

2017

Marketing Practices of International Schools in a Competitive Asian Context

Nicholas Bernard Kent
Lehigh University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kent, Nicholas Bernard, "Marketing Practices of International Schools in a Competitive Asian Context" (2017). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2949.
<https://preserve.lehigh.edu/etd/2949>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

Marketing Practices of International Schools in a Competitive Asian Context

by

Nicholas B. Kent

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

Lehigh University

March 2017

Copyright by Nicholas Kent

March 2017

Certificate of Approval

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Date

Accepted Date

George White
Committee Chair
Iacocca Professor of Education
Lehigh University

Committee Members:

Jill Sperandio
Associate Professor of
Educational Leadership
Lehigh University

Richard Krajczar
Executive Director
East Asia Regional
Council of Schools

Louise Donohue
Professor of Practice
College of Education
Lehigh University

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Dr. David Harris who started me on this journey, Dr. Daphne Hobson who would not let me stray from this path (yes, I have on my big boy pants), and Dr. Dick Krajczar who has been a strong proponent of the “Lehigh Group” in EARCOS as we do our research. Laura Roberts was instrumental in providing me positive feedback and wisdom as I grappled with my stats. Thank you to Dr. Jill Sperandio who was there to greet me when I entered Lehigh and helped me exit. Finally, there isn’t gratitude large enough for Dr. George White. I am indebted to him for helping me finish with as much enthusiasm as with which I started.

My wife Erin, who is a constant cheerleader and “partner” in this process and my daughter Alice who I hope will not remember my absences or stress during this process. Without the encouragement and presence of these two women my research would have never happened. I love you both and feel lucky to have you in my life.

Dedication

This is dedicated to Dr. James Koerschen who believed in me and I wish I could have finished sooner. You may be gone but never forgotten.

Table of Contents

Copyright Page.....	ii
Certificate of Approval	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Dedication	v
List of Tables	ix
Abstract.....	1
Chapter 1.....	2
Introduction.....	2
Marketing and Independent School Leadership.....	2
Globalization of the World’s Workforce	2
International Schools.....	3
Marketing of Schools	4
Educational Marketing	6
The Marketing Mix	7
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions	13
Conceptual Framework	14
Definition of Terms.....	15
Chapter 2.....	17
Review of Literature	17
Historical Progression of Marketing	18
Marketing Orientation	20
Service Marketing	21
Internal Marketing.....	22

Relationship Marketing	23
Volunteer Non Profit Organizations	24
School Choice and the Rise of School Marketing.....	25
Educational Marketing	27
Perceived Limitations of School Marketing.....	30
Limitations to the Literature.....	33
Chapter 3	35
Methodology	35
Introduction	35
Purpose of Study	35
Research Questions	36
Population and Sample.....	37
Response Rate to the Instrument/Questionnaire	38
Instrumentation and Construct Validity	39
Delphi Study Procedure	40
Pilot Study Procedure	40
Data Collection Procedures.....	41
Chapter 4	45
Results.....	45
Research Questions.....	45
Responses	46
Data Analysis	53
Question 1	53
Question 2	56

Question 3	60
Question 4	62
Question 5	65
Question 6	67
Question 7	71
Summary	78
Limitations to the Study	83
Appendices.....	111
Appendix A: Tables A1–A88.....	111
Appendix B: Delphi Study – Please participate in Delphi study	151
Appendix C: Delphi Study – Reminder to participate in round 2 of Delphi study	152
Appendix D: Heads of School Study – Please participate in pilot study	153
Appendix E: Heads of School Study – Reminder to participate in pilot study	154
Appendix F: Heads of School Study – Please participate in doctoral dissertation study.....	155
Appendix G: Heads of School Study – Reminder to participate in doctoral dissertation study.....	157
Appendix H: Members of the Delphi Study.....	159
Appendix I: Section One Marketing Activities.....	161
Appendix K: Survey for Understanding Marketing Practices in International Schools	176
Vita.....	185

List of Tables

Table 1. Timeline for Instrument Use and Development	42
Table 2. Research Questions, Data Sources, and Data Analyses.....	43
Table 3. Frequency and Percent of Respondents from Each City	47
Table 4. Frequency and Percent of Not-for-Profit Schools and For-Profit Schools	49
Table 6. Frequency and Percent of Curriculum and Program Types Provided by the Schools	50
Table 7. Frequency and Percent of Schools in Each Enrollment Figure Category	51
Table 8. Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on School Population Size	51
Table 9. Frequency and Percent of Schools in Each Category of Number of Years in Operation	52
Table 10. Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on Continuous Years of Operation.....	52
Table 11. Frequency and Percent of Number of Schools Respondent Identified as Competitors in their	53
Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for Current Use of Marketing Activities Organized from Highest to Lowest Mean.....	54
Table 13. Extent to which EARCOS Schools Desire to Achieve the Marketing Objectives of Recruitment, Retention, and Brand Awareness.....	57
Table 14. Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Student Recruitment as an Important Marketing Objective.....	58

Table 15. Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Student Retention as an Important Marketing Objective	59
Table 16. Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Brand Awareness as an Important Marketing Objective	60
Table 17. Descriptive Statistics for Frequency of Use of Various Marketing Tools from Highest Mean to Lowest Mean	61
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective Toward Reaching Marketing Objectives	63
Table 19. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Student Recruitment	64
Table 20. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Student Retention	64
Table 21. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Promoting Brand Awareness	65
Table 22. Descriptive Statistics for the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools Organized from Highest Mean to Lowest Mean	66
Table 23. Results of the Multivariate Regression of Marketing Activities on School Size and Years in Operation	68
Table 24. Descriptive Statistics for the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities	68

Table 25. Multivariate Test of the Difference Between Schools in the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on Use of Marketing Activities.....	69
Table 26. Results of the Multivariate Regression of Marketing Tools on School Size and Years in Operation	70
Table 27. Multivariate Test of the Difference Between Schools in the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on Use of Marketing Tools	71
Table 28. Results of the Multivariate Regression of the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities on School Size and Years in Operation.....	72
Table 29. Univariate Effects of the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools on School Size.....	72
Table 30. Descriptive Statistics for Respondents from the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities	73
Table 31. ANOVA Results for the Links Between City Size and the perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities	74
Table 32. ANOVA Results of the Link Between City Size and Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools.....	75
Table 33. Descriptive Statistics for the Answer to the Question: To What Extent Does Your School Use a Formal Marketing Plan?	78
Table 34. ANOVA Results of the Link Between City Size and the Extent to Which the School Uses a Formal Marketing Plan.....	78
Table A 1. Frequencies for each Response to the item, “To what extent does your school use a formal.....	111

Table A 2. During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school’s strengths.	111
Table A 3. During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school’s strengths.....	112
Table A 4. During the admissions process, we claim the schools’ tuition is worth the value they receive.	112
Table A 5. During parent coffees, we claim the schools’ tuition is worth the value they receive.	112
Table A 6. During the admissions process, we provide applicants contact information of current families as resources to answer questions	113
Table A 7. During admissions process, we claim the location of the school is a strength of the school	113
Table A 8. During the admissions process, we claim the faculty is a strength of the school	113
Table A 9. Head of school invites prospective families to apply.	114
Table A 10. Division Principal invites prospective families to apply.	114
Table A 11. Admissions director invites prospective families to apply.	114
Table A 12. Parent representative invites prospective families to apply.	115
Table A 13. We provide parents direct access to administrators (such as parent coffees, special lectures, book studies, open forums, webinars, etc.).....	115
Table A 14. We hold events aimed toward specific subgroups of our parent and student population who have specific concerns (such as, parent coffees, discussion groups, book groups, town hall, etc.).....	116
Table A 15. Head of school meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction.....	116

