

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# U·M·I

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**Order Number 9212195**

**Marketing and recruiting efforts used in hospitality education  
graduate programs: Perceptions of effectiveness and influence in  
selection of graduate program**

**Strohbehn, Catherine Hemphill, Ph.D.**

**Iowa State University, 1991**

**U·M·I**

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**



Marketing and recruiting efforts used in  
Hospitality education graduate programs:  
Perceptions of effectiveness and influence in  
selection of graduate program

by

Catherine Hemphill Strohbehn

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education  
Major: Higher Education

**Approved:**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**In Charge of Major Work**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**In Charge of Major Work**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Department**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Education Major**

Signature was redacted for privacy.

**For the Graduate College**

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1991

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for Study	1
Statement of Problem	8
Characteristics of students and programs	10
Perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices	10
Factors considered important by students in selection of a graduate program	11
Attitudes and values held by graduate students	11
Purpose of Study	12
Definition of Terms	14
Limitations	15
Significance of Study	16
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Enrollment Management for Colleges and Universities	17
Introduction	17
Marketing of nonprofit institutions	18
Development of institutional marketing strategy	21
Utilization of marketing strategies	22
Attitudes and Values of College Students in the United States	26
Introduction	26
Changes in attitudes and values of students	27
Conclusion	32
History of Graduate Education in the United States	33
Development of purpose	33
Graduate degrees	34
Graduate programs	35

	Page
Marketing and Recruiting Efforts of Graduate and Professional Programs	37
Literature review	37
Recruitment of students	38
Marketing and recruiting practices at the graduate level	41
Selection Criteria of Prospective Graduate Students	43
Reasons for advanced study	43
Preliminary model for institutional selection	43
Student expectations	44
Four-Year and Graduate Programs of Hospitality Education in the United States	45
Profile of four-year programs	45
Faculty characteristics	48
Graduate programs of hospitality education	51
CHAPTER THREE. METHODOLOGY	55
Introduction	55
Subjects	56
Sample of administrators	57
Sample of students	58
Characteristics of population and sample	59
Geographic regions	62
Instruments	63
Introduction	63
Survey to graduate program administrators	64
Development of survey to graduate students	66
Procedures	70
Pilot testing	70
Collection of data	71
Data Analysis	76

	Page
CHAPTER FOUR. RESULTS	78
Characteristics of Students and Programs	79
Demographic characteristics	79
Work experience	83
Career plans	85
Program	87
Selection criteria	90
Faculty characteristics	92
Perceptions of Effectiveness of Marketing and Recruiting Practices	94
Perceptions of administrators	94
Perceptions of students	98
Comparison of perceptions	105
Factors Considered Important by Students in Selection of a Graduate Program	107
Categories	108
Differences in ratings of importance between student groups	115
Attitudes and Values Towards Work and Lifestyle Preferences	120
Ratings of importance of attitude and value statements	121
Differences in ratings of importance between student groups	126
CHAPTER FIVE. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY	132
Discussion	132
Student demographics and characteristics of graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States	133
Characteristics of graduate programs	136
Perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts	141
Factors considered important in selection of graduate program	150



	Page
Attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences	157
Summary	164
Recommendations	170
REFERENCES	174
APPENDIX A. LETTER TO GRADUATE ADMINISTRATORS	183
APPENDIX B. SURVEY TO ADMINISTRATORS	185
APPENDIX C. LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS WITH STUDENT SURVEYS	193
APPENDIX D. SURVEY TO GRADUATE STUDENTS	195
APPENDIX E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS	206
APPENDIX F. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF PRACTICES USED BEFORE STUDENT INQUIRY	208
APPENDIX G. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF PRACTICES USED AFTER STUDENT INQUIRY	210
APPENDIX H. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS	213
APPENDIX I. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS	216
APPENDIX J. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS	219
APPENDIX K. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES	222
APPENDIX L. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES	225

	Page
APPENDIX M. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE AND SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES	228

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Characteristics of population and survey respondents of students enrolled in participating graduate programs of hospitality education	60
Table 2. Distribution of survey respondents by characteristics of gender, level of study, and citizenship status	61
Table 3. Geographic distribution of population of graduate students in hospitality education and student respondents	62
Table 4. Distribution of study sample graduate students of hospitality education by ethnic identification and level of study	81
Table 5. Percent of domestic and international master's students having different levels of hospitality industry work experience	84
Table 6. Years of graduate student managerial experience by employment sector and level of study	85
Table 7. Plans of student currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs immediately following completion of degree	86
Table 8. Percentage of graduate students employed on departmental assistantships as reported by departmental administrators	89
Table 9. Estimated number of student inquiries regarding hospitality graduate programs for the 1989-1990 academic year	89
Table 10. Selection criteria and use by graduate programs of hospitality education	90
Table 11. Ranking of criteria used by graduate programs of hospitality education in selection of graduate students	91

	Page
Table 12. Areas of faculty research interest	93
Table 13. Ratings of administrators' perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices before student inquiry	95
Table 14. Mean ratings of administrators' perceptions of marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry	97
Table 15. Mean ratings of students' perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used before student inquiry into a program	100
Table 16. Mean ratings of students' perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used by programs after student inquiry	103
Table 17. A summary of significant t-test analysis of administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry	107
Table 18. Student ratings of importance of reputation factors in student selection of current graduate program	109
Table 19. Distribution of student ratings of importance of personal factors in final selection of graduate program	109
Table 20. Distribution of student ratings of importance of departmental characteristics in selection of graduate program	111
Table 21. Distribution of student ratings of importance of financial assistance factors in final selection of graduate program	112
Table 22. Distribution of student ratings of importance of external factors in selection of graduate program	113

	Page
Table 23. Distribution of student ratings of importance of community characteristics	114
Table 24. Distribution of student ratings of importance of institutional characteristics in final selection of graduate program	115
Table 25. A t-test analysis of ratings of importance of departmental reputation in final selection of graduate program	116
Table 26. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance between master's and doctoral students for factors used in final selection of graduate program	118
Table 27. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance of factors between domestic and international students	120
Table 28. Means for inner-oriented cluster of attitudes and values for all respondents (n = 85)	122
Table 29. Means for group-oriented cluster of attitudes and values for all respondents (n = 85)	124
Table 30. Means for material-oriented cluster of attitudes and values for all respondents (n = 85)	125
Table 31. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance of attitudes and value statements by male and female graduate students of hospitality education	126
Table 32. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance of attitude and value statements between master's and doctoral level students	128
Table 33. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance of attitude and value statements between domestic and international students	129

	Page
Table 34. Twelve of 33 factors considered in final selection of graduate program with mean ratings of importance $\geq 3.50$	169

## CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

## Need for Study

The need to attract and prepare greater numbers of qualified students as future educators and practitioners of hospitality management will grow in response to increasing numbers of hospitality programs and the change to a global economy. Marketing research emphasizes the importance of knowing how an institution is perceived by strategic constituencies. Studies of undergraduate student recruitment methods and student selection of programs have noted the significance of perceptions held by strategic constituencies, such as students and administrators, towards the institution and specific departments (Jackson, 1982; Litten, 1982).

Fewer numbers of traditional age college-bound students have been projected since the early 1980s (Lolli & Scannell, 1983). Interest in university marketing and student recruitment has increased at the undergraduate level as a response to these demographic projections. Variables that influence selection of an undergraduate institution include student ability, socioeconomic status, values, attitudes, family, and plans of close friends. Institutional characteristics such as location, cost, and academic programs also affect student choice of college (Jackson, 1982; Litten, 1982).

Graduate students choose institutions on the basis of perceived quality and reputation of the program, net cost, and location, Hossler (1984) reported after a review of the available literature. Olson and King (1985) suggested graduate student characteristics such as attitudes, values, financial situation and marital status play an important role in student response to recruitment efforts.

Some researchers have studied student reasons for enrolling in graduate education. Primary reasons why students enrolled in a variety of specific graduate programs included 'credentialing', academic or research interests, personal satisfaction, or better career opportunities (Gagnon, 1988; Malaney, 1987b).

Malaney (1987a) organized a study of the utilization of marketing and recruiting efforts into two phases. Administrators of graduate programs at one research university recorded practices used by the department before students initiated contact and practices used after a student had inquired about a program. Although utilization of marketing and recruiting practices across a variety of academic disciplines was reported, the effectiveness of these practices, as perceived by administrators and prospective students, was not researched.

Most of the published studies on marketing efforts of graduate and professional programs have researched specific



student characteristics, such as gender or minority group membership, or specific program characteristics, such as social work or medicine (Henry, 1980; Czintoka, Johnson, & Jelly, 1980; Malaney, 1983).

Redlin et al. (1991) stated one weakness of graduate programs in hospitality education, and an impediment to growth, was competition with graduate programs of business for outstanding students. Combined with the documented need (Calnan, Chacko, & Nebel, 1986) for qualified faculty, and dwindling numbers of prospective students, it is critical that graduate programs of hospitality education enlarge the pool of qualified undergraduate students recruited for graduate study. In order to attract a larger pool of prospective students, administrators must determine what methods are effective in creating student interest in a program.

Hospitality management as a field of study is relatively young and has experienced tremendous growth in the past 15 years. There are currently over 150 four-year programs and 23 graduate programs of hospitality education. Historically, graduate education has played a limited role in the education of future hospitality management professionals and educators. In the past, hospitality educators completed advanced academic preparation in related disciplines such as business administration, nutrition, or education and relied on work experience for knowledge of the industry (Rutherford, 1982).

Graduate education in hospitality management is increasing in importance due to various factors. Currently, hospitality education programs face a shortage of qualified faculty. The shortage is attributed to the rapid growth in number and size of four-year programs, and institutional expectations of an earned doctorate as an appropriate academic qualification.

Faculty shortages are widespread across all disciplines, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. El-Khawas (1990) noted faculty shortages are due to ageing of current faculty and the inability in past years to attract "historically excluded ethnic group members and women" into doctoral programs.

The need for hospitality education faculty with earned doctorates has been documented in the literature. Calnan, Chacko, and Nebel (1986) reported a growing gap between the available supply and demand for educators with doctoral degrees, a finding repeated by Fenich two years later (1988). Levefer and Graves' (1990) content analysis of position announcements for hospitality educators indicated approximately 50% of the position vacancies required completed doctorate degrees and 9% required industry and teaching experience.

Another factor contributing to the increasing importance of graduate education is industry recognition of the benefits

of employees with master's degrees. As the field matures into an established profession, industry representatives will seek candidates with advanced degrees (Levefer & Graves, 1990). Although hospitality management is an applied field, industry leaders recognize the need for managers able to blend theory with practical knowledge.

Additionally, as women become a larger segment of the work force and assume responsibilities equal with men, the need for equivalent academic preparation and industry experience will increase. Demographic projections of the future labor pool show an increased diversity amongst all sectors of the work force with managerial positions no longer dominated by white males.

With increasing globalization of business and industry, multi-national corporations will seek qualified professionals to manage hospitality locations worldwide. The United States is one of the few countries that offer advanced graduate education in the applied field of hospitality management. Parallel increases in the move towards globalization in business and industry and international student enrollment in graduate programs of hospitality management have been noted (Bosselman & Fernsten, 1989).

A conservative estimate of international student enrollment in hospitality education graduate programs indicates it is more than twice that of enrollment in other fields.

Bosselman and Fernsten (1989) estimated international student enrollment of 25% to 50% in hospitality education graduate programs compared to recent figures released by the Council of Graduate Schools (1991) showing that international students account for 12% of graduate enrollment at institutions in the United States.

Administrators of graduate programs of hospitality education face concerns regarding over-representation of international students. Although international students contribute multi-cultured perspectives to the curriculum, special needs do exist and time is required to adjust for cultural differences and language difficulties.

No published research has studied the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used by graduate programs of hospitality education. The perceptions of strategic constituencies of effective practices used before or after student inquiry into a program has not been explored.

Factors considered important by students in selection of various graduate programs have been researched in a limited number of studies (Olson & King, 1985; Moore & Halfond, 1986; Gagnon, 1988). Factors why students select graduate programs of hospitality management have not been researched.

In addition, there has not been any published research that has studied attitudes and values held by graduate students of hospitality education towards work and lifestyle

factors. Some studies have compared business ethics and social responsibility between groups of undergraduate hospitality education students and hospitality managers (Whitney, 1989; Freedman & Bartholomew, 1991). Yet knowledge of the attitudes and values towards personal and professional preferences held by future educators and industry professionals will have implications as the labor force undergoes demographic changes and responses in the shift towards a global economy.

Some observations by practitioners working with college age men and women have noted gender differences in attitudes towards career opportunities and decisions regarding lifetime employment. Economic conditions and societal views towards the role of women have contributed to the formation of some of these attitudes and values. A recent Wall Street Journal article (Stern, 1991) quoted one university career planning counselor as saying that young women today have "inherited a sense of entitlement" and are convinced "they are going to have to work throughout their lives, and are preparing themselves in much the same way as men." In the same article, another psychologist noted rules of traditional relationships were based on one person as the "career driver," but now changes have put "two people in the driver's seat."

Characteristics and attributes of graduate students currently enrolled in hospitality education programs have not

been published for a representative sample of the entire population. One study has reported on students enrolled in a certain geographic region (Khwaja, Bosselman, & Fernsten, 1990).

Only one study is available in the current literature that describes characteristics of graduate hospitality education programs. Zabel's work encompassed the broader field of hospitality which included areas of tourism and resort and club management (Zabel, 1991).

Knowledge of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts as perceived by strategic constituencies, an awareness of characteristics of students currently attracted to graduate programs of hospitality education, and factors that influenced the decision to enroll at a particular program can contribute in resolving some of the problems that impede the growth of graduate education in hospitality management. Information of this nature can be used in design and implementation of marketing and recruiting strategies to attract qualified students for graduate study in hospitality education to prepare as future industry leaders and educators.

#### Statement of Problem

It is expected that graduate programs in hospitality education will develop and mature in response to the need for

qualified educators with earned doctorates and the need for practitioners to manage hospitality businesses in a global economy. Information is needed to attract qualified students to prepare as future educators and industry leaders.

Determinations of effective marketing and recruiting practices used before student interest in a program is expressed, and practices used in response to student inquiry are needed. The comparison of perceptions of effectiveness of utilized marketing and recruiting practices between the strategic constituencies of administrators and students will provide helpful information as marketing strategies are developed in response to the need for an enlarged pool of prospective students.

Barton and Treadwell (1978) recommended the initial task of the marketing process include an objective analysis of institutional strengths and the population currently served. Information about established graduate programs, such as number of students and faculty, areas of research interest, and selection criteria is needed to contribute to the body of knowledge and assess strengths of programs of advanced study. Demographic information about students currently enrolled will describe the population attracted by current marketing and recruiting efforts. An assessment of student attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences will

contribute information helpful in marketing programs and meeting career objectives.

Research questions for this study were grouped into four content areas. The present study addresses the following questions:

Characteristics of students and programs

1. What is the profile of students currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs at the masters and doctoral levels?
2. What are the characteristics of institutions and graduate programs in hospitality education?

Perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices

1. What are the marketing and recruiting efforts used by graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States before student inquiry?
2. What are the marketing and recruiting efforts used by graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States after student inquiry?
3. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions held by graduate program administrators and graduate students of hospitality education in the United States in terms of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used before student inquiry?



4. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions held by graduate program administrators and graduate students of hospitality education in the United States in terms of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry?

Factors considered important by students in selection of a graduate program

1. What are the factors involved in student selection of a graduate program in hospitality education?
2. Is there a significant difference between male and female graduate students of hospitality education in their rating of factors used in selection of graduate program?
3. Is there a significant difference between master's and doctoral graduate students of hospitality education in their rating of factors used in selection of graduate program?
4. Is there a significant difference between international and domestic graduate students of hospitality education in their rating of factors used in selection of graduate program?

Attitudes and values held by graduate students

1. What are the attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences considered important or very important by graduate students in hospitality education programs?

2. Is there a significant difference between male and female graduate students of hospitality education in their ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values?
3. Is there a significant difference between master's and doctoral graduate students of hospitality education in their ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values?
4. Is there a significant difference between international and domestic graduate students in their ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values?

#### Purpose of Study

The goal of this study is to provide information that will aid graduate programs of hospitality education in attracting qualified students in response to needs for future educators and industry practitioners. Data will be collected by mail surveys addressed to administrators of all known hospitality education graduate programs in the United States ( $n = 23$ ). Another survey will be mailed to a random sample of students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality management.

A profile of students currently enrolled in graduate hospitality education programs will be compiled. Institutional and departmental characteristics of graduate programs in hospitality education will be gathered.

One purpose of this study is to determine marketing and recruiting practices used by graduate programs of hospitality education before and after a student expresses interest in a program. Perceptions of program administrators and current graduate students of the effectiveness of practices used before and after student inquiry will be compared.

Students will rate 33 factors that they might have considered in their final selection of a graduate program. Factors will be grouped into seven categories. Individual factors ratings and group factor ratings will be determined. Ratings of importance will be compared between groups of students classified by characteristics of program level, gender, and citizenship status to determine if significant differences exist.

Students will assess the importance of 35 statements about attitudes and values relating to work and lifestyle factors. Attitude and values statements will be clustered into three categories - inner-, group-, and material-oriented. Individual item mean ratings of importance and category mean ratings of importance will be assessed and compared between the same groups of students.

This study will introduce baseline data on marketing and recruiting efforts considered effective by both students and administrators. The findings from this study will provide input to administrators of graduate programs to a) target

graduate student recruiting efforts towards a desired market segment, b) aid in decisions surrounding program development, and c) better meet the needs of prospective students.

#### Definition of Terms

Operational terms used in this study include:

Hospitality education or management program - a four-year program, leading to a baccalaureate degree, which offers options in at least one of the following areas; hotel, restaurant, or institution management.

Graduate program in hospitality education or management - program of study that will lead to a masters and/or doctoral degree in at least one of the following areas; hotel, restaurant, or institutional management.

Marketing - efforts utilized by hospitality education personnel to promote a particular graduate program.

Recruitment - efforts made to enroll prospective students for graduate study in hospitality education.

Minority students - citizens of the United States of America with ethnic identification in one of the following protected categories: Asian-Pacific Islander. African-American, Hispanic-Mexican American-Puerto Rican, or Native American Indian.

International students - students who are not citizens of the United States of America.

Attitudes - a feeling or emotion toward a fact or situation.

Values - a standard for decision-making held by the individual and identified by verbal expression or behavior.

#### Limitations

The results of this study will be generalizable to four-year hospitality education programs in the United States currently offering graduate degrees in the fields of hotel, restaurant or institution management. Because the number of current graduate programs is limited (population is 23), the rate of non-responses may significantly affect the research findings. The reported findings may not accurately represent the perceptions of all graduate program administrators.

Random selection of students to complete the survey for graduate students will be performed by graduate program administrators at schools when a list of student names is not returned. Although directions will be provided in these cases, the researcher can not verify that each of the graduate student respondents will have an equal chance for selection as a participant in this study. In addition, the rate and pattern of responses may not accurately represent the characteristics and perceptions of the entire population of currently enrolled graduate students in hospitality education.

### Significance of Study

This exploratory study will determine the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices currently used by a specific field of graduate study - hospitality education. As programs in hospitality education increase in size and number, characteristics about programs in place will aid in development of future programs. Knowledge of the factors that students in this field of study consider important in final selection of graduate program will allow administrators to effectively meet the needs of student populations. In addition, information from this study will identify effective marketing and recruiting practices perceived by specific student markets. The assessment and values held by students of hospitality education towards work and lifestyle preferences will provide a profile of the future educator or practitioner of hospitality education. With increasing diversity in the work force in the United States and globalization of many corporations, knowledge regarding attitudes and values held by one future professional group towards professional and personal lifestyle factors can aid in efforts to attract and retain qualified industry practitioners and hospitality educators.

## CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For this study, the literature was reviewed in six areas: enrollment management for colleges and universities, attitudes and values of college students in the United States, history of graduate education in the United States, marketing and recruiting efforts of graduate and professional programs, selection criteria of prospective graduate students, and description of four-year and graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States.

### Enrollment Management for Colleges and Universities

#### Introduction

Hossler (1984) defined enrollment management as a process or activity which influences the size, shape, and the institutional characteristics of a student body. This process includes directing institutional efforts in the areas of marketing, recruitment, admissions, and financial aid. A total enrollment management concept includes market research needs such as enrollment profiles, population analysis, regional needs assessment, student value surveys, institutional image studies, feasibility studies for new programs, curriculum evaluation, and retention programs. The concept of enrollment management is replacing an admissions model that focused only on the recruitment and admittance of quali-

fied students. Factors contributing to the expanded scope in enrollment management are declining pool of high school graduates, population migrations to different geographic regions, and decreasing federal support of student financial aid (Lolli and Scannell, 1983a). Demographic projections show an expected decline of college bound high school graduates (Marshall and Delman, 1984). Hossler (1984) recommended improved student retention efforts, beginning from the point of initial student contact to the point of graduation, as methods to combat decline in student numbers and quality.

#### Marketing of nonprofit institutions

Kottler and Fox (1985) defined marketing as the analysis of planning, implementation, and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets to achieve institutional objectives. Historically, the marketing discipline has focused on marketing physical goods in the private sector. Not until the 1970s were efforts made to learn more about marketing applications in public and nonprofit sectors. A key factor underlying the trend toward a greater marketing orientation among nonprofit organizations is increased competition to improve institutional market share (Lovelock & Weinberg, 1984).



Distinctive characteristics of nonprofit marketing include an emphasis on services, social behaviors, and non-financial objectives. Kleemann and Richardson (1985) wrote that as competition for students increases, marketing of the institution to different constituencies will become even more critical. The main task of any institution in the marketing process is to determine the needs and wants of target markets, and to satisfy them through the designs and delivery of viable programs and services. However, the needs and preferences of students must be weighed with the preservation of the institutions' academic reputation and other institutional goals and priorities (Kottler & Fox, 1985).

Yet, as the trend towards an increased marketing orientation by colleges and universities continued, there was the concern that admissions counselors would have to choose whether they would be "counselors or marketers" (Phelps & Swann, 1984). This was a historical concern dating back to the time of the philosophers Plato and Aristotle, when merchants were considered unproductive and acquisitive.

Another concern regarding the use of marketing strategies for educational institutions included incompatibility of purpose - the purpose of education being to impart knowledge while the purpose of marketing was to make money (Kottler & Fox, 1985). Litten (1981) expressed a concern for potential usage of unethical or undesirable recruiting practices.

But, there were advocates for the use of marketing strategies in higher education. Litten (1981) referred to Frederick Rudolph's history of higher education to illustrate examples of efforts of colleges and universities to respond to changes in American society and to serve new markets. Wofford and Timmerman (1982) stated that,

Marketing, at the highest level of acceptance, provides the means with which to choose a course of action that is balanced between the institutional mission and the needs and realities of the market place. It can be quite dangerous to respond to either of these with disregard for the other.

Litten (1981) recommended faculty play a central role in all aspects of academic marketing because they control the curriculum and influence many institutional policies. He further recommended an institution's principal marketing position be held by an individual with extensive academic experience. Hossler (1984) wrote individuals responsible for enrollment management must be able to influence academic advising, orientation, retention studies, student services, and the institutional research agenda, in addition to marketing, recruitment, admissions, and financial aid. Common goals for institutions of higher education using marketing strategies included more students, better students, better retention, and a balanced student population (Barton & Treadwell, 1978).

### Development of institutional marketing strategy

Bruker and Taliana (1985) wrote the initial step for an institution before beginning any type of market research is to undertake a self-study, in which the mission, objectives, and resources of the institution are defined. Two major elements of a well planned marketing program include an objective analysis of institutional strengths and the population it currently serves and determination of institutional goals in terms of student enrollment and services performed Barton and Treadwell (1978).

The development of a marketing strategy involves choice of a competitive position, the selection of one or more target market segments, and the development of an effective marketing mix to reach and serve the selected market (Kottler & Fox, 1985). Marketing segmentation defines prospective customer groups from within the total population and breaks these groups into segments for specifically tailored marketing strategies. These markets are segmented by different variables such as demographics, geographics, benefits sought, or product related behavior.

A marketing program is comprised of the following four elements; benefits of the product, good, or service, price to consumers of obtaining these benefits, logistics of product distribution, and means used to communicate information about the product, good or service to prospective customers

(Lovelock & Weinberg, 1984). Collectively, these elements are referred to as the marketing mix.

Litten and Brodigan (1982) suggested the medium by which information is communicated is as critical as the message itself. In college marketing, information is communicated to prospective students by college publications, admissions officers, high school counselors, current students, alumni, or traditional advertising methods. The literature suggests varying degrees of initiative exist amongst high school seniors to gather information about colleges (Kleemann & Richardson, 1985). Chapman (1981) reported students with expectations of attending college were more likely to seek out information about college than those without expectations for college attendance.

#### Utilization of marketing strategies

Utilization of market research data in higher education has several functions. Market research can be used by colleges and universities to improve the quality of student applicants, combat enrollment decline, and to increase the graduation rate (Marshall & Delman, 1984; Lollic & Scannell, 1983b). Knowledge of how an organization is perceived by strategic constituencies is important to ensure that information made available to specific markets is an accurate reflection of the institution (Jackson, 1982).

Retention process      One of the factors important in the retention process is the establishment of a good student - institution match in the recruiting and admissions process. This concept considers the match of a student's personal attributes, needs, goals, interests, and values with the institutional characteristics which make up the campus environment. Research demonstrates that a good fit between students and their institutions results in increased satisfaction, achievement, and retention (Banning, 1978; Moos, 1973; Painter & Painter, 1982 in Hossler, 1984). Achievement of a good student-institution match requires both sophisticated marketing techniques and a thorough understanding of the institution and its place in the market of higher education (Litten and Brodigan, 1982).

College choice process      Several models of the college choice process identify factors that influence the enrollment decision. Jackson (1982) presented a three-phase model for college choice that showed enrollment decisions are based on interactional factors. His model identified student abilities, socioeconomic status, aspirations, attitudes and values, and plans of family and close friends as the most influential factors in phase one. In phase two, students considered their preferences amongst different types of institutions before evaluation and selection of a college in phase three. Institutional characteristics such as location,

net cost, academic programs and other environmental considerations interacted with student attributes in the final enrollment decision.

Another model proposed by Kottler and Fox (1985) listed seven sequential steps followed in college selection; the decision to attend, information seeking and receiving, inquiries to specific colleges, the application process, admission into one or more schools, selection of an institution, and enrollment.

Gorman (1976) found that location and size of the institution, curriculum offerings, and the institution's reputation for high quality education were the three primary reasons for selection to a particular school. His study reported the greatest sources of personal influence in the decision of which college to attend to be family and friends. Similar results were found by Marshall and Delman (1984). These researchers stated that academic program offerings, financial concerns, and prestige and reputation of the school were other important determinants in college selection. Jackson (1982) ranked the effects of different factors in college selection into three categories: strong effects (family background, academic experience, location of school, and college costs), moderate effects (information about college attributes), and weak effects (peers, neighborhood, and school).

Chapman (1981) wrote college choice depended on student characteristics and external influences, comprised of significant persons, characteristics of the college, and institutional efforts to communicate with prospective students. Litten (1982) wrote that student choice was affected by individual student characteristics, such as socioeconomic status, and external influences, such as parents, friends, and various forms of contact with prospective colleges and universities.

Gorman (1976) wrote successful student attracting methods included personal visits by prospective students on visitation day; personal contact by a student already enrolled in the school; and contact with a college recruiter. Carter and Garrigan (1979) stressed the theme of personalization in the recruitment process.

Geller (1982) concluded institutions in one study erred in terms of providing too little information to prospective students. Huddleston and Batty (1978) suggested student financial assistance services be included as a major part of institutional marketing. Jackson (1982) recommended tactics designed to persuade the largest number of prospective students to enter a college at the lowest cost: specific information directed to individuals after an contact has been established and academic help to individual students to prepare for college-level work.

## Attitudes and Values of College Students in the United States

### Introduction

Madden (1977) observed our society has become a clash between the culture of tradition and the culture of science with science called upon to answer moral dilemmas by providing objective data to resolve ethical questions. In the midst of an increasingly complex society, traditional college students attempt to resolve questions about their own attitudes and values. The degree of involvement of the college and university in student development varies from institution to institution, according to philosophy of the school. One leading educator wrote (Boyer, 1987) "education's primary mission is to develop within each student the capacity to judge wisely in matters of life and conduct." Bowen (1979) described the chief educational task of colleges and universities was to help students achieve cognitive learning, emotional and moral development, and practical competence.

