduate. If an institution under-enrolls, services may be cut for existing students that may diminish their educational experience, which could potentially impact the ability to recruit future students. Enrolling the right amount of students at the right time is a delicate balance. Stabilization of enrollment numbers assists the institution in effective planning and fiscal effectiveness (Johnson, 2000).

The Need for an Enrollment Management Structure

Prior to 1971, American colleges and universities experienced sustained growth but the tide was beginning to change (Coomes, 2000). A misguided projection showing the decline in the number of high school graduates in the 1970s and 1980s mirrored the overall decreases in student enrollment that had already been presented (Galsky, 1991). The mid-1970s brought about changes by college and university administrators as they searched for ways to recruit new students and decrease attrition of existing students (Hossler, 1987). To maintain financial solvency after “baby boomer” students graduated, private institutions, and those four-year public institutions that relied heavily
on tuition revenue, needed to organize differently, or restructure enrollment operations, to address maintaining adequate enrollment levels (GAO, 2012).

Predicting enrollment has become increasingly challenging since the 1970s, because of demographic changes in student populations and the creation of different methods for calculating potential enrollees. Many agencies attempt to predict enrollment: The College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) are three of the major research agencies that attempt to forecast the number of high school graduates. These agencies present a forecast based on information reported to them by high schools and project class sizes using students who take standardized tests that would potentially find a particular college or university as a future high school graduate. Based on the different methods of calculation used, the projections from each of these agencies are slightly different, but they do provide a basis for enrollment forecasting. Despite these differences, the forecasts offer important information to college and university administrators who want assistance in planning for and budgeting enrollment (Antons & Maltz, 2006).

Enrollment Issues

The prediction methods used by the above-mentioned agencies do not include a major source of student enrollment; non-traditional students, who are not recent high school graduates. These potential students might be entering as undergraduate transfer students, graduate students, or non-degree seeking students. These students represent an enrollment sector for private colleges and universities that has the potential to
substantially affect revenue and expense projections (Humphrey, 2006). A method has yet to be developed to predict enrollment for non-traditional students, except for previous enrollment history by these groups; thus colleges and universities must rely upon information which is limited to overall decreasing numbers of high school graduates and specific geographic and demographic shifts in the U.S. (Prescott & Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 2008).

According to a national study conducted by Noel-Levitz (2005), enrollment management staff at colleges and universities addresses a variety of enrollment issues. Sustaining or increasing net revenue always appears near the top of the list of priorities (Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2005). The highest priority is to enroll new, full-time students. The second priority is the enrollment of transfer students. The third priority is the geographic and demographic makeup of all students. Other priorities involve ethnicity representation, gender balance, program specific goals by major, filling residence halls, and the overall academic profile of the incoming class (Ward, 2005).

Today’s students of higher education have changed from enrollees in the 1970s. Potential enrollees today are sensitive to marketing strategies and have access to much more college information than their predecessors did. Public and private institutions must “brand” themselves to influence diverse constituents: parents, students, guidance counselors, alumni, and even community members. This branding increases the need to find an effective organizational structure to align staffing and resources to meet institutional enrollment and revenue targets (Swann & Henderson, 1998).
Enrollment Management Characteristics and Models

In the book entitled *A Practical Guide to Enrollment and Retention Management in Higher Education*, Dennis (1998) listed some basic premises regarding enrollment management. According to Dennis, a successful enrollment management program or system cannot exist without a thriving retention operation. Dennis also considered having faculty involvement in the recruitment and retention of students as important, because the quality of academic programs and faculty reputation are just a few of the reasons why a student chooses to attend a particular institution. An additional premise is that a college or university can only market what it has to offer; perception must align with reality.

Financial aid strategies must be in line with the institution’s goals and recruitment and retention activities (Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1997). Dennis also suggested that both the recruitment and retention of students must be based on data and desired outcomes, and be measured and evaluated accordingly. Student choice has not been studied enough to predict enrollment of students to a particular institution or to better understand why they decide to leave prior to degree completion (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). Many economic, geographic, sociological, psychological, and intellectual reasons are associated with enrollment and retention. An additional idea is that solid enrollment management and retention programs are built over time, not overnight. An enrollment management and retention program must correlate to the culture of the institution. Enrollment management and retention management is a campus-wide responsibility. Dennis also proposed that one person cannot solely be responsible for the
success or failure of enrollment and recruitment efforts. Responsibility is carried from the
president to the physical plant staff; they all matter. Also offered was the idea that if an
institution creates programs that students want, treats them well, and makes them believe
they are part of the learning continuum, they will stay and thrive (Dennis, 1998).

Additional advice comes from other sources. In 1990, Hossler and Bean defined
enrollment management as an “organizational concept and a systematic set of activities
designed to enable an educational institution to exert more influence over its student
enrollments” (p. 5). This definition has some overarching characteristics of enrollment
management, which include the use of institutional research to determine market position
relative to competitive institutions. Data collected and analyzed by institutional research
offices can be used to predict what types of students persist. Marketing strategies and
potential pricing implications can also be determined by using institutional research.
Paying attention to academic, social, and institutional factors that can affect student
retention through studies performed by institutional research such as the National Survey
on Student Engagement (NSSE) is also important (Henderson, 2005).

Many institutions follow different organizational models to meet their needs and
external issues regarding enrollment. The four model structures are: enrollment
management committee, staff coordinator/director of enrollment management, enrollment
management matrix, and enrollment management division. There may be slight
variations to each of these models employed at each institution, but these are the typical
configurations. The next section will provide detailed information about these typical
configurations commonly found in higher education institutions.
**Enrollment Management Committee.** This early enrollment management model involves the entire campus community in the recruitment and retention process. Typically, the enrollment management committee involves the director of admissions, director of financial aid, dean of students, and faculty members. Since this committee is advisory, it typically contains members within each of those departments in order to supplement the knowledge spectrum.

The enrollment management committee is advisory. It has no direct authority over decisions related to its findings. Typically, the enrollment management committee is formed to: (a) define primary and secondary markets for recruitment efforts, (b) evaluate yields on applications for admission and (c) research the effects of student life and other environmental factors on student success and retention (Kemerer et al., 1982). This research area affects the type of students the institution recruits and will lead to the question, “Are all the support structures in place for students to succeed?” Most importantly, research should evaluate the strength of academic programs because they play a major role in the recruitment and retention of students. Careful evaluation of these activities is essential in fostering a public image (Hossler, 1984).

The enrollment management committee model has advantages and disadvantages (Kemerer et al., 1982). The foremost advantage is that the committee brings together important players in the recruitment and retention process. The second advantage is transparency in the enrollment process. Based on the committee format, more staff members are informed on what is occurring on a day-to-day basis. The major disadvantage of the enrollment management committee is that it is only advisory in
nature. It cannot elevate priority issues to the top of the organization through formal processes or channels (Black, 2005).

**Staff Coordinator or Director of Enrollment Management.** A second enrollment management organizational approach is the designation of a staff coordinator or director of enrollment management. This person is employed to coordinate campus marketing activities (Fram, 1975). According to Fram, the staff coordinator works with nine areas: admissions, public relations, retention, counseling, academic program development, alumni relations, career placement, institutional research, and development. However, the coordinator has little authority over the activities of these areas. Success is based on the coordinator’s leadership and ability to persuade the leadership in these areas to change and make efficiencies (Kemerer et al., 1982).

The staff coordinator model has some advantages and disadvantages (Kemerer et al., 1982). One of the advantages is that the position affirms an institution’s awareness that recruitment and retention-related issues need to be addressed, communicating one consistent message about the institutional mission and the goals and objectives of enrollment management. A second advantage is that this individual is appointed and is responsible and accountable for enrollment management activities directly not indirectly, as in the enrollment management committee model (Hossler & The College Board, 1984). The disadvantages of the staff coordinator model are common to any position that is established with responsibility but no authority to fulfill its defined mission; staff coordinators have to depend on the goodwill of others to be successful. Without line
authority, fiscal resources and autonomy, the staff coordinator’s authority to make
decisions is limited (Kemerer et al., 1982).