Table A 16. Head of school meets with current faculty to understand employee satisfaction	117
Table A 17. Head of school meets with current students to understand student satisfaction	117
Table A 18. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current families to understand customer perception of areas of school strength	118
Table A 19. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current faculty to understand employee perception of areas of school strength	118
Table A 20. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current students to understand student perception of areas of school strength	119
Table A 21. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Tours for Marketing	119
Table A 22. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Open Houses for Marketing	120
Table A 23. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Print Advertising for Marketing	120
Table A 24. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Profiles/Brochures for Marketing	121
Table A 25. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Websites for Marketing	121
Table A 26. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use LinkedIn for Marketing	122
Table A 27. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Facebook for Marketing	122

Table A 28. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Twitter for Marketing.....	123
Table A 29. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Instagram for Marketing.....	123
Table A 30. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Pinterest for Marketing.....	124
Table A 31. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use YouTube for Marketing.....	124
Table A 32. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Promotional Videos for Marketing.....	125
Table A 33. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Hosting Events for Outside Public for Marketing.....	125
Table A 34. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Parent/Student Referrals for Marketing.....	126
Table A 35. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Corporate Human Resource Outreach for Marketing.....	126
Table A 36. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Relocation Agency Outreach for Marketing.....	127
Table A 37. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Media Outlets in Students' Hometowns for Marketing.....	127
Table A 38. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Attending Educational Fairs for Marketing.....	128
Table A 39. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Educational Websites for Marketing.....	128

Table A 40. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Faculty Hiring Websites for Marketing.....	129
Table A 41. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Focus Groups for Marketing.....	129
Table A 42. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Local Media Outlets for Marketing.....	130
Table A 43. Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Promotional Gifts for Marketing	130
Table A 44. Other Marketing Tools Mentioned by Respondents.....	131
Table A 45. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Tours	131
Table A 46. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Open House	132
Table A 47. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Open House	132
Table A 48. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Profile/Brochure	133
Table A 49. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Website	133
Table A 50. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Facebook.....	134
Table A 51. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Twitter.....	134
Table A 52. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Instagram	135

Table A 53. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Pintrest	135
Table A 54. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for YouTube	136
Table A 55. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Promotional Video	136
Table A 56. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc.)	137
Table A 57. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Parent and Student Referrals	137
Table A 58. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Corporate Human Resource Outreach	138
Table A 59. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Relocation Agency Outreach	138
Table A 60. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Media Outlets in Student’s Hometown.....	139
Table A 61. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Attending Educational Fairs	139
Table A 62. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Educational Websites.....	140
Table A 63. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Faculty Hiring Websites	140
Table A 64. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Focus Groups	141

Table A 65. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Local Media Outlets	141
Table A 66. Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)	142
Table A 67. Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Tours on School Size and Years in Operation	142
Table A 68. Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Open House on School Size and Years in Operation	143
Table A 69. Parameter Estimate:Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Print Advertising on School Size and Years in Operation.....	143
Table A 70. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Profile/Brochure on School Size and Years in Operation.....	144
Table A 71. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Website on School Size and Years in Operation.....	144
Table A 72. Parameter Estimates:Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Facebook on School Size and Years in Operation	144
Table A 73. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Twitter on School Size and Years in Operation.....	145
Table A 74. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Instagram on School Size and Years in Operation	145

Table A 75. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Pintrest on School Size and Years in Operation	145
Table A 76. Parameter Estimates:Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of YouTube on School Size and Years in Operation	146
Table A 77. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Promotional Video on School Size and Years in Operation.....	146
Table A 78. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc)on School Size and Years in Operation	146
Table A 79. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Parent/Student Referrals on School Size and Years in Operation.....	147
Table A 80. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Corporate Human Resources outreach on School Size and Years in Operation	147
Table A 81. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Relocation Agency Outreach on School Size and Years in Operation	147
Table A 82. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Media Outlets in Student’s Hometown on School Size and Years in Operation	148
Table A 83. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Attending Educational Fairs on School Size and Years in Operation	148

Table A 84. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Educational Website on School Size and Years in Operation.....	148
Table A 85. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Faculty Hiring Website on School Size and Years in Operation.....	149
Table A 86. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Focus Groups on School Size and Years in Operation	149
Table A 87. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Local Media Outlets on School Size and Years in Operation.....	149
Table A 88. Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc)on School Size and Years in Operation	150

Abstract

This exploratory, descriptive study identifies marketing activities, marketing tools, and the perceived effectiveness of both towards achieving institutional marketing goals of international schools in the East Asia Region Council of Overseas Schools (EARCOS). There is scant research about marketing practices of international schools. An increase in the number of international schools in the EARCOS region coupled with the declining number of students in the past three years signal the need for schools to be more proactive in their marketing practices to recruit and retain students by implementing successful marketing activities, tools, and strategic plans. Though this study focuses on the population of 150 EARCOS schools, it is believed that the results will help inform similarly dynamic theoretical populations like South East Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe where school administrators are looking to improve institutional marketing activities.

The return rate of 67 schools, 45% of the population, fell beneath the target sample size, however the demographic distribution of the respondents mirrored the population of EARCOS member schools. The results of the study indicate that schools across the EARCOS region participate in similar marketing activities and use similar tools. The size, age, and location of the school made no significant difference in the results. The most effective marketing activities and tools identified by marketing research, center on the customer and experience-centric concepts of relationship marketing (RM) and internal marketing (IM), yet EARCOS schools indicate that they use more rudimentary activities and tools associated with buying and selling of a product. EARCOS schools also indicated that they find a greater degree of success reaching institutional marketing goals by using RM and IM but employ the rudimentary activities and tools associated with buying and selling more. Simply, EARCOS schools are using marketing activities and tools poorly and they are all doing it poorly together.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Marketing and Independent School Leadership

The roles and responsibilities of an independent school leader have greatly increased in recent history. No longer is the school leader considered simply the “head teacher,” the leader now must be an expert in many areas and must lead in the areas of pedagogy, school law, technology, community relations, strategic financial planning, fund raising, and marketing (Wickenden, 2008). These varied leadership responsibilities are daunting but are even more so for the leadership in an international school. An international school leader also needs to be aware of the changing global market place and how it will affect the future of the institution. A failure to lead in all these areas could negatively impact a school’s ability to best serve their student population who hail from nations far beyond the host country.

Globalization of the World’s Workforce

Globalization of the world economy has evolved significantly over recent decades as organizations have sought opportunities to remain competitive (Lowe, et al., 2002). The US Department of State estimates that 7.6 million US citizens are living and working abroad (Burggraf, 2015). The use of expatriate employees or “expats” in foreign subsidiaries represents a substantial investment of resources, including time and money (Baruch, 2004).

Compensation packages for expat assignments are developed as incentives to offset financial, personal, and professional costs that are associated with accepting an overseas assignment (Rivard, 2015). Expats are employees who perform their duties outside of the country where they are brought up and require different compensation packages that differ from locally hired employees (Nazir, Shah & Zaman, 2014).

Organizations have discovered that the compensation package is among the most important factors when potential employees consider accepting an overseas assignment (Baruch, 2004). Organizations vary in how they constitute and apply compensation packages, but there are some basic concepts such as providing for health care, housing, payment of foreign taxes, and providing for the education of their employees' children. Of all of the benefits associated with overseas assignments, education is frequently regarded as non-negotiable for the "expat" relocation (Melissa Rivard, personal communication, September 3, 2015). The practice of employees of multinational corporations is to send their children to what are broadly known as international schools, rather than to the local public schools of the host country.