Researchers have investigated the value of higher education from both economic and individual perspectives. The economic value of higher education has been measured by private returns to the student in the form of higher income and returns to society in the form of higher taxes, public service contributions, and less dependence on state welfare (Leslie & Brinkman, 1988).



### Changes in attitudes and values of students

Feldman and Newcomb's (1969) review of the literature from 1957 to 1969 of the impacts of higher education on students' values, attitudes, satisfactions, personality characteristics and orientations towards post-college life found some changes universal in nearly all American colleges. Their findings indicated increases in student open-mindedness, independence, and confidence but declines in commitment to religion and political conservatism. This review of the literature found college-educated individuals were more inclined to search for intrinsic rewards from their occupations while non college-educated employees were more concerned with extrinsic factors such as income, security, and working conditions (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Withey, 1971).

Career aspirations and philosophies of life      A comparison of results from over 20 years of surveys of incoming freshmen (1966-1990) indicated trends in educational and career aspirations of students and student values (Astin, 1985). Students who were freshmen within the last decade comprise a large percentage of the population of current or prospective graduate students. Astin (1991) reported increased interest in business, engineering, and computer science as intended fields of study with plans to become business executives, accountants, engineers, and computer analysts more than doubled since 1966. There was less re-

ported intent to study in the liberal arts and humanities and declines in intended human service occupations such as the clergy, nursing, teaching, or social work.

Over 50% of the 1990 entering freshmen listed preparation for graduate or professional school as a very important reason to attend college. Almost 60% of the same student group planned on earning advanced degrees (master's - 37%, doctoral -12%) or professional degrees (law, medical, veterinary - 10%) (Astin, 1991).

Astin (1991) reported responses to a life goal statement of being "well off financially" increased from 40% of freshmen surveyed in 1973 to over 70% of freshmen surveyed in 1990. The life goal of developing "a meaningful philosophy of life" was considered the most valued by only 43% of the entering freshmen in 1990, compared to 83% of the 1970 class.

Astin summarized that most of the values given priority in recent years were related with money, power and status, while those concerned with altruism and social concerns, and creativity and artistic goals have declined (Astin, 1985). He reflected these changes in attitudes and values were highly consistent with changes in student majors and career expectations. Horowitz (1987) described college students today as "hungering to reproduce the material world of their parents" with a primary concern for achieving good grades, which in turn represents the ability to earn more money even

at the expense of personal growth through risk taking and resolution of values and identity. She described this "grim professionalism as mindless professionalism." Astin (1991) found 41% of freshmen anticipated they would earn a B average or higher in college.

Another researcher (Otten, 1990) noted little variation in responses by gender: Female students were indistinguishable from male students in aspirations for high paying, prestigious jobs and administrative responsibility over other life goals such as "helping others" and "correcting social inequalities." Astin (1991) found more female students considered participation in a community action program and helping others in difficulty as very important or essential than male students.

Sandeen (1985) described the current generation of traditional college students as more cautious and less idealistic than students in the 1960s and 1970s. Thompson's (1981) study of 1978 college students indicated a greater preference for "activities that do not require excessive planning" or "long periods of self-denial." Lasch (1978, cited in Sandeen, 1985) wrote students appear more willing to have rules prescribed for them and to accept the authority of the institution. Conversely, graduate education has as its goal the production of independent, original scholars and researchers.

Economic concerns Boyer (1987) reported that over half of all full-time students and 94% of all part-time students worked 16 or more hours per week. He predicted this trend would continue as tuition costs increased. Astin (1991) reported 62% of entering freshmen in 1990 worked 6 or more hours a week.

Horowitz (1987) wrote of a sense of fear among students from middle and upper middle class families of downward social mobility and a fear of their inability to maintain an expected level of affluence. However, a recent Roper organization poll of college students asking what characteristics were most important in a job showed the opportunity for promotion, job security, long term income potential, opportunities for creativity, and employee benefits were listed as the most important criteria. In this survey, salary was the characteristic ranked sixth in importance of job rewards (Wall Street Journal, 1988).

Political orientations Boyer's (1987) comparison of student political orientations from 1976 and 1984 showed a shift from liberal (34% to 23%) to moderately conservative (21% to 31%). Fewer students in 1984 (76%) than in 1976 (84%) favored stronger environmental legislation at the expense of economic growth (Boyer, 1987). However, Astin (1991) reported 88% of entering freshmen felt the government is not doing enough to control environmental pollution, a

finding which has steadily risen in the past six years. Over 20% of entering freshmen plan to influence the political structure and 42% plan to keep up to date with political affairs. Almost 40% of the students participated in demonstrations more than once in the past year (Astin, 1991).

Ethical orientations Levine (1981) noted a trend in his study of college students in 1979 of a questioning of traditional values and diminished confidence in established institutions: "Most entering freshmen believe that all social institutions from large corporations to the church are at least somewhat immoral or dishonest." Astin (1991) reported that almost 70% of entering freshmen in 1990 felt strongly that the government is not doing enough to protect the consumer.

Bok (1986) wrote moral dilemmas and social responsibilities seemed to come second to the need to master skills and knowledge needed for professional practice. In a call for the introduction of ethics into all curriculums, especially at the graduate and professional school level, Bok (1986) cautioned against university emphasis on tolerance in the resolve of moral dilemmas as simply matters of individual preference.

### Conclusion

A review of the literature indicated the impact of the college experience on student attitudes and values appears to vary by student personality, sex, social and economic backgrounds, and race (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). The type and size of institution, environmental influences, major field of study and maturation level of student have also been shown to affect student values and attitudes (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). Some authorities (Chickering, 1972; Bowen, 1979) concurred the effect of college may not be only to change the specific content of values but also to bring about total integration of the personality as the matrix for formation of specific values.

Research on college students in the 1970s and 1980s indicated economic factors influenced student choices of career, decision to attend college, and attitudes and values regarding social responsibility and lifestyle factors. Students who attended college in these two decades comprise the population of current graduate students.

Recent research on students entering higher education in 1990 indicates a new trend may be emerging. The majority of entering freshmen in 1990, 61%, reported an interest in attending graduate or professional school (Astin, 1991). Recent reports on the attitudes and values of entering freshmen indicate a concern for the environment and a sense of

responsibility to promote racial understanding, although career aspirations and philosophies of life still appear to be economically motivated.

### History of Graduate Education in the United States

#### Development of purpose

Graduate education in the United States, established in 1876 with the founding of The John Hopkins University, has been significantly influenced by the German model. The German model of advanced education advocated original research and independent investigation initiated from within the university. The German concept of graduate education placed emphasis on the use of seminars and laboratories, on the freedom of both the student and professor to investigate and report their findings. The organizational structure separated the graduate program from the undergraduate with graduate faculty across all disciplines organized as a united body.

American graduate education, although established with the German model as an ideal, experienced some modifications in its development. The initial purpose of the production of original, theoretical research has been expanded to include functions of service to the public, and the training of future scholars and educators.

Presently, three functions exist at most graduate schools in the United States; instruction at an advanced level to prepare future scholars, production of original, theoretical research, and service to society through applied research (Griggs, 1965).

### Graduate degrees

The training of advanced students as research scholars within the academic community is a goal of graduate education. Students earn the doctorate of philosophy degree at the completion of an academic experience, generally within a time frame of seven to eight years. The purpose of graduate education has expanded in its development in the United States as have the types of degrees and the time frame of the academic experience.

Currently, there are two major kinds of graduate degrees, professional and research degrees, and two major levels of study, master's and doctoral. At the master's level, a professional degree is awarded after the instruction of a specific set of skills needed to practice a particular profession. It is generally a final degree. The research master's emphasizes research and scholarship, the dual characteristics of advanced study (Council of Graduate Schools, 1989).



At the doctoral level, professional degrees are highly specialized and training is practitioner oriented such as in law, medicine, or business. The research doctoral degree, the doctorate of philosophy, is research oriented. A doctoral program typically involves advanced level academic course work and a research project that will contribute significantly to the body of knowledge in the particular field (Bok, 1986; Council of Graduate Schools, 1989).

A recent report (Mooney, 1991) stated a record number of doctoral degrees were awarded from U.S. institutions of higher education in 1990, however, over 25% were earned by international students. In 1981, approximately 20% of doctoral degrees were awarded to non-U.S. citizens. Caucasians earned 86% and Asians earned five percent of the degrees awarded. More African-American students, almost four percent, earned doctoral degrees than Hispanic students, three percent.

The majority of degrees were awarded to male students, 64%. The median age of new degree holders was 34. Over one-third of the recipients plan to teach while approximately 30% plan to engage in research and development.

#### Graduate Programs

Typically, one quality indicator of higher education institutions has been the existence and visibility of the

graduate program. In 1940, 300 higher education institutions offered the master's degree and 100 offered the doctorate of philosophy degree (Griggs, 1965). Today, almost 50% of the colleges and universities in the United States, over 1200, offer graduate degrees (Council of Graduate Schools, 1989).

Several historical reasons explain the growth in number of graduate programs. Increasing numbers of students entered the higher education system after World War II and created a need for academically qualified instructors. Post World War II national interest in science and research was sparked with the successful Russian spaceship Sputnik and the beginning of the "space race." Graduate programs in science and related fields were sponsored and supported by federal research grants and university administrators.

Graduate programs have also expanded in the number of subject matter areas in this century. In 1916, there were 149 fields available from which to earn a doctorate of philosophy but in the 1950s there were over 500 fields of study (Griggs, 1965). The increase in subject matter offerings can be attributed to the specialization of knowledge, due in part to advanced technology, and the prestige associated with the doctoral degree.

## Marketing and Recruiting Efforts of Graduate and Professional Programs

### Literature review

There has been little research on the topics of marketing efforts of graduate programs and professional schools and recruitment of prospective students. Some authors have attempted to explain the small amount of published research in this area. Olson and King (1985) wrote that historical and philosophical factors contribute to the lack of research on this topic.

Graduate education has an underlying philosophy of elitism. Traditionally, graduate study has been available only for academically superior students, with little effort to provide graduate education to the masses (Olson, 1985). Until recently, there has been no evidence of decline in enrollment for most graduate programs so there has not been a perceived need.

However, with dwindling numbers of undergraduate students and expected faculty shortages, interest is increasing in marketing of graduate programs and recruitment of prospective students (El-Khawas, 1990). Cooper, 1984, cited in Olson & King, 1985) stated that literature that is available on graduate student recruitment was simply an extension of recruitment studies from other markets, such as undergraduate education.

Malaney (1987b) suggested two reasons for the limited research in this area. One reason was that graduate student recruitment cannot be effectively centralized like undergraduate student recruitment because of the discipline-specific nature of graduate education. Another reason for the lack of research was that because of the higher perceived value of graduate education, arguments against marketing and student recruitment were even stronger at the graduate level.

Research on the subject of marketing of graduate programs and graduate student recruitment has focused on specific student characteristics, such as women and minority groups, or students in specific departments. The literature reviewed is presented within these categories.

#### Recruitment of students

Specific characteristics      Specific recruitment of minority students has been a controversial issue for close to two decades. The impact of student affirmative action programs on minority graduate students was examined by Pontorotto, Martinez, and Hayden (1986). These researchers found that students surveyed strongly supported student affirmative action policies but believed their admittance to graduate school was based on their academic qualifications and not ethnic identification.

Henry's (1980) research reviewed strategies for in-

creasing the recruitment and retention of minority students in a dental program. Malaney (1987b) found two primary reasons foreign students chose a specific school were because they had friends at the school, or because the institution was large. Law schools have actively recruited students from minority groups, but enrollment of these students has increased only slightly in the past 12 years. One reason offered for this lack of success is the scarcity of minority faculty members at law schools.

Specific programs Czinkota, Johnson, and Jelly (1980) cited factors that contributed to the decline in the rate of applications to medical schools were the possibility of a national health care system and the decreasing number of individuals in the age group from which medical students were typically selected. An article in the Wall Street Journal (James, 1989) discussed the marketing strategies used by medical schools in the Midwest and wrote a commercialized approach was viewed by many administrators as a necessary evil.

The five most important decision factors in choice of a surgical residency program were reported as satisfaction of the current residents, educational philosophy of the program, general reputation of the program, operative work load, and faculty-resident relations (Horan, 1988). A recent survey to pharmaceutical programs found geographic location was a

larger factor in student selection of a program than perceived quality (Gagnon, 1988). Roche (1987) reported student-centered attributes had a greater impact on student selection of pharmacy school than program or institutional characteristics.

McClain, Vance, and Wood (1984) examined the choice process for a Master of Business Administration program from the perspective of the administrator. Student characteristics observable to the administrator which might influence student choice were analyzed. One result of this study indicated the implementation of a more cost-effective methodology for disbursement of financial aid.

Moore and Halfond (1986) found prospective MBA students ranked college characteristics differently than prospective undergraduates. General academic reputation in the business community, placement record, and teaching reputation were characteristics considered most important by prospective MBA students in college selection.

Malaney (1983) surveyed prospective graduate students in the field of public administration at one university. He found 71% of the students in the program were graduates of colleges and universities in the state.

### Marketing and recruiting practices at the graduate level

Other researchers have identified successful student-attracting methods at the undergraduate level (Gorman, 1976; Marshall & Delman, 1984). It becomes more difficult to analyze recruiting practices at the graduate level because most marketing efforts of graduate programs are done within each academic unit and because of the uniqueness of each field of study. However, there are recruiting practices which are commonly used by academic departments.

In a study of departmental recruiting practices of graduate students at one institution, Malaney (1987a) categorized these efforts as belonging to one of two groups: practices used prior to expressed interest of the students and practices used after a student has initiated an inquiry. Of the twelve practices Malaney (1987a) classified as belonging to group one, three predominant forms of recruitment were identified by departments as being used in the early stage. These include faculty meeting with prospective students at professional conferences (79%); faculty making personal contact with other schools or colleagues (72%); and mass mailings of flyers and posters (72%). The two practices least used by departments at the university studied were attendance at Career Day programs at other schools (22%) and sponsorship of summer internship programs for undergraduates (15%).

In the same study, Malaney (1987a) reported the typical practice used by the departments after student inquiry was to send a letter and a brochure (95%). Because this was a large research university, departments would often pass along requests for admissions materials and housing information to the university offices (67% and 35%) rather than send the information directly from the department (55% and 22%). Other practices used by the departments in this study at this point in the recruiting process were to invite the student to visit the campus, at the student's expense, and to telephone the student (63% and 39%).

Malaney (1987a) concluded that recruiting practices used by departments were somewhat dependent upon the area of study. At this university, the departments in Agricultural Science employed a higher number of recruiting practices than the departments in Mathematical and Physical Sciences. The researcher suggested varying degrees of administrative support might explain the difference in utilization of recruiting practices.

Another conclusion reached by Malaney (1987a) in this study was that use of recruiting practices changed as the size of the academic unit increased. Small departments, those with less than 28 students enrolled in the graduate program, tended to use fewer recruiting practices. One possibility for this occurrence is that it was unnecessary



for the smaller departments to recruit for students to fill available openings.

### Selection Criteria of Prospective Graduate Students

#### Reasons for advanced study

Malaney (1987b) reported on a study which asked the question, "Why do students pursue a graduate education?" Almost 74% of the respondents' listed one reason was to learn more about their special area of study and 62% wanted an advanced degree for personal satisfaction. About half of the respondents listed employment opportunities as a factor for graduate school enrollment. Malaney (1987b) concluded reasons for going to graduate school varied upon certain demographic variables, such as sex and age, although there were no significant response differences between Caucasians and non-whites. Kolman, Gallagher, Hossler and Catania (1987) reported doctoral students in the social sciences and education listed 'credentialing' as their primary reason for advanced study while humanities and medical science students gave an academic or research interest as their reason.

#### Preliminary model for institutional selection

Olson and King (1985) developed a preliminary model of college selection by prospective graduate students, based on

the rationale that graduate students have different needs and concerns than prospective undergraduate students. Their research indicated factors that influenced initial consideration of a university were geographical location of the school (61%), personal contact with faculty (49%), reputation of the department (47%), and educational cost factors (39%). Research within individual graduate disciplines reported similar findings (Moore and Halfond's, 1986; Roche, 1987; Gagnon, 1988; Horan, 1988).

However, Olson and King (1985) concluded factors that influenced the final decision to enroll at a particular university were reported as positive interaction with university personnel (53%), personal reasons such as marriage, employment opportunities for spouse, children in school system, and size of community (35%), and status as an alumnus of an undergraduate program (30%).

#### Student expectations

In a time-series study which compared the expectations and perceptions of students in four types of graduate schools (arts and sciences, law, medical, and education), Baird (1978) reported observations with some implications for recruitment of prospective students for advanced study. Baird stated students in all four types of advanced study found that the teaching was not as good as expected, that a

different method of study was required, that the course work was duller than expected, and that they did not like the course work as much as anticipated.

#### Four-Year and Graduate Programs of Hospitality Education in the United States

##### Profile of four-year programs

Professionalism of the field      Hospitality education programs are those that offer options in at least one of the following areas of study; hotel, restaurant, or institutional management. The literature reviewed addressed only four-year hospitality education programs. Hospitality education as a field of study is relatively young and has experienced tremendous growth in the past fifteen years. In 1989, there were almost 160 four-year hospitality education programs in the United States (Riegel, 1989).

The field of hospitality education is progressing through traditional and modern processes of professionalization. Traditionally, characteristics of a profession included a professional organization, a service and trust orientation, a belief in self-regulation, broad autonomy and personal responsibility, a sound conceptual base, extended special training and a code of ethics (Hall, 1985). Recently, professionalization has been defined as the recognition of an occupation as a profession, or as Klegon notes (in Hall,

1985) "the issue of professional knowledge becomes a social question as well as a scientific or technical one."

The field of hospitality education has evolved and matured as student interest in college has changed from a classical liberal education to career education, and as the industry itself has grown. The opportunity for participation in higher education has been offered to a broader base of the population in the last three decades since the Truman Report of 1947.

Concurrently, the decision to pursue a college education has become more focused on career and economic goals in addition to cultural or personal development (Boyer, 1987). Schmelzer, Costello, and Blalock (1987) wrote that college and university administrators have been hesitant to support hospitality education programs because of their applied nature. Riegel (1989) defined an emerging view of hospitality education as a field of multi-disciplinary study, particularly in the areas of social and behavioral sciences.

Program location Powers and Riegel (1984) wrote that the type of college in which a program is situated influences the direction of development. Institutional administration programs grew primarily in colleges of home economics while hotel and restaurant management programs most often developed in business colleges. The majority of hotel, restaurant, or institution management academic programs were housed in col-

leges of business (29%) or home economics (17%), or were independent schools or colleges (24%) (Pizam & Milman, 1988b). Other researchers have reported similar findings (Schmelzer, Costello, & Blalock, 1987; Fenich, 1988).

Schmelzer, Costello, and Blalock (1987) reported program options were similar among various program settings except hotel management and tourism options were more available in business and independent units than in programs housed in home economics. Laboratory facilities did not vary between types of programs (Schmelzer, Costello, & Blalock, 1987).

Characteristics Pizam and Milman (1988a) found half of the four-year programs in 1986 had been in existence for fifteen years or less. The mean number of students in these programs numbered 400, with a median enrollment figure of 300, and faculty average of 11 with a median of six. These researchers repeated the study the following year and reported mean student enrollments of 464, with a median of 350, and a faculty average of 12 with a median of seven (Pizam & Milman, 1988b).

Laudadio (1988) estimated 45-50% of the students enrolled in hospitality education programs were women. The available research indicated the number of four-year hospitality education programs and student enrollment in these programs were increasing.

### Faculty characteristics

The growth of hospitality education as an area of study, coupled with the increasing professionalization of this field, have implications for current and prospective faculty. Powers and Riegel (1984) categorized credentials required for hospitality faculty as industry experience and academic qualifications. Industry experience provides the faculty member with an understanding of the realistic application of specialized techniques in hospitality areas and an understanding of the setting in which people are managed in addition to providing the faculty member with classroom credibility.

Academic qualifications Faculty academic qualifications have generally been defined by the traditions and accreditation needs of the units in which they are housed, in addition to general university expectations for research (Powers and Riegel, 1984). Powers and Riegel (1984) wrote that hospitality education faculty must have a thorough understanding of theory in order to effectively teach. In an applied field such as hospitality education, faculty translate theory (principles of observed phenomena) into practice.

Industry experience The issue of industry experience or academic preparation for faculty has been a controversial one for those involved in hospitality education. Wachtel and Pavesic (1983) have contended pursuit of the doctorate is

done at the expense of industry experience, which may in the long run lower the quality of education. Olsen and Reid (1983) argued that hospitality educators must obtain the doctorate to enhance their standing within the larger academic community, and to acquire in-depth knowledge of their subject areas which will enhance teaching effectiveness.

Compliance with accreditation standards, institutional expectations, and an increasing sense of professionalization are factors which suggest a trend towards hiring faculty with earned doctorates. Rutherford (1983) hypothesized a hiring trend from reliance on industry experience to a reliance on the attainment of advanced academic credentials, although results from his study did not support this hypothesis.

Demographic characteristics      Attempts to describe characteristics of hospitality education faculty began as early as 1982, when the field was relatively young and the number of four-year programs were limited. At that time, Rutherford (1982) reported 89% of the educators were male, 92% were Caucasian, and 72% were married. Fifty-six percent had earned doctorates (generally in business or education), 75% had less than 16 years teaching experience, and over 65% of the respondents had three or more years of industry experience.

Lefever's and Graves' (1991) reported on a content analysis of position announcements listed in the past 72

issues (four years) of the professional newsletter for hospitality educators. These researchers found 47% of the job listings required completed doctorate degrees, but only 14 and 9% required industry and teaching experience, respectively. In their conclusion, a trend was spotted for increasing acceptance of completion of doctoral course work with the research component of the degree in progress. In addition, Lefever and Graves noted increased use of the requirements of industry and teaching experience, although specification of type of industry experience was not included.

Calnan, Chacko, and Nebel (1986) reported 40% of full-time hospitality educators in four-year programs had earned doctorates while Pavesic and Brymer (1986) wrote that 58% of this population had completed doctoral programs. Pizam and Milman (1988b) reported 49% of faculty in four-year programs listed the doctorate as the highest earned academic degree while Fenich (1988) found that less than half of all hospitality education faculty in four-year programs hold the doctoral degree.

This review of the literature found variation in years teaching experience among educators in four-year hospitality programs. In comparison with Rutherford's (1982) findings of teaching experience (75% with 16 years or less) and industry experience (65% with three or more years), Pavesic and Brymer



(1986) reported similar data. These researchers found 79% of educators had less than 15 years teaching experience and 45% had worked 10 or more years in industry related positions. Pizam and Milman (1988b) listed the mean number of years experience in college teaching as 13 years. Fenich (1988) reported 14 years as the average length of teaching experience and 11 years as the average number of years in industry for hospitality educators.

#### Graduate programs of hospitality education

Ness (1960) wrote, "graduate study is in a sense the extension of undergraduate work in the direction of specialization and research." The majority of graduate programs in hospitality education were independent of other disciplines and were designed to train professionals for positions in industry, public institutions, or academia. Pizam (1985) wrote graduate programs that offered the master's degree emphasized professional skills and knowledge while those that offered the doctorate emphasize research and teaching skills.

Zabel (1991) reported on characteristics of undergraduate and graduate programs in hospitality education, although this research encompassed a broader field which included resort and club management and tourism. In this study, 38 graduate programs were identified with 10 of these offering the doctoral degree. Over 900 master's level stu-

dents and 70 doctoral students were enrolled in graduate programs. The 1989 Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education Directory listed 23 M.S or MA programs and doctoral programs within the traditional scope of hospitality education. At this writing, there were five doctoral programs of hospitality education in the United States with two being classified as 'stand-alone' programs. Zabel (1991) reported that 29 of the 90 undergraduate programs in her study intended to develop a graduate program within the next five years.

One expected trend for the area of hospitality education was the continuing shortage of academically qualified faculty. This statement is supported by various studies (Calnan, Chacko, & Nebel, 1986; Fenich, 1988; Guyette, 1983; Pavesic & Brymer, 1986).

Calnan, Chacko, and Nebel (1986) predicted a growing chasm between the available supply and demand for faculty with doctorates. Fenich (1988) suggested the growth in hospitality education programs would result in the percentage of faculty holding doctorates to stay below 50%.

Guyette (1983) reported the results of a content analysis of the classified section of the Chronicle of Higher Education which indicated a wide-ranging availability of faculty positions in hospitality education. Many of these positions required a masters, but a doctoral degree was

listed as preferred. Pavesic and Brymer (1986) found a small pool of candidates existed to fill available faculty positions, however, the primary source of candidates with appropriate academic preparation, and industry and teaching experience were the current professoriat.

Calnan, Chacko, and Nebel (1986) reported that hospitality education program administrators intended to hire 170 new faculty with doctoral degrees over the next five years. This finding suggests Rutherford's 1983 hypothesized trend towards hiring educators based on academic credentials might be accepted today.

Meyer and Koppel (1991) reported on a symposium attended by hospitality educators that addressed concerns facing graduate programs of hospitality education. One major concern cited by group members was the difficulty of finding qualified faculty, individuals with strong academic credentials; research, teaching, and industry experience; and a responsible personal code of ethics.

Meyer and Koppel (1991) noted the second major concern expressed at the symposium was the large enrollments of international students and special needs associated with these students such as language skills and cultural adjustments. Khwaja, Bosselman, and Fernsten (1990) reported on the perspectives held by international students in hospitality education in one region of the country. It has been

estimated (Bosselman and Fernsten 1989) that 25% to 50% of the students enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education were from foreign countries while the Council of Graduate Schools (1991) estimated international students account for 12% of enrollment in graduate programs in the United States.

Redlin, Tabacchi, Sherry, and Boothe (1991) listed strengths and weaknesses of graduate programs in hospitality education. Strengths included demand by students, need for graduates with advanced degrees as educators in undergraduate programs, and demand for research. Two major obstacles to the growth of graduate programs in hospitality education were competition with business schools for outstanding students and the lack of awareness of the practitioner-based master's program.

There is no shortage of interest in hospitality education as a field of study. Growth at the undergraduate level has contributed to the demand for qualified educators. Growth in both the number and size of graduate programs in this field was indicated in the reported research. The need for qualified students that will provide a balance in student enrollment distributions has been reported. The available research suggests graduate programs in hospitality education will continue to grow even as many institutions experience economic difficulties.

### CHAPTER THREE. METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The existing literature on the topics related to marketing of graduate programs and graduate student recruitment has focused primarily on specific student characteristics or specific student programs. There is no published study of marketing and recruiting efforts for graduate programs in hospitality management. The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of administrators of graduate programs and graduate students in hospitality education on the effectiveness of institutional marketing and recruitment efforts, and to determine factors that influence student selection of a particular program.

The initial component of any sound marketing effort is research. For institutions of higher education, this function would include all elements related to attracting and retaining students such as identification and composition of the target markets, consumer demands for programs by various market segments, the extent and effect of the institution's competition, and the effectiveness of the institution's promotion efforts (Kottler & Fox, 1985; Olson, 1985). This chapter will describe subjects, instruments, procedures, and data analysis.

### Subjects

All known graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States were asked to participate in this study (n = 23). The primary source for this information was the 1989 Directory of the Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. Further review of other directories and personal contacts did yield one additional graduate program in hospitality education started in the Fall of 1990 and therefore not listed in the 1989 CHRIE Directory.

A telephone call was made to administrators of all known graduate programs in hospitality education the last two weeks of August 1990. The researcher introduced herself, explained the objectives of the study, and identified sponsorship by the Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management at Iowa State University. The graduate program administrators were told that the purposes of the study were 1) to assess the perceptions of administrators of graduate programs and graduate students in hospitality education on the effectiveness of institutional marketing and recruiting efforts, and 2) to determine factors that influence student selection of a particular program. The details of participation were described and a verbal request for participation was made.

Sample of administrators

A follow-up letter to the telephone call was sent September 4, 1990. This letter contained an appeal for participation and an outline of tasks that would be asked of study participants. A copy of the survey designed to assess the perceptions of graduate program administrators on the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts was enclosed. Program administrators were also asked to return a list of the names of all graduate students enrolled in their program for Fall of 1990 with their completed survey in the postage paid envelope by September 18, 1990. (See Appendix A and B).