**Enrollment Management Matrix.** The third enrollment management model
used at institutions is called the enrollment management matrix. This model is the next
level in enrollment organization structures, leading towards a more centralized and tightly
coupled system with structure (Kemerer et al., 1982). The matrix model typically does
not require major changes in institutional structure. It places existing functions under the
jurisdiction of a senior administrator who functions similarly to the “staff coordinator,”
but with authority and responsibility (Kreutner & Godfrey, 1980). For example, all
undergraduate and graduate recruitment and retention efforts may reside under the
responsibility of one individual, but the undergraduate admission, graduate admission and
retention offices may still exist separately.

The advantages of this model are based on its centralized and tightly coupled
nature. Because similar functions are grouped together, this can lead to the acquisition
and planning of additional resources to meet enrollment management goals. The second
advantage is increased communication within the system (Hossler & The College Board,
1986). Kemerer, Baldridge, and Green (1982) wrote that the major disadvantage of this
matrix model involves limits on the amount of time that the senior-level administrator
can dedicate to the enrollment management effort. A highly centralized system also can
limit cooperation on issues of importance and the positioning of resources because the
areas are not fully integrated under the director’s control.
**Enrollment Management Division.** The enrollment management division is the fourth organizational model that exists in higher education literature. Typically, the institutions that use this model identify a vice president (VP) for institutional advancement, a VP for student enrollment, or a VP of enrollment management. This position, whether the VP for institutional advancement, student enrollment, or enrollment management, is the authority on enrollment related functions and policy decisions (Hossler & The College Board, 1986). This model is more tightly coupled and centralized than any of the other models and Caren and Kemerer (1979) suggested that successful enrollment management requires this type of restructuring. They recommended using the enrollment division organizational model because it aligns resources and service areas more closely together than do any of the other models.

This fourth enrollment management model has many positive attributes. First, a VP is now a member of the university head’s cabinet and can influence policy making. This official can ensure enrollment issues are addressed in a timely manner and adequate resources are available (Kemerer et al., 1982). Another advantage is the increased visibility of enrollment management across campus relative to the other models. The importance of enrollment management should be evident at all levels of the organization (Jonas & Popovics, 2000). Students base their enrollment decisions on campus cleanliness, academic reputation, overall reputation, other students, athletics, and employment possibilities upon graduation, which a VP of enrollment management can influence (Chapman, 1981).
The main deficit of this enrollment management model is that it changes organizational lines. A VP of student affairs does not easily give up ownership and control of an area such as career placement, and an academic VP rarely cedes control over academic advising or student retention (Hossler, 1984), unless an enrollment crisis precipitates organizational change. There may also be increased costs to the actual shifting of workspaces of employees and different accounting practices for allocating resources for the division model (Hossler & Bean, 1990).

Enrollment Management Key Functional Areas

As stated earlier, nine areas can be involved directly with enrollment management: admissions, financial aid, public relations, retention, counseling, academic program development, alumni relations, career placement, institutional research, and development. Each of these areas is described in this chapter. Financial aid directors were surveyed for this study primarily because their offices are an essential component of all four of the organization models. They are involved with most enrollment management models based on their connection with enrolling and retaining students (Huddleston, 2000).

The Admissions Office. The Admissions function of an institution is typically under the realm of enrollment management (Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2005). This office is in charge of the efforts of filling an incoming class of students, getting an adequate supply of transfers to offset students who are leaving, and represent the institution’s mission, vision, and values to prospective students (Swann & Henderson, 1998). The admissions office is the initial point of entry for most students at a college or university.
Recruiting a student requires substantial financial and human resources, especially since this process begins as early as the ninth grade (Holley & Harris, 2010). In 1992, Donald Stewart, former President of *The College Board* stated “The admissions profession can be compared to the college coaching profession in the fact that without a winning season or meeting enrollment goals, future employment is questioned” (Swann & Henderson, 1998, p. 120). Around 1949, the admissions office became the central office that handled student admission decisions and student recruitment across higher education. Prior to that time, the registrar’s office was the gatekeeper of who was admitted to the institution. The admissions office became recognized as an official organization as a result of becoming a member of the *American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers*. Their professional association today is called the *National Association of College Admission Counselors* (Dixon, 1995).

Admission officers face different challenges today compared to their counterpart, the registrar of the early 1920s. In the past, enrolling a certain number of students was the primary goal of this position, not the specific make-up of the class such as gender balance or demographic representation. Today, the goal is measurably different because it is based on the quality (as measured by standardized test scores and high school grade point average), gender, and ethnicity of the students, along with the ranking a college or university strives to acquire. In order to meet today’s demands of the university board; the make-up of the class (male-to-female ratio, academic profile, and geographic and ethnic diversity) has become as important as meeting the basic numeric enrollment goal.
established each year. This may also correspond to the institution’s mission of enrolling a certain type of student.

Considerable effort is required to move upward in the various college ranking lists, such as those that appear in *Kiplinger’s, Princeton Review* and *Business Week*. The factors that are used in the determination of rank may include items such as financial solvency, academics, student life, and support structures. Each agency that ranks an institution varies in the methods that it uses. Most importantly, institutions would likely prefer to move up in the ranking versus down. Rankings are typically placed in marketing materials for potential students and donors. These rankings have become an integral part of the multiple factors involved in college choice (Hossler, 1984).

The role of admissions at a college or university is sound but fluid. Successful achievement of enrollment goals is a major event that is based on the changing marketplace and competition. The admissions officer must stay current on academic programs, student life opportunities, faculty successes, and program successes to attract the next class of students to their institution. This process is an ongoing struggle for admissions offices because of changing financial aid policies, increased cost of attendance, and strategic responses by competitors offering new programs or gimmicks to enroll a student from the institutions’ admit pool (Swann & Henderson, 1998).

**The Student Orientation Function.** A well-developed student orientation program is critical to the enrollment management function and overall success of the university (Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997). Upcraft, Perigo, and Barefoot (2005) define an orientation program as a program that transitions new students from their
previous academic environment to new institutions to provide a framework for potential success. An orientation program may also enhance the success of transfer students because these students are new to the processes at that specific institution. Hossler and Bean (1990) stated that the importance of a sound orientation program is to introduce students to services and facilities on campus.

The importance of a sound orientation and integration program also relates to a well-developed enrollment management program (Kramer, 2003). Kramer indicated that most freshmen who dropped out tended to do so in their first six weeks of school. A strong orientation program that engages and involves the student may decrease the possibility of withdrawal from the college or university. Mullendore and Banahan (2005) stated “orientation is the college’s best opportunity to introduce a strong learning environment, build the foundations for academic success, promote student interactions with faculty and staff, and convey the values and traditions of the new institution” (as cited in Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot, 2005, p. 55). Sound orientation programs support enrollment management efforts by delivering a solid foundation to assist enrollment and retention.

The Registrar. The registrar’s office provides another function that affects enrollment management success. The registrar has a long history related to enrollment management because historically it absorbed admissions’ functions into its professional association. Functions that typically occur in admissions today originated in the office of the registrar. An example of such a function would be the admissions application procedure (Huddleston, 2000).
The registrar’s staff manages numerous responsibilities including the registration of students, class schedules, room scheduling, degree audits, classroom utilization, student records, and catalog production (Dennis, 1998). The importance of operating an organized registrar function affects enrollment management efforts. By focusing on the student needs and keeping them on track to meeting major and degree requirements, registrars are essential to enhancing graduation rates.

**Other Offices and Functions.** The following functional areas are important to enrollment management, but their entire operations are rarely housed within enrollment management divisions. They are not listed by order of importance or by the critical nature of how they are related to enrollment management. They are all important to the success of enrollment management activities on college and university campuses (Dennis, 1998).

**Institutional Research.** Institutional or enrollment research is a critical piece of evaluating enrollment management-related activities (Hossler, 1986). Hossler identified that integrating research and planning efforts assists the institution in managing enrollment changes and forecasts. Institutional or enrollment research may include evaluating enrollment yields, retention statistics, and student academic performances. Huddleston (2000) stated that the data collected through institutional or enrollment research can provide a framework for discussions to improve areas within the enrollment management area. Identifying an association between decreased enrollment yields and financial aid, for example, could assist the private college or university in the formulation
of a new aid policy, contributing to the recovery of market position, the maintenance of a current state, or the increase of enrollment yields (Day, 1997).