International Schools

The label *international school* is one that is difficult to define but appears not to be a new idea. Charles Dickens used a related term, "international education," as early as 1864 in a weekly periodical and there appeared to be a school with many nationalities formed near Middlesex, England in 1866 (Sylvester, 2002). In the late 19th century, schools in foreign countries labeled international, tended to serve the needs of missionaries and government officials who may have had trailing families living with them. In the 20th century, the rise of international education has been attributed to the philosophy of global communication and understanding toward the ends of avoiding war and destruction as seen during World War I. Then, at the end of World War II, the global economy witnessed the increased movement of workers and corporations into foreign countries. This migration has now transformed international schools from places originally created to further a peaceful world philosophy or educate and proselytize in a religious fashion, to institutions that serve the progeny of political operatives and global businesspeople (Hayden & Thompson, 1995).

Modern international schools are a free market response to a global corporate need (Hayden & Thompson, 1995). Because of the proliferation of multinational employees being assigned overseas, international schools have exploded in growth. The *1964 Yearbook of Education* identified approximately 50 international schools (Rossello, 1965). In 2006, James MacDonald of Yokohama International School used the Council of International Schools public data to estimate that there were, at that time, 551,232 students attending 907 international schools worldwide (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). In 2014 there were 7,148 international schools operating in 238 countries, serving the needs of 3,686,418 students ("ISC Research: The Market," 2014). This rise of potential students outpaced with the explosion of international schools has created competition within the market place for student enrollment. Since these schools rely heavily on the tuition dollars to provide a quality student education, new ways of viewing school management have begun to appear with a focus on sustainability of programs, increasing teacher retention to provide stability, and most significantly for my purposes, focusing on marketing the institution to attract and retain the most students. It is imperative for school administrators to understand and adapt to market forces.

Marketing of Schools

Previous research investigating school marketing can be divided between universities/colleges and secondary/high school. Though the end result of attracting students may be congruent, the challenges, practices, and methodologies differ greatly between these two. Focusing on the literature dealing with marketing secondary/high school education, it is evident that it primarily covers three areas. The most widely researched area pertained to Great Britain after the Education Reform Act of 1988; this act allowed open enrollment irrespective of neighborhood or district boundaries

and established formula funding that directly linked funding to pupil numbers (Foskett, 1998). The second most researched area is the open enrollment movement of secondary schools in Israel. In large cities, the competitors to secondary schools come in numerous forms; Kibbutzim schools, holistic schools, democratic schools, community schools, and so forth (Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2007). The third most reported research pertained to the growth of charter schools in the United States post 1990. This movement allowed parents in public districts to choose the option of sending their child to another public institution that had been created with a focus on site-based management (Richardson, 2013). Due to the lack of scholarly attention paid specifically to marketing in international schools, this review is focused primarily on investigating marketization of secondary/high schools in Great Britain, Israel, and the US and I hypothesize that the generalizability of this research will extend to the international school marketplace as well.

The increase in open enrollment in many countries (Oplatka, 2002; Leggate & Thompson, 1997; Ozretic-Dosen & Martinovic, 2003; Robenstine, 2000) and the proliferation of international schools around the world have made the education environment more competitive. With this reality comes marketization, a process that is largely characterized by school administrators placing a higher priority on the marketing of their schools (Foskett, 2002). The success of these schools is determined by student recruitment and retention, increasing the results of standardized tests, and marketing this information to the public. This new pressure put on secondary administrations requires administrators to be more than just educators, but to add to the strategic planning of their school to incorporate the methods of marketing. It is becoming increasingly important for all administrators in secondary

and international schools to become current with research related to marketing in their context.

The research pertaining to marketing secondary schools is very recent and under-investigated. The first researchers who covered marketing education emerged during the early 1980's. Authors like Gray, Kotler and Fox, and Pardey applied their research from a non-education base. Marketing strategies used for non-profit businesses and service industry providers were assessed and heavily applied to the education construct. Though there are parallels with these non-education ventures, the strategies, definitions, and the intellectual basis from which they sprung did not fit well. Marketing was initially described as, "the process which enables client needs to be identified, anticipated, and satisfied, in order that the institution's objectives can be achieved" (Pardey, 1991, p. 1). Further defining explains marketing as "the analysis, planning, implementation and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with a target market to achieve organizational objectives" (Kotler & Fox, 1995). Marketing was also defined as "the means by which the school actively communicates and promotes its purpose, values, and products to pupils, parents, staff, and the wider community" (Davis and Ellison, 1997). Ten years later marketing was recognized as "a process of producers engaging and positioning themselves in the market-typically including such activities as product development, pricing, and advertising" (Lubienski, 2007, p.121).

Educational Marketing

Educational marketing is a new responsibility for leaders borne from competitive markets that will not disappear. It is becoming accepted that schools no longer can simply consider themselves effective by graduating students, but schools now need to publicize and promote their successes for parents, students, and other

stakeholders (Oplatka, 2007). Marketing is considered to be a holistic practice (Foskett, 2002) aimed at improving effectiveness through satisfaction of parents' needs and desires, rather than selling the product of the school or a special segment of the academic program. Marketing in the case of schools is not about selling, but about communication and strengthening relationships.

However, later studies conducted to examine marketing practices in schools, mostly in Britain, Israel, and to a lesser extent in the USA, have illustrated that administrators and teachers do not have a coherent understanding of marketing and strategies nor do they understand the importance of market research or formal strategy (Bell, 1999; Dosen & Martinovic, 2003; Leggate & Thompson, 1997; Maguire, et al., 2001). There have been many interpretations of marketing among high school principals and confusion about its relationship to public relations, promotions, advertising, and management of external relations (Foskett, 2002). This confusion can be traced to the traditional understanding of marketing mentioned above.

The Marketing Mix

Traditional marketing strategies for consumer products that were awkwardly applied to education were based on the concept of the marketing mix. The concept of the marketing mix is central to an organization's understanding of "where it is" and "where it wants to go" (James & Phillips, 1995) as opposed to promoting one's product strictly on its merits. The marketing mix can be separated into four traditional sections recognized by marketing students around the world as follows: product, place, price, and promotion (the 4 P's). Schools that believe they are "selling" a product, focusing on providing the highest quality for the lowest price, employ this concept. The Marketing Mix focuses on convincing the public that the merits of the product are superior to the rest of the market offerings. But this concept ignores the

idea that education is a service industry and the product is in the act of educating. Some scholars argue that business-originated concepts and models are being misapplied to education (Oplatka & Hemsley-Brown, 2004). Marketing a service is different from marketing manufactured items because of its intangibility (education cannot be identified by the senses), its heterogeneous nature (the human element of interaction between student and teacher cannot be standardized), perishability (education is consumed immediately), and inseparability (the service cannot be separated from its consumption) (Rushton & Carson, 1985). Scholars suggest two more P's should be added to the marketing mix, people and process. It appears that marketing schools in the modern sense is recognizing that the product is in the process and that it needs to be valued through open communication with people (James & Phillips, 1995).

A major theme revealed in more recent studies has been principals' and teachers' attitudes towards marketing schools. Looking at studies and papers starting in the late 1990's, two competing ideas emerged: a) marketing for student recruitment and retention is an indispensable organizational activity that is imperative for a school located in a competitive market and b) marketing is generally viewed negatively in education by many principals and faculties. One way for administrators to address the problem of negativity among employees is to step up internal marketing processes.