Surveys were returned from 16 administrators by the response deadline. An indication of willingness to participate in the study was received from 15 program administrators by the end of September, 1990. This agreement was indicated by return of the survey addressed to graduate program administrators or through telephone conversations with the researcher. It was estimated that in order to achieve a predetermined sample size of 150 graduate students, 25% of the students from each of the 15 participating institutions should be randomly selected. Because only five of the administrators had returned a list of the names of graduate students enrolled in their program for Fall of 1990, directions for random selection of graduate students to participate in

study were given to the administrators of the other ten participating institutions.

Graduate program administrators from four other institutions returned their surveys after the response deadline, for a total participation from 20 administrators. One program, initiated Fall term 1990 and without enrolled students, was unable to participate in the second phase of this study, the survey of students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education. Another program's survey was received too late to include in phase two of this study. As a result, 20 institutions participated in the survey of administrators of graduate programs in hospitality education, and 18 programs received surveys addressed to currently enrolled graduate students.

#### Sample of students

Graduate program administrators at the participating institutions had agreed to distribute the survey packets to students randomly selected for study participation, collect the completed surveys, and return them to the researcher in a provided postage-paid envelope. The majority of the survey packets ( $n = 162$ ) were mailed with a cover letter to the graduate program administrator on October 1, 1990 to 15 participating institutions. (See Appendix C and D). Three other institutions were included in phase two of this study



after October 1, 1990. Survey packets ( $n = 21$ ) were mailed to these institutions the day surveys from administrators were received by the researcher. Even with the withdrawal of three programs from the second phase of data collection, a total of 87 surveys were returned from the 183 surveys mailed to graduate students, for a response rate of 48% from the total initial sample.

#### Characteristics of population and sample

Characteristics of enrolled students, such as program, gender, citizenship status, and minority group identification were provided by program administrators. Table 1 shows the representation of the sample from the population as identified by participating administrators for defined student characteristics.

Close to 12% of the student population identified by program administrators responded to this study. When the population of enrolled graduate students provided by the administrators was compared with the sample of students returning the survey, it was found that the student sample adequately represented the population with two exceptions. First, findings of this study reflect an over-representation of doctoral students from the population by approximately 50%. Second, international students were over-represented at the doctoral level, yet under-represented at the master's

Table 1. Characteristics of population and survey respondents of students enrolled in participating graduate programs of hospitality education

Characteristic	Population		Survey	
	No.	%	No.	%
Gender <sup>a</sup>				
Male	327	47.0	39	45.0
Female	369	53.0	48	55.0
Program				
Master's	705	92.8	75	86.2
Doctoral	57	7.2	12	13.8
Citizenship				
Domestic	360	47.4	60	69.0
International	400	52.6	27	31.0
Minority <sup>b</sup>				
Minority	52	6.8	6	6.9
Non-Minority	708	93.2	81	93.1
Total	760		87	

<sup>a</sup>Three programs did not provide a breakdown by gender of students enrolled in programs. Percentages given reflect percentage of populations without the 64 students enrolled in the three programs, ie. 327 is 47% of 696.

<sup>b</sup>Minorities were defined as citizens of the USA with ethnic identification in one of several protected categories.

level. While international students enrolled in doctoral programs comprised less than 2% of the entire graduate student population, close to 5% of the student sample was represented by these students. In addition, international students enrolled in master's level programs comprised 51% of

the reported population yet were represented by only 27% of the respondents.

In this study, comparisons were made between students grouped by characteristics of gender, level of study, and citizenship status and their ratings of importance for factors used in final selection of graduate program and attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences.

Table 2 shows the distribution of students participating in this study by these defined characteristics.

Table 2. Distribution of survey respondents by characteristics of gender, level of study, and citizenship status

	<u>Domestic</u>				<u>International</u>				<u>Total</u>	
	Masters	PhD	No.	%	Masters	PhD	No.	%	No.	%
Male	19	6	25	29	10	4	14	16	39	45
Female	33	2	35	40	13	0	13	15	53	55
Total	51	8	60	69	23	4	27	31	87	100

A review of the breakdown indicates only a small percent (4%) of all females are enrolled at the doctoral level, and no international female student is represented at the doctoral level. Cautions should be made when interpreting the findings to reflect this confoundation of student characteristics.

### Geographic regions

A mail questionnaire was sent to administrators of hospitality education graduate programs in the United States (n = 23). A response rate of 87% was achieved (n = 20). Programs were categorized into five geographic regions: Northeast (n = 7), Southeast (n = 5), Midwest (n = 5), Northwest (n = 1) and Southwest (n = 5). Nonresponses were from the Northeast (n = 2) and Southeast (n = 1) regions.

Graduate program administrators provided information regarding student enrollments for fall semester 1990. Table 3 shows the distribution of the population of hospitality education graduate students and student responses to the second phase of this study by geographic regions.

Table 3. Geographic distribution of population of graduate students in hospitality education and student respondents

Region	No. of programs	Total no. students F'90	No. of responses	% region
Northeast	5	192	18	(9.33)
Southeast	4	152	25	(16.34)
Midwest	5	160	15	(9.43)
Northwest	1	8		
Southwest	5	246	29	(11.79)
Total	20	760	87	(11.46)

As shown in Table 3, with the exception of the Northwest region, students responses were evenly distributed amongst the five geographic areas. Because there is only one program in the Northwest region, lack of participation in the second phase of this study did result in lack of representation for students from this area. However, an overall response rate of approximately 50% from a selected sample of 25% of the population was achieved, resulting in students responses representing approximately 12% of the population.

The estimated number of students not represented in this study was calculated by review of the 1991 CHRIE Directory. Approximately 200 students were enrolled amongst the three schools that did not participate in either phase of this study. Student enrollment amongst the three institutions that withdrew from the second phase of this study was 72. Only one of the institutions offered a doctoral program.

## Instruments

### Introduction

The exploratory nature of the study was best served by collection of data via mail survey. Two survey instruments were developed as a method for collection of data in this study. A review of the literature revealed factors considered by students to be important in the school selection process and the marketing and recruiting activities utilized

by institutions of higher education. The literature on survey design and methods for administration was reviewed.

Research indicates there is an interaction between sponsorship and response rates of a mail survey. If rapport exists between an organization and the population to be studied, response rates generally are higher than if a relationship does not exist (Weaver, Chiv & McCleary, 1991; Jones, 1979). Weaver, Chiv and McCleary (1991) found use of a university letterhead generated a higher response rate than a commercial organization in the same appeal to business travelers.

The graduate program in the Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management at Iowa State University was established in 1925 and has contributed significantly to the body of knowledge in food service management and more recently, hospitality education. This department is an active participant in the professional organization for hospitality education programs, the Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education (CHRIE).

#### Survey to graduate program administrators

Dillman (1978) recommended that a questionnaire begin with a request for information most relevant to the purpose of the study. The survey designed for graduate program chairpersons was divided into three sections (See Appendix

B). Section one was divided into two parts. An organizational format used by Malaney (1987a) in a study of graduate departmental marketing and recruiting practices at one university was followed. Part one asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts that might have been used by the department before a student expressed interest in the graduate program. Part two of this section asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of listed marketing and recruiting activities that the department might have used after a student initiated an inquiry about the graduate program.

A five-point Likert-type scale was presented for respondents to use in rating the effectiveness of the listed activities in Section One. Effectiveness was defined in the directions for each part of the first section. A rating of NA indicated that the activity was not used, 1 indicated it was used but not effective, 3 indicated it was somewhat effective, and 5 indicated that the activity was very effective.

Section Two asked the respondents to complete descriptive data about institutional enrollment, departmental faculty and the graduate program. Categorical and open-ended questions were used in this section of the survey.

Section Three of the survey provided a space for graduate program administrators to offer any comments concerning

the nature and direction of graduate study in hospitality management. Administrators were asked to enclose any samples of promotional publications used to market their graduate program. It was explained that these materials would be used to form a composite of printed marketing materials used by similar programs. Also in this section, program administrators were asked to provide their name and mailing address if they were interested in receiving a summary of survey results.

#### Development of survey to graduate students

One of the objectives of the study was to provide a profile of students enrolled in hospitality management graduate programs. A survey designed to assess student perceptions of the effectiveness of the marketing and recruiting activities used by their current department and to determine factors involved in student selection of a graduate program was developed (See Appendix D). Attitudes and values students hold toward work and lifestyle preferences were asked in addition to questions about academic and work experiences.

This survey was divided into four sections. Section One consisted of two parts, similar to Section One of the survey addressed to administrators. The organizational format used by Malaney (1987a) was also followed in development of this survey. The first part asked student respondents to rate the



effectiveness of a list of marketing and recruiting activities that their department might have used before they expressed an interest in the program at that institution. Part two of this section asked students to rate the effectiveness of a list of marketing and recruiting activities that might have been used by their present department after they had expressed an interest in the program. The list of marketing and recruiting activities often used by institutions of higher education was compiled after a review of the literature. The activities were categorized into groups to provide a framework for response.

A definition of effectiveness was included in the directions for each of the two parts of this section. A five-point Likert-type scale was also used for both parts of this section. A rating of NA indicated an activity was not used, a rating of 1 indicated students perceived the activity as not effective, a rating of 3 indicated the activity was perceived as somewhat effective, and a 5 indicated the activity was perceived by students as very effective.

Section Two of the survey consisted of a listing of factors that could influence student selection of a particular graduate program. The list was categorized by group headings, with a category labeled other influences for students to provide additional factors. The list was compiled after a review of the literature.

Students were asked to rate the importance of each factor in their final selection of graduate program using a five-point Likert-type scale, similar to the scale presented in Section One of the survey. A rating of NA indicated the factor was not applicable, a rating of 1 indicated the factor was of no importance, while a rating of 5 indicated the factor was very important in the final selection decision.

Section Three of the survey was designed to assess attitudes and values graduate students in the field of hospitality education hold towards the work place and certain lifestyle factors. For this study, attitudes were defined as a feeling or emotion toward a fact or situation. Values were defined as a standard for decision-making held by the individual and identified by verbal expression or behavior. The literature on the attitudes and values of college students in the States was reviewed. Figler's (1975) Career Workbook for Liberal Arts Students and Nevill and Super's (1986) inventory of values, The Values Scale, provided a framework for the items used in this questionnaire.

Students were asked to rate the degree of importance 35 listed statements of attitudes and values held for them. A factor analysis of an earlier version of The Values Scale (1980, in Nevill and Super, 1986) resulted in clusters of items labeled material, group-oriented, inner-oriented, and activity and risk. Three of the four values clusters were

determined most germane to the study; material, group-oriented, and inner-oriented.

The values cluster labeled material-oriented included 10 items on the questionnaire used in this study. Survey participants rated the importance of economic rewards and advancement, economic security, and prestige. Thirteen questionnaire items were from the cluster labeled group-oriented. Statements on topics such as altruism, aesthetics, cultural identity, and social relations and interaction were presented for students to rate. The values cluster labeled inner-oriented contributed twelve survey items to the survey. Students rated the importance of ability, creativity, personal development, and lifestyle preferences. A five-point Likert-type scale was provided for students to rate the importance of the listed statements.

The last section of the survey addressed to graduate students asked for demographical information. Students were also asked about their past and current academic and employment experiences. Some questions regarding students' expectations for the future were presented in this section. Categorical and open-ended question formats were used. A space for students to write additional information was provided. Students interested in further information about the study or interested in the survey findings were requested to

contact the researcher at the phone number listed on the survey.

### Procedures

#### Pilot testing

Surveys were reviewed for content validity by individuals with characteristics similar to the research sample in June 1990. Due to the limited population of subjects, the survey for graduate program administrators was reviewed by three administrators of graduate programs in fields related to hospitality education, such as nutrition. An undergraduate hospitality management program was in place at each of these three institutions.

Four graduate students of the program in hospitality management at Iowa State University agreed to participate in a pilot study to review the survey designed for current graduate students in hospitality management programs. Two of the students had graduated with their master's degrees by Fall 1990 (the semester of data collection). The one doctoral student was not enrolled that semester. The fourth student was asked to review the survey to provide the perspective of an international student, even though she would be enrolled the semester of data collection. This individual's name was eliminated from the list of graduate students provided by the administrator of her graduate program. Suggest-

ed item changes were discussed with committee members. The format of the survey was considered acceptable by the pilot study participants. The survey was revised and then duplicated. Data collection instruments were reviewed and approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research.

#### Collection of data

The data for this study were collected in two phases. Program administrators of all known graduate programs of hospitality education were contacted by telephone the last two weeks of August 1990 ( $n = 23$ ). The purpose of the study was explained and a verbal request for participation was made by the researcher. Administrators were informed the survey addressed to graduate program administrators and a letter explaining the details of participation would be mailed in the next few weeks.

The following materials were mailed to the 23 administrators of graduate programs in hospitality education on Tuesday, September 4, 1990:

1. A cover letter, which thanked administrators in advance for their cooperation, outlined details involved in participation and requested a list of the names of all students enrolled in their program for Fall 1990 (See Appendix A).

2. A copy of the survey addressed to graduate program administrators (See Appendix B).
3. A postage-paid enveloped addressed to the researcher.

Efforts were made to personalize the request letter for graduate program chairpersons by addressing the cover letter and mailing envelope with the participant's name, title, and institution. In one instance, this information was not known. The cover letter and packet were addressed to the title of graduate program chairperson.

Of the known graduate programs ( $n = 23$ ), almost 70% ( $n = 16$ ) of the population had returned the completed survey by September 28, 1990. One follow-up reminder letter and an additional copy of the survey were sent mid-September to the remaining seven administrators. (See Appendix E). Because the population of known graduate programs of hospitality education is small, additional follow-up efforts were made to retrieve completed questionnaires from graduate program chairpersons. The researcher telephoned non-respondents and made a personal appeal, stressing the importance of their contribution to the study. Four additional surveys were returned after October 5, 1990 for a total of 20 participating institutions, close to 87%.

Only five of the participating institutions returned a list of names of students enrolled Fall 1990. A response rate of 66% from the graduate student sample was projected,

based on a review of the literature of surveys to hospitality management educators and students. In order to achieve a sample of 100 useable surveys, it was determined approximately 150 surveys should be mailed. The total number of students enrolled in each program was provided on the survey returned by the graduate program administrator. A sample of approximately 25% of the students in each program was selected for participation in this study.

In order to maintain consistency and ensure random selection from the student population, directions for selection of students to participate were provided to the graduate program administrator. These directions, established and used by the researcher for the five institutions that did provide a list of names of currently enrolled graduate students, were as follows:

1. Take an alphabetical listing of all students enrolled in the graduate program for Fall 1990.
2. Select every fourth listed name for a total of \_\_\_\_ (number of surveys for students provided).

On October 1, 1990, the following materials were sent to graduate program administrators at each of the participating institutions (n = 15):

1. A cover letter to graduate program administrators with directions for selection of student participants in this study and response deadlines (See Appendix C).

2. A specified number of survey packets to be distributed to graduate students selected for study participation. Survey packets included a coded copy of the survey addressed to graduate students and a privacy envelope contained in a sealed envelope. A letter addressed to graduate students that explained the objectives of the study and directions for completion of the survey was printed on the front cover of the survey (See Appendix D). The names of the students selected from the five institutions that provided the list of student names were typed on the outer envelope of the survey packet.

3. A copy of the student survey for the information of the graduate program administrator.

4. A postage-paid envelope addressed to the researcher.

Five institutions participated in phase one of this study by completing the survey addressed to graduate program administrators, yet for various reasons did not participate in the survey of graduate students. One of these institutions was unable to participate in phase two because the graduate program had just opened and no students were currently enrolled for fall semester. The other institution did not return the graduate program administrators survey until mid-November, at which point the decision was made to utilize the information received from this institution for phase one of the study only.



As noted previously, three institutions withdrew from phase two of this study and declined to participate in the study of graduate students. However, three additional surveys from graduate program administrators were received during the period of data collection. Although the established deadlines for survey participation were not initially met, it was decided that increased participation would enhance the validity of this study with no marked effect on the collected data. Packets of information with appropriate number of student surveys were mailed the day surveys were received to administrators at these three programs. A total of 182 survey packets were sent to 18 institutions and 87 surveys were returned from 15 institutions.

Of the 182 surveys targeted for students currently enrolled in graduate program of hospitality management, 62 surveys were returned by the end of October 1990 from nine schools. Due to the method used in this study to distribute the questionnaires to the graduate students, follow-up efforts were executed through the graduate program chairperson, the distributor of the surveys. To avoid excessive reminders to this individual, the researcher analyzed non-response patterns by known graduate programs. In instances where it appeared that not one of the surveys sent to a specific program was returned, a follow-up reminder was sent to the graduate program chairperson of that particular program

(n = 7). A telephone call reminder was made the week of November 12, 1990 to four program administrators to determine the nature of the delay. The three institutions that withdrew from the study during the collection of data from graduate students, decreased the total student sample from 183 to 165. The total number of student surveys received by November 30, 1990 was 87, or 53% of the final sample.

#### Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (1988) was used for analysis of the two sets of data. All surveys received from the graduate program administrators were coded and entered into a computer file by the researcher. Clarification of received information was made by a telephone call to the graduate program administrator when necessary (n = 3). Attempts were also made to discover missing information from other sources, such as the 1989 Directory of the Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. Accuracy of the data was verified by the researcher. Descriptive statistics, and comparisons of group means were determined.

Data from completed student surveys were entered into a computer file and verified by a technician from the Iowa State University Data Processing Department in January 1991. Portions of all 87 surveys were useable. Descriptive statistics and reliability of organizational categories were calcu-

lated. Logical groupings from open-ended questions were made.

Comparisons of groups means were calculated for students grouped by characteristics of gender, level of graduate study, and citizenship status. The effectiveness of certain marketing and recruiting efforts used by graduate schools of hospitality education before and after students expressed interest in the program as perceived by the program administrators and graduate students were compared.

## CHAPTER FOUR. RESULTS

This study researched the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used by graduate programs of hospitality education before and after student inquiry as perceived by administrators and students. Mail surveys were sent to all known graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States (n = 23). Administrators rated their perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before and after a student expressed interest in the program. Information about the institution and hospitality education program (n = 20) was provided.

Responses from another survey sent to a sample of students enrolled in participating programs were analyzed (n = 87). Questions related to the following topic areas were addressed: demographic information, student perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before and after they expressed interest in a program, factors considered important by students in selection of a graduate program, attitudes and values regarding work and lifestyle preferences.

Findings of this study are presented in the following order: demographic information about students and characteristics of graduate programs of hospitality education, administrators' and students' perceptions of effectiveness of

marketing and recruiting practices used before and after student inquiry, factors considered important by students in selection of a graduate program, attitudes and values regarding work and lifestyle preferences.

#### Characteristics of Students and Programs

Two objectives of this study were to compile a profile of students currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs and to describe institutional and departmental characteristics of hospitality education graduate programs. Findings for this section are presented in the following categories: demographic characteristics, work experience, career plans, program characteristics, faculty, and selection criteria.

##### Demographic characteristics

Of the 87 students responding to the survey, 39 (44%) were men and 48 were women (56%). Over half of the 75 students enrolled in master's level programs were women ( $n = 46$ ) and 29 were men. Ten of the doctoral students were men. Of all 87 respondents, 75 (86%) were enrolled in master's level programs of hospitality education and 12 were studying towards the doctoral degree. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents were citizens of the United States of America (USA) while the remaining 27 students were considered inter-

national students. Almost all of the international students were enrolled in master's programs ( $n = 23$ ) with the remaining 68% of master's students classified as citizens of the USA. Four international students were enrolled in doctoral programs.

The majority of the respondents were not married (70%). Of the 26 students that were married, 65% ( $n = 17$ ) had children living at home. Of the 75 master's students, 19 were married and approximately half of these students had children living at home. The number of children living at home ranged from one to three with an age range of one month to twenty-two years. Of the married respondents, 11 reported having children younger than school age and 11 indicated at least one child in the family enrolled in primary or secondary school.

The majority of respondents ( $n = 60$ ) defined their racial or ethnic identification as Caucasian (69%) and approximately one-fourth classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander. The rest of the respondents identified themselves as African-American or Black (5.7%), Hispanic (1%) or specified Greek, Canadian, West Indian, or Arabic in the other category (1%). Table 4 shows the distribution of students by racial or ethnic identification and program level.

Table 4. Distribution of study sample graduate students of hospitality education by ethnic identification and level of study

Ethnicity	Masters <sup>a</sup>	PhD <sup>b</sup>	Total
Asian	18	1	19
African American/Black	3	2	5
Hispanic	1	0	1
White American	51	9	60
Other	2	0	2

<sup>a</sup>Total number master's level students = 75.

<sup>b</sup>Total number doctoral students = 12

Respondents were asked to provide their present age. Responses ranged from 22 to 49 years, with a median age of 28. Approximately one-third of the students were under age 25. Those students 26 to 30 years of age represented 25% of the respondents while the 13 students in the category of 31 to 35 years of age represented almost 15% of the sample. Less than 10% of the respondents were 41 to 45 (n = 6) or 46 to 50 (n = 2) years old.

Close to 60% of all students applied to only one graduate school while 20% applied to two or three graduate programs of hospitality education. The remaining 20% of respondents applied to four (7%) and up to thirteen programs (1%).

Of the 87 students responding to the survey, 73 (84%) were enrolled as full-time students for over six credits at

the time of data collection. Of all students, 14 were enrolled for six or fewer credits, 11 of these students were studying for the master's degree and 3 were enrolled in a doctoral program.

Over 80% of the sample reported the bachelors as their highest earned degree while the remaining 17% (n = 15) had earned a master's. Because only 12 of the respondents indicated they were enrolled in a doctoral program, the researcher assumed three of the master's level students had earned a master's in another field.

Approximately 65% of the 87 respondents reported undergraduate grade point averages above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale with a grade point average of over 3.5 indicated by 22% (n = 19). Although the majority of bachelors degrees (67%) were earned in the fields of business (28%), hotel, restaurant, and institution management (24%), food and nutrition (12%) or home economics (3%), 33% of the respondents (n = 29) reported degrees from other fields of study. Economics, education, history, psychology, and sociology were listed as undergraduate fields of study for two or more respondents.

Over one-half of the respondents graduated within the last 4 years with 25 students receiving their bachelors degree in the last 2 years. Approximately 18% of the respondents graduated in the past 5 to 10 years. Surprisingly, 25%



of the respondents (n = 22) earned their bachelors degrees over 10 years ago.

#### Work experience

Almost 80% of the respondents (n = 69) reported work experience of some type in the hospitality industry, with an average length of six years of employment and a median experience of three to four years. All twelve doctoral students reported managerial work experience in the hospitality field.

Table 5 illustrates the levels of hospitality industry work experience by citizenship status for all master's level students (n = 75). Approximately 75% (n = 57) of all master's level students reported work experience in the hospitality field. Almost 70% (n = 16) of the international students (n = 23) at the master's level reported industry experience yet over 20% (n = 11) of master's level students with citizenship in the United States (n = 51) did not indicate any work experience in the hospitality field.

Less than half of master's level students were employed within the department as graduate assistants (39%) while almost all (83%) of the doctoral students had departmental assistantships. However, many master's level students worked outside the department on either a full-time (19%) or part-time basis (33%), and 30 of these students classified their employment as related to the hospitality industry. The

Table 5. Percent of domestic and international master's students having different levels of hospitality industry work experience

Industry Experience	Domestic <sup>a</sup>	International <sup>b</sup>	Combined
No employment	15	9	24
Some employment	54	21	75
Some managerial	32	7	39

<sup>a</sup>Total number domestic students = 51.

<sup>b</sup>Total number international students = 23.

average number of hours worked per week by students employed part-time was 18, with a range from 4 to 30 hours. Even though 10 of the 12 doctoral students were employed within the department as graduate assistants, 5 students reported employment outside the department in hospitality related positions, although only two classified their work as full-time. The other three students employed outside the department reported an average work week of 5 (n = 2) or 10 hours (n = 1) per week.

Close to half (n = 41) of all respondents reported managerial experience in the hospitality field. Of the respondents with managerial experience in commercial or institutional sectors, 16 had 0 - 2 years, 11 had 3 - 5 years, 6 had 6 - 10 years and 4 had 11 - 15 years. The majority of managerial experiences were in operations of a commercial nature.

However, 3 survey respondents worked in a managerial capacity for 16 to 20 years in an institutional facility. Table 6 shows the distribution of students by length of managerial experience, employment sector and program. All of the 12 doctoral students possessed managerial work experience in the commercial (n = 8) or institutional (n = 4) sector.

Table 6. Years of graduate student managerial experience by employment sector and level of study

Years of experience	<u>Commercial</u>		<u>Institutional</u>	
	Ms	PhD	Ms	PhD
1 to 2	10	0	4	1
3 to 5	6	4	1	0
6 to 10	1	2	1	2
11 to 15	1	0	0	1
16 to 20	1	2	0	0

### Career plans

Respondents indicated career plans immediately following graduation from their current program. Over one-half of the students (n = 45) planned to seek employment in the commercial sector of the hospitality industry, with 16 of the 45 international students. Only three international students indicated plans to return home.

Pursuing further graduate study was the intent of 11 master's level students. Approximately 13% of the respon-

dents planned to seek a position in a four-year hospitality education program with eight students currently enrolled in a doctoral program and seven enrolled in a master's program.

Table 7 shows plans of students immediately following graduation broken down by program and citizenship status.

Table 7. Plans of students currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs immediately following completion of degree

Plan <sup>c</sup>	<u>Domestic</u> <sup>a</sup>		<u>International</u> <sup>b</sup>		Total
	MS	PhD	MS	PhD	
Pursue further graduate study	9	0	2	0	11
Seek commercial position	28	0	16	0	45
Seek institutional position	3	0	4	0	7
Continue present position	3	2	1	0	6
Seek position 2-year program	2	0	0	0	2
Seek position 4-year program	6	6	1	2	15
Return to present position	0	1	0	1	2
Other	11	0	1	2	14

<sup>a</sup>Total number of domestic students = 60.

<sup>b</sup>Total number of international students = 27.

<sup>c</sup>Respondents rated more than one plan.

Multiple responses were given by survey participants. Other responses included plans to start their own business (n = 3), return home (n = 3, all international respondents), become a consultant to industry (n = 2), continue with their own business, begin a military assignment, or complete a dietetics experience.

#### Program

Two-thirds of the graduate programs were part of public institutions (n = 14). The majority of graduate programs were housed in colleges of home economics (n = 7) while colleges of business and independent schools or colleges each housed four programs. Of the five programs that classified themselves in the category of other school or college, responses included School of Human Resources and School of Applied Professional Studies, which might have been formerly titled colleges of home economics.

Undergraduate hospitality education programs were begun before 1925 at three of the responding institutions while three began this curriculum between 1926 and 1950. The majority of programs began in the years between 1950 and 1975 (n = 12), while four programs started after 1975. Compared with the general population of undergraduate hospitality education programs where the majority of undergraduate

programs were begun in the past 15 years, programs in this study were more established and mature.

There was a wide range in the number of years graduate programs have been offered at the institutions, from 1 year ( $n = 1$ ) to 65 years ( $n = 2$ ). Of the 20 programs responding, six were established in the last 0-5 years, and six in the last 6-10 years. Of those programs established over 10 years ago, four were started in the last 11-15 years and four were begun in the last 28-65 years.

The master's degree is the highest degree offered in 13 programs while the doctoral degree (independent or joint) is offered by seven schools. Administrators provided the maximum number of students the graduate program could currently accommodate. The number of student spaces ranged from 25 ( $n = 6$ ) to 200 ( $n = 1$ ). However, five programs were able to accommodate up to 100 students and two programs could enroll up to 150 students.

Ten administrators estimated 25% or fewer of graduate students enrolled in the department were employed in departmental financed assistantship positions. Table 8 shows the percentage of graduate students employed on departmental financed assistantships.

Financial assistance in the form of departmental scholarships was available from 13 programs, while 12 programs offered opportunities for college scholarships, and 16

Table 8. Percentage of graduate students employed on departmental assistantships as reported by departmental administrators

Percentages	No. of Programs <sup>a</sup>
25 or less	10
26 to 50	3
51 to 75	3
more than 75	3

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs=20; one program responding to survey did not have students currently enrolled.

programs provided assistance in the form of university scholarships.