**Student Retention Activities.** Institutional campus retention offices and functions involve evaluating individual students and student cohort success. These data can provide critical feedback to the admissions office to identify predictors of success or failure. With non-success factors identified, intervention strategies can be developed and implemented to increase retention rates and change admissions policy (Huddleston, 2000). In order of importance, student recruitment and retention rank close to each other because an institution needs to find students to enroll and keep them enrolled (Dennis, 1998). Retention, rather than enrollment, may be a more effective measure of an institution’s success because it is the second step in the educational journey.

High student retention and student satisfaction statistics go hand-in-hand. Lower retention rates tend to impact graduation rates and enrollment yield rates. Many variables, however, affect this trend, such as admissions standards, residence life activities, economics, and overall campus climate. It is important for the staff in an enrollment management organization to be aware of all these indicators.

A 2005 Noel-Levitz study revealed that the cost to recruit a student at a private college or university is around $2,000. Attracting and retaining those students who will be successful and committed to an institution is important (Noel-Levitz, Inc., 2005). Even though private colleges and universities have higher graduation rates when compared to their public counterparts, keeping a majority of students who initially enroll is still important because they do not have to be replaced with new students (Coomes,
2000). If all goes well, successes in student retention will bring fiscal stability to the private or public college or university (Swann & Henderson, 1998).

*Academic advising and faculty involvement.* Academic advising and faculty involvement affect enrollment management efforts extensively (Dennis, 1998). Pascarella (1982) noted that faculty involvement could positively affect student careers and student success because most students come to campus expecting to have meaningful interactions with faculty. The importance of ensuring that these effective relationships exist is critical to the recruitment and retention of students.

Enrollment management is no longer viewed as just a function to enroll new students to the institution. It should be viewed as an effort pertaining to retention, graduation and potential alumni relations. It should also be seen as an effort including academic advising and faculty involvement because these functions are essential to student success. King and Kerr (2005) stated, “effective academic advising is clearly much more than scheduling and registration” (as cited in Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot, 2005, p. 125). Advising can be a growth process for students in which the courses that the student choose can meet specific degree requirements but may also provide a basis for career choices.

*Marketing Function.* Marketing has become a critical function of the enrollment management organization (Huddleston, 1980). It is a major consideration when advertising new programs or the institution’s characteristics in general to attract students. Kotler (1975), a marketing researcher, stated,
“marketing is the thorough 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 organization objectives. It relies heavily on designing the organization’s offering in terms of the target market’s needs and desires, and on using effective pricing, communication, and distribution to inform, motivate and serve markets” (p.5).

Dennis (1998) found that, “higher education marketing is nothing more than offering the right academic programs and courses at the right time and place and at the right price to the right students” (p. 101).

Fully understanding the marketplace in which a particular institution competes, such as public versus private or four-year versus two-year is important for those staff members engaged in the enrollment management process. The organization should collect data on the students who inquire, matriculate, graduate, and withdraw after matriculation (Brooks, 1997). The data obtained could provide solid evidence and assist with the development of a marketing strategy to recruit future students (Huddleston, 2000).

The marketing area will also help identify the “brand” by which the institution represents itself. It is important that this brand is universal across the campus and is communicated in the same way consistently. Without a consistent message, the institution could struggle with offerings and messages sent to prospective students.

The Financial Aid Office. The second most prominent function of enrollment management models at private colleges and universities is the financial aid office (Noel-
Levitz, Inc., 2005). Financial aid has become an integral part of why students enroll; students make decisions based on the service provided and the amount of gift assistance that they may receive (Day, 2007). Connecting the duties of this financial aid office with the activities of enrollment management is imperative because of the linkage between affordability and college choice (DesJarnis, Smyth, & Christian, 2006). Institutional financial aid or tuition discounting has also become more critical at four-year public institutions, as state support has been dwindling. The financial aid office has become a major role in the student decision process, especially at private colleges and universities (Swann & Henderson, 1998).

According to Hossler and Bean (1990), the importance of financial aid derives from increasing tuition and increasing competition among colleges and universities. At public and private four-year institutions, offering non-need based aid for students is commonplace to encourage students to enroll. Financial aid and admissions offices must collaborate to ensure students receive their aid packages in a timely manner to allow and ensure proper decision-making based on the aid offered (Borus, 1995).

In conjunction with the normal day-to-day activities of administering financial assistance, the overall role of the financial aid office increases as it becomes an important part of the enrollment management process (Maltz, 2007). At private colleges and universities, the financial aid office often will evaluate enrollment yields based on a variety of factors to analyze trends and comparisons of aid differences between enrollees and non-enrollees at various points based on demonstrated need or academic ability (Russo & Coomes, 2000). Because of this strategic role in enrollment management, it
may give credibility to the argument that financial aid should increase or remain steady relative to tuition charges.

Summary

The lifespan of enrollment management in higher education began within the last thirty or so years. This literature review provides a roadmap of how and why it came into existence. Enrollment managers must understand the concepts of enrollment management and the theories of why students enroll and why they choose to leave. It has evolved in many forms based on the multitude of institutions in higher education (Claffey & Hossler, 1986). The basic premise for the beginning of enrollment management still holds true; it was developed by the perceived need to stabilize enrollment and to assist institutions in planning accordingly (Lapovsky, 1999). Specifically, if enrollment is too high, an institution can adjust and manage, for example, by creating additional housing and increasing the number of class offerings. However, if enrollment is too low, institutions may face potential revenue shortfalls (Day, 1997).
Chapter 3: Methodology

This study is a quantitative examination of financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management models at four-year public and private colleges and universities in the U.S. A survey instrument was used to gather these perceptions of effectiveness. The employed survey questions focused on the perceptions of the extent to which the enrollment management models used at the schools were effective in achieving institutional enrollment management goals. Questions were also included in the instructions to gather institutional characteristics in order to perform between group comparisons.

Purpose of the Study

Little evaluation has been made of the effectiveness of enrollment management organizational models (Pollock & Wolf, 1989). Less is known about how effective these enrollment management models are at different sizes and types of institutions where they are operated. These models’ effectiveness can be a determinant of success in enrollment-related activities such as recruitment and retention efforts. A previous researcher (Smith, 2000) recommended the importance of further research on the effectiveness of these models from inside the organization versus from the top. The four enrollment management models that the research measured were: a) the enrollment management committee, b) the enrollment management coordinator, c) the enrollment management matrix, and d) the enrollment management division.

The purpose of this study was to assess financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management models nationally. This purpose was
accomplished by surveying 716 financial aid directors employed at four-year colleges and universities (500 from private institutions and 216 from public institutions). Based on the perceptions of financial aid directors who were working within enrollment management systems at their respective institutions, the effectiveness of particular organizational models at four-year public and private colleges and universities across the nation were examined.

**Research Questions**

Enrollment management today encompasses recruitment and retention activities on most campuses. These are important areas that determine the livelihood of most higher education institutions. If the institution is able to recruit qualified students and enroll them, but not retain them until graduation, it becomes problematic. As retention numbers begin to dwindle, recruitment is slowly impacted because students typically want to finish their education where they start. The ability to sustain strong retention rates positively impacts recruitment activities for institutions of higher education. This also ties well to how effectively the institution is meeting its students’ needs.

Organizational effectiveness in enrollment management is paramount today to ensure that the right people are in the right places and are doing the right things. Enrollment management organizations are only as good as they people that operate within them. If the employees do not feel that the enrollment management structure is effective in meeting the needs of the institution, they are the first line of defense to improve the organization.
Based on research that has previously been conducted, not enough is known about the functional managers’ perceptions concerning the general effectiveness of enrollment management models in meeting institutional goals. Based on the gaps that exist in the research, this problem stimulates the following six research questions. These questions are an attempt to determine where the most effective enrollment management models reside and which specific model is most effective at meeting institutional goals.

1. What do directors of financial aid perceive to be the overall effectiveness of the enrollment management models used at their colleges and universities?
2. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional control?
3. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional size?
4. Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the organizational model?
5. Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on institutional control?
6. Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on institutional size?

**Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses have been developed from the research questions:
H_01 There is no significant difference in the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of the general effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on institutional control.

H_02 There is no significant difference in the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of the general effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on institutional size.

H_03 There is no significant difference in the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of the general effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on enrollment management models deployed at their institution.

H_04 The effects of the enrollment management model deployed by each institution on the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of general effectiveness of their enrollment management models are the same across both versions of institutional control.