Student Recruitment and Retention

Marketing in a competitive market for student recruitment and retention is a necessary reality for schools. The new environment of open enrollment in most western countries and the market place reality of international schools competing for students is now a growing concern for school leadership. This change in landscape is forcing schools to address the issue in their strategic planning. Since the early 1990's

the literature has suggested that marketing has been the responsibility of the principal alone. In James' and Phillips' 1995 study, none of the schools researched had anyone but the principal as the lead marketer. As principals' job descriptions grow larger and larger, it is not realistic to ask them to take on yet another role, and even less realistic to ask them to take on a role for which they are not trained nor have the time to accomplish. Tristan Bunnell, one of the few researchers to tackle this subject in international schools, wrote in 2005 that of the 34 international schools he investigated in 22 countries, 33% of those responsible for marketing are current school heads, 41% have no previous PR or marketing experience, 47% have no formal marketing qualifications, and 47% are the first person in their school to ever do the job (Bunnell, 2005).

Many international schools have not fully embraced the idea of marketing. Seventy percent of the schools contacted in a previous study believed they needed a long term, structured marketing plan (Bunnell, 2005). This would indicate, on an international level, that marketing was being recognized as an important component to running successful schools. However, this was only recognized in large schools, i.e., schools that were larger than 1,000 students. In 2005, 95% of international schools in Europe were full (Bunnell, 2005) and had a record high attendance. But the percentage of those schools surveyed with a long-range plan of attracting and retaining students did not match the number of schools that were full (Bunnell, 2005). In the current economic climate, this shortsighted view is a dangerous one to have.

The hesitation to install a long-range marketing plan can be blamed on complacency, but other internal factors may exist. There are 8,646 international schools operating in 238 countries, serving the needs of 4.61 million students. In 2000 the international school market was valued at \$4.9 billion dollars (using school fees

alone), in 2017 that value is \$41.5 bn, and in 2027 it is estimated to be \$85.7bn ("ISC Research: The Market," 2017). This rise of potential students has been outpaced by the explosion of international schools has created competition within the market place for student enrollment. Talk of marketing and the idea of selling raise strong emotions among education professionals because the terminology is not congruent with educational vocabulary, even if marketing is simply "concerned with the quality of the relationships between producers and consumers" (Harvey & Busher, 1996). Overall marketing has a negative connotation of deception. One educator declared, "I don't see that attracting students is part of a teachers' job. I believe that the focus of their job is to be teaching the children that they have, and I don't think that teachers should be spending their time thinking about attracting students" (Oplatka, Brown & Foskett, 2002, p. 189).

Educators believe it appears unprofessional if not unethical to try to attract or retain students, while their implicit professional code emphasizes looking after people altruistically (Harvey & Busher, 1996). Principals are not the only ones in the building unfamiliar and uncomfortable with marketing. Many faculty members are also bothered by the idea of "selling the school" (Ozretic- & Martinovic, 2003; Oplatka, Brown, and Foskett, 2002; Oplatka, 2006; Cuthbert, 2010; James & Phillips, 1995; Schuller & Chalupsky, 2011). There is a special complexity about the educational relationship between student and teacher that makes the concept of marketing distasteful for educators. However, this aversion to marketing appears to be rooted in a misinterpretation of the term; the main focus of marketing is a dialogue between an organization and its clients, a school and its students and parents, and on how their different needs can be met most effectively, issues which are at the heart of most teachers' professional concerns (Harvey & Busher, 1996). Since there appears

to be a misunderstanding by teachers of the terms involved with marketing, but not the aims, it is important for principals and public relations practitioners within a school to be intentional in how they market in the field of education.

Relationship Marketing. The two most recent topics discussed in the literature are, ironically, based in the previously dismissed field of business service marketing. First, Relationship Marketing (RM) is the concept that attracting, maintaining, and enhancing customer relationships and is an important determinant of the customer's overall level of satisfaction (Oplatka, 2002). RM puts emphasis on nurturing current relationships, especially with existing customers, to increase positive word of mouth communication and retention of current students. Little research has been directed towards understanding to what extent schools have made RM part of their overall marketing strategy, assuming they have one. The cost of losing a student in an international school to a competitor far exceeds the simple tuition reduction. This concept is also widely understood in business as studies demonstrate that it costs much more to obtain new customers than to retain current ones, but most money is and resources are directed towards attracting new customers (Massnick, 1997; Celuch, Robinson & Walz, 2011).

Internal Marketing

The second topic covered frequently in literature, but not studied in great length is the concept of Internal Marketing. Internal Marketing focuses on harnessing the positive perceptions and attitudes of current faculty and staff. The head of school should be marketing their school (the product) to the staff that in turn market it to the current school community (the marketplace) of students and parents (James & Phillips, 1995). The idea is that a satisfied faculty will lead to satisfied students. This is accomplished by using marketing activities such as gathering information through

surveys, focus groups, town-hall meetings, forums (both informal and formal) to create marketing segmentation on the levels of satisfaction of school staff, parents, and students. An effective, caring, moral, and innovative schooling process is assumed to enhance the current students' and parents' satisfaction, which, in turn, increases the likelihood that they will informally market the school in their community (Oplatka, 2007).

The reality of a globalized economy requires multinational corporations to move their employees overseas to serve in emerging and changing markets and brings with it a pressing need for international schools to meet the educational needs of foreign nationals not wanting to enroll in local schools. The number of international schools has increased significantly over the past 50 years to address this need. Multinational corporations in trying economic times are attempting to control costs of expat compensation packages that sometimes include paying for the education costs of the overseas assigned children. This increase in number of schools, coupled with leaner resources indicates that competition in international school markets will become more challenging. Schools will need to adapt to the changing market or risk losing funding from student tuition. The practices of Relationship Marketing and Internal Marketing are models that schools can utilize to increase the probability that their student base will not transfer or exit the school.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to capture knowledge about the marketing activities and tools used by International schools located in the East Asia region and the perceived effectiveness of the activities and tools in accomplishing desired school objectives as indicated by school leadership. The findings from this research will be added to the sparse offerings that address the marketing practices of international

schools. Demographic data, identified marketing practices, and the perceived effectiveness by schools will be gathered from the 150 international schools in East Asia who are members of the East Asia Region Council of Overseas Schools (EARCOS). These data will provide valuable information to help schools identify their current practices, to compare their own practices to practices of other schools in a crowded market, and to implement changes to better position their own school in the future marketplace.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do EARCOS schools currently engage in educational marketing activities?
2. What are the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities?
3. What marketing tools do EARCOS schools currently use in their educational marketing activities?
4. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' educational marketing activities towards reaching the schools' desired objectives?
5. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' use of marketing tools towards reaching their schools' desired objectives?
6. Is there any significant difference in use of marketing activities and tools in relation to
 - a. Size of school?
 - b. Years of operation?
 - c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?
7. Is there any significant difference in the effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to

- a. Size of school?
- b. Years of operation?
- c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is an adaptation and modification of Horn's 1997 study of the role and perceived effectiveness of marketing tools and planning activities in Arizona's private schools. An examination of prior research (Oplatka, 2004; Bunnell, 2005; Bell & Rowley, 2002; Foskett, 1995; Gibbs, 2002; Grady, et al., 2002; Richardson, 2013) has yielded studies that examine the role of marketing in secondary schools in the UK, USA, and Israel. These studies were predicated on the idea that the school personnel in their study were aware of the competitive nature of their markets and were aware that effective marketing was essential to reach their goals regarding student recruitment and retention. Only one study, a mixed methods, exploratory and descriptive study by Bunnell, was found to target international schools. His 2002 study surveyed 35 schools in 22 European countries. Horn's 1997 dissertation was a descriptive study that looked at the marketing activities of independent schools in Arizona and their perceived effectiveness. This study raised awareness within independent schools in Arizona of the need to be more proactive with a formal marketing plan. It also identified common marketing activities in relation to particular demographic characteristics. The current study looks to adapt this descriptive study to look into the marketing practices and perceptions of success of international schools in the competitive market of Asia. Asia is fast becoming a more competitive market for international schools. An increase in the number of international schools in the EARCOS region coupled with the declining number of students in the past three years due to the effects of

globalization on expatriate job assignments, and numerous other factors all signal the need for schools to be more proactive in marketing their schools. A failure to recognize this changing economic landscape could result in ruin if schools do not have solid marketing plans.