Administrators estimated the number of student-initiated inquiries received regarding the graduate programs for the 1989-1990 academic year. As shown in Table 9, almost one-half of the programs received in excess of 100 inquiries.

Table 9. Estimated number of student inquiries regarding hospitality graduate programs for the 1989-1990 academic year

No. student inquiries	No. of Programs <sup>a</sup>	%
Less than 25	3	15
26 to 50	3	15
51 to 75	3	15
76 to 100	1	5
More than 100	9	45

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs = 20; one program newly started time of data collection.

### Selection criteria

The criteria used in selection of students by individual graduate programs were provided by the administrators. Selection criteria and frequency of use are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Selection criteria and use by graduate programs of hospitality education

Selection Criteria	No. Programs <sup>a</sup>	%
Undergraduate grade point average	20	100
Letters of reference	17	85
Prior industry work experience	15	75
Score on GRE or GMAT	15	75
Graduate work grade point average	13	65
Completion of prerequisites	13	65
Written communication abilities	12	60
Career goal statement	11	55
Verbal communication abilities	9	45
Others (ie.interviews, area of interest)	7	35
Special group membership	5	25
Reputation of undergraduate institution	4	20

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs = 20.

Administrators ranked three criteria considered most important in selection of students to their graduate program. Table 11 shows the ranking of importance of selection criteria used by graduate programs of hospitality education.

Undergraduate grade point averages and scores on the GRE or GMAT were the criteria ranked as one of the three most important by all programs. Letters of reference and prior



Table 11. Ranking of criteria used by graduate programs of hospitality education in selection of graduate students

	No. of programs <sup>a</sup>	%
<u>First</u>		
Undergraduate grade point average	14	70
Others (ie interviews, area of interest)	2	10
Career goal statement	2	10
GRE or GMAT	1	5
Verbal communication abilities	1	5
<u>Second</u>		
GRE or GMAT	11	55
Letters of reference	4	20
Undergraduate grade point average	3	15
Completion of prerequisites	1	5
<u>Third</u>		
Letters of reference	6	30
Others (ie interviews, area of interest)	4	20
GRE or GMAT	3	15
Prior industry work experience	2	10
Undergraduate grade point average	1	5
Career goal statement	1	5
Verbal communication abilities	1	5
Written communication abilities	1	5

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs=20.

industry work experience were used by 17 and 15 of the programs but considered to be part of the three most important criteria by less than half of the respondents. Because of the applied nature of the hospitality field, it is surprising that industry work experience was considered important in

selection of students into a program of advanced study by only two programs.

The results of this study showed 9 of the 20 institutions currently had centralized marketing efforts in place while three institutions indicated plans to implement centralized systems. These findings indicate widespread recognition of the need to recruit graduate students in all disciplines. Economic concerns and effects on budgets of institutions of higher education mandate the need to achieve this objective in a cost effective manner.

#### Faculty characteristics

The total number of individuals with faculty appointments for all hospitality education programs with graduate levels of study were 216. Of these faculty, 144 were men (67%) and 72 (33%) were women. A total of 58 temporary faculty appointments for faculty were budgeted for the 1990-1991 academic year, with a range from zero at seven schools to 11 at one school. Over one-half of all faculty have earned doctorates ( $n = 143$ ). Of the 349 advanced degrees earned by all faculty, 160 (46%) were received from institutions other than the institution where they are currently employed.

Graduate faculties were in place at 17 of the 20 institutions surveyed (85%), with 11 of the institutions having

levels of appointments. There were a total of 120 faculty who direct master's and doctoral students, with 24 (20%) guiding dissertations. Areas of faculty research at all 20 institutions are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Areas of faculty research interest

Area	No. Programs <sup>a</sup>	%
Business law	6	30
Computer applications	13	65
Cost controls	13	65
Education	14	70
Food and beverage mgt.	13	65
Personnel management	17	85
Layout and design	5	25
Marketing	11	55
Nutrition	6	6
Tourism	17	85
Other <sup>b</sup>	9	45

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs = 20.

<sup>b</sup>Other areas of research included service, transportation, food science, food systems, and lodging development.

Personnel management and tourism were each major areas of interest for research at 17 of the 20 programs (85%).

Personnel management was an area of research focus for

faculty at 17 of the 20 programs. Layout and design was the research area listed least frequently ( $n = 5$ ).

### Perceptions of Effectiveness of Marketing and Recruiting Practices

#### Perceptions of administrators

At the time of data collection, 23 graduate programs of hospitality education were identified. Administrators of the programs were asked to rate the effectiveness (5 = very effective) of listed marketing and recruiting practices used before a student expressed interest in their programs. Using the same scale, administrators rated the effectiveness of listed marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry. Perceptions of administrators are presented within the sections entitled before and after student inquiry.

Before student inquiry Although 20 administrators responded to the survey, many practices listed in this section were rated as not used. The number of programs actually rating the effectiveness of the practice is shown in Table 13. In this section, practices were presented in categories such as printed information and faculty outreach. Distribution of the mean ratings for the 15 listed practices and mean ratings for categories of practices used before student inquiry are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Ratings of administrators perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices before student inquiry

Category of practice	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	Programs <sup>b</sup>	
			No.	%
<u>Printed Information</u>				
Mailing of form letters to undergraduate institutions	2.71	.95	7	35
Mailings of flyers and posters to undergraduate schools	2.38	.92	8	40
Advertisements through local media	2.63	1.19	8	40
Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate Study	2.31	.95	13	65
<u>Faculty Outreach</u>				
Contacts with industry representative	2.90	.99	19	95
Contacts with alumni of institution	3.22	.94	18	90
Contacts with faculty other institutions	3.11	1.10	19	95
Contacts with undergraduate placement office	1.79	.98	14	70
Contacts with academic advisors in undergraduate hospitality programs	2.79	.98	14	70
<u>Departmental Sponsored Activities</u>				
Career Day programs at your institution	2.53	1.25	15	75
Career Day programs at other schools	2.00	.76	8	40
Summer internship program for undergraduates	2.55	1.29	11	55
Booth or exhibit at conferences or trade shows	2.71	.92	17	85
<u>Departmental Practices</u>				
Classes scheduled at nontraditional times	3.59	1.12	17	85
Satellite locations for graduate coursework	3.00	1.27	6	30

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (not effective), 2 (marginally effective), 3 (somewhat effective), 4 (effective), 5 (very effective).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of participating programs = 20.

Four of the 15 listed practices were rated with a mean rating of 3.0 (somewhat effective) or higher by administrators responding to the survey, indicating these were the practices considered most effective. Of the 17 schools that scheduled classes at non-traditional times, a mean rating of 3.59 was calculated. "Contacts with alumni of institution" was the practice considered second in effectiveness by administrators with a mean rating of 3.22. Of the 20 administrators surveyed, 19 rated the effectiveness of "contacts with faculty from other institutions" with a mean rating of 3.11. Only one practice received a mean rating of less than 2.0 (marginally effective). "Contacts with undergraduate placement office" received a mean rating of 1.79 from 14 program administrators.

After student inquiry      Marketing and recruiting efforts that might be used by graduate programs after a student expressed interest in a program were listed. Respondents rated their perceptions of the effectiveness of the listed efforts using the same five-point scale, with 5=very effective. Efforts were grouped into categories such as departmental printed information and financial aid information for presentation on the survey. Mean ratings of listed marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry are shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Mean ratings of administrators perceptions of marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry

Category of practice	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	Programs <sup>b</sup>	
			No.	%
<u>Departmental Printed Information</u>				
Personalized letter from graduate program administrator	3.74	.87	19	95
Brochure describing the program	3.77	.90	17	85
<u>Institutional Printed Information</u>				
Application for institutional enrollment	3.33	1.09	18	90
Information about on-campus housing	2.82	.88	17	85
Catalog describing the university	3.00	1.00	15	75
Catalog describing university graduate programs	3.06	.90	17	85
<u>Financial Aid Information</u>				
Information about graduate assistantships	3.61	.85	18	90
Information about institutional scholarships, grants, or awards	3.22	1.06	18	90
Information about financial aid	3.29	1.21	17	85
Information about departmental scholarships, grants, or awards	3.11	1.20	19	95
<u>Community Information</u>				
Information about community (schools, etc)	2.53	.52	15	75
Information about off-campus housing	2.33	.62	15	75
<u>Faculty and Departmental Outreach</u>				
Telephone call by faculty member	4.07	.62	14	70
Telephone call by current graduate student	3.88	.99	8	40
Student invited to visit the campus (at own expense)	3.12	.86	17	85
Student invited to visit the campus (expenses paid)	3.67	1.16	3	15
Faculty member provided as contact person	3.56	.92	18	90
Graduate student provided as contact person	3.70	1.06	10	50

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (not effective), 2 (marginally effective), 3 (somewhat effective), 4 (effective), 5 (very effective).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of respondents = 20.

With the exception of three listed efforts that pertained to housing or information about the community, all 18 listed marketing and recruiting efforts used after student inquiry received mean ratings of 3.0 (somewhat effective) or higher. Personalized attention, through "personalized letter from graduate program administrator" or a "telephone call by a faculty member" were considered effective efforts with mean ratings of 3.74 ( $n = 19$ ) and 4.07 ( $n = 14$ ), respectively. A "telephone call from a current graduate student" was a recruiting effort used by less than half of the schools yet received a mean rating of 3.88. A similar effort "graduate student provided as a contact person" to prospective students was used by 10 of the 20 programs and received a mean rating of 3.70.

The marketing and recruiting effort of sending a "catalog describing the university" was used by 75% of the respondents and received a mean rating of 3.00. Seventeen of the programs sent a "catalog describing the university graduate programs" after student inquiry but only a slightly higher mean rating of effectiveness, 3.06, was calculated.

#### Perceptions of students

Responses from 87 students currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs were received. Using the same scale as administrators, students rated their percep-



tions of the effectiveness of listed marketing and recruiting practices used by their current schools before and after they had expressed an interest in the program. Less than half of the respondents rated the effectiveness of most of the practices used before student inquiry. However, efforts used by schools after a student expressed interest in a program generated a greater response. Perceptions of students are presented within sections titled before and after student inquiry.

Before student inquiry      Students rated the effectiveness of 18 listed marketing and recruiting practices used by their current institutions (5 = very effective). Effectiveness for this section was defined as a measure of the interest created before a student inquired into the program. Listed practices were grouped into categories of printed information, faculty outreach, departmental sponsored activities, and external influences. Table 15 shows mean ratings of effectiveness for listed practices.

Student ratings of effectiveness of the 18 listed marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry ranged from 2.00 to 3.51, marginal ratings of effectiveness to the high end of the somewhat effective range. Practices were rated by 24 to 68 respondents. Students rated the effort of alumni contacts as the most effective practice with a mean rating of 3.51 from 37 students. The interest created in a

Table 15. Mean ratings of student perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used before student inquiry into a program

Category of practice	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	Students <sup>b</sup>	
			No.	%
<u>Printed Information</u>				
Letter of information sent to undergraduate department	2.89	1.40	27	31
Flyer/posted displayed at your undergraduate institution		2.89	1.17	2832
Advertisements through local media	2.39	1.20	26	30
Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate study	2.95	1.22	37	43
<u>Faculty Outreach</u>				
Industry representative	2.97	1.43	34	39
Alumni contacts	3.51	1.24	37	43
Visiting faculty	3.35	1.07	34	39
Undergraduate career counselor	2.65	1.23	34	39
Undergraduate faculty member	3.46	1.12	37	43
Undergraduate academic advisor	3.33	1.22	36	41
<u>Departmental Sponsored Activities</u>				
Career Day program at your institution	2.66	1.13	32	37
Career Day program at other institution	2.00	1.06	24	28
Summer Internship program	3.36	1.33	31	36
Booth or exhibit at trade show or professional conference	2.97	1.22	34	39
<u>External Influences</u>				
Friends	3.49	1.11	68	78
Parents or other family members	3.24	1.34	58	67
Classes scheduled at nontraditional times	2.61	1.44	51	59
Satellite location of graduate coursework	2.44	1.33	34	39

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (not effective), 2 (marginally effective), 3 (somewhat effective), 4 (effective), 5 (very effective).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of students respondents = 87.

program prior to student inquiry by friends was also considered effective with 68 of the 87 students rating this effort 3.49. Undergraduate faculty members and academic advisors were rated as effective in marketing and recruiting efforts of students with mean ratings of effectiveness of 3.46 and 3.33 respectively. Summer internship programs, used as a marketing effort by institutions where 31 students were enrolled, were considered effective by students with a mean rating of 3.36. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents rated parents or other family members as effective in creating interest in a program prior to student inquiry with a mean rating of 3.24.

Some students commented on practices used by their institutions prior to their expressions of interest in the program on the questionnaire, however, none of the respondents rated the effectiveness of these practices. Location and reputation of the program were each cited by three respondents, and graduate faculty involvement and contact with university administrative staff also were mentioned. A New York Times review, a listing by the American Dietetic Association of graduate programs, weather, high school and vocational counselors, and the inclusion of graduate program information as part of undergraduate application were additional comments provided by students.

After student interest expressed      Students rated the effectiveness of 18 listed marketing and recruiting efforts used by their current institutions using the same scale (5 = very effective). Effectiveness for this section of the survey was defined as the influence the effort had on final selection of graduate program. Marketing and recruiting efforts were presented within categories of departmental and institutional printed information, financial aid and community information, and faculty and departmental outreach. Table 16 shows the mean ratings of effectiveness for marketing and recruiting efforts and categories of efforts used after student inquiry into a graduate program of hospitality education.

Student ratings of effectiveness for 18 marketing and recruiting efforts used by institutions after student inquiry ranged from 2.37 for "information about on-campus housing" to 3.96 for "telephone call from faculty of program." The marketing and recruitment literature focusing on the undergraduate level stresses the theme of personalization in the student attraction process. Findings from this study indicate students at the graduate level also find this important.

Personalized attention was considered effective by students also in the forms of a "personal letter on departmental stationary" (mean rating of 3.59), "telephone call from current graduate student" (mean rating of 3.26), and

Table 16. Mean ratings of student perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts used by programs after student inquiry

Category of Practice	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	Student <sup>b</sup>	
			No.	%
<u>Departmental Printed Information</u>				
A personal letter on departmental stationery	3.59	1.14	68	78
A brochure about the program	3.58	.99	74	85
<u>Institutional Printed Information</u>				
Application for institutional enrollment	2.85	1.30	78	90
Information about on-campus housing	2.36	1.34	69	79
Catalog describing the university	3.27	1.19	75	86
Catalog describing university grad program	3.55	1.21	75	86
<u>Financial Aid Information</u>				
Information about graduate assistantships	3.32	1.44	65	75
Information about institutional scholarships, grants, or awards	3.16	1.46	64	74
Information about financial aid	2.82	1.38	64	74
Information about departmental scholarships, grants, or awards	3.19	1.40	64	74
<u>Community Information</u>				
Information about the community	2.54	1.27	57	66
Information about off-campus housing	2.47	1.41	55	63
<u>Faculty/Departmental Outreach</u>				
Telephone call from faculty of program	3.96	1.37	52	60
Telephone call from current graduate student	3.26	1.44	31	36
Invitation to visit campus (own expense)	3.15	1.37	48	55
Invitation to visit campus (expenses paid)	3.73	1.51	26	30
Faculty member provided as contact person	3.83	1.22	64	74
Graduate student provided as contact person	3.33	1.39	36	41

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (not effective), 2 (marginally effective), 3 (somewhat effective), 4 (effective), 5 (very effective).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of respondents = 87.

"faculty member" or "graduate student provided as a contact person" (ratings of 3.83 and 3.33 respectively). Over half of the students reported recruiting efforts that relied on faculty were effective while approximately one-third of the students indicated contact with currently enrolled graduate students were slightly less effective.

Outreach efforts such as "invitations to visit the campus" were rated as effective, although an "invitation with expenses paid" was considered higher in effectiveness but less frequently used (3.73, n=26) than an "invitation at the student's own expense" (3.15, n=48).

Students rated the use of printed information as effective with ranges between 2.36 to 3.59. Brochures about the program were received by 74 of the 87 respondents and rated with an effectiveness mean rating of 3.58. Institutional catalogs about the university graduate programs were sent to 75 of the 87 respondents and given an effectiveness rating of 3.55, while institutional catalogs about the university were sent to the same number of students yet rated 3.27 on the effectiveness scale.

Approximately 75% of the programs sent financial aid information to all students expressing an interest in the program, although, mean ratings for practices listed within the category of financial aid ranged from 2.82 for "financial aid information" to 3.32 for "information about graduate

assistantships." Clearly, prospective students were more interested in funding their advance studies through work within the department than incurring loans.

Other practices mentioned by students in the space provided included current employment at the institution, personal attention of the department head ( $n = 3$ ), secretarial staff, speed of communication ( $n = 2$ ), and faculty attitude at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

#### Comparison of perceptions

One objective of this study was to compare perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices between two strategic constituencies. Comparisons were made between administrators' and students' ratings of the effectiveness for 15 of the 18 listed practices used before student inquiry. Three practices included on the student survey were not rated by administrators, "undergraduate faculty member", "friends", and "parents or other family members." Results of t-test analysis are shown in Appendix F. Results of t-test analysis for comparisons between administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness for 18 practices used after student inquiry are shown in Appendix G.

Before student inquiry      Significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) were found between administrators' and students' ratings for two practices used before student inquiry about a

program. Administrators rated the practice "scheduling classes at nontraditional times" higher (mean rating of 3.59) than students (2.61). The utilization of this particular practice may not be perceived as effective by students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education because there was not a need for such a practice in their particular case. The majority of student respondents in this survey were enrolled with full credit loads. The assumption can be made that a non-traditional class schedule was not a concern for these students, hence not considered effective. Administrators, possibly due to input from a broader contact among prospective students and industry representatives, have different perceptions. Results from t-test analysis are shown in Table 17.

A significant difference also was found ( $p \leq .05$ ) for ratings of the practice "contacts with undergraduate placement office" by the two groups. Neither group rated this practice higher than 3.0, yet students considered this practice more effective (mean rating of 2.65) than administrators (mean rating of 1.79). Results of t-test analysis are shown in Table 17.

After student inquiry      Comparisons between administrators and students ratings of 18 practices used after student inquiry were also made by t-test analysis. Results of the analysis are shown in Appendix G. Administrators and



Table 17. A summary of significant t-test analyses of administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry

Practice	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Students</u>			t	2-tail Prob.
	No.	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD		
Scheduling classes nontraditional times	17	3.59	1.12	51	2.61	1.44	-2.55	.013
Contacts with undergraduate placement office	14	1.79	.98	34	2.65	1.23	2.33	.024

students reported similar perceptions of effectiveness for marketing and recruiting practices used after student inquiry into a program. There were no significant differences between administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness for the 18 practices listed in this section.

#### Factors Considered Important by Students in Selection of a Graduate Program

Another objective of this study was to determine the importance of factors involved in student selection of a hospitality education graduate program. Students rated the importance of 33 listed factors that might have influenced their final selections of graduate programs on a scale from 1 (of no importance) to 5 (very important). Factors were

grouped by the following categories on the questionnaire: reputation; institutional, departmental, and community characteristics; financial assistance; external influences; and personal considerations. Responses from students grouped by gender, program level, and citizenship status were compared to determine if significant differences existed in their ratings of the importance of various factors. Findings for questionnaire items are first shown by categories, in student ranked order of importance, and then significant differences between student groups are presented.

#### Categories

Reputation        Students rated the importance of reputation factors of the university, department, and faculty in their decisions to enroll in their current programs. Distributions of student ratings of the importance of reputation factors in final selection of graduate school are shown in Table 18.

As Table 18 shows, factors listed within the category of reputation were considered in the "somewhat important" range (3.0) by all students. Mean ratings were highest in importance for the factor of "departmental reputation" (4.38) while "faculty" were considered somewhat less important (3.87).

Table 18. Student ratings of importance of reputation factors in selection of current graduate program

Reputation Factors	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Department	4.38	.87	82
University	3.94	.97	82
Faculty	3.87	1.08	83

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of student respondents = 87.

Personal considerations Respondents rated the importance of five listed personal considerations in their final selection of graduate program. Distribution of student ratings of the importance of personal considerations are shown in Table 19.

Table 19. Distribution of student ratings of importance of personal factors in final selection of graduate program

Personal Consideration Factors	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Career advancement	4.39	.97	80
Personal satisfaction	4.38	.85	80
Personal reasons	3.70	1.24	76
Employment opportunities for spouse	2.39	1.54	31
Academic opportunities for spouse	2.03	1.30	31

<sup>a</sup>Rating Scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of respondents = 87.

Three of five listed personal factors received mean ratings of higher than 3.0, which was labeled "somewhat important" on the rating scale, "career advancement," "personal satisfaction," and "personal reasons." "Career advancement," which was considered the most important personal factor in selection of graduate program, received a mean rating of 4.39 from the highest number of respondents. "Personal satisfaction" received a similar score from the same number of respondents.

Departmental characteristics      The importance of listed departmental characteristics in final selection of graduate program were rated by respondents. Distribution of students ratings of eight departmental characteristics and the importance of these characteristics in final selection of programs are shown in Table 20.

Graduate students considered the "curriculum" the most important departmental characteristic in their selections of schools with a mean rating of 3.96. The departmental characteristic rated second in importance for the sample was personal contact with faculty with a mean rating of 3.82. "Research interest of the faculty" was rated the lowest of all factors in this category with a mean of 3.0, or somewhat important. Another departmental characteristic, "alternatives to the thesis," was rated as slightly more important with a mean of 3.02.

Table 20. Distribution of student ratings of the importance of departmental characteristics in selection of graduate program

Departmental Characteristics	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Curriculum	3.96	1.04	82
Personal contact with faculty	3.82	1.25	79
Departmental business and industry contacts	3.70	1.20	76
Flexibility of program	3.66	1.05	79
Personalization of POS.	3.50	1.05	76
Opportunities for assistantship	3.39	1.43	75
Alternatives to thesis	3.02	1.31	65
Research interest of faculty	3.00	1.37	78

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of respondents = 87.

Financial assistance Students were asked to rate the importance of three factors pertaining to financial assistance. Table 21 shows the distribution of student ratings of the importance of financial assistance factors in final selection of graduate program.

The "dollar value of financial assistance" in the form of scholarships, loans, or grants was considered the most important factor in this section with a mean rating of 3.43 while the "dollar value of assistantships" was considered slightly less important with a mean rating of 3.34.

Table 21. Distribution of student ratings of importance of financial assistance factors in final selection of graduate program

Financial Assistance Factors	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Dollar value of financial assistance	3.43	1.39	63
Dollar value of assistantship	3.34	1.45	64
Special fellowships	2.76	1.40	55

<sup>a</sup>Rating Scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number respondents = 87.

External factors Respondents rated the importance of five external factors in their final selections of graduate programs. Distributions of student ratings of external factors and the importance in final selection of graduate program are shown in Table 22.

Two of the items categorized as external factors received mean scores of less than 3 on the 5 point rating scale (5 = very important). The importance of an "undergraduate advisor or instructor" in final selection of graduate program received a mean rating of 2.55. Respondents rated "employers" with a mean of 2.67. The questionnaire item rated most important in this category of factors by the highest number of respondents was "dissatisfaction with current employment."

Table 22. Distribution of student ratings of importance of external factors in selection of graduate program

External Factors	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Dissatisfaction with current employment	3.48	1.40	65
Lack of advancement opportunities current job	3.43	1.50	65
Graduate advisor	3.42	1.34	67
Employer	2.67	1.58	58
Undergraduate advisor or instructor	2.55	1.44	53

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number respondents = 87.

A similar item "lack of advancement opportunities" received a mean rating of 3.43 from 65 respondents.

Community characteristics Four community characteristics were rated by respondents; "size," "quality of life," "geographic location," and "current employment in the area." Distribution of student ratings of the importance of community characteristics in final selection of graduate program are shown in Table 23.

The highest ranking community characteristic was "geographic location," which received a mean rating of 3.54. The limited number of studies of graduate student marketing and recruitment also have emphasized the importance of location.

Table 23. Distribution of student ratings of importance of community characteristics

Community Characteristics	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Geographic location	3.54	1.21	82
Quality of life	3.30	1.34	77
Current employment in area	2.95	1.49	77
Size	2.73	1.22	78

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3(somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number respondents = 87.

"Size" of the community was considered least important by all students surveyed, findings somewhat surprising considering career opportunities in the hospitality field are typically found in metropolitan areas. A mean rating of 2.73 was received for this factor.

Institutional characteristics      Students rated the importance of institutional characteristics in their final selections of graduate programs lowest of all seven categories. Distributions of student ratings of importance of institutional factors are shown in Table 24.

None of the institutional characteristics listed received a mean score of 3.0 or above, indicating students considered these factors less than "somewhat important." The institutional factor rated highest with a mean of 2.95 by



Table 24. Distribution of student ratings of importance of institutional characteristics in final selection of graduate program

Institutional Characteristics	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Speed of application and acceptance process	2.95	1.39	79
Residency requirements	2.28	1.37	57
Alma mater	2.25	1.39	45
Parent's alma mater	1.73	1.07	32

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of respondents = 87.

the highest number of students was the "speed of the application and acceptance process," noted especially by international students. Surprisingly, over half of the students were enrolled at their current institutions as an undergraduate student.

#### Differences in ratings of importance between student groups

Students' ratings of the importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate program were compared between students grouped by characteristics of gender, program level, and citizenship status. Findings are presented by the categories of student groupings.

Male and female students      A summary of the ratings of importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate

program by male and female students are shown in Appendix H. A significant difference was found between the two groups of students in their ratings of importance of "departmental reputation" ( $p \leq .01$ ). Male students rated this factor significantly higher than female students, although both groups of students considered reputation of the department as important. Males rated this factor with a mean of 4.68 while female students assigned a mean of 4.13, on the 5.0 scale. Interpretation of the findings should note all but 2 of the 45 female students were enrolled in the master's level program of study. This was the only difference found between male and female students. Results of a t-test analysis are shown in Table 25.

Table 25. A t-test analysis of ratings of importance of departmental reputation in final selection of graduate program

Groups	No.	Mean	SD	t	2-tail Prob.
Male	37	4.68	.626	3.06	.003
Female	45	4.13	.968		

Master's and doctoral students      A summary of ratings of importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate programs by master's and doctoral students are shown in

Appendix I. Of the 33 listed factors, 4 were rated significantly different by master's and doctoral students.

Two departmental characteristics were rated significantly different, as shown in Table 26, in importance by these two groups of students ( $p \leq .05$ ). The factor, "departmental business and industry contacts" was considered more important to master's students (mean rating of 3.83) than to doctoral students (mean of 2.91) while the factor, "alternatives to the thesis" followed the same pattern with mean ratings of 3.14 and 1.83, respectively. One explanation for the low level of importance attached to the factor "alternatives to the thesis" by doctoral students might be the lack of this alternative as a consideration.

The results of additional t-test analysis are shown in Table 26. A significant difference ( $p \leq .01$ ) was found between students enrolled in master's and doctoral programs for their ratings of the importance of "academic opportunities for spouse" in final selection of graduate program. Master's students considered this more important than doctoral level students, although only 25% of all master's students were married. Of the 12 doctoral students in the study, 7 students had indicated they were married, however, only 6 responded to this survey item. In addition, 10 of the 12 doctoral students were men. Traditionally, the career goal of

the husband has taken precedence over opportunities available to the female spouse.

Further analysis between groups of graduate students showed a significant difference ( $p \leq .05$ ) between master's and doctoral students (mean ratings of 2.86 and 1.67, respectively) in their ratings of importance of "employer" in final selections of graduate programs. Master's level students might attach more importance to the relationship with the employer than doctoral students due to career goals. Doctoral students typically plan on remaining in the academic environment as opposed to master's level students with plans as practitioners. Table 26 shows results of t-test analysis.

Table 26. A summary of significant t-test analyses of ratings of importance between master's and doctoral students for factors used in final selection of graduate program

Factors	Master's			Doctoral			t	2-tail Prob.
	No.	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD		
Business and industry contacts	65	3.83	1.15	11	2.91	1.22	2.43	.017
Alternatives to the thesis	59	3.14	1.28	6	1.83	.98	2.42	.019
Academic opportunities for spouse	25	2.24	1.36	6	1.17	.41	3.36	.002
Employer	49	2.86	1.57	9	1.67	1.32	2.15	.037

Domestic and international students Domestic and international students' ratings of the importance of all listed factors in final selection of graduate program are shown in Appendix J. Three significant differences were found between students grouped by citizenship status. A summary of significant t-test analysis are shown in Table 27.

Significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) were found for ratings of the importance of "research interest of faculty, as shown in Table 27. International students rated this factor higher (mean of 3.48) than domestic students (mean of 2.78). Differences might be attributed to established cultural attitudes towards relationships with faculty or future career plans. Approximately one-fifth of the master's level international students ( $n = 9$ ) planned to continue graduate study.

Domestic students were influenced to a significantly greater extent ( $p \leq .05$ ) than international students by "personal reasons" in their decisions to attend a particular graduate school. This factor received one of the highest ratings of importance by all students. Domestic students rated this factor with a mean of 3.94 while international students rated this factor 3.23, as shown in Table 27.

Domestic students also rated the factor "dissatisfaction with current employment" as significantly more important than international students, at the  $p \leq .01$  level. A mean rating

of 3.79 was calculated for domestic students while a mean of 2.71 was found for international students. Table 27 shows the results of t-test analysis. Close to 80% of the international master's students reported no management level experience in the hospitality industry.

Table 27. A summary of significant t-test analysis of ratings of importance of factors between domestic and international students

Factors	<u>Domestic</u>			<u>International</u>			t	2-tail Prob.
	No.	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD		
Research interest of faculty	54	2.78	1.37	23	3.48	1.28	-2.10	.039
Personal reasons	53	3.94	1.13	22	3.23	1.27	2.40	.019
Dissatisfaction current employment	47	3.79	1.35	17	2.71	1.26	2.88	.006

#### Attitudes and Values Towards Work and Lifestyle Preferences

One objective of this study was to assess the importance of attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences held by graduate students enrolled in the field of hospitality education. As the demand for hospitality educators and industry management personnel increases, an assessment of preferences held by the pool of candidates for

these positions will indicate if actual work and lifestyle are realized. In addition, this study compared students grouped by gender, level of study, and citizenship status to determine if significant differences existed in their ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values. The ratings of importance of attitude and value students by all students responding to the survey are presented first, followed by comparisons between groups of students.

#### Ratings of importance of attitude and value statements

Figler's (1975) Career Workbook for Liberal Arts Students and Super and Nevill's (1985) inventory of values, The Values Scale provided a framework for the questionnaire items used in this section of the survey. An earlier factor analysis (Super, 1980, cited in Nevill & Super, 1986) grouped the questionnaire items into three clusters. Labels attached to these clusters of questionnaire items were inner-, group-, and material-oriented. Findings for this section are presented by cluster labels.

Inner-oriented      The values cluster labeled inner-oriented contained 12 survey items which focused on factors of ability utilization, creativity, personal development, and lifestyle preferences. Students rated the importance of these factors on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = very important). Means and standard deviations for individual statements of

attitudes and values grouped in this cluster are shown in Table 28 for all respondents.

Table 28. Means for inner-oriented cluster of attitudes and values for all respondents (n = 85)

Attitude and Value Statement	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD
Find personal satisfaction in my work	4.78	.49
Maintain my own personal and moral standards	4.51	.68
Achieve high standards in my work	4.49	.66
Do work which fully utilizes my abilities	4.46	.67
Maintain a healthy lifestyle	4.39	.79
Learn new skills at work	4.27	.78
Create new ideas or methods in my work	4.27	.71
Have children	3.40	1.44
Have an active religious life	2.81	1.28
Be self-employed	2.80	1.28
Have work be the central focus of my life	2.62	1.10
Be politically active	2.41	1.11

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

Four statements of attitudes and values in the inner-oriented cluster received mean scores of less than 3.0 (somewhat important). Students rated the statements "have an active religious life," "be self-employed," "have work be the central focus of my life" and "be politically active" with means below 3.0. The highest rated statement, "find personal satisfaction in my work" received a mean rating of 4.78. Another statement which rated the factor of personal



development "maintain my own personal and moral standards" was considered second in importance in this cluster with a mean rating of 4.51.

Group-oriented        There were 13 attitude and value statements from the group-oriented cluster included in the questionnaire. The importance of factors such as altruism, aesthetics, cultural identity, and social relations and interactions were assessed. Distribution of mean ratings and standard deviations for the sample ( $n = 85$ ) of student respondents for items included in this cluster are shown in Table 29.

None of the statements listed in Table 29 received an average rating in importance below 3.00 (somewhat important) or above 4.00 (important) on the 5.00 scale, indicating a certain ambivalence. The statement "deal with a variety of people at work" was rated highest in this cluster while "live and work where people of my race and religion are accepted" was rated lowest in importance. The third lowest mean reported by the sample in this category was "improve the welfare and peace of the world" with a mean rating of 3.25.

Material-oriented        Much of the research on attitudes and values held by undergraduate students have indicated a trend towards a more materialistic orientation with selection of careers based on economic rewards. Factors grouped in the

Table 29. Means for group-oriented cluster of attitudes and values for all respondents (n = 85)

Attitude and Value Statement	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD
Deal with a variety of people at work	3.98	.82
Have a lot of day to day contact with people	3.93	.84
Help people with their problems in a direct way	3.87	.92
Be involved in work the goal is to help people	3.87	.90
Find pleasure in the beauty of my work	3.87	1.03
Work in a way that makes the world a better place	3.87	1.03
Work with people of my own background	3.85	1.06
Work as team member towards established goals	3.84	.95
Be with other people while I work	3.74	.99
Feel accepted at work as member of my ethnic group	3.65	1.53
Improve the welfare and peace of the world	3.25	1.06
Change work activities frequently	3.19	1.13
Live and work where people of my race and religion are accepted	3.09	1.39

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

material attitudes and values cluster included economic rewards, advancement, economic security, and prestige. Ten survey items were analyzed in this cluster. Table 30 shows the distribution of survey responses for the material-oriented cluster of attitude and value statements for all students.

All 10 statements received mean ratings ranging from 3.38 to 4.42 on the 5.0 scale. To be "publicly recognized for the quality of my work" was rated least in importance

Table 30. Means for material-oriented cluster of attitude and values for all respondents (n = 85)

Attitude and Value Statement	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD
Be respected for my knowledge and skills	4.42	.75
Know that I can always make a living	4.25	.82
Have a good income	4.08	.89
Be held in high esteem because of my work	3.86	.95
Be where employment is regular and secure	3.85	.99
Get ahead quickly in my career	3.84	.97
Earn a high salary and PERKS	3.75	.96
Be viewed as a special person	3.73	.91
Be able to support a high standard of living	3.65	1.13
Be publicly recognized for quality of my work	3.38	.99

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

while "be respected for my knowledge and skills" was rated highest.

#### Differences in ratings of importance between student groups

Male and female Male and female student ratings of the importance of the attitude and value statements are shown in Appendix K. Significant differences were found between male and female ratings of the importance of 4 of the 35 attitude and value statements, as shown in Table 31.

There were no significant differences between male and female students in their ratings of importance of attitudes and value statements in the inner-oriented cluster. Three

Table 31. A summary of significant t-test analyses of ratings of importance of attitude and value statements by male and female graduate students of hospitality education

Statement	Male <sup>a</sup>		Female <sup>a</sup>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean <sup>b</sup>	SD	Mean <sup>b</sup>	SD		
Change work activities frequently	2.87	1.26	3.45	.95	-2.42	.018
Improve welfare and peace of the world	2.95	1.16	3.49	.91	-2.42	.018
Team member established goals	3.58	.89	4.04	.96	-2.29	.024
Support a high standard of living	3.37	1.13	3.87	1.10	-2.08	.04

<sup>a</sup>Male students = 38; female students = 47.

<sup>b</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

attitude and value statements listed in the group-oriented cluster elicited significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) in the responses between male and female students, as shown in Table 31. "Change work activities frequently" was rated higher by female students (mean of 3.45) than male students (mean of 2.87). The statement "improve the welfare and peace of the world" was also rated higher by female students with a mean

of 3.96 than male students (mean of 2.95). Again, female students rated the statement "work as a team member toward established goals" significantly higher than male students (mean ratings of 4.04 and 3.58).

When comparing male and female groups of graduate students, only one attitude and value statement in the material-oriented cluster elicited a statistically significant difference ( $p \leq .05$ ). The statement "be able to support a high standard of living" received a mean rating of 3.87 from female students and a mean rating of 3.37 from male students. This finding is surprising and appears to conflict with the higher rating given by females to the statement "improve the welfare and peace of the world". Results of t-test analysis are shown in Table 31.

Master's and doctoral students      Master's and doctoral students' ratings of the importance of selected attitudes and values for the three clusters are shown in Appendix L. There were no statistically significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) found between groups of students enrolled in masters and doctoral programs and their ratings of importance of attitudes and values in the inner-oriented and group-oriented clusters.

Statistically significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) were found between students enrolled in master's level and doctoral programs for three attitude and value statements in the material cluster, as shown in Table 32.

Table 32. A summary of significant t-test analyses of ratings of importance of attitude and value statements between master's and doctoral level students

Statement	Master's <sup>a</sup>		Doctoral <sup>a</sup>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD		
Be able to support a high standard of living	3.80	1.13	2.75	.62	4.69	.000
Earn a high salary and PERKS	3.93	.90	2.67	.65	4.65	.000
Get ahead quickly in career	3.97	.91	3.00	.95	3.40	.001

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Master's students = 73; Doctoral students = 12.

Master's level students rated each of the three statements significantly higher than doctoral students. These findings suggest doctoral students, all of whom reported managerial work experience, were focusing less on quick achievement of career goals and more on pursuits with less economic rewards. Findings may be confounded with male and female ratings of importance due to the gender breakdown by level of study as 10 of the 12 doctoral students were men. Additionally, findings may be confounded with breakdown by citizenship status as 8 of the 12 doctoral students were domestic.

Domestic and international students      Ratings of the importance of attitudes and values by students who are citizens of the United States and international students are shown in Appendix M. Of the 35 listed statements, 6 received statistically significant ( $p \leq .05$ ) responses from domestic and international students, as shown in Table 33.

Table 33. A summary of significant t-test analyses of ratings of importance of attitude and value statements between domestic and international students.

Statement	<u>Domestic</u> <sup>a</sup>		<u>International</u> <sup>a</sup>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean <sup>b</sup>	SD	Mean <sup>b</sup>	SD		
Have an active religious life	3.02	1.26	2.38	1.24	2.14	.036
Work central focus of my life	2.36	.89	3.23	1.31	-3.08	.004
Change activities frequently	3.40	1.10	2.73	1.08	2.57	.012
Accepted as member of ethnic group	2.57	1.38	3.65	1.62	-3.15	.002
Support a high standard of living	3.43	1.16	4.12	.95	-2.64	.01
Get ahead quickly in my career	3.64	.97	4.27	.87	-2.84	.006

<sup>a</sup>Domestic respondents = 58; International respondents = 26.

<sup>b</sup>Rating scale = 1 (of no importance), 2 (of little importance), 3 (somewhat important), 4 (important), 5 (very important).

Two statements, found in the inner-oriented cluster of values, were rated significantly different by domestic and international students, as shown in Table 33. "Have an active religious life" was rated significantly higher by domestic students than international students with means of 3.02 and 2.38, respectively. However, "have work be the central focus of my life" was rated significantly more important by international students (mean of 3.23) than domestic students (mean of 2.36), suggesting a stronger commitment to the chosen career path.

Statistically significant differences ( $p \leq .05$ ) were found between domestic and international students for two attitude and value statements in the group-oriented cluster. Table 33 shows the results of t-test analysis. Students that were citizens of the U.S. rated the statement "change work activities frequently" significantly higher than international students with means of 3.40 and 2.73, respectively. Not surprisingly, international students rated the statement "feel accepted at work as a member of my ethnic group" significantly higher ( $p \leq .01$ ) than domestic students, predominately Caucasian, with mean ratings of 3.65 and 2.57.

A statistically significant difference ( $p \leq .01$ ) was found between domestic and international graduate students for two statements in the material-oriented cluster, as shown in Table 33. In both instances, international students



considered the statements more important. International students rated the statement "be able to support a high standard of living" with a mean of 4.12 while the mean rating from domestic students was 3.43. International students rated the statement "get ahead quickly in my career" with a mean of 4.27 compared to a mean rating of 3.64 from domestic students. When higher ratings by international students for these two statements are considered along with a higher rating by international students to "have work be the central focus of their life," a picture of a very determined and motivated employee emerges.

The statement "be able to support a high standard of living" was significantly different in ratings of importance between all three grouped categories of graduate students. The statement to "get ahead quickly in my career" was rated differently in importance by groups of students enrolled in two levels of programs and by domestic and international students.

## CHAPTER FIVE. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

In this study, administrators of hospitality education graduate programs provided data regarding institutional and program characteristics, and rated their perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used by programs. Demographic information was collected from a sample of graduate students currently enrolled in the surveyed programs of hospitality education. Students rated their perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices, the importance of listed factors in final selection of program, and the importance of selected attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences. A discussion of the findings and conclusions of the study, summary, and recommendations for future research are presented in this chapter.

### Discussion

Research questions for this study addressed four content areas: student demographic information and characteristics of graduate programs of hospitality education, perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices, factors considered important by students in selection of graduate program, and attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences. A discussion of the findings follow this sequence.

Student demographics and characteristics of graduate programs of hospitality education in the United States

Student demographics      One objective of this study was to compile a profile of students enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education with options in hotel, restaurant, or institution management. Of the 87 respondents, slightly over half were female (55%), approximately 70% were Caucasian, unmarried, and born in the United States, and 80% were childless. Ages ranged from 22 to 49 with a median age of 28. Over 85% were enrolled in master's programs and 21 of these students indicated plans to study for the doctorate.

Administrators in this study of only hotel, restaurant, or institutional management graduate programs reported an enrollment of 705 master's and 55 doctoral students for a total of 760 graduate students. In her 1991 survey of 38 graduate hospitality education programs in the United States that included areas of tourism and resort and club management, Zabel found an enrollment of 900 master's and 70 doctoral students.

Administrators indicated over half of the population of graduate students currently enrolled ( $n = 760$ ) were from a country outside the United States. Approximately two-thirds of the student respondents in this study were citizens of the United States, with 23 of the 27 international students enrolled in master's level programs. Additionally, almost

25% of the student respondents classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islanders.

The Council of Graduate Schools (1991) estimated 12% of all graduate students enrolled in American programs were categorized as non-citizens of the United States. Findings from this study concur with Bosselman and Fernsten's (1989) estimation that 25 to 50% of graduate students enrolled in hospitality education programs were considered foreigners, and their identification of the largest international component as Asian or Pacific Islanders.

The majority of all respondents were enrolled full-time for an average of 10 credits per term with only about one-third employed as graduate assistants. One limitation of this study is that the random sampling procedure employed was outside the control of the researcher. An over-representation of full-time students might be a reflection of the availability of student respondents.

Prior to the growth of hospitality education as a four-year field of study, many practitioners earned bachelor's degrees in related fields and gained industry expertise through employment (Rutherford, 1982). Industry recruiters often focused on interpersonal and organizational skills of prospective employees rather than academic field of study. It is not surprising that approximately one-third of the respondents had earned undergraduate degrees in

non-hospitality fields such as history or psychology. Of the 87 students, approximately 65% had undergraduate grade point averages greater than 3.0, from fields of business (n = 23), hotel, restaurant or institutional management (n = 23), nutrition (n = 10), home economics education (n = 3), or other (n = 29).

Newly adopted accreditation standards for undergraduate hospitality programs by the Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Educators in 1990 emphasized the need for industry work experience. Some students, (n = 44), were currently employed outside the department with 30 of these employed in industry related positions. Almost 80% of respondents reported an average work experience of six years in the hospitality industry, although slightly less than half had worked in a managerial capacity. However, all 12 doctoral students responding to this survey did report managerial work experience.

After graduation from their current program, 52% of graduate students currently enrolled planned to seek a position in the commercial sector of the hospitality industry, 17% as instructors in a four-year hospitality education program, and 8% in the institutional sector. Only 3 of the 27 international students indicated plans to return to their native country. This particular finding has implications for industry representatives.

### Characteristics of graduate programs

Characteristics of institutions with graduate programs of hospitality education were identified by program administrators. The majority of the responding graduate programs were located at public institutions. Programs were housed in colleges of home economics ( $n = 7$ ), colleges of business ( $n = 4$ ) or in independent schools or colleges ( $n = 4$ ). Of the 5 remaining programs that categorized location as other school or college, defining responses included School of Human Resources and School of Applied Professional Studies, which might have formerly been titled colleges of home economics. Pizam and Milan (1988b) found the majority of hospitality undergraduate programs were housed in colleges of home economics (17%), colleges of business (29%) or as independent schools or colleges (24%).

Most of undergraduate hospitality education programs were begun in the last 20 years (Schmelzer, Costello, & Blalock, 1987). Undergraduate programs at institutions with graduate levels of study were begun before 1925 at three of the graduate schools surveyed and between 1926 and 1950 at another three universities. Over half of responding graduate programs, 60%, began undergraduate programs in the years between 1950 and 1975. As might be expected, findings from this study show graduate levels of study have been established at institutions with more mature undergraduate programs.

The highest degree offered by 13 of the 20 responding programs was the master's. Doctoral degrees were awarded at the other seven schools, although at two of the programs the degree was jointly administered with another department. Mean master's program enrollment was 35 students and mean doctoral student enrollment was nine. A mean maximum enrollment capability of 60 graduate students was reported. On the average, opportunities for increased numbers of graduate students existed. As the need for hospitality educators with earned doctorates grows, it will become a higher priority for programs to enroll greater numbers of doctoral-bound students.

Rutherford (1982) reported that of all faculty of hospitality education programs, 89% were male, 92% were white, and 56% had earned a doctorate degree. This study of hospitality programs with undergraduate and graduate levels of study eight years later found 67% of all faculty were men and 66% had earned doctorates. Membership in a graduate faculty was held by 120 faculty. Changes in the percentages of female faculty and faculty with earned doctorates could be accounted for by the focus of this study on graduate programs only. Hospitality programs with graduate levels of study would be expected to have faculty with earned doctorates, in compliance with institutional expectations. The reported increase of women faculty could be attributed to findings that

showed the majority of the graduate programs were housed in colleges of home economics, where typically the majority of the faculty are women.

Societal trends and possible trends in responses to needs of female graduate students could also account for the increased numbers of women faculty. Over half of the graduate students responding to this study were women (55%), yet only 2 of the 12 students enrolled at the doctoral level were women. Mooney (1991) reported the number of doctoral degrees awarded to women in the last ten years has increased. Women earned over 35% of all doctoral degrees in 1990 with over half of doctoral degrees in non-science and non-engineering fields awarded to women. These figures indicate a need still exists to recruit women for study at the doctoral level in many fields of study, including hospitality management, and to train as future educators.

Of a total of 349 advanced degrees earned by all faculty, 160 (46%) were received from institutions other than the institution where currently employed. This finding indicates a philosophy of training students as future educators at their alma mater was acceptable to many program administrators. Due to the limited availability of qualified faculty, if numbers of "educators in the pipeline" do not increase, this practice may become more widespread in the future.



Graduate assistantships were available to 25% or fewer of the students enrolled at half of the programs, although students rated the importance of the opportunity for departmental assistantships with a mean score of 3.39 on a 5-point scale. Financial assistance in the form of scholarships was offered by two-thirds of the programs.

Over two-thirds of the programs surveyed indicated areas of faculty research interest included computers, education, food and beverage management, personnel management, and/or tourism. Tourism related research has increased in recent years as part of economic development and revitalization programs in many states. Personnel management as an area of research focus is not surprising due to the applicability for industry, availability of external funding, and educational backgrounds of many faculty.

Centralized marketing efforts at the institutional level were currently in place at 9 of the 20 schools, while 3 of the remaining 11 programs had plans to implement such efforts. Although a definition of centralized marketing was not provided on the survey, findings of this study do indicate a trend towards centralization of marketing efforts at the graduate level. As enrollment numbers and accompanying tuition revenues decrease, administrators will search for cost-effective methods of marketing programs and recruiting students.

Of the 20 administrators surveyed, 13 estimated their program received over 50 student inquiries about the hospitality education graduate program in the last year while nine administrators estimated over 100 inquiries had been received. Most of the students accepted into graduate programs and respondents to this study ( $n = 51$ ) applied to only one graduate program, however, close to 10% applied to over five schools with a range from 6 to 13.

Criteria used most frequently by graduate programs in selection of students were undergraduate grade point averages, GRE or GMAT test scores, and references. One finding, reported earlier in this study and illustrating the application of selection criteria, was that approximately 65% of student respondents entered graduate school with undergraduate grade point averages of 3.0 or higher, on the 4.0 scale. Interestingly, undergraduate field of study, or completion of prerequisites, were not used as selection criteria for 7 of the 20 programs.

Newly adopted accreditation standards for undergraduate programs by the professional organization of hospitality educators emphasize industry work experience. Although 15 of the 20 programs responding indicated industry work experience was considered in selection of students, it was considered as one of the three most important selection criteria by only

two of the programs. Given the applied nature of the hospitality field, this finding is surprising.

Perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts

There is little reported research regarding administrators or students perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices. Malaney (1987a) reported on the usage of practices by all graduate programs at one large midwestern university, although the effectiveness of practices were not determined. His research, which served as a framework for development of questionnaires to administrators and students of graduate programs of hospitality education, categorized marketing and recruiting practices into two phases. Administrators and students surveyed in this study rated the effectiveness of practices used before and after student inquiry on a five-point scale, with 5 = very effective. Non-response was interpreted as an indication that the practice was not used by the institution. An analysis of the present research study is presented within this framework.

Before student inquiry      From a review of the literature, 15 practices used before student inquiry were identified and rated on a five-point scale (5 = very effective) by administrators and students of hospitality education. Few of the practices were considered more than somewhat effective.

Administrators The practices used most frequently by administrators of graduate programs in hospitality education (95%); and which illustrate the applied nature of the profession, were faculty contacts and contacts with industry representatives. Similarly, 90% of hospitality program administrators used contacts with alumni of the institution, some practicing professionals, as a marketing and recruiting tool. Faculty contacts with other institutions were considered in the somewhat effective range, with a mean rating of 3.11, while contacts with industry representatives and alumni were perceived in the low end of the somewhat effective range, with mean ratings of slightly less than 3.0 on the 5.0 scale.

Similar findings were reported in the literature. Malaney (1987a) researched the utilization of marketing and recruiting practices among graduate programs at one large university and found faculty contacts with other institutions were used by 72% of program administrators.

Over three-fourths of hospitality program administrators in this study rated scheduling of classes as the most effective practice used before student inquiry with a mean of 3.59 on the 5.0 scale. The high perception of effectiveness could be attributed as a response to changing demographics and lifestyle factors of the graduate student pool, and an awareness of the desire by practicing industry professionals to earn an advanced degree in the field.

Hospitality program administrators (85%) monitored booths at trade shows and conferences in efforts to raise awareness of the program with prospective students, yet the practice was perceived as in the lower end of the somewhat effective range. Malaney (1987a) reported this practice was used most frequently before student inquiry, as indicated by 79% of the respondents in his study.

Although less than half (40%) of the hospitality graduate program administrators utilized the practice of mass mailings of flyers and posters, this was the practice used second in frequency by approximately three-fourths (72%) of the program administrators in Malaney's study of graduate program administrators (1987a). Hospitality graduate program administrators rated this practice as between marginally and somewhat effective, 2.0 and 3.0 on the 5.0 effectiveness scale.

Administrators of hospitality education graduate programs attended Career Day programs at other institutions more frequently (40%) than administrators in Malaney's study (22%). However, the effectiveness of this practice was considered marginally effective with mean ratings of 2.0 by both administrators and students.

The practice used least frequently by administrators of graduate programs of hospitality education was satellite locations of graduate coursework. Yet, close to one-third

(30%) of responding administrators rated this practice as somewhat effective.

Students Student respondents in this study rated the effectiveness of 18 listed practices used by the graduate program of current enrollment before an interest in the program was expressed. Three additional practices were added to the list of fifteen marketing and recruiting practices rated by administrators.

Two practices listed only on the survey addressed to graduate students were reported as the most frequently used and as very effective. Approximately 75% of all students and 80% of the 27 international students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education indicated interest in the program was created by friends. Student respondents rated this practice with an effectiveness rating of 3.49, second only to the effectiveness of contacts with alumni (mean effectiveness rating of 3.51).

Another practice rated only by student respondents was that of "parents or other family." Interest created by parents or other family members was reported by 66% of all students and 74% of international student respondents. This practice was considered in the somewhat effective range, with a mean of 3.24. Findings from this study support prior research.

Research on marketing and recruiting practices at the undergraduate level note the significance of friends and family in student selection of an institution (Jackson, 1982; Gorman, 1976; Litten, 1972). Previous research has shown international students choose particular course of graduate study at specific institutions due to the enrollment of friends (Malaney, 1987b). Khawja, Bosselman, and Fernsten (1990) found international students enrolled in hospitality graduate programs cited friends as the leading influence in selection of institution.

The effectiveness of advertisements through local media were rated by 30% of the respondents with a mean score of 2.39. This marketing and recruiting practice has increased most notably at the undergraduate level as a response to dwindling numbers of applicants and an effort to expand the applicant pool beyond traditional sources. Although viewed as somewhere between marginally and somewhat effective as a sole marketing and recruiting practice, advertisements and publicity in the form of articles do establish the program's name and purpose. The carry-over effect of this particular practice to other sources of information for the students, such as friends and family should be noted. One anecdotal response in this study indicated a newspaper article about one program, carried on a national wire service, was the key factor in the selection of the particular school.

A research question in this study asked if significant differences existed between administrators' and students' perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry. Significant differences were found between administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness for 2 of the 15 practices used before student inquiry.

The practice used before student inquiry considered the most effective by administrators was "scheduling classes at non-traditional times" (mean rating of 3.59) while students' mean rating of this practice was significantly lower ( $p \leq .01$ ) at 2.61. A significant difference ( $p \leq .05$ ) also was found between mean ratings by the two groups for the practice "contacts with undergraduate placement office" with means of 1.79 for administrators and 2.65 for students.

After student inquiry      The utilization and effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices appeared to increase after student inquiry into a program, as evidenced by responses from administrators and students of graduate programs of hospitality education in this study. More frequent usage of practices after student initiated inquiry were reported by administrators and students.

The theme of personalization in student recruitment strategies, stressed in the undergraduate marketing literature (Gorman, 1976; Jackson, 1982; Lolli & Scannel, 1983;



Litten, 1982) and in the limited graduate marketing literature (Olson & King, 1985; Hossler, 1989) was found to be effective by strategic constituencies in this study also.

Administrators Almost all (95%) of hospitality program administrators responded to student inquiries with a letter and/or brochure, and rated this practice high in effectiveness with a mean of 3.74. Malaney (1987a) reported the same percentage of graduate program administrators from one institution utilized this practice.

In this study of hospitality graduate programs, 85% of the administrators issued invitations for a campus visit at the student's expense and the other 15% paid for the student's trip expenses. Not surprisingly, expense-paid visits were rated higher in effectiveness (mean of 3.67) than student-paid visits (mean of 3.12). Malaney reported 63% of administrators issued invitations to visit the campus, all at the student's expense. Gorman (1976) found institutional visits by the prospective student to be a strong influence in final selection of school by undergraduate students.

Telephone calls to prospective students from faculty members were made in 70% of the hospitality graduate programs surveyed as compared with approximately 40% of the programs studied by Malaney (1987a). Administrators rated this practice highest in effectiveness with a mean rating of 4.07 on the 5.0 scale. A similar practice, telephone calls from

current graduate students, was rated by less than half ( $n = 8$ ) of administrators as effective with a mean of 3.88.

Students Almost 60% of the responding students who reported receiving a telephone call from a faculty member rated this practice at the high end of the effectiveness range, with a mean of 3.96. Approximately one-third of the students rated the practice of a telephone call from a current graduate student as effective, although slightly less so than a call from a faculty member. Student perceptions of effectiveness were similar to the perceptions of administrators.

The provision of a faculty member as a contact person was rated by students as the second most effective practice. A personalized letter from the graduate program administrator was a practice also considered effective by students with a mean rating of 3.59.