H_05 The effects of the enrollment management model deployed by each institution on the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of general effectiveness of their enrollment management models are the same across institutional sizes.

**Population and Selected Sample**

The focus of this research is on four-year public and private colleges and universities in the U.S. This research suggests that the prevalence of enrollment management models at four-year public and private institutions is greater than at two-
year or proprietary institutions within higher education (Huddleston & Rumbough, 1997; Pollock & Wolf, 1989; Smith, 2000). The population of interest is directors of financial aid at four-year public and private colleges and universities in the U.S. that have enrollment management models in effect. Financial aid offices are typically a component of most of the enrollment management models because of their direct connection in enrolling and retaining most students (Borus, 1995).

The exact number of institutions currently utilizing an enrollment management model is not known, so the targeted sample size accounted for non-respondents. At the time of the study, in the U.S., 1,508 private four-year institutions and 616 public four-year institutions existed. Equal percentages were drawn from each of these two groups. Financial aid directors from 500 four-year private and 216 four-year public institutions were recruited to be surveyed. This estimation is based on power = .80, alpha = .05 and a medium effect size of $f = .25$ for analysis of variance (ANOVA). For the institutional size comparison, 2 x 3 ANOVA, 158 participants were needed. For the 2 x 4 between-subjects ANOVA, 179 participants were needed. With a projected response rate of 25 percent, a total of 716 financial aid directors were randomly selected and recruited to be surveyed. A disproportionate sample was drawn to obtain equal distribution of public and private institutions in each institutional size category identified in the survey. The randomization was achieved with the use of the random number generator program on a graphing calculator. The use of this tool allows one to input the range of values and acquire a random sample from the range. For instance, the sampling frame of the 1,508 private institutions is ordered numerically. The input into the calculator’s random number
generator (Math-Prb-#5RandInt) would be (1, 1508). When the enter button is pushed, a random value appears within this range. This value would then be matched with the institution on the list. The process would continue until the desired sample is achieved for private institutions, and then repeated for the public institutions. Because the number of institutions using each enrollment model was unknown, oversampling occurred for public and private institutions in each size category to maximize the likelihood of adequate numbers of each enrollment model.

**Development of Instrument**

A modified survey instrument, with expressed permission from Dr. Steve Robinson’s 2006 study on practitioner perception of enrollment management, was used. A modification was made to include additional demographic information regarding institution size, selectivity, and age of the current enrollment management organizational structure being used. The original instrument did not ask for the specific structure that existed at each institution, which was particular to this study in order to evaluate which organizational structure was potentially identified as more effective. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) contains two sections. The first section involves demographic and institutional characteristics including institutional size, institutional control and the enrollment management model employed. The second section consists of 15 questions that speak to the financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the enrollment management structure that exists at their institutions.

The survey questions were composed using a 4 point Likert scale. All of the items required respondents to choose one of four points on the scale, with 1 = *strongly*
agree and 4 = strongly disagree. The items were reversed coded from 1-to-4 to 4-to-1 for later analysis and ease of understanding that a greater overall score would be representative of greater perceived effectiveness of a particular enrollment management structure. The items on the survey were summed together to determine an overall perceived effectiveness score for analysis. Recent research conducted by Fink (2009) has indicated that the use of a 4- or 5- point scale and the horizontal format planned for web forms is successful at getting effective responses. The time to complete the survey was not expected to exceed 15 minutes.

Validity

The extent of validity was determined by asking a group of financial aid directors at three public and three private universities to review the survey prior to administration. Existing financial aid directors were contacted for comments. These financial directors represented six different four-year institutions in two different states. The financial aid directors reviewed the survey instrument to make sure that the items were worded clearly and easily understood for financial aid professionals. Each director had a different professional background and experience working in a campus culture. Their views strengthened the survey instrument before final administration. This verification of content validity established that the questions asked were easily understood and were interpreted in a format similar to the intention of the researcher. Suggestions contributed to the development of additional survey items.
Data Collection Procedures

Data for this study were collected through a web-based survey. Researchers have indicated that the dynamics and challenges of web-based or email surveys are effective because they closely parallel paper mailed surveys (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009).

Follow-up techniques were used in an effort to increase the response rate of the web-based survey. An initial pre-notice letter was sent electronically to the survey population (see Appendix B). This electronic message encouraged the participants to respond because of the potential benefits of the information to enrollment management organizations at four-year public and private colleges and universities. The respondents were given an option to receive an executive summary of the results of the research and gain insights about different enrollment management models. A week after the initial electronic message was sent; the survey population received a second electronic message that contained a link to the web-based survey (see Appendix C). The electronic message provided information regarding informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality that would be extended to the survey respondent if the survey was completed. The message repeated the rationale for participation, the opportunity to receive results, and the need for a strong response rate.

The database of financial aid directors of these institutions, provided by the Department of Education, was refreshed every two weeks. Institutions that utilize Title IV federal funding are required to supply information to the Department of Education as to who their financial aid director is and supply their contact information as well as the email contact. This updating and necessary recordkeeping requirement would ensure that
the individual identified as the financial aid director was current and accurate at the time of the survey.

The Survey Monkey web-based service was used to collect results from the survey instrument. This application permits the collected data to be exported in a common text file or excel file that could be imported into a statistical software application for later review and analysis. This survey application permitted various touch points during the survey administration to send follow-up notification to be sent to targeted members of the sample group who had not responded. The initial reminder was transmitted six business days after the initial survey was sent (see Appendix D). Approximately 11 business days later, a second follow-up message was distributed to the non-respondent part of the sample. One month after the first contact, a final email was sent to encourage participation in order to improve the response rate.

**Data Analysis**

Multiple statistical methods were used to examine the data collected. Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and percentages provided an overview of the data. Factorial analysis of variance was completed to test the hypothesis associated with the research questions. A probability value of .05 or less was used to determine significance.

The first analysis that occurred was a 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA that simultaneously tested Hypotheses 2, 4, and 5. The second hypothesis addressed whether differences existed in the perceptions of the enrollment management models’ overall effectiveness, based on institutional control. The fourth hypothesis addressed whether
differences exist in the perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management models based on the organizational model employed by colleges and universities by institutional control. The fifth hypothesis addressed whether differences existed in the perceptions of overall model effectiveness based on institutional control. The independent variables were the enrollment management structure with three levels (enrollment management committee/enrollment management coordinator, enrollment management matrix, and enrollment management division), and institutional control with two levels (public versus private). The dependent variable was the perceptions of effectiveness of institutions’ enrollment management.

The second analysis that occurred was a 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA that simultaneously tested Hypotheses 3 and 6. The third hypothesis addressed whether differences existed in the perceptions of overall effectiveness based on institutional size. The sixth hypothesis addressed whether differences existed in the perceptions of effectiveness based on the organizational model employed by colleges and universities by institutional size. The independent variables were the versions of enrollment management structure with four levels (enrollment management committee, enrollment management coordinator, enrollment management matrix, and enrollment management division) and institutional size with two levels based on undergraduate full-time equivalents (level 1: 0 to 5,000 and level 2: more than 5,001). The dependent variable was the perceptions of effectiveness of the institutions’ enrollment management.

Some assumptions were associated with these statistical procedures that were performed on the data collected. The first assumption is that data collected from the two
groups were normally distributed. The second assumption is of homogeneity of variance, which means that the variances of the dependent variable were the same between the two groups. Field (2005) describes the third assumption more specifically, “the data from different participants were independent of one another, which means one participant could not influence the behavior of another participant.” (p.64)
Chapter 4: Results

This study involved examining the condition of enrollment management organizations nationally. Additionally, the study involved examining financial aid directors’ opinions of the perceived effectiveness of enrollment management structures at four-year public and private colleges and universities. The survey consisted of items that addressed the relationship of enrollment management structures and their perceived effectiveness. Additionally, a series of demographic items were included.

Survey Population and Response Rate

The survey was sent to financial aid directors employed at 500 four-year private and 216 four-year public institutions; a total of 295 financial aid directors responded to the survey, for an overall response rate of 41%. The response rate for the private institutions was 34% and 58% for the public institutions. Based on the sample size needed to test the various hypotheses, the desired response rate was 25%. A sample of at least 176 financial aid directors was needed for hypotheses testing.