Definition of Terms

EARCOS- East Asia Region Council of Overseas Schools

EDUCATION MARKETING- The analysis, planning, implementation and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with a target market to achieve organizational objectives (Kotler & Fox, 1995).

Educational organizational objectives may include student recruitment, student retention, and school branding.

EXPATRIATE-A foreign national working or living in a host country for a limited period of time.

INTERNAL MARKETING (IM)- the act of using marketing techniques in the organization to enhance relationships among employees, departments, and leaders.

Activities may include marketing segmentation, marketing planning, marketing positioning put in place to effectively present the institutional image and develop their brand position in the minds of stakeholders.

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL-a school that primarily serves foreign students residing as expatriates in a host country. These schools normally follow a national or international curriculum with mostly expatriate teachers and administrators.

LARGE SCHOOL-school in EARCOS that has an enrollment of over 1500 students.

MARKETING ACTIVITIES-Any activity or program that is designed to facilitate the exchange of resources and raise brand awareness from a client or customer for goods or services produced by an individual or organization.

MARKETING MIX-The design and blend, for a given product or service, of the four major marketing variables; product, place, price, and promotion. In addition, educational marketing mix adds, “people” and “process” for a total of six marketing variables.

MARKETING POSITIONING- The act of developing and implementing strategies put in to place to raise awareness of an organization in the minds of the public.

MARKETING SEGMENTATION- Profiling the various demographics of the marketplace into distinct groupings to identify specific needs and desires.

MARKETING TOOLS- The materials used by an institution engaged in educational marketing such as surveys, websites, print material, open house days, press releases, social media, etc.

MEDIUM SCHOOL- a school in EARCOS that has an enrollment between 700-1500 students.

PUBLIC RELATIONS-Involves a broad set of communication activities employed to create and maintain favorable relations between the organization and its public.

PROPRIETARY SCHOOL-A privately owned school (corporation, partnership, family) that derives profits from its operation.

RELATIONSHIP MARKETING (RM)- is the concept of attracting, maintaining, and enhancing customer relationships; these relationships are important determinants of the customer’s overall level of satisfaction.

SECULAR SCHOOL-A school that is not affiliated with any particular, religion or faith.

SMALL SCHOOL- schools in EARCOS that have an enrollment under 700 students

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

This exploratory, descriptive study identifies the type of marketing activities and marketing tools and the perceived effectiveness of both by heads of school in the EARCOS region. The literature on the history of marketing, marketing strategies used by nonprofit organizations, the growth of marketing in education, the perceived limitations of marketing in an educational context are reviewed to gain a better understanding of this topic. In the first half of this chapter the history of marketing and the growth of educational marketing will be reviewed. The second half of the chapter will be a more narrowed look at marketing practices in secondary education and perceived limitations. Although marketing literature and studies researching practices in secondary schools exist there is scant literature pertaining specifically to international schools that is a branch of secondary education that has been in existence for over 100 years.

The literature covering the history of marketing in practice and in theory is extensive and diverse. It is difficult to determine a singular definition of marketing as the concept is continually evolving to adjust to new market conditions, organizational structures, institutional goals/outcomes, and academic investigations. In 1975, Crosier looked to define marketing and winnowed it down to no less than 50 working definitions. Forty-one years later the field is full of definitions and sub definitions to fit the needs of not just for profit organizations, but volunteer and nonprofit as well. For the purpose of clarity and simplicity, I will give an overview of the modern history of the concept of marketing.

Historical Progression of Marketing

The chronological review of marketing activities can also serve as an illustration of the evolution of a business. The foundational work understanding the historical evolution of marketing comes from Keith (1960) and Kotler and Levy (1969). Marketing is a process, a philosophy, and an orientation all at the same time that is evidenced by the changes in marketing from the late 19th century to today.

The first era of marketing identified is Production Orientated or product focused which historically is placed from 1870-1930 (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969). This era is focused strictly on the concept of commodity driving the market exchange. Early examples of this would be farm products, minerals, and manufactured goods. The belief is that the commodity is unique or of such high quality that the product will drive customers to buy it. The self-identified needs of the consumer are of secondary importance as the producer “knows best” (Foskett, 1998). In a modern sense this works for new technologies, but is short lived, as competitors are able to duplicate the product, causing the very nature of its appeal, uniqueness, to be eliminated.

The second era of marketing is the Promotion Orientation or sales focused which is historically placed in 1930-1950 (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969). This era saw an increase in maximizing profits by recognizing outreach through promotion would increase sales. It was not enough to create a product, but advertising and convincing customers of its value and the customer’s perceived need to have the product increased. This era coincided with the rise of popular media in the United States. A curious off shoot of this era was recognition of a specialist who promotes the product (salesman) beyond the creator or manufacturer.

The third era of marketing is Marketing Orientation or market focused which is historically placed 1950-1970 (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969). This era saw an increase in analyzing the market for trends and segmenting the population. Companies no longer advertised or sold to the entire public, but recognized an advantage in researching specific segments of the population. This era saw the creation of the Marketing Mix. This idea was based that all products could be effectively marketed by understanding how the customer viewed the Product, Price, Placement, and Promotion (McCarthy and Perreault, 1993).

The fourth era of marketing is Holistic Marketing Orientation or integrated marketing which is historically placed from 1970 to today (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969). This era saw an increased level of strategic research towards market efficiency, product quality, and social impact. This era is a time when businesses are moving from a stratified and discreet marketing department. It is now the responsibility of all in the organization to be invested in the planning, execution, and vision of marketing activities (Kotler, 1994; Kotler and Andreasen, 1996; Kotler and Fox, 1995; Zeithaml, 1996) This period is a time when marketing is defined not as an external process that but now internalized as a philosophy held by companies and focused on more than simply selling the product. It was common to see companies marketing their business philosophy and promoting company values in addition to selling their product. This concept grew to include all company activities that involved the consumer as well as anything that might reflect or influence the public's perception of the organization (Horn, 1997). Marketing has ceased being a function and is now viewed as a way to do business (Esteban et al, 2002) It is the fourth era of marketing which is the most recent that should be investigated to explore trends that occurred during the time: the emergence of the nonprofit sector, including the field of

education, as embracing marketing and the practice of internal marketing and relationship marketing.

Marketing Orientation

Much like with the term marketing, the concept of Marketing Orientation has many definitions, yet there appears to be a common theme and agreement amongst the experts (Slater and Narver, 1994; Kohli and Jaworski, 1994; Helfert, Ritter, & Walter, 2002; Harris, 2002). To distill it down to the two most significant approaches is identifying Market Orientation as the generation of market information, cross departmental dissemination of information, and responsiveness to disseminate information (Kholi and Jaworski, 1990) and a simple focus on customer orientation, competitor orientation, and inter-functional coordination (Narver and Slater, 1990). Simply, both are focused on consumers, competitors, and market conditions and how to react appropriately to those factors. At the core of Market Orientation are the concepts that the organization is customer-driven, aware of competitor's practices, and there is an emphasis put into providing quality service. The great distinction about this concept opposed to previous marketing concepts is that the tangible product becomes secondary to the satisfaction of the experience of the customer. The customer's needs, desires, lifestyles and perceptions of themselves become the main focus of the organization. Meeting consumer's needs is now considered the objective of business who embrace marketing orientation (Esteba, Millan, Molina, & Martin-Consuegra, 2002) Market Orientation is the degree in which the organization researches data about the current needs of its customers looks at future needs the customer might have, and develop a strategy to address and implement new customer orientated practices (Oplatka, 2002). As the fourth era of marketing developed

regarding Marketing Orientation with its focus on process and experience, a new subset of this construct emerged in the form of Service Marketing.