Olson and King (1985) reported 49% of prospective domestic graduate students at one large university considered personal contact with faculty as important in their selection of program. All forms of personal contact with students from the department and institution were well received by the students in this study, consistent with findings from earlier research of various student groups.

The final research question in this content area asked if significant differences existed between administrators'

and students' perceptions of effectiveness of practices used after student inquiry. Analysis by t-test comparisons were reviewed for 18 practices listed in the category after student inquiry. Significant differences were not found in the perceptions of effectiveness held by administrators and students for any of the listed practices.

Further analysis found significant differences existed between students grouped by gender, program level of study, and citizenship status for some of the practices used before and after student inquiry. One conclusion of this study is that administrators are aware of successful recruiting efforts for students currently enrolled, however, there appear to be discrepancies between marketing and recruiting practices that are effective in identifying programs to prospective students.

From the data collected in this study, it was estimated that slightly more than half of the students had earned at least one other degree from the current institution. Malaney (1983) reported one low-cost method for increasing enrollments of professional public administration graduate program was to draw on current undergraduate students. It appears from this study that many schools employ this method, perhaps contributing to the variance in perceptions towards the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry.

As marketing and recruiting practices become more sophisticated and begin to address target markets, such as female doctoral students, an awareness of efforts considered effective by the target groups is necessary.

Factors considered important in selection of graduate program

Four research questions addressed the content area of selection factors. This study grouped 33 factors into seven categories: reputation, institutional, departmental, and community characteristics, financial assistance, external influences, and personal considerations. Similar factors and groupings were reported in the literature (Olson & King, 1985; Moore & Halfond, 1986; Horan, 1988; Gagnon, 1988; and Hossler, 1984). Students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education rated the importance of listed factors in their final selection of graduate program on a five-point scale, with 5 = very important.

Although reputation of the "university" and "faculty" were considered as important selection factors by students, the highest rated factor in the category of reputation was "reputation of the department," which received a mean rating of importance of 4.38 on the 5.0 scale. These findings were consistent with previous research and emphasized the importance of the academic discipline in selection of institution for graduate study.

Olson and King (1985) found that 47% of all graduate students surveyed in their study considered departmental reputation as important in final selection of graduate program while Moore and Halfond (1986) reported reputation of the business school as the most important factor considered by prospective graduate students of business. In Horan's study (1988), general reputation of a residency program was the factor rated third by prospective resident physicians.

Similarly, the category of departmental characteristics which included factors such as curriculum, personal contact with faculty, and departmental business and industry contacts were considered important by students in final selection of a graduate program. The high ratings of importance also emphasize the importance of the role of the department in graduate study. "Curriculum" was the factor in this category rated as most important with a mean of 3.96, followed by the factor "personal contact with faculty." Students in hospitality education graduate programs, often housed in business departments and colleges, indicated the importance of departmental business and industry contacts, not only in initial consideration but also in final selection of a program with a mean of 3.70. Given the applied nature of hospitality management, the importance of this factor is not surprising, and consistent with research of business schools.

Moore and Halfond (1986) found that reputation of a graduate business program among business and industry representatives was a leading factor in student selection of a program. Olson and King (1985) reported 49% of the students considered personal contact with faculty as very important while Horan (1988) found that prospective resident students considered faculty-student relations in final selection of graduate program.

The category of personal considerations included factors such as personal reasons, personal satisfaction, career advancement, and employment and academic opportunities for spouse. Two items in this category were considered the most important of the 33 listed factors. "Career advancement" received a mean rating of importance of 4.39 and "personal satisfaction" closely followed with a mean of 4.38. These findings are consistent with other studies of graduate level marketing and recruiting (Kolman, Gallagher, Hossler, & Catania, 1987).

Although Olson and King (1985) reported for 35% of prospective graduate students, some personal reasons, such as marital status or employment opportunities for spouse, were important in final selection of program, results from this study did not support their findings, although approximately 30% of the sample of students surveyed for this study were married. Differences in findings from the two studies could

be attributed to the populations sampled as Olson and King surveyed only domestic students. Another conclusion might be that the profile of the hospitality education graduate student varies from other fields of study with respect to marital status.

External factors was the title of the category that included factors such as "dissatisfaction with current employment" and "lack of advancement opportunities with current job." These two factors were rated with means above 3.0 on the 5.0 scale.

Malaney (1987b) surveyed graduate students to determine their reasons for advanced study and found 50% enrolled in a graduate program to broaden employment opportunities. Kolman, Gallagher, Hossler, and Catania (1987) found credentialing was the primary reason for advanced study amongst doctoral students in social sciences and education.

The category of community characteristics included factors of size, quality of life, geographic location and employment in area. "Geographic location" was the factor rated highest within the category with a mean of 3.54 on the 5.0 scale. Similar reportings of the importance of geographic location in selection of graduate program have been found in the literature.

Gagnon (1988) found that geographic location was a more important factor in student selection of a pharmaceutical

program than perceived quality. Olson and King (1985) reported 61% of prospective domestic graduate students considered location a factor in selection of program. Other factors in this study may not have been rated as important due to the demographic composition of the student sample and majority of respondents with status as a full-time student. Quality of life and size of the community are factors that might have more importance to individuals with dependents to consider, or individuals with greater career and life experience.

The importance attached to factors within the category of financial assistance indicate financial considerations are of influence in student selection of a graduate program, although not of primary importance. "Opportunities for a departmental assistantship" was a factor that received a mean rating of importance of 3.39 from students, indicating prospective students were interested in working in the field under the guidance of academic advisors and faculty mentors.

Educational cost has been considered in other studies regarding graduate student recruitment although a high rating of importance has not been reported. Olson and King (1985) reported that educational cost was a factor in final selection of program for 39% of the prospective graduate students responding to their study while prospective master's of



business students ranked cost of program 8th out of 15 factors (Moore & Halfond, 1986).

The category of institutional characteristics, with factors such as "speed of application and acceptance process" and "alma mater" was not considered as important by hospitality students in final selection of graduate program. The relative unimportance of these factors stresses the greater importance placed on academic discipline over the institution itself.

Findings from this study indicated graduate students of hospitality education used the same factors as students in other disciplines when deciding which school to attend. Significant differences existed between male and female, master's and doctoral, and domestic and international graduate students in their ratings of importance for 9 of the 33 factors used in selection of graduate program.

A significant difference ( $p \leq .01$ ) was found between male and female students in their rating of the importance of "departmental reputation," with mean scores of 4.68 and 4.13 respectively. This was the only significant difference in ratings of importance for listed selection factors between the male and female groups of students. Although Malaney concluded that reasons for graduate study varied by gender and age, only one significant difference was found between

male and female. The variable of age was not researched in this study.

Significant differences were found between master's and doctoral level students' ratings of importance for 4 of the 33 listed factors. Interpretation of these findings should reflect the small number of female doctoral students ( $n = 2$ , or 16% of all doctoral students) and view the doctoral student ratings as predominately those of male students. Ratings of importance by master's level students were higher for three factors; "academic opportunities for spouse," "departmental business and industry contacts," and "alternatives to the thesis." Explanations for differences can be attributed to age and position in the life cycle, marital status, and career objectives, although these variables were not studied. In many master's level programs, alternatives to the thesis research component are considered while no doctoral programs offer this option.

Doctoral students rated the importance of "employer" higher than master's level students. The higher rating of importance might be due to their greater length of experience in the work force and greater levels of responsibility.

Domestic and international students rated 4 of the 33 factors significantly different. Domestic students rated the factors of "personal reasons" and "dissatisfaction with current employment" as more important than international

students, findings that might be attributed to cultural differences of the importance of self-satisfaction. The largest category of international students were Asian-Pacific Islanders, cultures that stress sense of duty and responsibility to society over personal reward.

International students reported more importance was attached to the factor of "speed of the application and acceptance process" than domestic students. Due to the distance and expense involved for graduate students in their decision to study in America, in addition to political or other bureaucratic factors, this finding is not surprising. International students also considered "research interest of faculty" as more important than domestic students, a difference that might be attributed to greater attention to academics in early education and a greater awareness of and respect for the professor's role.

As the need for recruitment of students to train as future educators increases for all disciplines (El-Khawas, 1990), results of this study can contribute to the growing body of knowledge regarding graduate student selection of institution and program.

#### Attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences

Additional objectives of this study were to assess the importance of selected attitudes and values held by hospital-

ity education graduate students towards work and lifestyle factors, and to determine if significant differences existed between the ratings of importance of students grouped by characteristics of gender, level of study, and citizenship. Figler's (1975) Career Workbook for Liberal Arts Students and Nevill and Super's (1985) inventory of values, The Values Scale, provided a framework for the questionnaire items. A previous factor analysis (Super, 1980, cited in Nevill and Super, 1986) grouped questionnaire items into three value clusters labeled inner-, group-, and material-oriented. A five-point scale (5 = very important) was used.

There is no reported research regarding attitudes and values of graduate students in the literature. However, many articles and books have reported on attitudes and values held by undergraduate students. Findings from this study are compared with literature reported for undergraduate students within the previously labeled clusters.

Inner-oriented      Students rated the importance of twelve survey items which comprised the inner-oriented value cluster focusing on factors of ability utilization, creativity, personal development, and lifestyle preferences. The highest rated attitude and value statement for all student respondents was found in this category. The item "find personal satisfaction in my work" received a mean rating of importance of 4.78 on the 5.0 scale. The importance of

"personal satisfaction through my work" to graduate students was discussed in the previous section and underscores the importance students in this study placed on self-fulfillment.

Four statements were considered as less than somewhat important and all four were clustered in the inner-oriented category. The statement considered least important of all 35 statements was "be politically active" which received a mean rating of 2.41, although doctoral students rated this statement lower than master's level students. Only 14% of the students considered this attitudes and value statement to be important or very important.

Astin's (1991) study of entering freshmen found that 21% of all respondents rated this statement as "important" or "essential," (4.0 or 5.0 on a 5.0 scale). The mean age of hospitality students responding to this study was 28, which would indicate the majority of the students were undergraduate students in the late 1970s and 1980s, a period described by one researcher as "the shift to conservatism" (Sandeem, 1985).

Hospitality graduate students responding to this study rated the importance of "being self-employed" as less than somewhat important with a mean of 2.80 on the 5.0 scale. Only 7 of 87 students indicated plans to initiate their own business or join an existing family business. Furthermore, over one-half of the 87 students responding to this study

earned the bachelor's degree between the years 1986 and 1990. Findings from this study are consistent with descriptions of college students of the 1980s as cautious, accepting of prescribed rules and regulations, and concerned for job security (Horowitz, 1987; Sandeen, 1985; Thompson, 1981). However, almost half of entering freshmen in 1991 (43%) rated the statement "becoming successful in my own business" as important or essential, with scores of 4.0 or 5.0 on a 5.0 scale (Astin, 1991).

Another statement rated with a mean score of less than 3.0 was "have an active religious life," which received a mean rating of 2.81 from responding hospitality education students. Levine (1981) noted a trend in his study of college students towards a questioning of traditional values and diminished confidence in established institutions. He reported most entering freshmen in 1979 believed all social institutions, including the church, were immoral or dishonest. Many of the responding students in this study were just beginning their academic experience at the time of Levine's work.

The statement "have work be the central focus of my life" was also considered in the low end of the somewhat important range by hospitality education graduate students. Previous research has indicated the increased priority by students for values related to money, power and status

(Astin, 1985, Horowitz, 1987). Attainment of these tangible and non-tangible factors is typically achieved through the employment situation.

A significant difference was found between international and domestic students in their ratings of the importance of this statement. The largest represented group of international students in this study was Asian-Pacific Islanders. The findings illustrate cultural differences in student and future employee attitudes and values towards work.

Group-oriented Thirteen attitude and values statements comprised the group-oriented cluster which assessed concepts such as altruism, cultural identity, and social interactions. None of the 13 statements received an average rating of importance below 3.0 (somewhat important), although subgroups within the sample did rate some items lower. The item rated highest in this cluster with a mean of 3.98 on the 5.0 scale was "deal with a variety of people at work" while the lowest rated item (mean of 3.09) was "live and work where people of my race and religion are accepted."

Three attitude and value statements in the group-oriented value cluster elicited significant differences in responses between male and female students. Female students rated the statement "improve the welfare and peace of the world" significantly higher than male graduate students, in contrast to research by Otten (1990) which showed little

variation between gender groups in ratings of importance of similar statements.

Female students also considered it significantly more important than male students to "work as a team member towards established goals" and "change work activities frequently." Female students rated these statements with means of importance of 4.04 and 3.45, while male students' ratings were 3.58 and 2.87, respectively.

Domestic students rated the value statement "change work activities frequently" as significantly more important ( $p \leq .05$ ) than international students. Not surprisingly, given their status as members of a minority population in this country, international students rated the statement to "feel accepted at work as a member of my ethnic group" as significantly more important ( $p \leq .01$ ) than domestic students.

Material-oriented Concepts grouped in the material cluster included economic rewards, advancement, economic security, and prestige. All ten attitude and value statements in this cluster received a mean rating  $\geq 3.38$ , indicating students considered all items to be more than somewhat important. The statement "be respected for my knowledge and skills" was rated highest in importance in this cluster with a mean of 4.42 while the statement "be publicly recognized for the quality of my work" received a mean rating of 3.38.



Although Otten (1990) found little variation between gender groups in aspirations for high-paying, prestigious jobs, female hospitality graduate students rated the importance of "being able to support a high standard of living" significantly higher than male students. Over 96% of responding female students were enrolled in a master's level program.

Statistically significant differences were found between students enrolled in master's and doctoral level programs for three statements in the material-oriented value cluster: "be able to support a high standard of living," "earn a high salary and perquisites," and "get ahead quickly in my career." The majority of doctoral students were men, indicating any differences found between master's and doctoral level students could also be confounded by gender differences.

In each instance, master's level students rated the statement as more important than doctoral students. These findings are consistent with trends noted by Astin (1985). He reported 40% of freshmen in 1973 rated the statement "be well-off financially" as essential or important (4.0 or 5.0) compared with over 70% in 1990.

The median age of doctoral hospitality education students surveyed in this study in 1990 was 37, while the median age of master's level students was 27. Many of the doctoral

students would have been undergraduates in 1973, and thus have similar attitudes and values of freshmen surveyed by Astin in that year towards the importance of personal financial reward.

Two statements in this value cluster were considered significantly more important ( $p \leq .001$ ) to international students than to domestic students: "get ahead quickly in my career" and "be able to support a high standard of living." As technology increases communication and the world economy becomes more globally based, cultural diversity in the work setting and personal environment will mandate a better understanding of the attitudes and values of international residents.

Implications exist for hospitality industry personnel managers when the importance attached by domestic and international students to work and personal financial reward is compared, and considered with future career plans of the students. Interestingly, the majority of international graduate students of hospitality education planned to seek a position in the commercial sector of the industry.

#### Summary

Graduate programs in hospitality education will develop and mature in response to demands for qualified educators with earned doctorates and practitioners to manage hospital-

ity businesses in a global economy. Subsequently, a need exists to enlarge the pool of qualified prospective students to prepare as future educators and industry leaders.

Research questions in this study addressed four content areas: characteristics of students and programs, perceptions of effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts, factors used in student selection of a graduate program, and attitudes and values held by graduate students. The data were collected by mail surveys addressed to administrators of all known graduate programs in the United States and a sample of 25% of students enrolled in the participating programs. Of the 23 identified graduate programs of hospitality education, 20 administrators responded to the survey and 18 agreed to distribute surveys to a random sample of graduate students. A response rate of 47% was achieved from graduate students for a participation number of 87.

This exploratory study compiled a profile of students currently enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education and characteristics of departments and institutions with graduate programs of hospitality education. This study introduced baseline data on marketing and recruiting efforts considered effective by strategic constituencies of administrators and students. Factors considered important in final selection of program were rated by students and an

assessment of student attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences was made.

Administrators reported a total of 760 students were enrolled in graduate programs of hospitality education for Fall semester 1990, with an estimated 200 additional students enrolled in the three programs that did not participate in this study. While there was approximately equal distribution of male and female students, over 90% were enrolled in master's level programs and 52% were classified as international students. The largest represented group of international students were Asian-Pacific Islanders.

Over 60% of the students surveyed applied to only one graduate program and 20% applied to two or three. Selection criteria used most frequently by programs were undergraduate grade point average, GRE or GMAT scores, industry work experience, and letters of reference. The three most important selection criteria, as identified by the majority of the respondents, were undergraduate grade point average, GRE or GMAT scores, and letters of reference.

Administrators rated the practice of "classes scheduled at non-traditional times" as the most effective, although a significant difference was found in students' mean rating of this practice. Students considered "contact with alumni" as the most effective practice, and "friends" as the second highest in effectiveness. Students' ratings of effectiveness

for the practice "contacts with undergraduate placement office" were significantly higher than those of administrators. "Career Day programs at other schools" were considered "marginally effective" by both administrators and students.

Practices that are perceived as effective by both strategic constituencies in broadening the pool of applicants to study hospitality management at the graduate level are needed. This need will increase as the demand for future hospitality educators and practitioners grows.

Findings from this study showed current practices used by graduate programs after student interest is expressed in the program are viewed as effective by both administrators and students. Administrators and students rated faculty and departmental outreach practices, such as a "telephone call by faculty member" or a "personal letter on departmental stationery" as the more effective practices. The theme of personalization was considered effective in responses from graduate students surveyed for this study.

No significant differences were found between administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness for practices used after student inquiry. Future research can study the effectiveness of practices used at this stage of the marketing and recruitment process with the added variable of cost constraints.

Hospitality students are similar to graduate students in other fields of study in their ratings of the importance of factors considered in final selection of graduate program. Twelve factors received mean ratings of importance of 3.50 or higher on the 5.0 scale, as shown in Table 34. Table 34 shows significant differences were found between three groups of students categorized by gender, level of study, and citizenship status.

Attitudes and values towards work and lifestyle preferences held by graduate students were assessed. The importance of "finding personal satisfaction in my work" was rated highest of all listed statements by graduate students of hospitality education. Four of the 35 statements received mean ratings of less than 3.0, "have an active religious life," "be politically active," "be self-employed," "have work be the central focus of my life." Significant differences were found between male and female, master's and doctoral, and domestic and international students.

Four statements received significantly different mean ratings of importance from male and female students; "change work activities frequently," "work as a team member towards established goals," "improve the welfare and peace of the world," and "be able to support a high standard of living." Women rated each statement higher than men respondents.

Table 34. Twelve of 33 factors considered in final selection of graduate program rated with means of importance  $\geq 3.50$

Factor	Mean <sup>a</sup>	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>
Career advancement	4.39	.97	80
Personal satisfaction	4.38	.85	80
Departmental reputation	4.38	.87	82
Curriculum	3.96	1.04	82
University reputation	3.94	1.97	82
Faculty reputation	3.87	1.08	83
Personal contact with faculty	3.82	1.25	79
Departmental business industry contacts	3.70	1.20	76
Personal reasons	3.70	1.24	76
Flexibility of program	3.66	1.05	79
Geographic location	3.54	1.21	82
Personalization of POS	3.50	1.05	76

<sup>a</sup>Rating scale: 1 (not important); 5 (very important).

<sup>b</sup>Total number of students = 87.

Master's level students rated three statements as significantly more important than doctoral students. All items were clustered in the material-oriented category; "get ahead quickly in my career," "earn a high salary and perquisites," and "be able to support a high standard of living."

International students rated three statements as significantly more important than domestic students. These

items present a picture of a strongly motivated student; "have work be the central focus of my life," "be able to support a high standard of living," and "get ahead quickly in my career."

Findings from this study provide input to administrators of graduate programs to a) target graduate recruiting efforts towards a desired market segment, b) aid in decisions surrounding program development, and c) better meet the needs of prospective students.

#### Recommendations

Findings from this exploratory study suggest the need for future research in several topic areas. Significant differences were found between administrators' and students' perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry, although the perceptions of all prospective students were not identified. In addition, significant differences were found between students grouped by gender, program level of study, and citizenship status.

Significant differences were not found between administrators' and all student respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used after student inquiry. Practices viewed as 'personalized' were considered very effective by students. However, sig-



nificant differences were found in the perceptions of effectiveness for these practices between students grouped by gender, program level of study, and citizenship status. These variations in perceptions found between the strategic constituencies of administrators, and groups of students indicate refinement of marketing and recruiting practices could be studied further.

Additionally, with uncertain budgets in times of declining student enrollments, accompanying tuition revenues, and decreasing state support, many administrators in this study reported centralized marketing programs were in place or being considered. The pressure exists to enroll qualified students with minimum expenditures of fiscal resources. Future research could investigate the added variable of cost.

Administrators responded to the request for promotional material such as departmental and institutional brochures. A content analysis of the information returned to student after an initial inquiry could be included in future research.

Other research and findings from this study indicated the importance of geographic location of institutions in selection of a program. Future research for specific regional areas could determine the significance of this variable in the student selection process.

Findings from this study indicated over half of the 87 student respondents ( $n = 49$ ) had earned previous degrees from

the institution of current enrollment. An additional variable of student status as an alumnus of the institution could be included in the selection process.

Responses from administrators of the 20 graduate programs showed colleges of home economics ( $n = 7$ ), colleges of business ( $n = 4$ ), independent school or college ( $n = 4$ ) or other school or college ( $n = 5$ ) were the housing locations. Future research could assess the impact of program location within the institution on student selection of the program.

Although gender breakdown of faculty was analyzed in this study, information regarding other demographic characteristics of the hospitality professoriat could be researched in future studies.

In this study, a profile of the current student population indicated a need to target segments of the prospective student market to increase enrollment in hospitality doctoral programs, specifically of women students. Future research could be done to address needs of doctoral students, and to determine reasons and influencing factors in the decision to pursue this degree.

Future research could assess attitudes and values held by graduate students of hospitality education towards work and lifestyle factors on a periodic basis. This work would track trends of personal and professional values held by

hospitality graduate students, future practitioners and professionals.

Findings from this study also showed managerial work experience in the hospitality field by current master's level students was limited, and could possibly be correlated with age of the respondents, and undergraduate field of study. Future research could address these variables and further define the variable of industry work experience.

Recommendations for future research also include the development of a model for recruitment of targeted student groups. The need for empirical evidence to provide data from a representative sample of the population with regard to status as student is also necessary to be used in decision-making of marketing and recruiting priorities.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adler, H. (1985). Professional development of faculty in hotel and restaurant administration programs. Proceedings of the 1985 Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education Annual Conference, 104-109.
- Aslanian, C. (1990, May). Back from the future. Paper presented at the 75th Anniversary Conference of National University Continuing Education Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Astin, A. (1978). Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (1985). Achieving educational excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (1991, January 30). This years college freshmen: Attitudes and characteristics. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, A30, A31.
- Baird, L. L. (1978). Student expectations and the realities of graduate and professional schools. College and University, 54(1), 68-73.
- Barton, D. W., & Treadwell, D. R. (1978). Marketing: A synthesis of institutional soul-searching and aggressive-ness. In D.W. Barton (Ed.) Marketing higher education: New directions for higher education series No. 21, (pp. 77-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bok, D. (1986). Higher learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bosselman, R. H., & Fernsten, J. A. (1989). Graduate hospitality and tourism education: A review of programs. Hospitality and Tourism Educator, 2(1), 27-29.
- Bowen, H. R. (1977). Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

- Bruker, R. M. & Taliana, L. E. (1985). The institutional self-study: First step in a viable marketing program. College and University, 61(1), 32-42.
- Calnan, T. W., Chacko, E. H., & Nebel, E. (1986). Hospitality doctorates: A seller's market? Proceedings of the Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education Annual Conference, 10(2), 216-218.
- Carter, V. L., & Garigan, C. S. (Eds.) (1979). A marketing approach to student recruitment. Alexandria, VA: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Chickering, A. (1971). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chapman, D. (1981). A model of student college choice. Journal of Higher Education, 52(5), 490-505.
- Council of Graduate Schools. (1989). Graduate school and you. Washinton, D.C.: Author.
- Council of Graduate Schools. (1991). International graduate students: A guide for graduate deans, faculty, and administrators. Washington. D.C.: Author.
- Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. (1989). United States and international directory of schools. University Park, PA: Author.
- Czinkota, M. R., Johnson, W. J., & Jelly, E. C. (1980). Medicine and marketing: The case of graduate medical education. Journal of Medical Education, 55, 906-911.
- Dillman, D. (1978). Telephone and mail surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- El-Khawas, E. (1990, June). Faculty shortages: Will our responses be adequate? Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Council on Education, San Francisco, CA.
- Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fenich, G. G. (1988). An empirical assessment of support for pursuit of doctoral degrees in hotel, restaurant, and institutional education. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 12(2), 107-113.

- Figler, H. E. (1975). PATH: A career workbook for liberal arts students. Cranston, Rhode Island: Carrole Press.
- Freedman, A. M., & Bartholomew, P. S. (1990). Age/-experience and gender as factors in ethical development of hospitality managers and students. Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2), 1-9.
- Gagnon, J. P. (1988). Understanding what motivates someone to pursue pharmacy graduate education. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 52(1), 10-15.
- Geller, W. W. (1982). How colleges respond to letter of inquiry: Is your mail effective? College and University, 57(3), 307-313.
- Gorman, W. P. (1976). An evaluation of student-attracting methods and university features by attending students. College and University, 51(2), 220-225.
- Griggs, C. M. (1965). Graduate education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Guyette, W. C. (1983). A checklist for the position search and hiring considerations in hospitality education. Journal of Hospitality Education, 7(2), 18-31.
- Hall, R. H. (1985). Professional management relations: Imagery versus action. Human Resource Management, 24(2), 227-236.
- Henry, J. L. (1980). Increasing recruitment and retention of minority students in health programs - dentistry. Journal of Dental Education, 44, 191-194.
- Horan, M. P. (1988). An analysis of medical students' speciality and residency choices. Journal of Medical Education, 63(1), 38-43.
- Horowitz, H. L. (1987). Campus life: Undergraduate attitudes from the end of the 18th century to the present. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hossler, D. (1982). College enrollment: The impact of perceived economic benefits. College and University, 58(1), 85-96.
- Hossler, D. (1984). Enrollment management: An integrated approach. New York: College Board Publications.

- Hossler, D. (Ed). (1986). Managing college enrollment: New directions for higher education No. 53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hossler, D. (Ed). (1989). Enrollment management review, 6(1). (Available from Regional Office of the College Board).
- Huddleston, T., & Batty, B. F. (1978). Marketing financial aid. In D. W. Barton (Ed.) Marketing higher education: New directions for higher education series No. 21 (pp. 37-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jackson, G. (1982). Public efficiency and private choice in higher education. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4(2), 237-47.
- James, F. E. (1989, April 25). Are ad campaigns a cure for ailing medical schools? The Wall Street Journal, p. B1.
- Jones, W. (1979). Generalizing mail survey inducement methods: Population interactions with anonymity and sponsorship. Public Opinion Quarterly, 43(1), 102-105.
- Khawaja, H. S., Bosselman, R. H., & Fernsten, J. A. (1990). Perspectives on hospitality and tourism graduate programs: The view from international students. Hospitality and Tourism Educator, 2(3), 26-29.
- Khawaja, H. S., & Bosselman, R. H. (1990). Cultural adjustment of international graduate students in American hospitality and tourism programs. Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2), 75-83.
- Kleemann, G. L., & Richardson, R. C. (1985). Student characteristics and perceptions of university effectiveness. The Review of Higher Education, 9(1), 5-20.
- Kolman, E. M., Gallagher, K. S., Hossler, D., & Catania, F. (1987). The outcomes of doctoral education: An institutional study. Research in Higher Education, 27(2), 101-117.
- Kottler, P., & Fox, K. F. (1985). Strategic marketing for educational institutions. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

- Laudadio, D. M. (1988). Sexual and gender harassment: Assessing the current climate. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 12(2) 411-415.
- Lefever, M. M., & Graves, R. (1990). The changing job market for hospitality educators, 1987-1990. Hospitality and Tourism Educator, 3(2), 14-18.
- Leslie, L. L., & Brinkman, P. T. (1988). The economic value of higher education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Levine, A. (1980). When dreams and hereos died: A portrait of today's college student. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Litten, L. H. (1981). Avoiding and stemming abuses in academic marketing. College and University, 56(2), 105-122.
- Litten, L. H. (1982). Different strokes in the applicant pool: Some refinements in a model of student college choice. Journal of Higher Education, 53(4), 383-402.
- Litten, L. H., & Brodigan, D. (1982). On being heard in a noisy world. College and University, 57(3), 252-259.
- Lolli, A., & Scannell, J. (1983a). Admissions market research: An alternative to decline in the eighties. College and University, 58(2), 135-151.
- Lolli, A., & Scannell, J. (1983b). Expanding the focus of admissions marketing utility. College and University, 59(1), 5-29.
- Lovelock, C. H., & Weinberg, C. B. (1984). Marketing for public and nonprofit managers. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- McClain, D., Vance, B., & Wood, E. (1984). Predicting yield in MBA admissions. Research in Higher Education, 20(1), 55-76.
- Madden, C. (1977). Forces which influence ethical behavior. In C.C. Walton (ed.) The ethics of corporate conduct (pp 31-78). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.