Instrument Reliability

After the collection of the survey responses, the instrument was tested for reliability. A Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was calculated for the survey questions. It was calculated to be .957, which is good indicator of reliability (Field, 2005). Another part of this calculation determines if questions were individually and randomly removed from the survey, if the survey would still remain reliable. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of each item was also computed to determine if any items should be removed
from the scale to improve reliability. None of the values were higher that the Cronbach’s alpha for all items, so none of the items were considered for removal.

**Descriptive Statistics**

This section provides descriptive statistics on the data collected from financial aid directors using the survey instrument, including the means and distribution of the variables used for later analysis to test the research hypotheses.

Table 1 lists the distribution of survey respondents by institutional control. Private institutions made up a slightly larger percentage of the respondents based on initial sample size. Even though private institutions represented a larger percentage of the survey respondents, the public institutions responded at a higher than expected rate.

Table 1

*Distribution of Response rates by Institutional Control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution control</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>% of selected sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 lists the distribution of survey respondents by enrollment management model. The divisional model, with all enrollment efforts spearheaded by one VP, appears to be the largest representation of the organizational models reported by the survey respondents. This model is the most structured enrollment management model which has multiple administrative offices under one direct report who is typically at the cabinet level at the college or university. The committee and coordinator model groupings are
combined into one group for analysis of the hypotheses in this chapter to equalize the percentages of respondent groups. Analysis was performed with the existing four models and similar results were calculated as with three model groups. This combination was chosen because committee and coordinator models have similar characteristics, as both are more unstructured than the other models. It is interesting that greater the two thirds of the survey respondents are representative of a more structured enrollment management organization. This distribution supports that institutions are more structured to potentially address enrollment changes.

Table 2

Distribution of Enrollment Management Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 lists the distribution of survey respondents by institutional size. The largest respondent group was those institutions with an undergraduate full-time equivalent value of less than 5,000 students. A similar analysis was performed at the three levels of institutional size and a similar result was calculated comparable to the two size grouping analysis. The other two respondent sizes are combined into one group for analysis of the hypotheses in this chapter to equalize the percentages of the respondent groups.
Table 3

*Distribution by Institutional Size using Undergraduate FTE (Collapsed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5000</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5001</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Analysis**

The following section provides an in-depth analysis of the six previously identified research questions to evaluate the data collected in order to determine enrollment management model effectiveness as identified by financial aid directors at four-year private and public institutions. Each research question will be restated along with the statistical measure that was used to determine the results. The results of the statistical tests will be reported and identified, if they had any significance in identifying any potential differences in the variables identified.

**Research Question 1: What do directors of financial aid perceive to be the overall effectiveness of the enrollment management models used at their colleges and universities?**

Because this research question was descriptive, there was no hypothesis to test. To answer this research question, an evaluation of the overall effectiveness score was calculated from all institutions that responded to the survey. Based on the data collected from the survey respondents, means and standard deviations were calculated. The overall effectiveness score for the survey respondents was $M = 42.58$ and $S.D. = 7.76$. This score correlates to the survey of an overall response of *agree* with the financial aid
director’s perceived effectiveness of the enrollment management model that they operate within. The overall effectiveness score was calculated by summing the score of the 15 survey questions. A response of strongly agree was coded as a 4 and strongly disagree was coded as a 1. A higher score represented a higher perceived effectiveness of the current enrollment management model. This score represents that financial aid directors surveyed perceive their current enrollment management structure as effective in meeting enrollment goals. Although they may be asked to provide input, the financial aid directors typically do not have much influence over which model their institution uses, this is typically a Board of Trustees or Cabinet decision. This finding also relates to previous studies (Smith, 1997; Robinson, 2006) which show that most enrollment management professionals are satisfied with how their current enrollment management model is meeting the institution’s goals and objectives.

Some of the measures of an effective enrollment management structure are performance indicators, such as a stable academic profile of incoming students and stable or increasing graduation and retention rates (Dolence, 1990). These measures are a few of the indicators of enrolling, retaining, and graduating the right students at an institution to ensure the college and university’s livelihood over a long period of time.

**Research Question 2: Do differences exist in financial aid director’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional control?**

The corresponding null hypothesis for this research question is that there is no significant difference in the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on institutional control. The
independent variable was institutional control (public versus private) and the dependent variable was overall effectiveness score.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional control and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. The dependent variable, perceived effectiveness score, was normally distributed for the groups formed by the combination of institutional control and enrollment management models. The means and standard deviations for each group are presented in Table 4. There was homogeneity of variance between groups as assessed by the Levene’s test for equality of variance. There was a significant effect of institutional control, $F(1, 285) = 6.276, P = .013$. The ANOVA results are listed in Table 8. The null hypothesis described in this section was rejected based on these reported values. The financial aid directors from both public and private institutions reported different levels of effectiveness of their respective enrollment management organizational models. This finding indicates that private colleges and universities had higher perceptions of effectiveness than public colleges and universities. This is consistent with the results found in the previous study (Pollock & Wolf, 1989) that concluded that private institutions were more developed in their enrollment management practices than four-year public institutions, based on sensitivity to enrollment changes and tuition revenue budgeting. This finding represents that public institutions are becoming more like private institutions and are impacted by enrollment management related pressures, recruiting and retention demands, similar to private institutions.
Table 4

Mean Satisfaction Scores and Standard Deviations by Enrollment Management Model and by Institutional Control and Institutional Size (Collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management Model</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/coordinator</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>9.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>9.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>7.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the institutional size?

The corresponding null hypothesis for this research question is that there is no significant difference in college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on institutional size. As previously mentioned, institutional size groupings were combined to create two groups (1-5,000 and more than 5,000) for hypotheses testing. The independent variable was institutional size (1-5,000 versus more than 5,000) and the dependent variable was overall effectiveness score.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional size and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. The dependent variable, perceived effectiveness score, was normally distributed for the groups formed by institutional size and enrollment model. The means and standard deviations are identified in Table 4. There was homogeneity of variance between groups as assessed by the Levene’s test for equality of variance. There was not significant effect of institutional
size on perceived effectiveness score, $F(1, 285) = .077$, $p = .781$. The null hypotheses described in this section were not rejected based on these reported values. As such, financial aid directors from both institutional size groupings reported similar levels of effectiveness of their enrollment management organizational models. The results of this ANOVA are identified in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>187.74</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>561044.01</td>
<td>8336.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>425.15</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHSIZE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL2*SCHSIZE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.74</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>67.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $R^2 = .04$: Adjusted $R^2 = .03$; *p<.05*

This finding could also be related to the Pollock and Wolf (1989) study that evaluated private institutions and found that those with fewer than 5,000 students were more developed in their enrollment management practices than four-year publics based on sensitivity to enrollment changes and tuition revenue budgeting. This finding represents that public institutions are becoming more like private institutions and are impacted by enrollment management related pressures, recruiting and retention demands, similar to private institutions.
Research Question 4: Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the organizational model employed?

The corresponding null hypothesis for this research question is that there is no significant difference in the college and university financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their enrollment management models based on the model employed by their institution. The tabulated overall effectiveness score was used to answer this research question. Based on the distribution of financial aid directors in each model not being equal, the committee and coordinator groups were combined for this test and for research question five. The four organizational models were compressed in this analysis based on the small number of respondents who identified their institutions as operating under a staff coordinator enrollment management model.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the overall effectiveness means by organizational model to evaluate which organizational model had greater impact on overall effectiveness. The dependent variable, overall effectiveness score, was normally distributed. The means and standard deviations for each group are presented in Table 4. The ANOVA revealed a significant difference in the overall effectiveness score between the organizational models. The test statistic, $F(2, 285) = 7.699, p = .001$, indicates a statistically significant finding from these data, beyond the .05 standard. The ANOVA results are identified in Table 8. Based on the results of the statistical test, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, effectiveness scores among financial aid directors differed based on the enrollment management model.
Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were conducted to compare the different organizational models for differences. The financial aid directors in a divisional model reported greater overall effectiveness than both the directors in a matrix model $p = .009$, and the directors in a committee/coordinator model, $p = .016$. The directors in a committee/coordinator model did not differ significantly from the directors in a matrix model $p = .912$.