Service Marketing

Although the marketing of services have many similarities to product marketing, there are some important differences. Since there is no universal definition of service as the range of activities can be very disparate (lawyer, banker, teacher, escort, waiter, housekeeper) it can be difficult to have a unifying strategy. In addition, service industry has no tangible product. Using the examples listed above, it is difficult to separate the sale of the service from the person who provided it.

Rushton and Carson (1985) define characteristics of the service industry to be intangibility (services cannot be identified by the senses), heterogeneity (the human element involved in their provision means they cannot be standardized), perishability and inseparability (the provision of the service cannot be separated from its consumption). Intangibility is the single most important feature separating products from service. Because consumers cannot see, touch or feel the product in service they assess quality by the tangible elements associated with it. The level of communication for a lawyer, the speed in which a glass of water is refilled or dirty dishes cleared away in a restaurant, or the warm greeting of a limo driver at the airport as he grabs your bags and asks about your flight. In each of these cases it is important in marketing to explain to clients the service they will receive in the process not simply that a law document will be written, a sandwich prepared, or a ride home from the airport provided. Cowell (1984) recognizing the need to synthesize the traditional 4 Ps of the Marketing Mix with the needs of service marketing, by offering the idea that people, process and proof should be added to the mix. The addition of people focuses on building sustainable relationships through education of customers

and employees as one markets its service. Process was added to established how service marketing existed in a different sphere than product marketing. And finally, proof is added to the marketing mix to encapsulate the constant need to analyze data to make better-informed decisions. Gray (1991) refuted these additions as only complicating a distinction he deemed slight between product and service marketing. He did offer that people is a helpful addition as recognizing the importance of relationship and internal marketing concepts.

Internal Marketing

Two new areas of interest that distinguish modern marketing practices from previous activities especially within the service marketing area are the practices of internal marketing and relationship marketing. Internal marketing is simply the act of using marketing techniques in the organization to enhance relationships among employees, departments, and leaders (George, 2000) If employees are working towards a common goal, feel empowered in the organization, have positive interactions within the organization, the thinking is that the positive experience will be passed on to the consumer. Satisfied employees usually lead to satisfied customers. This philosophy is defined as concentrating on internal communication, and motivation of harnessing and focusing people to meet the objectives of the marketing plan (Mercer, 1998). If top managers express the importance of a commitment towards customer satisfaction it is natural that the rest of the organization will assume that same attitude (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). It is important for any organization to stress a common organizational commitment (Hopson and Scally, 1989). In the area of education, James and Phillips found in their 1995 study of school marketing practices in England that a number of head teachers recognized the importance of internal marketing and that they should be marketing their school (the product) to the

staff that in turn should market it to their current stakeholder. One of the most effective ways of ensuring a positive image for the school is to ensure that everyone associated with it becomes a convinced, committed, and passionate ambassador (Davies, 1995). This positive image that emanates from the faculty and staff can positively influence stakeholders in the form of parents and students. To reach out to stakeholders in the community with a common, positive message, and a goal of sustaining an association helps strengthen relationships. Relationship marketing largely depends on successful internal marketing in an organization. This is a clear articulation of an institution wide commitment to the stated vision and the recognition of all involved in propelling it forward.

Relationship Marketing

Relationship Marketing begins with a commitment to Marketing Orientation and to develop an organizational culture that is truly customer centered which aims to provide quality experiences (Narver and Slater, 1990). The core operating direction of a business is to create and keep a customer. (Berry, 1983) Relationship Marketing is attracting, maintaining, and enhancing customer relationships (Kerin, Hartley, & Rudelius, 2007). Relationship Marketing is a personal and on-going relationship between an organization and its individual customers that begins before and continues after the sale. Relationship marketing emphasizes building long-term relationships with customers rather than focusing on each individual transaction (Berry, 2002). It strengthens by identifying and creating new value with individual customers and then sharing the benefits from it over a lifetime association (Gordon, 1998). In building relationships, organizations develop reputations that precede any commercial transaction. Reputation is founded on the organization's past relationship with stakeholders and contributes to improved customer loyalty (Nguyen and Lebanc,

2001). The rise and perceived effectiveness of internal and relationship marketing is not limited to commercial, product driven enterprises.

Volunteer Non Profit Organizations

The broadening of marketing to include service marketing and more specifically non profit organizations began in the early 1970s (Kotler & Zaltman, 1971; Shapiro, 1973; Kotler and Levy, 1969). It was at this time that volunteer non profit organizations began to adopt marketing practices that normally were used to market tangible products with a profit-minded goal to promoting services used to serve the public good like conservation, education, and charitable relief. As early as 1969, Koter and Levy were advocating for volunteer non profit organizations to embrace marketing strategies. This was met with skepticism from volunteer non profit organizations and antagonism from marketing professionals who did not see this an appropriate market. Their findings, in hindsight, showed that volunteer non profit organizations were not ready yet to understand the philosophical nature of marketing as people kept referring to it as selling, advertising, and such (Kotler, 1979). This industry showed the same sort of evolutionary understanding of marketing that is illustrated in the chronology of marketing eras. It is not enough for the volunteer non profit organizations to engage in marketing activities but to understand and embrace the variables involved. Recently, volunteer non profit organizations have become aware of the advantages of marketing orientation based management as they are dealing with the volatile market conditions like that of for profit institutions (Shoham, 2006). The meaning and importance of Marketing Orientation has been studied in the for-profit industry (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990) but it is a new concept in the volunteer non profit organizations.

Educational institutions face similar challenges as for profit institutions, which make marketing orientation, particularly internal and relationship marketing, used by these companies, a viable strategy for educational institutions (Arnett, Wittman, and Wilson, 2003). The three largest meta-analysis of marketing orientation in volunteer non profit organizations were by Esteban et al (2002), Cervera, Molla, & Sanchez, (2001) and Shoham et al (2006). Combined, these studies analyzed 105 theoretical and empirical studies that looked at marketing orientation in volunteer non profit organizations but none of industries covered in the studies were in the field of education. These studies offer much in understanding the marketing practices within volunteer non profit organizations and are interesting in their own right to investigate and critique, however the results of such are not as important as recognizing that it is significant that in all of these studies the area of education was completely omitted.