- Malaney, G. D. (1983). Graduate student recruitment in professional public administration programs: A low cost method of projecting potential student markets. College and University, 58(3), 260-269.
- Malaney, G. D. (1987a). Efforts to recruit graduate students: An analysis of departmental recruiting practices. College and University, 62(2), 126-136.
- Malaney, G. D. (1987b). Why students pursue graduate education, how they find out about a program, and why they apply to a specific school. College and University, 62(3), 247-257.
- Marshall, J. F., & Delman, J. M. (1984). Researching institutional image: The development and implementation of a market research plan for educational institutions. College and University, 59(4), 316-333.
- Meyer, R. A., & Koppel, J. (1990). Graduate hospitality: Where are we in our search for excellence? Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2). 183-189.
- Mooney, C.A. (1991, May 29). Universities award record number of doctorates. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 10.
- Moore, T. E., & Halfond, J.A. (1986). Comparative marketing strategies: MBA programs in contrast to undergraduate programs. College and University, 61(4), 294-299.
- Ness, F. W. (1960). A guide to graduate study - programs leading to the Ph. D. degree. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Neville, D. D., & Super, D. E. (1986). The values scale: Theory, application, and research manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Olsen, M. D., & Reid, R. D. (1983). How to judge the hospitality program. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 24(2), 37-40.
- Olson, C. (1985). Marketing graduate education: The past, present and future. The College Board Review No. 137, pp. 22-27.

- Olson, C., & King, M. A. (1985). A preliminary analysis of the decision process of graduate students in college selection. College and University, 60(4), 304-315.
- Otten, A. (1990, March 17). The 80's materialism marks American youth. The Wall Street Journal, p. 23.
- Pavesic, D. V. & Brymer, R. A. (1986). Recruitment and retention factors for the hospitality professoriate. Proceedings of the 1986 Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education Annual Conference, 73-80.
- Phelps, M. O., & Swann, C. C. (1984). Counseling versus marketing. College and University, 59(3), 285-286.
- Pizam, A. (1985). Graduate programs: Are they effective? (Editorial). Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 10(1), 5-6.
- Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1988a). Academic characteristics and faculty compensation in U.S. hospitality management programs. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 12(1), 93-105.
- Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1988b). The 1987-88 academic characteristics and faculty compensation in U.S. hospitality management programs. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 12(3), 17-41.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Martinez, F. M., & Hayden, D. C. (1986). Student affirmative action programs: A help or hindrance to development of minority graduate students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27(4), 318-325.
- Powers, T. F., & Riegel, C. D. (1984). R (for research) and D (for doctorate): An affirmative definition of hospitality education. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 25(2), 43-48.
- Redlin, M. H., Tabacchi, M. H., Sherry, J. E. H., & Boothe, S. K. (1990). Graduate programs in hospitality education: A strategic analysis. Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2), 666-667.
- Riegel, C. D. (1987). Doctoral education for HRI: Defining a field of study. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 28(2), 28-33.

- Riegel, C. D. (1989). An introduction to career opportunities in hospitality and tourism education. The guide to hospitality and tourism education 1989-1990. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rutherford, D. G. (1982). Who teaches hospitality education? The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 23(2), 38-41.
- Rutherford, D. G. (1983). An analysis of career determinants and publishing patterns among the hospitality professoriate. Journal of Hospitality Education, 7(2), 7-17.
- Sandeen, A. (1976). Undergraduate education: Conflict and change. Lexington, MA: Lexington Cook.
- Sandeen, A. (1985). The shift to conservatism: Implication for student affairs. National Association Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 22(4), 2-8.
- Schmelzer, C. D., Costello, P. S., & Blalock, S. L. (1987). A comparative profile of four-year baccalaureate hotel, restaurant, and institutional management programs. Proceedings of the 1987 Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education Annual Conference, 67-75.
- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Inc. (1988). Statistical package for the social sciences user's guide. (3rd. ed.) Chicago: Author.
- Stern, G. (1991, September 16). Young women insist on career equality, forcing the men in their lives to adjust. The Wall Street Journal, p. B1.
- Thompson, K. S. (1981). Changes in the values and lifestyle preferences of university students. Journal of Higher Education, 52(5), 506-519.
- Tolson, E. R. (1986). Changes in enrollment and applications to graduate schools of social work 1972-1982. Journal of Social Work Education, 22(2), 82-97.
- Vicere, A. A. (1988). Beyond a lick and a promise: Effective marketing communications for higher education. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 1(1), 73-82.

- Wachtel, J. M., & Pavesic, D. V. (1983). The doctorate dilemma. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 24(2), 35-40.
- Wall Street Journal. (1988, September 7). People patterns. The Wall Street Journal, p. 23.
- Weaver, P. A., Chiu, E., & McCleary, K. W. (1991). Can choice of letterhead affect your mail survey response rate? Hospitality and Tourism Educator, 3(2), 10-13.
- Weisman, R. A., Weinberg, P. C., & Winstel, J. W. (1972). On achieving greater uniformity in admission committee decisions. Journal of Medical Education, 47(3), 593-602.
- Whitney, D. L. (1989). The ethical orientations of hotel managers and hospitality students: Implications for industry, education, and careers. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 13(3), 187-192.
- Withey, S. B. (1971). A degree and what else: Correlates and consequences of a college education. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Wofford, D. O. & Timmerman, E. (1982). Marketing in admissions: The information system approach. College and University, 58(1), 49-56.
- Zabel, D. (1990). Characteristics of baccalaureate and graduate programs in hotel, restaurant and institution management: A recent survey. Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2), 571.

APPENDIX A. LETTER TO GRADUATE ADMINISTRATORS

*Iowa State University of Science and Technology*

Ames, Iowa 50011-1120



September 4, 1990

James F. Downey, Ph.D.  
Coordinator of Graduate Programs  
School of Hotel, Restaurant  
and Tourism Administration  
University of New Haven  
West Haven, Connecticut 06516

College of Family and Consumer Sciences  
Department of Hotel, Restaurant,  
and Institution Management  
11 MacKay Hall  
Telephone 515-294-1730

Dear Dr. Downey:

As part of a research study of marketing and recruiting efforts utilized by graduate programs in hospitality education, we are requesting your input. As a follow-up to our phone conversation last week, this letter will review the details of your participation.

We ask that you:

1. Complete the enclosed questionnaire designed to assess the perceptions of graduate program administrators of hospitality education in the United States on the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts.
2. Return a list of the names of the graduate students enrolled in your hospitality education program for Fall 1990 in the enclosed envelope along with the completed questionnaire by September 17, 1990.
3. In October 1990, distribute a survey packet (questionnaire and return envelope) to the students in your program that have been randomly selected for study participation from the mailing list provided by you in September. This questionnaire is designed to assess the perceptions of graduate students on the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts and to determine factors involved in student selection of a graduate program.
4. Collect and return the completed graduate student surveys to the researcher in the addressed, postage-paid envelope by October 15, 1990. Additional details on the second phase of the study will be provided with that mailing.

All information received will be pooled in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Results of the research data will be available upon request. Your input is greatly appreciated. Please contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Catherine H. Strohbehn, M.S., R.D.  
Graduate Student and Researcher

Thomas Walsh, Ph.D.  
Department Head

Enclosures

APPENDIX B. SURVEY TO ADMINISTRATORS

SURVEY TO ADMINISTRATORS OF GRADUATE  
PROGRAMS IN HOSPITALITY EDUCATION

I. SECTION ONE DEPARTMENTAL MARKETING AND RECRUITING PRACTICES

A. Listed below are marketing practices used by some graduate departments to recruit prospective graduate students. Please rate your perception of the effectiveness of practices utilized by your department to market the graduate program and to recruit students for the graduate program in hospitality education BEFORE a student initiates an inquiry. Effectiveness is defined for this section as a significant increase in the number of student inquiries. Using the scale described below, rate each of the listed practices in the blank space provided.

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT USED	NOT EFFECTIVE	MARGINALLY EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE

PRACTICES

PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Mailings of form letters to undergraduate institutions
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Mailings of flyers and posters to undergraduate schools
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Advertisements through local media
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate Study

FACULTY OUTREACH

- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Contacts with industry representatives
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Contacts with alumni of institution
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Contacts with faculty from other institutions
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Contacts with undergraduate placement office
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Contacts with academic advisors in undergraduate hospitality programs

DEPARTMENTAL SPONSORED ACTIVITIES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Career Day programs at your institution
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Career Day programs at other schools
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Summer internship program for undergraduates
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Booth or exhibit at conferences or trade shows

DEPARTMENTAL PRACTICES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Classes scheduled at non-traditional times
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Satellite locations for graduate coursework
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_



B. Please rate the effectiveness of the practices utilized by your department to market and recruit students for the graduate program in hospitality education AFTER a student initiates an inquiry, using the scale below. For this section, effectiveness of the practice is defined as the degree of influence it had on student selection of your graduate program.

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT USED	NOT EFFECTIVE	MARGINALLY EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE

#### PRACTICES

##### DEPARTMENTAL PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_1. Personalized letter from graduate program administrator
- \_\_\_2. Brochure describing the program

##### INSTITUTIONAL PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_3. Application for institutional enrollment
- \_\_\_4. Information about on-campus housing
- \_\_\_5. Catalog describing the university
- \_\_\_6. Catalog describing university graduate programs

##### FINANCIAL AID INFORMATION

- \_\_\_7. Information about graduate assistantships
- \_\_\_8. Information about institutional scholarships, grants, or awards
- \_\_\_9. Information about financial aid
- \_\_\_10. Information about departmental scholarships, grants, or awards

##### COMMUNITY INFORMATION

- \_\_\_11. Information about community (schools, services, etc.)
- \_\_\_12. Information about off-campus housing

##### FACULTY AND DEPARTMENTAL OUTREACH

- \_\_\_13. Telephone call by faculty member
- \_\_\_14. Telephone call by current graduate student
- \_\_\_15. Student invited to visit the campus (at own expense)
- \_\_\_16. Student invited to visit the campus (expenses paid)
- \_\_\_17. Faculty member provided as contact person
- \_\_\_18. Graduate student provided as contact person
- \_\_\_19. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

## II. SECTION TWO FACULTY AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

### A. ENROLLMENT

Q1. What is the total headcount enrollment of students at your institution for Fall semester 1990?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q2. Using student enrollment figures of undergraduate and graduate students for Fall semester 1990, how many students are enrolled in your department?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q3. Indicate the number of students enrolled for Fall semester 1990 at each level of study. Include any joint majors for the doctoral degree and identify area of study.

- |          |                                     |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| _____ 1. | UNDERGRADUATE                       |
| _____ 2. | MASTER'S LEVEL                      |
| _____ 3. | DOCTORAL LEVEL (STAND ALONE)        |
| _____ 4. | DOCTORAL LEVEL (JOINT MAJOR: _____) |
| _____ 5. | TOTAL                               |

Q4. Indicate the gender and number of students enrolled at each level of study.

- | MASTER'S |        | DOCTORAL |        |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|
| _____ 1. | MALE   | _____ 1. | MALE   |
| _____ 2. | FEMALE | _____ 2. | FEMALE |

Q5. How many of the graduate students enrolled at each level of study are classified as international students? (Not citizens of the United States of America).

- |          |                |
|----------|----------------|
| _____ 1. | MASTER'S LEVEL |
| _____ 2. | DOCTORAL LEVEL |
| _____ 3. | TOTAL          |

Q6. Indicate the gender and number of international graduate students enrolled at each level of study.

- | MASTER'S |        | DOCTORAL |        |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|
| _____ 1. | MALE   | _____ 1. | MALE   |
| _____ 2. | FEMALE | _____ 2. | FEMALE |

Q7. How many of the graduate students enrolled at each level of study are classified as minority students? (Citizens of the USA with ethnic identification in one of the following protected categories: Asian-Pacific Islander, African American, Hispanic-Mexican American-Puerto Rican, or Native American Indian).

- |          |                |
|----------|----------------|
| _____ 1. | MASTER'S LEVEL |
| _____ 2. | DOCTORAL LEVEL |
| _____ 3. | TOTAL          |

Q8. Indicate the gender and number of minority graduate students enrolled at each level of study.

MASTER'S		DOCTORAL	
_____ 1.	MALE	_____ 1.	MALE
_____ 2.	FEMALE	_____ 2.	FEMALE

Q9. What is your best estimate of the actual number of graduate students enrolled Fall semester 1990 by credit load?

_____ 1.	SIX OR LESS CREDITS
_____ 2.	OVER SIX CREDITS

#### B. FACULTY

Q1. How many full-time faculty equivalents (FTE) are budgeted appointments in your program for the academic year?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q2. What is the total number of individuals with faculty appointments in your program and their gender?

_____ 1.	MALE
_____ 2.	FEMALE
_____ 3.	TOTAL

Q3. How many temporary appointments for faculty are budgeted for the 1990-1991 academic year?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q4. How many of your faculty have earned doctorates? \_\_\_\_\_

Q5. How many of the faculty have advanced degrees earned from other institutions?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q6. Does your institution have a graduate faculty?

_____ 1.	YES
_____ 2.	NO

Q7. If so, are there levels of appointment?

_____ 1.	YES
_____ 2.	NO
_____ 3.	NOT APPLICABLE

Q8. How many faculty members in your program direct graduate students and at what level?

_____ 1.	MASTER'S
_____ 2.	DOCTORAL
_____ 3.	TOTAL

Q9. What are major areas of faculty research in your department?  
Please check all that apply.

- ☐ 1. BUSINESS LAW
- ☐ 2. COMPUTER APPLICATIONS
- ☐ 3. COST CONTROLS
- ☐ 4. EDUCATION
- ☐ 5. FOOD AND BEVERAGE MANAGEMENT
- ☐ 6. HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
- ☐ 7. LAYOUT AND DESIGN
- ☐ 8. MARKETING
- ☐ 9. NUTRITION
- ☐ 10. TOURISM
- ☐ 11. OTHER; PLEASE LIST \_\_\_\_\_

### C. PROGRAM

Q1. Is your school a public or private institution?

- ☐ 1. PUBLIC
- ☐ 2. PRIVATE

Q2. In what year was the undergraduate hospitality education curriculum begun at your institution?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q3. Within your institution, where is your program housed?

- ☐ 1. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
- ☐ 2. COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS
- ☐ 3. COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
- ☐ 4. INDEPENDENT SCHOOL OR COLLEGE
- ☐ 5. OTHER SCHOOL OR COLLEGE; PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q4. What is the highest degree offered in your graduate program?

- ☐ 1. MASTER'S
- ☐ 2. DOCTORAL

Q5. How many years has the graduate program been offered?

\_\_\_\_\_YEARS

Q6. What is the maximum number of graduate students your program can accommodate?

\_\_\_\_\_STUDENTS

Q7. What are the criteria used for selection of students to the graduate program? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ 1. UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGE
- ☐ 2. GRADUATE WORK GRADE POINT AVERAGE
- ☐ 3. LETTERS OF REFERENCE
- ☐ 4. PRIOR INDUSTRY WORK EXPERIENCE
- ☐ 5. SCORE ON GRADUATE RECORD EXAM
- ☐ 6. REPUTATION OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION
- ☐ 7. SPECIAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP (IE. MINORITY)
- ☐ 8. CAREER GOAL STATEMENT
- ☐ 9. COMPLETION OF PREREQUISITES
- ☐ 10. VERBAL COMMUNICATION ABILITIES
- ☐ 11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS
- ☐ 12. OTHER; PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q8. List the three criteria considered most important in selection of students to the graduate program.

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_

Q9. What is the percentage of graduate students on assistantships financed by the department?

- ☐ 1. 25 PERCENT OR LESS
- ☐ 2. 26 TO 50 PERCENT
- ☐ 3. 51 TO 75 PERCENT
- ☐ 4. MORE THAN 75 PERCENT

Q10. Is financial assistance in the form of scholarships available from the following sources?

- |            |                                 |                                |
|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> YES | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| COLLEGE    | 3. <input type="checkbox"/> YES | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| UNIVERSITY | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> YES | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> NO |

Q11. Please estimate the number of student-initiated inquiries received regarding your graduate program for the 1989-1990 academic year.

- ☐ 1. LESS THAN 10 INQUIRIES
- ☐ 2. 11 TO 25 INQUIRIES
- ☐ 3. 26 TO 50 INQUIRIES
- ☐ 4. 51 TO 75 INQUIRIES
- ☐ 5. 76 TO 100 INQUIRIES
- ☐ 6. MORE THAN 100 INQUIRIES

Q12. Is a centralized marketing effort for graduate programs at your institution currently in place?

- ☐ 1. YES
- ☐ 2. NO

Q13. If no, is such an effort in the planning or development stages?

- ☐ 1. YES
- ☐ 2. NO
- ☐ 3. NOT APPLICABLE

### III. SECTION THREE

A. Hospitality education at the graduate level is still in the developmental stage. Please use the space below to share any comments you might have concerning the nature and direction of graduate study in hospitality management.

B. Please enclose examples of promotional publications or brochures used to market your graduate program. These will be used to form a composite of printed marketing materials used by graduate programs in hospitality education.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY. RESULTS OF THE STUDY WILL BE PROVIDED TO INTERESTED RESPONDENTS. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR INTEREST BY WRITING YOUR NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS IN THE SPACE BELOW.

APPENDIX C. LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS  
WITH STUDENT SURVEYS

October 1, 1990

Richard Wisch, Ph.D.  
Director, SHRTM  
Fairleigh Dickinson University  
223 Montross Avenue  
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070

Dear Dr. Wisch:

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey for graduate program administrators concerning the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts. I enjoyed visiting with you on the phone this morning, and appreciate your willingness to cooperate with the data collection from graduate students.

To refresh your memory, the second phase of this study consists of a questionnaire designed to assess perceptions of students currently enrolled in hospitality education graduate programs of effective marketing and recruiting efforts and to determine factors involved in student selection of a particular program. Enclosed are four surveys for graduate students who will be selected for participation in this phase of the study. In order to ensure the random selection of study participants, we are asking that all graduate program administrators follow this procedure:

1. Obtain an alphabetical listing of all students enrolled in your graduate program for Fall semester 1990.
2. Select every fourth listed name for a total of four participants.

Please distribute survey packets (questionnaire and privacy envelope) to those students whom you have randomly selected. Students are asked to return completed surveys in a sealed envelope to you by January 3, 1991. Please place the collected surveys in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and mail by January 5, 1991. A copy of the student survey is enclosed for your information.

Your cooperation is very important to the success of this study. Results of the research data will be sent to you next spring. I thank you for your participation. Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Catherine H. Strohbehn, M.S., R.D.  
Graduate Student and Researcher

Enclosures



APPENDIX D. SURVEY TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

Iowa State University of Science and Technology



Ames, Iowa 50011-1120

College of Family and Consumer Sciences  
Department of Hotel, Restaurant,  
and Institution Management  
11 MacKay Hall  
Telephone 515-294-1730

October 1, 1990

Dear Graduate Student:

We are conducting a study of graduate student perceptions of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting efforts for graduate programs in hospitality education, and are requesting your input. In addition, the study will assess important factors in graduate student selection of such programs, as well as attitudes and values of the students. As you can see, your cooperation is very important to the success of this study. To accurately describe the perceptions of graduate students, participation by all graduate students selected for this study is vital.

Please complete this survey and place it in the enclosed envelope. Write your name across the sealed flap of the envelope and return it to your program director by October 10. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, responses will be grouped by categories and mean scores analyzed. Surveys are coded only for purposes of follow-up with nonrespondents.

Completion of the survey should take 15 to 20 minutes of your time. Your contribution of time and knowledge is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

*Catherine H. Strohbehn*

Catherine H. Strohbehn, M.S., R.D.  
Graduate Student and Researcher

*Thomas Walsh*

Thomas Walsh, Ph. D.  
Department Head

## SURVEY TO GRADUATE STUDENTS IN HOSPITALITY EDUCATION

## SECTION I

## PERCEPTIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL MARKETING AND RECRUITING EFFORTS

A. Listed below are some marketing activities used by some graduate programs to inform prospective students of the program. Which of the marketing and recruiting efforts that were used by your current school did you feel were effective? For this section, effectiveness is defined as a measure of the interest created BEFORE you expresses an interest in the program. Please rate the effectiveness of each listed marketing activity in the space provided using the scale described below.

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT AWARE OF ACTIVITY	NOT EFFECTIVE	MARGINALLY EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

## PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Letter of information sent to undergraduate department
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Flyer/Poster displayed at your undergraduate institution
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Advertisements through local media
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate Study

## FACULTY OUTREACH

- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Industry representative
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Alumni contacts
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Visiting faculty
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Undergraduate career counselor or placement office
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Undergraduate faculty member
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Undergraduate academic advisor

## DEPARTMENTAL SPONSORED ACTIVITIES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Career Day program at your institution
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Career Day program at other institution
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Summer internship program
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Booth or exhibit at trade show or professional conference

## EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Friends
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Parents or other family members
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Classes scheduled at non-traditional times
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Satellite location of graduate coursework
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

B. The marketing efforts used by some graduate programs to recruit future students after a student has expressed an interest in the programs are listed below. Please rate the effectiveness of the marketing and recruiting activity used by the institution where you are presently enrolled AFTER you expressed an interest in the program. For this section, effectiveness of the effort is defined as the influence it had in your selection of graduate program. Using the scale described below, rate the effectiveness of each marketing and recruiting effort in the blank space provided.

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT AWARE OF ACTIVITY	NOT EFFECTIVE	MARGINALLY EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE

#### MARKETING AND RECRUITING EFFORTS

##### DEPARTMENTAL PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. A personal letter on departmental stationary
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. A brochure about the program

##### INSTITUTIONAL PRINTED INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Application for institutional enrollment
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Information about on-campus housing
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Catalog describing the university
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Catalog describing the university graduate program

##### FINANCIAL AID INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Information about graduate assistantships
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Information about institutional scholarships, grants, or awards
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Information about financial aid
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Information about departmental scholarships, grants, or awards

##### COMMUNITY INFORMATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Information about the community (schools, services)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Information about off-campus housing

##### FACULTY/DEPARTMENTAL OUTREACH

- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Telephone call from faculty of program
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Telephone call from current graduate student
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Invitation to visit the campus (at your own expense)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Invitation to visit the campus (expenses paid)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Faculty member provided as contact person
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Graduate student provided as contact person
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION II

A. Some of the factors which might have influenced your decision to enroll in your present graduate program are listed below. Please rate the importance of each of these factors in your final selection of graduate program using the scale described below.

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT APPLICABLE	OF NO IMPORTANCE	OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT

## RANK

## REPUTATION

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. University
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Department
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Faculty

## INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Alma mater (your undergraduate school)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Speed of application and acceptance process
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Parent's alma mater
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Residency requirements

## DEPARTMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Curriculum
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Research interest of faculty
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Opportunities for assistantship
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Personal contact with faculty
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Departmental business and industry contacts
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Flexibility of program
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Alternatives to thesis component
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Personalization of academic program of study

## COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Size
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Quality of life
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Geographic location
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Current employment in area

NA	1	2	3	4	5
NOT	OF NO	OF LITTLE	SOMEWHAT		VERY
APPLICABLE	IMPORTANCE	IMPORTANCE	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT

## RANK

## FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Dollar value of assistantship
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Dollar value of financial assistance  
(scholarships, loans, grants)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Special fellowships

## EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Undergraduate advisor or instructor
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Graduate advisor
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Employer
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Dissatisfaction with current employment
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Lack of advancement opportunities current job

## PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Employment opportunities for spouse
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Academic opportunities for spouse
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Personal reasons
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Career advancement
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Personal satisfaction
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Other, \_\_\_\_\_

## OTHER INFLUENCES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION III ATTITUDES AND VALUES

Listed below are some attitudes and values you might hold towards your lifestyle or profession. How important to you are these attitudes and values? Please read each statement, then use the scale described to indicate the degree of importance that attitude or value has for you.

1	2	3	4	5
OF NO IMPORTANCE	OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
_____	1.	Be viewed as a special person		
_____	2.	Be with other people while I work		
_____	3.	Have a good income		
_____	4.	Work in a way that makes the world a better place		
_____	5.	Keep on learning new skills at work		
_____	6.	Have an active religious life		
_____	7.	Work with people of my own background		
_____	8.	Be where employment is regular and secure		
_____	9.	Change work activities frequently		
_____	10.	Have a lot of day to day contact with people		
_____	11.	Be respected for my knowledge and skills		
_____	12.	Create new ideas or methods in my work		
_____	13.	Feel accepted at work as a member of my ethnic group		
_____	14.	Be able to support a high standard of living		
_____	15.	Find personal satisfaction in my work		
_____	16.	Help people with their problems in a direct way		
_____	17.	Achieve high standards in my work		
_____	18.	Deal with a variety of people at work		
_____	19.	Maintain a healthy lifestyle		
_____	20.	Be publicly recognized for the quality of my work		
_____	21.	Earn a high salary and perquisites (PERKS)		
_____	22.	Maintain my own personal and moral standards		
_____	23.	Be involved in work in which the goal is to help people		
_____	24.	Work as a team member toward established goals		
_____	25.	Find pleasure in the beauty of my work		
_____	26.	Be held in high esteem because of my work		
_____	27.	Improve the welfare and peace of the world		
_____	28.	Do work which fully utilizes my abilities		
_____	29.	Get ahead quickly in my career		
_____	30.	Be politically active		
_____	31.	Have children		
_____	32.	Live and work where people of my race and religion are accepted		
_____	33.	Be self-employed		
_____	34.	Have work be the central focus in my life		
_____	35.	Know that I can always make a living		

## SECTION IV DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Q1. What is your gender?

- ☐ 1. MALE
- ☐ 2. FEMALE

Q2. Are you a citizen of the United States of America?

- ☐ 1. YES
- ☐ 2. NO

Q3. Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification?

- ☐ 1. ASIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER
- ☐ 2. AFRICAN AMERICAN/BLACK
- ☐ 3. HISPANIC/ MEXICAN-AMERICAN/ PUERTO RICAN
- ☐ 4. NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN
- ☐ 5. WHITE/CAUCASIAN
- ☐ 6. OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q4. What is your present age in years?

\_\_\_\_\_ YEARS

Q5. Are you married?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES

Q6. Do you have children living at home?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES, PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER AND AGES \_\_\_\_\_

Q7. What is your highest earned degree?

- ☐ 1. BACHELORS
- ☐ 2. MASTER'S
- ☐ 3. OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q8. What was your undergraduate major?

- ☐ 1. BUSINESS
- ☐ 2. FOOD AND NUTRITION
- ☐ 3. HOME ECONOMICS
- ☐ 4. HOTEL, RESTAURANT, INSTITUTION MANAGEMENT
- ☐ 5. OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q9. Was your undergraduate school a public or private institution?

- ☐ 1. PUBLIC
- ☐ 2. PRIVATE



Q10. What was the number of students enrolled in your undergraduate institution when you were a student there?

- ☐ 1. LESS THAN 1000 STUDENTS
- ☐ 2. 1000 TO 10,000 STUDUENTS
- ☐ 3. 10,001 TO 20,000 STUDENTS
- ☐ 4. 20,001 TO 30,000 STUDENTS
- ☐ 5. OVER 30,000 STUDENTS

Q11. How many years has it been since you received your Bachelors degree?

- ☐ 1. LESS THAN TWO YEARS
- ☐ 2. TWO TO FOUR YEARS
- ☐ 3. FIVE TO SEVEN YEARS
- ☐ 4. EIGHT TO TEN YEARS
- ☐ 5. OVER TEN YEARS, PLEASE SPECIFY NUMBER OF YEARS \_\_\_\_\_

Q12. What was your undergraduate grade point average (on a four point scale)?