These results suggest that the more organized an institution becomes, from an enrollment management structure perspective, the greater possibility of stronger perceived effectiveness from that structure. This idea would be supported by the structural nature of the organization changing the perspective of those within (Black, 2005).

Table 6 represents the perceived satisfaction scores of the organizational models after combining the committee and coordinator models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Coordinator</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44.48</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5: Do the effects of organization models employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on institutional control?

The corresponding null hypothesis for this research question is that the effects of enrollment management model on perceptions of effectiveness are the same at each level of institutional control. A two-way ANOVA was used to determine what differences, if any, existed between the groups. This analysis was to determine if organizational model has an effect on the overall effectiveness score that differed for public and private institutions.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional control and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. The dependent variable, perceived effectiveness score, was normally distributed for the groups formed by the combination of institutional control and enrollment management models. The means and standard deviations for each group are presented in Table 8. There was homogeneity of variance between groups, as assessed by the Levene’s test for equality of variance. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of institutional control and enrollment management model, $F(2, 285) = 1.521, p = .22$. The null hypothesis described in this section was not rejected based on these reported values. As such, the effects of organizational model on perceived effectiveness were not different for public and private institutions. The ANOVA table for this data is listed in Table 7.
Table 7

2 x 3 ANOVA for Effectiveness Score, Model and Institutional Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>563037.31</td>
<td>8540.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>507.56</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHTYPE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>413.78</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL2*SCHTYPE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>65.920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .06$; Adjusted $R^2 = .04$; *p < .05

This finding is different than the Pollock and Wolf (1989) and the Smith (1997) studies which concluded that there was a difference between public and private institutions. The structure or organizational culture may have an effect on the perceived enrollment management model effectiveness which has changed the public institutions to look more like private institutions from an enrollment management perspective.

Table 8

Mean Satisfaction Scores and Standard Deviations by Enrollment Management Model and by Institutional Control (Collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management Model</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/Coordinator</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>9.436</td>
<td>45.82</td>
<td>8.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>9.690</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>7.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>7.406</td>
<td>47.87</td>
<td>7.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question 6:** Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment model differ based on institutional size?

The corresponding null hypothesis for this research question is that the effects of enrollment management model on perceptions of effectiveness are the same across institutional sizes. A two-way ANOVA was used to determine what differences, if any, existed between the groups. This analysis was to determine if organizational model has an effect on the overall effectiveness score that differed based on institutional size.

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional size and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. The dependent variable, perceived effectiveness score, was normally distributed for the groups formed by the combination of institutional control and enrollment management model. The means and standard deviations for each group are present in Table 9. There was homogeneity of variance between groups as assessed by the Levene’s test for equality of variance. There was not significant interaction between the effects of institutional size and enrollment management model, \( F(2, 285) = 1.036, p = .356 \). The null hypothesis described in this section was not rejected based on these reported values. As such, the effects of organizational model on perceived effectiveness were similar based on institutional size. The results of this ANOVA are in Table 7.

The size of an institution seems to have little bearing on the overall perceived effectiveness by model. The size of the institution and the model employed did not have
significant effects on the financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness within those models.

Table 9

*Mean Satisfaction Scores and Standard Deviations by Enrollment Management Model and by Institutional Control and Institutional Size (Collapsed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Management Model</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public M SD</td>
<td>Private M SD</td>
<td>0-5000 M SD</td>
<td>&gt;5001 M SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee/coordinator</td>
<td>42.89 9.436</td>
<td>45.82 8.744</td>
<td>44.82 8.484</td>
<td>44.32 10.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>41.37 9.690</td>
<td>45.58 7.017</td>
<td>44.79 7.282</td>
<td>42.93 9.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>47.65 7.406</td>
<td>47.87 7.251</td>
<td>46.98 6.945</td>
<td>48.51 7.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The results of this study did concur with those from some of the previous studies of enrollment management model perceived effectiveness. A 3-way ANOVA was performed on the comparison of model, institutional control, and institutional size and there was no difference in the result compared to the previous ANOVAs presented. From the results of the ANOVAs, no one organization model, institutional size, or form of institutional control was an indicator of increasing perceived effectiveness, as determined by the directors of financial aid at those institutions. Financial aid directors in divisional enrollment management models reported significantly higher levels of perceived effectiveness than did the financial aid directors working in the other enrollment management models.
Chapter 5: Summary

This chapter provides a summary of the study, as well as conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the research. Conclusions to the research questions will be presented, as well as recommendations for future study by other enrollment management professionals. The importance of understanding the effectiveness of an enrollment management organization extends to the individuals who work within it and not just those at the top of the college or university’s organizational structure. It is important for the organization to be effective first, then to collaborate with professionals across campus to enhance the student experience and to develop a culture of buy-in regarding the importance of sound enrollment management practices (Dennis, 1998).

The impending effects of distressed economic conditions, combined with the decrease in high school graduating class sizes over the next several years will have an effect on the work of enrollment management professionals (Prescott, 2009). The need to operate efficiently and effectively as an enrollment management organization, no matter what shape or structure, will remain critical in the coming years. The ability to strategically forecast options to stabilize or sustain enrollment will be important.

The study addressed a critical component of most enrollment management models, the financial aid office, to gather insights on the effectiveness of the organizational models employed at the institutions. It involved seeking the financial aid directors’ opinions to determine if their perceived effectiveness differed based on enrollment management model, institutional size, or institutional control.
The importance of strategic enrollment management is increasing as the landscape of higher education changes due to decreased public support of higher education and the changing demographics of high school graduates. The ability of an institution to organize around and work to overcome a perceived threat, such as decreased state support or a decrease in high school graduates in a geographic area can indicate its potential to address the changes required to remain financially stable as the enrollment management industry continues to face changes. Institutions must develop and utilize organizational models that enable them to gain positive tuition revenues beyond those provided by an entering freshman class (Dennis, 1998).

This study is an attempt to assess the perceptions of the effectiveness of particular organizational models at four-year public and private colleges and universities nationally, according to the financial aid directors who are working within the four enrollment management systems. Although public relations, retention, counseling, advising, placement, institutional research, development and/or fundraising might be involved in activities that relate to enrollment, they are not found within the enrollment management organization as often as are financial aid offices. These offices are critical to the success of any enrollment management organization, based on their interaction and input (Coomes & Hossler, 1994).

The results of this study can assist the chief enrollment officer on campus to understand the perceived effectiveness from practitioners’ perspectives to potentially identify any opportunities for additional assessment or input from the respondents. Previous studies evaluated the organization from the top of the organization (de leur
This study attempted to evaluate the organization from within, because a successful enrollment management organization is only as effective as its people and the corresponding functions in which they work.

**Summary of Findings**

The following section provides a summary of the in-depth analysis of the six previously identified research questions to evaluate the data collected in order to determine enrollment management model effectiveness as identified by financial aid directors at four-year private and public institutions. Each research question will be restated along with the statistical measure that was used to determine the results. The results of the statistical tests will be reported and identified, if they had any significance in identifying any potential differences in the variables identified.

**Research Question One.** Research Question One focuses on the perceived overall effectiveness of enrollment management models at colleges and universities by financial aid directors and is stated as follows:

What do directors of financial aid perceive to be the overall effectiveness of the enrollment management models used at their colleges and universities?

Based on the data collected from the survey respondents, means and standard deviations were calculated. The overall effectiveness score for the survey respondents was $M = 42.58$ and $S.D. = 7.76$. This score correlates to the survey of an overall response of *agree* with the financial aid director’s perceived effectiveness of the enrollment management model that they operate within. This finding also relates to
previous studies (Smith, 1997; Robinson, 2006) which show that most enrollment management professionals are satisfied with how their current enrollment management model is meeting the institution’s goals and objectives.

**Research Question Two.** Research Question Two focuses on the comparison of perceived model effectiveness by institutional control and is stated as follows:

Do differences exist in financial aid director’s perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on institutional control?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional control and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. There was a significant effect of institutional control, $F(1, 285) = 6.276, P = .013$. The financial aid directors from both public and private institutions reported different levels of effectiveness of their respective enrollment management organizational models. This finding indicates that private colleges and universities had higher perceptions of effectiveness than public colleges and universities. This is consistent with the results found in the previous study (Pollock & Wolf, 1989) that concluded that private institutions were more developed in their enrollment management practices than four-year public institutions, based on sensitivity to enrollment changes and tuition revenue budgeting. This finding represents that public institutions are becoming more like private institutions and are impacted by enrollment management related pressures, recruiting and retention demands, similar to private institutions.