School Choice and the Rise of School Marketing

It is well known to the community of educational research that something quite dramatic took place in the global arena of education during the last decade of the 20th century (Johnsson and Lindgren, 2010; Ball, Goodson, & Maguire, 2007; Daun, 2007) The introduction of educational markets into compulsory education in many western countries during this time has led to more competitive environments for schools (Bell and Rowley, 2002; Gewirtz et al., 1995; Levin, 2001; Oplatka, 2002, Taylor, 2001; Foskett, 2002). Around the world national school systems changed practices to address reform movements insistence on competition, choice, and decentralization (Ball, 2000). More schools in the western world are gaining a greater control over their own school management as they move any from centralization to site based management (Leggate and Thompson, 1997)

Proposals to increase the freedom of parents to choose their children's school typically are associated with economic theories of market behavior. The central tenant is that parents should be freed to act as rational consumers able to take their business elsewhere if they are unsatisfied with the product (Halverson, 1999). Since the late 1980s, advocates of markets and choice in education have been highly influential in restructuring public education in many countries around the world (Levin, 2001). For example, in the United Kingdom the introduction of open enrollment and per-capita funding established quasi-markets within the educational system (Maguire, Ball & McRae, 2001). Poetter and Knight-Abowitz (2001) report that in the United States these choices include: public school (including magnet schools), alternative schools, charter schools, private schools, and religious schools. School choice is a way to assure that publicly funded state schools are forced to compete with other choices and will therefore improve the offerings and quality of public school systems (Fowler, 2002). In Croatia, drastic changes in the socio-economic and political landscape post communism in the late 1990s allowed for the creation of private high schools created in reaction to the state sponsored high schools (Ozretic-Dosen and Martinovic, 2003). In Israel school choice took root in the late 1990s as public schools that previously only competed against religious-based private schools, now had to compete against other public schools (Oplatka, 2007). Taiwan has dealt with the issue (Li and Hung, 2008), India (Gauatm, 2011) and even the tiny country of Mauritius has seen the introduction of private secondary schools change the competitive landscape for public schools (Ramseeok-Munhurrun, Naidoo, Bhiwajee & Beejmohun, 2010).

Encouraging competition among schools through the introduction of new types of schools or by increasing the ability of parents to make choices among schools

(voucher plans, open enrollment, charter schools) has increased marketing practices by educational institutions. Such marketization has focused on making schools accountable by providing parents with information on which to make judgments about relative performance of schools and ensuring that funding follows pupils (Oplatka, 2006). This suggests that school choice competition has resulted in increases in academic performance levels by both public and private school students. As all over the world countries finance public education, this relative lack of competition in compulsory education sector tends to dull incentives to improve quality and restrain costs (Hanushek, 1994; Pritchett, 2003). Wolfsmann (2007) studied privately funded schools in 39 countries with over 266,000 13-year-old students found that students perform better in countries with more competition from privately managed schools and in countries where public funding ensures that all families can make a choice. Research indicates that schools recognize the need for marketing activities since they enable them to challenge their competition successfully and respond better to the more complex demands of parents and students when choosing schools (Harvey & Busher, 1996).

Educational Marketing

The definition of educational marketing is the analysis, planning, implementation, and control of carefully formulated programs designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values with a target market to achieve organizational objectives (Kotler and Fox, 1985). The research on school marketing has increased significantly over the past 20 years as more researchers are recognizing the market conditions that affect education and the marketing practices that result (Bunnell, 2005; Foskett, 2002; Oplatka, 2002, 2004, 2007; Oplatka and Brown, 2006). Schools needed to begin acting more like commercial enterprises yet understanding that

educational marketing, as service marketing, is complex and different from product marketing (Robenstine, 2000).

Traditional strategies developed for physical goods or for service organizations are inappropriate for schools and that school marketing, as a new area of study in educational administration, requires the development of new concepts and models that combine both knowledge from service marketing and from public sector administration (Oplatka and Brown, 2004). An awareness of marketing orientation can help educational institutions better meet the needs of their stakeholders. Schools adopting a marketing orientation are more responsive to parent's and children's needs and desires and are attentive to changes in the community needs. It is assumed that educational markets will drive up school performance through competition for students and the quality of teaching will be raised (Foskett, 1998). It is evident that schools working in a competitive environment tend to incorporate varied forms of marketing into their strategy in order to successfully recruit prospective students (Foskett, 2002; Oplatka and Hemsley-Brown, 2004). Additionally, a relationship marketing approach put emphasis on nurturing relationships, especially with existing customers to gain greater retention (Brown et al, 1994). Those involved in higher education should seek to develop educational relationships rather than transactional deals between traders (Gibbs, 2001). However, relationship marketing does not simply increase retention it aims towards generating new relationships as well. The marketing of education is needed for successful recruitment and increasing market share of students (Oplatka, 2002; Foskett, 2002). If schools do not understand the value of marketing or state they cannot afford to market, they might as well sell off desks and turn off the lights. Marketing is not so much about increasing enrollment but also keeping the kids you have (Mortland, 2010). The development, maintenance,

and enhancement of customer loyalty towards a firm's products or services are generally seen as the central thrust of marketing activities (Dick and Basu, 1994). This concept also applies to a service industry like education.

Since education is intangible and customers look to tangible evidence in the service to gauge their experiences schools can actively take advantage by providing information about opportunities available at the school, not just discuss curriculum. The level of communication with parents by teachers and administrators regarding their children's progress is another example, and simply having a welcoming entry way as parents and students enter the building, contributes to positive service marketing in schools. The main focus of marketing is on a dialogue between an organization and its clients, on how their needs can be met most effectively. With teachers and administrators serving as the organization and students and parents as clients, this appears to be congruent with the professional concerns carried in the hearts of teachers. Customer loyalty fosters positive word of mouth promotion, advocacy, and customer referrals (Dick and Basu, 1994). Teaching is not simply about responding to customer wants; it is also about meeting customer needs and it is in understanding customer wants and needs, and distinguishing between them, that professional judgment is required (James and Phillips, 1995). Loyal parents can be good advocates recommending the school to other parents and encouraging other students to study there thus attracting new students and tuition (Li & Hung, 2008). Brown and Oplatka (2007) claim that the focus of marketing orientation in a school context should revolve around the customer experience (students and parents) and worry less about competition and integrated cross-functional processes. However, in a competitive market place, simply providing a great experience will not create an advantage if your shared core-beliefs and internal marketing are not strong nor if you

are uninformed about what your competition is offering in way of service and relationships. Oplatka and Brown (2004) in earlier work claim that competitor orientation in Marketing Orientation is often neglected in educational institutions because educators perceive competition to be incompatible with the moral value and idealism of education. Perhaps their instruction to ignore this facet of Marketing Orientation in education is rooted in educators being hesitant to participate.

There is an ongoing debate as to how appropriate it is that educational institutions engage in marketing activities (Ozretic-Dosen & Martinovic, 2003). Talk of marketing raises strong emotions in educational circles. The terminology is new to most and is frequently interpreted to mean selling a product. The act of selling is incongruent with the value-laden mission of teaching.

Perceived Limitations of School Marketing

The question whether schools should engage in marketing activities presents a dilemma (Oplatka and Hemsley-Brown, 2004). Associated with aggressive outwardly activities, marketing is explicitly constructed around concepts of promoting and advertising. Gewirtz (1993) argues contemporary schools are being faced with “new moral environment”; quasi market forces in education have created new tensions that have to be worked through. The aspect of marketing which seems to cause most offense in schools is that which relates to selling. It is thought to be unprofessional, if not unethical, for professional educators to try to attract customers when their implicit professional codes emphasize looking after people altruistically (Harvey and Buscher, 1996). The negative meaning attached to marketing seems to derive from principals’ and teachers’ belief that misleading, even deceptive messages are inevitably embedded in marketing activities (Oplatka and Brown, 2004).

As administrators become more aware of the marketplace and the needs to address the changing landscape, decisions may need to be made that appear to be counter to the value-driven viewpoints held by faculty. There is a concern of tension between administrators and teachers as they try to make sense over their collective meaning and purpose (Robenstine, 2000) Teachers worldwide are highly resistant to adopting values of competition (Oplatka, 2006). Several teachers used the vocabulary borrowed from business including ideas like strong competition, survival, competitors which indicates an awareness of a marketplace but they would later argue these words to be incompatible with their educational values (Oplatka, Hemsley-Brown & Foskett, 2002) Opponents of the introduction of market forces believe the business world morally contradicts values of education (Brown & Oplatka, 2006)

When asked to describe what they understand by the term marketing, most teachers interviewed attached meanings to the concept of marketing associated with selling (Oplatka et al, 2002) considerable discomfort and resentment stemming from a belief that market values are incompatible with educational or professional values Gibbs (2011) warns against the theory that marketing can be applied to products and services of higher education without endangering the essential nature of higher education. There is a fear from some researchers that higher education is participating in professional marketing activities rather than focusing on education to enrich social offerings to society (Veloutsou, Paton & Lewis, 2005). Academics in USA, Australia, and UK reported that thinking of students as customers damages quality and academic standards and degrades student learning (Molesworth, Nixon & Scullion, 2009).