- ☐ 1. GPA LESS THAN 2.50
- ☐ 2. GPA 2.51 TO 3.00
- ☐ 3. GPA 3.01 TO 3.50
- ☐ 4. GPA OVER 3.50

Q12. How many graduate schools did you apply to?

\_\_\_\_\_

Q13. How many graduate schools accepted you into their program?  
\_\_\_\_\_SCHOOLS

Q14. Are you enrolled on a part-time or full-time basis this semester?

- ☐ 1. PART-TIME (SIX OR LESS CREDITS)
- ☐ 2. FULL-TIME (OVER SIX CREDITS)

Q15. What is your usual credit load per term?  
\_\_\_\_\_CREDITS

Q16. Are you employed as a graduate assistant within your department?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES

Q17. Are you employed outside the department?

- ☐ 1. EMPLOYED FULL-TIME
- ☐ 2. EMPLOYED PART-TIME; NUMBER HOURS WEEK \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 3. NOT EMPLOYED

Q18. If employed outside the department, is your work related to the hospitality industry?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES
- ☐ 3. NOT APPLICABLE

Q20. Have you ever been employed in the hospitality industry?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES; NUMBER OF YEARS \_\_\_\_\_

Q21. Have you ever been employed in a managerial position in the hospitality industry?

- ☐ 1. NO
- ☐ 2. YES; NUMBER OF YEARS \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ COMMERCIAL SECTOR
  - ☐ INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR

Q22. Are you enrolled in a master's or doctoral program?

- ☐ 1. MASTER'S
- ☐ 2. DOCTORAL (PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 26)

Q23. Are you planning to enroll in a doctoral program?

- ☐ 1. NO (PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 26)
- ☐ 2. YES

Q24. When would you begin your doctoral work?

- ☐ 1. IMMEDIATELY AFTER COMPLETION OF MASTER'S
- ☐ 2. AFTER WORKING FULL-TIME FOR A FEW YEARS
- ☐ 3. HAVE NOT DECIDED

Q25. In what field of study would you expect to enroll at the doctoral level?

- ☐ 1. BUSINESS
- ☐ 2. EDUCATION
- ☐ 3. HOSPITALITY EDUCATION
- ☐ 4. OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

Q26. What are your plans immediately following graduation from your current program?

- ☐ 1. PURSUE FURTHER GRADUATE STUDY
- ☐ 2. SEEK POSITION IN COMMERCIAL SECTOR OF HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY
- ☐ 3. SEEK POSITION IN INSTITUTIONAL SECTOR OF HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY
- ☐ 4. CONTINUE PRESENT POSITION
- ☐ 5. SEEK POSITION IN TWO-YEAR HOSPITALITY EDUCATION PROGRAM
- ☐ 6. SEEK POSITION IN FOUR-YEAR HOSPITALITY EDUCATION PROGRAM
- ☐ 7. RETURN TO PRESENT POSITION
- ☐ 8. OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY. IF YOU WOULD LIKE FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY, OR ARE INTERESTED IN SURVEY FINDINGS, PLEASE CONTACT THE RESEARCHERS AT 515-294-7549 OR 515-294-1730.

APPENDIX E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

September 19, 1990

Jeffrey A. Fernsten, Ph.D.,  
Department Hotel, Restaurant, and  
Travel Administration, Flint Lab  
University of Massachusetts-Amherst  
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

Dear Dr. Fernsten:

A few weeks ago, we discussed by telephone a research study at Iowa State University related to marketing and recruiting efforts utilized by hospitality education graduate programs. You had expressed an interest in participation in the study. Because of the relatively few graduate programs in our field, your input is needed.

We believe that the results of this study are important, especially for those schools presently offering or considering the offer of hospitality graduate programs. These schools will be the primary supplier of hospitality educators in the years ahead, so it is imperative that the best possible students be recruited. This was supported by Dr. Robert Smith, in his keynote address at the Hospitality and Tourism Graduate Education held this past April at Virginia Polytechnic Institute when he said "...besides great faculty, noteworthy graduate programs require outstanding students."

In the event that you misplaced or did not receive the survey questionnaire sent earlier, a second copy is enclosed. It should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. Please return in the enclosed envelope by September 28.

Also, we are asking for a list of the graduate students enrolled in your program this semester. We will randomly select the names of your graduate students who will be asked to participate in the study by completing a different questionnaire. In early October, you will receive the student questionnaires and privacy envelopes to distribute to the selected students. They will be instructed to return their sealed envelopes to you. You will be provided a postage-paid envelope for returning to us.

All information received will be pooled in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Results of the research data will be available upon request. Your cooperation is very important to the success of this study. Please contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Catherine H. Strohbehn, M.S., R.D.  
Graduate Student and Researcher

Thomas Walsh, Ph.D.  
Department Head

Enclosures

APPENDIX F. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF PRACTICES  
USED BEFORE STUDENT INQUIRY

Summary of t-test analyses of administrators' and students' ratings of effectiveness for marketing and recruiting practices used before student inquiry

Category of practice	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Students</u>			<sup>t</sup>	2-tail Prob.	
	Mean	SD	No. <sup>a</sup>	Mean	SD	No. <sup>b</sup>			
<u>Printed Information</u>									
Mailings of form letters to undergraduate institutions	2.71	.95	7	2.89	1.40	27	.31	.76	
Mailings of flyers/posters to undergraduate schools	2.38	.92	8	2.89	1.17	28	1.15	.25	
Advertisements local media	2.63	1.19	8	2.38	1.20	26	-.50	.62	
Peterson's Annual Guide to Graduate Study	2.31	.95	13	2.95	1.22	37	1.71	.10	
<u>Faculty Outreach</u>									
Contacts with industry reps	2.89	.99	19	2.97	1.43	34	.21	.84	
Contacts with alumni of institution	3.22	.94	18	3.51	1.24	37	.88	.38	
Contacts faculty other institutions	3.11	1.10	19	3.35	1.07	34	.80	.43	
Contacts with undergraduate placement office	1.79	.98	14	2.65	1.23	34	2.33	.02	
Contacts academic advisors undergraduate programs	2.79	.98	14	3.33	1.22	36	1.50	.14	
<u>Departmental Sponsored Activities</u>									
Career Day programs at your institution	2.53	1.25	15	2.66	1.13	32	.34	.74	
Career Day programs at other schools	2.00	.76	8	2.00	1.06	24	.00	1.00	
Summer internship program for undergraduates	2.55	1.29	11	3.35	1.33	31	1.75	.09	
Booth at conferences	2.71	.92	17	2.97	1.22	34	.79	.43	
<u>Departmental Practices</u>									
Classes scheduled non-traditional times	3.59	1.12	17	2.61	1.44	51	-2.55	.01	
Satellite locations graduate coursework	3.00	1.26	6	2.44	1.33	34	-.95	.35	

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs = 20.

<sup>b</sup>Total number of student respondents = 87.

APPENDIX G. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF PRACTICES  
USED AFTER STUDENT INQUIRY



Summary of t-test analyses of administrators' and students' ratings of the effectiveness of marketing and recruiting practices used after student inquiry

	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Students</u>			t	2-tail
Category of Practice	Mean	No. <sup>a</sup>	SD	Mean.	No. <sup>b</sup>	SD		Prob.
<u>Departmental Printed Info.</u>								
Personal letter on departmental stationery	3.74	19	.87	3.59	68	1.14	-.53	.60
Brochure about program	3.76	17	.90	3.58	74	.99	-.70	.49
<u>Institutional Printed Info.</u>								
Application for enrollment	3.33	18	1.03	2.85	78	1.30	-1.48	.14
Information on-campus housing	2.82	17	.88	2.36	69	1.34	-1.35	.18
Catalog describing the university	3.00	15	1.00	3.27	75	1.19	.81	.42
Catalog describing the graduate programs	3.06	17	.90	3.55	75	1.21	1.56	.12
<u>Financial Aid Information</u>								
Information about graduate assistantships	3.61	18	.85	3.32	65	1.44	-.81	.42
Information about institu- tional scholarships, grants, or awards	3.22	18	1.06	3.14	64	1.45	-.22	.83
Information about financial aid	3.29	17	1.21	2.83	64	1.38	-1.27	.21
Information about depart- mental scholarships, grants, or awards	3.11	19	1.20	3.19	64	1.40	.23	.82
<u>Community Information</u>								
Information about community (ie. schools)	2.53	15	.52	2.54	57	1.27	.05	.96
Information about off- campus housing	2.33	15	.62	2.47	55	1.41	.56	.58

	<u>Administrators</u>			<u>Students</u>			t	2-tail
Category of Practice	Mean	No. <sup>a</sup>	SD	Mean.	No. <sup>b</sup>	SD		Prob.
<u>Faculty and Departmental Outreach</u>								
Telephone call by faculty	4.07	14	.62	3.96	52	1.37	-.44	.66
Telephone call by current graduate student	3.88	8	.99	3.26	31	1.44	-1.14	.26
Student invited to visit campus (at own expense)	3.12	17	.86	3.15	48	1.37	.10	.92
Student invited to visit campus (expenses paid)	3.67	3	.67	3.73	26	1.51	.07	.94
Faculty member provided as contact person	3.56	18	.92	3.83	64	1.22	.88	.38
Graduate student provided as contact person	3.70	10	1.06	3.33	36	1.39	-.77	.44

<sup>a</sup>Total number of programs = 20.

<sup>b</sup>Total number of student respondents = 87.

APPENDIX H. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS

Summary of t-test analysis of male and female ratings of the importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate program

FACTOR	Male			Female			t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD	No.		
<u>Reputation</u>								
Department	4.68	.63	37	4.13	.97	45	3.06	.003
University	4.11	.84	37	3.80	1.06	45	1.44	.16
Faculty	4.05	1.05	37	3.72	1.09	46	1.42	.16
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Speed of acceptance process	3.09	1.48	35	2.84	1.34	44	.78	.44
Residency requirements	2.46	1.48	26	2.13	1.28	31	.91	.37
Alma Mater	2.43	1.56	23	2.08	1.23	26	.90	.38
Parent's alma mater	1.52	.87	21	1.92	1.21	24	-1.23	.23
<u>Departmental Characteristics</u>								
Curriculum	4.14	.90	36	3.83	1.12	46	1.36	.18
Personal contact with faculty	4.03	1.13	36	3.65	1.33	43	1.34	.18
Department business contacts	3.57	1.27	35	3.80	1.15	41	-.84	.40
Flexibility of program	3.51	1.10	35	3.77	1.01	44	-1.09	.28
Personalization academic POS	3.41	1.10	34	3.57	1.02	42	-.66	.51
Opportunities assistantship	3.37	1.52	35	3.40	1.37	40	-.09	.93
Alternatives thesis component	2.83	1.23	29	3.17	1.36	36	-1.04	.30
Research interest of faculty	3.22	1.46	36	2.81	1.27	42	1.34	.19
<u>Community Characteristics</u>								
Geographic location	3.58	1.37	38	3.50	1.07	44	.29	.77
Quality of life	3.30	1.41	37	3.30	1.29	40	-.01	.99
Current employment in area	2.97	1.53	34	2.93	1.47	43	.12	.91
Size	2.76	1.28	38	2.70	1.18	40	.23	.82
<u>Financial Assistance</u>								
Dollar value financial help	3.39	1.45	31	3.47	1.34	32	-.23	.82
Dollar value of assistantship	3.24	1.55	29	3.43	1.38	35	-.51	.61
Special fellowships	2.72	1.49	29	2.81	1.33	26	-.22	.83
<u>External Influences</u>								
Dissatisfaction current employment	3.69	1.39	29	3.31	1.41	36	1.10	.28
Lack of advancement opportunities current job	3.31	1.61	29	3.53	1.42	36	-.58	.57
Graduate advisor	3.48	1.44	31	3.36	1.27	36	.37	.71
Employer	2.31	1.57	26	2.97	1.56	32	-1.60	.11
Undergraduate advisor or instructor	2.64	1.50	25	2.46	1.40	28	.44	.66

FACTOR	Male		No.	Female		No.	t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD			
<u>Personal Considerations</u>								
Career advancement	4.34	1.26	35	4.44	.69	45	-.59	.56
Personal satisfaction	4.29	1.06	34	4.43	.66	46	-.68	.50
Personal reasons	3.55	1.50	31	3.80	1.04	45	-.81	.42
Employment opportunities for spouse	1.93	1.49	15	2.81	1.52	16	-1.63	.11
Academic opportunities spouse	1.63	1.09	16	2.47	1.41	15	-1.87	.07

APPENDIX I. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
MASTERS AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF  
IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS

Summary of t-test analysis of master's and doctoral students' ratings of the importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate program

Factor	<u>Master's</u>			<u>Doctoral</u>			t 2-tail	
	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD	No.		Prob.
<u>Reputation</u>								
Department	4.41	.77	70	4.17	1.34	12	.62	.54
University	3.91	.99	70	4.08	.90	12	-.55	.58
Faculty	3.80	1.09	71	4.25	.96	12	-1.33	.19
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Speed of acceptance process	2.87	1.35	67	3.42	1.56	12	-1.27	.21
Residency requirements	2.23	1.34	48	2.56	1.59	9	-.65	.52
Alma Mater	2.39	1.45	41	1.50	.76	8	1.69	.10
Parent's alma mater	1.76	1.07	37	1.62	1.19	8	.31	.76
<u>Departmental Characteristics</u>								
Curriculum	3.94	1.05	70	4.08	1.00	12	-.43	.67
Personal contact with faculty	3.75	1.26	67	4.25	1.14	12	-1.29	.20
Department business contacts	3.83	1.15	65	2.91	1.22	11	2.43	.02
Flexibility of program	3.62	1.02	68	3.91	1.22	11	-.85	.40
Personalization academic POS	3.48	1.05	65	3.64	1.12	11	-.46	.65
Opportunities assistantship	3.29	1.45	63	3.92	1.24	12	-1.41	.16
Alternative thesis component	3.14	1.28	59	1.83	.98	6	2.42	.02
Research interest of faculty	2.88	1.33	67	3.73	1.42	11	-1.94	.06
<u>Community Characteristics</u>								
Geographic location	3.59	1.09	71	3.18	1.83	11	.72	.49
Quality of life	3.32	1.30	66	3.18	1.60	11	.31	.76
Current employment in area	3.06	1.39	67	2.20	1.93	10	1.73	.09
Size	2.67	1.20	67	3.09	1.38	11	-1.05	.30
<u>Financial Assistance</u>								
Dollar value financial help	3.45	1.39	51	3.33	1.44	12	.26	.79
Dollar value assistantship	3.23	1.48	52	3.83	1.27	12	-1.30	.20
Special fellowships	2.86	1.41	43	2.42	1.38	12	.97	.34
<u>External Influences</u>								
Dissatisfaction current employment	3.39	1.42	57	4.13	1.13	8	-1.40	.17
Lack of advancement opportunities current job	3.46	1.44	54	3.27	1.85	11	.38	.71
Graduate advisor	3.50	1.25	56	3.00	1.73	11	1.13	.26
Employer	2.86	1.57	49	1.67	1.32	9	2.14	.04
Undergraduate advisor or instructor	2.51	1.44	45	2.75	1.49	8	-.43	.67

Factor	<u>Master's</u>			<u>Doctoral</u>			t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD	No.		
<u>Personal Considerations</u>								
Career advancement	4.37	.98	70	4.50	.97	10	-.39	.70
Personal satisfaction	4.37	.85	70	4.40	.84	10	-.10	.92
Personal reasons	3.61	1.21	66	4.30	1.34	10	-1.66	.10
Employment opportunities for spouse	2.56	1.58	25	1.67	1.21	6	1.29	.21
Academic opportunities spouse	2.24	1.36	25	1.17	.41	6	3.36	.002



APPENDIX J. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF  
IMPORTANCE LISTED FACTORS

Summary of t-test analysis of domestic and international students' ratings of the importance of listed factors in final selection of graduate program

FACTOR	<u>Domestic</u>			<u>International</u>			t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	No.	Mean	SD	No.		
<u>Reputation</u>								
Department	4.45	.81	56	4.32	.90	25	.63	.53
University	3.93	.93	56	4.00	1.08	25	-.30	.76
Faculty	3.88	1.12	57	3.88	1.01	25	-.01	.99
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Speed acceptance process	2.73	1.35	56	3.50	1.37	22	-2.24	.03
Residency requirements	2.46	1.52	39	1.88	.93	17	1.75	.09
Alma Mater	2.24	1.42	34	2.27	1.39	15	-.07	.93
Parent's alma mater	1.63	1.13	30	1.93	.99	14	-.84	.41
<u>Departmental Characteristics</u>								
Curriculum	4.00	1.03	56	3.88	1.09	25	.48	.64
Personal contact with faculty	3.83	1.26	54	3.88	1.23	24	-.14	.89
Department business contacts	3.69	1.24	51	3.71	1.16	24	-.07	.94
Flexibility of program	3.64	1.09	53	3.68	.99	25	-.15	.88
Personalization academic POS	3.54	1.09	52	3.39	.99	23	.55	.58
Opportunities assistantship	3.27	1.47	49	3.68	1.35	25	-1.18	.24
Alternatives thesis component	2.98	1.37	45	3.05	1.18	19	-.21	.84
Research interest of faculty	2.78	1.37	54	3.48	1.28	23	-2.10	.04
<u>Community Characteristics</u>								
Geographic location	3.67	1.18	54	3.26	1.26	27	1.43	.16
Quality of life	3.35	1.37	52	3.17	1.31	24	.54	.59
Current employment in area	2.83	1.53	52	3.17	1.40	24	-.92	.36
Size	2.71	1.29	52	2.72	1.10	25	-.03	.98
<u>Financial Assistance</u>								
Dollar value financial help	3.42	1.47	41	3.52	1.25	21	-.29	.77
Dollar value of assistantship	3.34	1.51	41	3.41	1.37	22	-.17	.86
Special fellowships	2.66	1.45	35	3.00	1.33	19	-.85	.40
<u>External Influences</u>								
Dissatisfaction current employment	3.79	1.35	47	2.71	1.26	17	2.88	.006
Lack of advancement opportunities current job	3.49	1.50	47	3.35	1.54	17	.32	.75
Graduate advisor	3.35	1.39	46	3.65	1.27	20	-.84	.40
Employer	2.49	1.66	41	3.19	1.33	16	-1.51	.14
Undergraduate advisor or instructor	2.34	1.51	41	3.41	1.37	22	-.17	.86

FACTOR	<u>Domestic</u>		No.	<u>International</u>		No.	t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD		Mean	SD			
<u>Personal Considerations</u>								
Career advancement	4.36	1.01	55	4.46	.93	24	-.39	.70
Personal satisfaction	4.45	.84	55	4.21	.88	24	1.18	.24
Personal reasons	3.94	1.13	53	3.23	1.27	22	2.40	.02
Employment opportunities for spouse	2.16	1.61	19	2.75	1.42	12	-1.04	.31
Academic opportunities spouse	1.79	1.32	19	2.42	1.24	12	-1.32	.20

APPENDIX K. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES

Summary of t-test analysis of male and female students' ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values

Attitude and Value Statement	Male		Female		t 2-tail	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		Prob.
<u>Inner-oriented cluster</u>						
Find personal satisfaction in work	4.71	.61	4.85	.36	-1.25	.22
Maintain own moral standards	4.39	.79	4.60	.58	-1.31	.19
Do work which fully utilizes my abilities	4.32	.78	4.57	.54	-1.74	.09
Achieve high standards in my work	4.34	.82	4.62	.49	-1.83	.07
Maintain a healthy lifestyle	4.45	.72	4.34	.84	.62	.54
Create new ideas in my work	4.24	.75	4.30	.69	-.39	.70
Learn new skills at work	4.16	.92	4.36	.64	-1.16	.25
Have children	3.45	1.57	3.36	1.34	.27	.79
Be self-employed	3.05	1.31	2.60	1.23	1.65	.10
Work be central focus in life	2.63	1.05	2.62	1.15	.06	.95
Have an active religious life	2.66	1.28	2.94	1.28	-1.00	.32
Be politically active	2.39	1.18	2.43	1.06	-.13	.90
<u>Group-oriented cluster</u>						
Deal with variety people at work	3.84	.82	4.09	.80	-1.37	.17
Have daily contact with people	3.79	.81	4.04	.86	-1.39	.17
Help people with problems in a direct way	3.87	.99	3.87	.88	-.02	.99
Involved in work to help people	3.71	.96	4.00	.83	-1.49	.14
Find pleasure in beauty of work	3.63	1.13	4.06	.92	-1.95	.06
Work makes world better place	3.66	1.15	4.04	.91	-1.73	.09
Work people of my own background	2.74	1.22	2.83	.92	-.40	.69
Work as team member towards established goals	3.58	.89	4.04	.96	-2.29	.02
Be with other people while I work	3.74	1.05	3.74	.99	-.04	.97
Feel accepted at work as ethnic group member	2.68	1.60	3.11	1.46	-1.27	.21
Improve the welfare and peace of the world	2.95	1.16	3.49	.91	-2.42	.02
Change work activities frequently	2.87	1.26	3.45	.95	-2.42	.02
Live/work people of my race and religion are accepted	3.13	1.47	3.06	1.33	.22	.82

Attitude and Value Statement	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		t 2-tail	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Prob.	
<hr/>						
<u>Material-oriented cluster</u>						
Respected for my knowledge/skills	4.32	.96	4.51	.51	-1.13	.26
Know can always make a living	4.21	.84	4.28	.80	-.37	.71
Have a good income	4.11	.76	4.06	.99	.21	.83
Held in high esteem for my work	3.74	1.11	3.96	.81	-1.03	.31
Employment is regular and secure	3.79	1.07	3.89	.94	-.48	.63
Get ahead quickly in my career	3.74	1.11	3.91	.86	-.84	.41
Earn a high salary and PERKS	3.53	1.06	3.94	.87	-1.96	.06
Be viewed as a special person	3.76	.94	3.70	.88	.31	.76
Support a high standard of living	3.37	1.13	3.87	1.10	-2.08	.04
Publicly recognized quality work	3.32	.96	3.43	1.02	-.51	.61

APPENDIX L. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF  
IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES

Summary of t-test analysis of master's (n=73) and doctoral students (n=12) ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values

Attitude and value statement	<u>Master's</u>		<u>Doctoral</u>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Inner-oriented cluster</u>						
Find personal satisfaction in work	4.78	.51	4.83	.39	-.34	.73
Maintain own moral standards	4.51	.69	4.50	.67	.03	.98
Do work which fully utilizes my abilities	4.47	.67	4.42	.67	.24	.81
Achieve high standards in my work	4.53	.65	4.25	.75	.43	.17
Maintain a healthy lifestyle	4.38	.76	4.42	1.00	-.13	.89
Create new ideas in my work	4.27	.71	4.25	.75	.11	.92
Learn new skills at work	4.27	.79	4.25	.75	.10	.92
Have children	3.36	1.44	3.67	1.50	-.69	.49
Be self-employed	2.81	1.22	2.75	1.66	.15	.89
Work be central focus in life	2.67	1.13	2.33	.88	.98	.33
Have an active religious life	2.84	1.30	2.67	1.16	.42	.67
Be politically active	2.49	1.08	1.92	1.17	1.69	.09
<u>Group oriented cluster</u>						
Deal with variety people at work	4.04	.81	3.58	.79	1.83	.07
Have daily contact with people	3.95	.88	3.83	.58	.42	.67
Help people with problems in a direct way	3.88	.91	3.83	1.03	.15	.88
Involved in work to help people	3.88	.88	3.83	1.03	.15	.88
Find pleasure in beauty of my work	3.96	.95	3.33	1.37	1.98	.06
Work makes world better place	3.79	1.03	4.33	.99	1.69	.09
Work people of my own background	2.74	1.01	3.08	1.31	-1.04	.30
Work as team member towards established goals	3.90	.90	3.42	1.17	.19	.10
Be with other people while I work	3.75	.99	3.67	.99	.28	.78
Feel accepted at work as ethnic group member	2.93	1.52	2.83	1.64	.20	.84
Improve the welfare and peace of the world	3.25	1.04	3.25	1.22	-.01	.99
Change work activities frequently	3.25	1.13	2.83	1.12	1.18	.24
Live/work where people of my race and religion are accepted	3.01	1.38	3.58	1.38	-1.33	.19



Attitude and value statement	<u>Master's</u>		<u>Doctoral</u>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Material-oriented cluster</u>						
Respected for my knowledge/skills	4.40	.77	4.58	.52	-.80	.43
Know can always make a living	4.25	.83	4.25	.75	-.01	.99
Have a good income	4.14	.92	3.75	.62	1.41	.16
Held in high esteem for my work	3.89	.92	3.67	1.16	.75	.45
Employment is regular and secure	3.82	.99	4.00	1.04	-.57	.57
Get ahead quickly in my career	3.97	.91	3.00	.95	3.40	.001
Earn a high salary and PERKS	3.93	.90	2.67	.65	4.65	.00
Be viewed as a special person	3.70	.91	3.92	.90	-.77	.44
Support a high standard living	3.79	1.13	2.75	.62	4.69	.00
Publicly recognized quality work	3.41	.97	3.17	1.12	.79	.43

APPENDIX M. SUMMARY T-TEST ANALYSIS OF  
DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RATINGS OF  
IMPORTANCE SELECTED ATTITUDES AND VALUES

Summary of t-test analysis of domestic (n=58) and international (n=26) students' ratings of importance of selected attitudes and values

Attitude and value statement	<u>Domestic</u>		<u>International</u>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Inner-oriented cluster</u>						
Find personal satisfaction in work	4.81	.40	4.77	.65	.30	.77
Maintain own moral standards	4.57	.62	4.38	.80	1.14	.26
Do work which fully utilizes my abilities	4.47	.66	4.46	.71	.03	.98
Achieve high standards in my work	4.52	.60	4.46	.81	.35	.73
Maintain a healthy lifestyle	4.31	.78	4.58	.81	-1.44	.16
Create new ideas in my work	4.29	.70	4.23	.76	.37	.72
Learn new skills at work	4.19	.78	4.46	.76	-1.48	.14
Have children	3.40	1.49	3.42	1.39	-.08	.94
Be self-employed	2.91	1.19	2.58	1.47	1.11	.27
Work be central focus in life	2.36	.89	3.23	1.31	-3.08	.004
Have an active religious life	3.02	1.26	2.38	1.24	2.14	.04
Be politically active	2.36	.99	2.54	1.36	-.59	.56
<u>Group-oriented cluster</u>						
Deal with variety people at work	3.95	.83	4.04	.82	-.46	.64
Have daily contact with people	3.95	.87	3.88	.82	.32	.75
Help people with problems in a direct way	3.76	.89	4.12	.99	-1.64	.10
Involved in work to help people	3.86	.87	3.88	.99	-.11	.92
Find pleasure in beauty of work	3.78	1.03	4.08	1.06	-1.23	.22
Work makes world better place	3.97	.92	3.65	1.26	1.13	.27
Work people of my own background	2.81	1.05	2.69	1.09	.47	.64
Work as team member towards established goals	3.79	.91	3.92	1.06	-.57	.57
Be with other people while I work	3.71	.97	3.81	1.06	-.43	.67
Feel accepted at work as ethnic group member	2.57	1.38	3.65	1.62	-3.15	.002
Improve the welfare and peace of the world	3.21	1.06	3.31	1.09	-.40	.69
Change work activities frequently	3.40	1.11	2.73	1.08	2.57	.01
Live/work where people of my race and religion are accepted	2.91	1.30	3.46	1.53	-1.69	.09

Attitude and value statement	<u>Domestic</u>		<u>International</u>		t	2-tail Prob.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Material-oriented cluster</u>						
Respected for my knowledge/skills	4.48	.60	4.31	1.01	.82	.42
Know can always make a living	4.28	.79	4.23	.86	.24	.82
Have a good income	4.12	.84	4.00	1.02	.57	.57
Held in high esteem for my work	3.79	.97	4.00	.94	-.91	.36
Employment is regular and secure	3.97	.97	3.58	1.03	1.66	.10
Get ahead quickly in my career	3.64	.97	4.27	.87	-2.84	.006
Earn a high salary and PERKS	3.69	.90	3.88	1.14	-.84	.40
Be viewed as a special person	3.67	.87	3.85	1.01	-.81	.42
Support a high standard of living	3.43	1.16	4.12	.95	-2.64	.01
Publicly recognized quality work	3.24	.90	3.66	1.13	-1.79	.08