**Research Question Three.** Research Question Three focuses on the comparison of perceived model effectiveness by institutional size and is stated as follows:
Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the institutional size?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional size and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. There was not significant effect of institutional size on perceived effectiveness score, $F(1, 285) = .077$, $p = .781$. As such, financial aid directors from both institutional size groupings reported similar levels of effectiveness of their enrollment management organizational models.

This finding could also be related to the Pollock and Wolf (1989) study that evaluated private institutions and found that those with fewer than 5,000 students were more developed in their enrollment management practices than four-year publics based on sensitivity to enrollment changes and tuition revenue budgeting. This finding represents that public institutions are becoming more like private institutions and are impacted by enrollment management related pressures, recruiting and retention demands, similar to private institutions.

**Research Question Four.** Research Question Four focuses on the comparison of perceived effectiveness based on the organizational model employed at each institution by financial aid directors and is stated as follows:

Do differences exist in financial aid directors’ perceptions of the effectiveness of enrollment management based on the organizational model employed?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the overall effectiveness means by organizational model to evaluate which organizational model had greater impact on
overall effectiveness. The ANOVA revealed a significant difference in the overall effectiveness score between the organizational models. The test statistic, 

\[ F(2, 285) = 7.699, \ p = .001, \]

indicates a statistically significant finding from these data, beyond the .05 standard. Based on the results of the statistical test, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, effectiveness scores among financial aid directors differed based on enrollment management models.

Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were conducted to compare the different organizational models for differences. The financial aid directors in a divisional model reported greater overall effectiveness than both the directors in a matrix model \( p = .009 \), and the directors in a committee/coordinator model, \( p = .016 \). The directors in a committee/coordinator model did not differ significantly from the directors in a matrix model \( p = .912 \).

These results suggest that the more organized an institution becomes, from an enrollment management structure perspective, the greater possibility of stronger perceived effectiveness from that structure. This idea would be supported by the structural nature of the organization changing the perspective of those within (Black, 2005).

**Research Question Five.** Research Question Five focuses on the comparison of perceived effectiveness based on the organizational model employed differing by institutional control and is stated as follows:
Do the effects of organization models employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment management model differ based on the institutions control?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional control and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. There was not a significant interaction between the effects of institutional control and enrollment management model, $F(2, 285) = 1.521, p = .22$. As such, the effects of organizational model on perceived effectiveness were not different for public and private institutions.

This finding is different than the Pollock and Wolf (1989) and Smith (1997) studies which concluded that there was a difference between public and private institutions. The structure or organizational culture may have an effect on the perceived enrollment management model effectiveness which has changed the public institutions to look more like private institutions from an enrollment management perspective.

Research Question Six. Research Question Six focuses on the comparison of perceived effectiveness based on the organizational model employed differing by institutional size and is stated as follows:

Do the effects of organizational model employed by colleges and universities on financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness of their institution’s enrollment model differ based on institutional size?

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of institutional size and enrollment management model on perceived effectiveness score. There was not significant interaction between the effects of institutional size and enrollment
management model $F(2, 285) = 1.036, \ p = .356$. As such, the effects of organizational model on perceived effectiveness were similar based on institutional size.

The size of an institution seems to have little bearing on the overall perceived effectiveness by model. The size of the institution and the model employed did not have significant effects on the financial aid directors’ perceptions of effectiveness within those models.

**Recommendation for Practice**

1. The results of this study demonstrate that the divisional model of enrollment management appears to have the highest perceived effectiveness by financial aid directors. This is based on the comparison of perceived effectiveness scores between the four management models. It is also supported by Black (2003), who noted that structure does matter as it relates to how enrollment management staffs can be more effective at meeting the needs of the institution when a comparison is made to the other enrollment management models. The results of this study may also be helpful when an institution is attempting to reorganize to address enrollment management related concerns and evaluate the way they may organize to meet their needs. The divisional model of enrollment management may have additional costs based on crossing divisional lines and incremental expenses of signage and administrative costs, but following Black’s (2005) statement about customer satisfaction having more to do with process than employee behavior, it is important to have good policies, processes, and procedures as an institution formulates a change in enrollment management structures.
2. The results of this study compared the effects of an institution’s size or control (public versus private) on the perceived effectiveness of the financial aid directors’ based on the enrollment management model employed at their institution. Institutional size or control had a significant effect on their perceived effectiveness score. Private and public institutions of any size concerned with organizing and the impact it may have on particular areas, such as financial aid offices, may realize overall improvement.

3. Organizations that migrate to a different level of organizational structure to address enrollment management-related issues would be wise to consult organizations with the desired future state already in place. This consultation would allow the organizations to strategize on the possibility to not create something new, but achieve institutional goals by employing a model that could be slightly modified from approaches used by other institutions. A massive institutional restructuring may cost additional resources that could be redirected in a slight paradigm shift or realignment of some operational activities. The successes or failures of other organizations may provide insight on the efficacy of a future enrollment management organizational model.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

This study provided some valuable information regarding the perceived effectiveness of enrollment management organizational models employed by public and private four-year institutions nationally. Additional research will provide more insight on improving the organizational models’ effectiveness and enrollment management as a
whole. The following recommendations do not represent an inclusive list of what is necessary for enrollment management models to become more effective, but rather a guide to stimulate further conversations and research.

1. Future studies could be directed toward individuals who have worked at multiple institutions who would be able to both shed light on the differences between different enrollment management models and compare the effectiveness of the models. These individuals may be able to provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of each model from their perspective.

2. Future studies could be directed toward the prevalence of the divisional model of enrollment management to evaluate if the natural progression of this structure was due to enrollment pressures, changing economic conditions, or overall preference by upper levels of the organization.

3. Future studies could be directed toward identifying the organizational models so that institutions continuously meet their enrollment goals. Is there a linkage between a certain organizational model that leads to sustained success in meeting institutional enrollment and retention goals?

4. Future studies could repeat the current study’s design with multiple members of each campus’ enrollment management model participating in order to evaluate the extent of agreement of multiple members from one organization evaluating the management structure. This type of study may present an overall climatic picture of the enrollment management model by institution.
5. Future studies could also focus on student perceptions of the enrollment management organizational structures at certain institutions. This study should be qualitative in nature. Participants would be asked to evaluate the areas that exist within the institution’s current enrollment management structure and how enrollment management impacted their experiences at their respective institutions.

6. Future studies could evaluate the perceived effectiveness at two-year institutions based on their current enrollment management structure. This type of study could shed light on the possibilities for improvement and possibilities to carry over some of those experiences to four-year institutions.

7. A future study might also involve surveying existing members of an enrollment management organization about what would make an ideal enrollment management structure. This study would be qualitative in nature and may provide richer sources of ideas that could help enrollment organizations increase effectiveness in meeting institutional goals.

8. A future study could be conducted to evaluate if there are any new organizational structures or hybrids that are in place at institutions, and the efficacy of those models. This type of study may provide input for enrollment managers to better utilize their staff and assist with meeting institutional goals.

9. A future study could be conducted to evaluate the relationship between enrollment management model and four-year graduation rates of institutions.
This type of study may provide a framework for institutions who seek to increase their graduation rates and stabilize enrollment.

10. A future study could be conducted to evaluate any potential linkage between enrollment management model and the National Survey on Student Engagement scores. This type of study may provide some insight on any effect that an enrollment management model may have on student success and engagement.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study indicated that there was one significant difference in the perceptions of effectiveness of financial aid directors. There was a significant difference in the perceptions of effectiveness by financial aid directors at based on the organizational model employed by that institution. This is supported by previous research by Smith (1997), who noted that the organizational structure did have an impact on perceived effectiveness. The private institution mean perceived effectiveness scores were consistently higher than the public institution mean perceived effectiveness scores by organizational model, which can be interpreted that private institutions’ financial aid directors are more satisfied with how the institution is organized to address enrollment management issues than their counterparts at public institutions. There was no significant difference in the responses of financial aid directors based on the size of the institution and the model that was employed at each institution. Size was not a determinant in having a higher perceived satisfaction score, based on the organizational structure that was employed.
This research was also supported by Smith’s (1997) earlier research on enrollment management model effectiveness as perceived by chief enrollment managers. It appears that more public institutions are organizing similarly to the private institutions, since there was strong representation of the divisional model of enrollment management, which was selected equally among the private and public institutions. Pollock and Wolf’s (1989) study did not show as many public institutions that had organized in such a way as the private institutions, but there were some indications that the public institutions were headed in that direction.

The scale of enrollment management functions ranged from as large as institution-wide initiatives to as small as the reorganization of a few campus offices to serve students more effectively. The importance of enrollment management is integral for the entire campus to embrace. The ability to attract and retain students is the business and concern of everyone on campus (Dennis, 1998). Specific reasons exist for any dips in enrollment or declines in graduation and retention rates that can be found in the academic context (Hossler, 2000). It is important for the entire institution to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses when it comes to enrollment management. The importance of enrolling, retaining, and graduating students is why institutions exist today (Kalsbeek, 2006).

Enrollment management has become one of the centerpieces of higher education based on calls for affordability and issues of graduation rates and outcomes. The importance of how an institution organizes to address concerns of the consumer, or student of the institution, is of utmost concern. The ultimate livelihood of an institution
is partly based on enrolling students who will then graduate and move on to bigger and better things. The positive attributes of a highly educated society rest on the shoulders of institutions of higher learning, which includes enrollment management professionals. They are the gatekeepers to ensure that the institution flourishes and meets the needs of the student at all levels.

Based on the resource dependency theory postulated by Hossler and Hoezee (2001) an institution will redirect its resources based on a perceived or actual threat. This threat may be a period of decreased enrollment in a specific program area, a need to respond to the changing needs of the workplace in which its graduates will be employed, or as serious as financial exigency. The enrollment management organization must be cognizant of the changing needs of the students and the issues that they bring forth in regards to satisfaction with the institution and how it could improve. Financial aid directors play a critical role in this process and their perspective on organizational effectiveness is critical to delivering quality customer service, from recruitment through graduation—and often beyond, through an effective enrollment management structure.
References


*New Directions for Student Services*, 71, 43-53.


*New Directions for Higher Education*, (68), 6-15.


Dolence, M. G., & American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. (Eds.). (1993). *Strategic enrollment management: A primer for campus...


Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2005) *2004 national enrollment management study: Key findings for two-year and four-year institutions.* Iowa City, IA: Noel-Levitz, Inc.


Appendix A: Survey Instrument

This survey examines your opinions on the effectiveness of your enrollment management model. The survey’s estimated completion time is around 10 to 15 minutes. Thank you for your time in completing this valuable survey.

1. Are you from a public or private institution?
   a. Public
   b. Private

2. Please select the description that best represents your organizational structure as it exists at your institution today.
   a. Enrollment Management Committee (Membership from the administration of enrollment departments and faculty. The committee addresses recruitment and retention issues).
   b. Enrollment Management Coordinator (An individual designated to coordinate efforts that influence recruitment and retention efforts. Some or all of the key enrollment departments do not report directly to this individual).
   c. Enrollment Management Matrix (A senior administrator who is responsible for enrollment, but, who does not have all the key enrollment departments (e.g., admissions, records and registration, financial aid, orientation, and advising) in their reporting lines).
   d. Enrollment Management Division (An administrative division directed by a senior administrator whose enrollment organization encompasses the key enrollment departments (e.g., admissions, records and registration, financial aid, orientation, and academic advising) in their reporting line).
   e. None of the above

3. What is the size of your undergraduate full-time enrollment?
   a. 0-5,000
   b. 5,001-10,000
   c. Over 10,001

4. The time period of your most recent re-organization regarding enrollment management issues?
   a. Have never changed since inception
   b. 1990-1995
   c. 1996-2001
   d. 2002-2006
   e. 2007 to current
5. On average, what is the percentage of applicants for admission are accepted for enrollment?
   50%  60%  70%  75%  80%  over 80%

6. Please identify who you directly report to in your organization.
   a. Admissions
   b. Student Affairs
   c. Academic Affairs
   d. Business/Financial Affairs
   e. Student Enrollment
   f. Other

Below are statements of opinion about the enrollment management structure at your institution. Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement.

SA=Strongly Agree   A=Agree   D=Disagree   SD=Strong Disagree

1. The performance of your current enrollment management structure on campus is satisfactory.

2. The current enrollment management structure provides the services and resources needed by the institution to manage enrollment.

3. The current enrollment management structure is effective in meeting the strategic goals for enrollment at your institution.

4. The current enrollment management structure at your institution is effective at communicating enrollment management issues to the campus community.

5. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has improved efficiencies within your areas of responsibility.

6. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has assisted in meeting departmental goals of customer satisfaction.

7. Does your current enrollment management structure enhance the visibility of enrollment activities on campus?

8. Does the campus enrollment management structure enhance the leadership role of the enrollment management function on campus?
9. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has increased or stabilized your student enrollment.

10. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has increased or stabilized your student profile.

11. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has increased or stabilized your graduation rates.

12. The current enrollment management structure that exists on your campus has increased or strengthened the profile of your entering class.

13. The current enrollment management structure is effective in supporting enrollment-related initiatives.

14. The current enrollment management structure is effective in supporting your institution’s ability to attract students.

15. The current enrollment management structure is effective in promoting the impact of enrollment management on institutional livelihood.
Appendix B: Pre-notice letter

Pre-notice letter

March 15, 2011

Dear «FAA_FIRST_NAME»,

I am a graduate student working on my Ph.D. in higher education at Ohio University. For my dissertation, I am looking at the effectiveness and benefits of enrollment management organizations at four-year private and public colleges and universities in the United States.

I have identified your institution through the Department of Education as a four-year institution and am inviting you to participate in this survey of financial aid directors. You will soon receive an email message that contains the web survey link. It will have the subject line: Evaluating Enrollment Management Models Survey. Your participation is important for the success of this study.

The financial aid office has become an essential and critical office in the last 30 years in enrollment management efforts. This study will help identify, from the financial aid director’s perspective, the effectiveness of specific enrollment management models and the perceived effectiveness as it relates to financial aid. The information collected may serve as a benchmark for other office within enrollment management.

The purpose of this study is to assess the perception of the effectiveness and focus of enrollment management models at private colleges and universities in the United States. While enrollment management found its roots in private higher education it is still in its growth state and is maturing as a management theory daily.

Your participation is important for the success of this study. The pilot study indicates the entire survey can be completed in 15-20 minutes. The survey consists of a few demographic/institutional items and 15 Likert scale questions. All survey responses will be kept strictly confidential. I have arranged to have email addresses stripped out by the local survey administrator so the downloaded data I analyze will not actually contain your personal information. If you volunteer your personally identifying information, nothing collected will be released without prior permission.

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. I look forward to reviewing the data and reading your responses. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Todd Everett, Ph.D. Candidate-Ohio University
Director of Financial Aid
Xavier University
March 16, 2011

Dear «FAA_FIRST_NAME»,

This is a follow-up message to my previous email regarding my dissertation research on enrollment management effectiveness from a financial aid director’s perspective.

The purpose of this study is to assess the perception of the effectiveness of enrollment management models at private and public four-year colleges and universities nationally. I appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. I look forward to reviewing the data and reading your responses.

Please click on the link below to begin the survey.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FG2JQB2

Thank you for your time in completing this survey.

Sincerely,

Todd Everett, Ph.D. Candidate-Ohio University
Director of Financial Aid
Xavier University
Appendix D: Reminder email with survey link

March 23, 2011

Dear «FAA_FIRST_NAME»,

I would like you to know that the survey on enrollment management effectiveness from a financial aid director’s perspective is still open.

My records indicate that you have not completed or started the survey and would ask for a few moments of your precious time to help me with my dissertation research.

As a reminder, the purpose of this study is to assess the perception of the effectiveness of enrollment management models at private and public four-year colleges and universities nationally.

I appreciate your willingness to participate in this study. I look forward to reviewing the data and reading your responses.

Please click on the link below to begin the survey.  
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FG2JQB2

Thank you for your time in completing this survey.  
Sincerely,

Todd Everett, Ph.D. Candidate-Ohio University  
Director of Financial Aid  
Xavier University
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