A shift from comprehensive values to market values where schools move away from student needs, away from cooperation with other schools, and from being

led by an agenda of social/educational concerns and community issues to a position that values student performance as a way of attracting the attention of competitive customers in the marketplace rather than students themselves is a concern for modern educators (Maguire, Ball, & Macrae, 2001). One other argument is that consumerism may threaten innovation and academic standards (Naidoo and Jamieson, 2005). There is a fear of the degradation of quality and standards as students are being encouraged by institutions to view knowledge as a commodity that can attract new students and increased funding. That an educational institution is where a student earns credit which is used to increase his or her own earning potential. Thus removes the social responsibility of giving back to society as an informed member looking to play a meaningful role. Firat and Venkatash (1995) believe that marketing can cause fragmentation in a community and Gibbs (2007) believes that educational marketing causes individuals to be more passive and less expressive which is the antithesis of an educated person. Schools that embrace marketing orientation focus on short-term goals (enrollment) and eschew long term goals (societal improvement). Gibbs (2002) proposes that market orientation debate has reduced the trust towards education, polarized the value of the reputation of institutions and damaged the collective perceived value of the awards achieved by students. The rise of massive open on-line courses (MOOC), the ability to earn digital badges and the talk of college being irrelevant abound. Educational institutions may be perceived as no longer being necessary to get a job and have a lucrative career, the new goal as lamented of opponents of schools that embrace marketing orientation. In 2013, 14% of Google hires had no college experience (NYT, 6-20-13)

The perceived limitations of marketing in an educational institution appear to be rooted in narrow understandings of the concept (James and Philips, 1995). Foskett

(1997) says educators have a polarized and narrow view of marketing. And possess a limited understanding of market, marketing theory or marketing practices. This viewpoint misunderstands the role of marketing as a philosophical orientation rather than an external process and falls into the old stereotype of marketing equals selling, selling is unethical and incongruent with the noble ideals of education.

Limitations to the Literature

The literature addressing the practice of marketing using numerous strategies is well covered in the field of for-profit businesses. The literature concerning marketing practices of volunteer non-profit organizations has grown in the past two decades with a better understanding of the concept of service marketing. What is noteworthy in the research is the omission of education as a service marketing industry within the realm of non profit organizations. Education Marketing, outside of Service Marketing, is a field studied quite heavily since the late 1990s due to changes in national policies around the world that have created private competition for publically funded secondary schools through the concept of school choice. Though the studies cited previously are predominately qualitative in nature, meant to gauge the perceptions of administrators and teachers inquiring into their feelings about the concept of marketing in a competitive marketplace, no studies cited previously use a full quantitative analysis in examining the current marketing practices of secondary schools and their effectiveness in reaching the institutional goals of attracting new students, retaining current students or increasing funding. The demographic of international schools is almost completely absent in this literature except the lone study by Bunnell in 2003. Bunnell's study, though an important foundational piece in the study of marketing practices in international schools, is very narrow in scope as it covers only 34 schools scattered across 22 different countries.

The study, aimed to investigate the nature and extent of marketing activities in international schools, spent as much time trying to identify and qualify the definition of international schools as a demographic, as it did identifying the marketing practices of a mere 34 schools. The vast difference in size of the global international school community at the time of Bunnell's study and the relative lack of marketplace competition compared to the current environment necessitates a reexamination of the marketing practices and perceived effectiveness of those practices. The lack of research on international school marketing practices makes this exploratory, descriptive research particularly valuable, and the research methodology of this study will be reviewed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, I will present the statement of purpose and research questions, describe the theoretical population, the accessible population, and the sampling methodology, present the research instrument, and explain the choice of methodology and analysis tools.

This exploratory, descriptive study identifies marketing activities, marketing tools, and the perceived effectiveness of both towards achieving institutional marketing objectives of international schools in the East Asia Region Council of Overseas Schools (EARCOS). Though this study only focuses on the accessible population of EARCOS schools, it is believed that the results will help inform similarly dynamic theoretical populations like South East Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe where school administrators are looking to improve institutional marketing activities.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to capture knowledge about the marketing activities and tools used by International schools located in the East Asia region and the perceived effectiveness of the activities and tools in accomplishing desired school objectives as indicated by school leadership. Marketing activities may include Internal Marketing and Relationship Marketing that utilize marketing planning, marketing segmentation, and marketing positioning. Marketing Tools may include websites, printed literature, social media, open houses, and advertising. This is an exploratory and descriptive study looking at some but not all the variables that are linked to marketing activities and tools of international schools in a competitive

context. It is considered basic research that will contribute to fundamental knowledge and theory (Patton, 1990). My goal is to provide statistical findings that help describe the actual marketing practices of international schools in a competitive context and allow generalizations to be made and relationships to be investigated in future research.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do EARCOS schools currently engage in educational marketing activities?
2. What are the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities?
3. What marketing tools do EARCOS schools currently use in their educational marketing activities?
4. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' educational marketing activities towards reaching the schools' desired objectives?
5. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' use of marketing tools towards reaching their schools' desired objectives?
6. Is there any significant difference in use of marketing activities and tools in relation to
 - a. Size of school?
 - b. Years of operation?
 - c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?
7. Is there any significant difference in the effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to
 - a. Size of school?
 - b. Years of operation?

c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

Population and Sample

The target population of the study consists of all schools that have full membership in EARCOS. This study involves a census sample of schools that are all members of the East Asia Region Council of Oversea School (EARCOS).

Criteria for EARCOS membership. The first criterion for membership in EARCOS is that schools must be elementary and secondary schools of American/international character in East Asia, governed by their own school boards or other competent authorities, (EARCOS, 2014). The second criterion for membership in EARCOS and for inclusion in the accessible population for the current study focused on schools being located in East Asia.

East Asia has seen an explosion of international schools over the past 20 years. Thirty seven percent of all international schools are located in East Asia ("ISC Research: The Market," 2014). Moreover, 5.8% of the world's international school students are located in China with the mega cities of Beijing, Hong Kong, and Shanghai alone comprising more than 1/3 of those students ("ISC Research: The Market," 2014). With over 2,600 international schools in East Asia, the marketplace is crowded and competitive which encourages the effective use of marketing activities and tools. When a number of viable options exist from which students and parents may choose, it can be assumed the level of marketing consciousness by schools would increase.

The third criterion for membership in EARCOS and for inclusion in the accessible population for the current study is that instruction in the school must be conducted in the common language of English. This criterion helps to establish a common variable for institutional expression in its marketing and understanding by

the researcher. All schools, which are members of EARCOS, must fit this criterion for membership.

There are 150 schools in 19 countries with full membership in EARCOS as listed in the 2015-16 directory, servicing 101,866 students. Schools range in size from 5,240 students to as few as 63 students. Seventy four percent of the schools in EARCOS have less than 1,000 students (EARCOS, 2015). The sample for the current study will be recruited with online survey methodology. An effort will be made to increase the probability that the sample represents the full range of schools with regard to location, size, and curriculum offered strengthening the external validity of this descriptive, exploratory research (Patton, 1990; Bogden & Biklen, 1992). All schools will be contacted through emails listed in the EARCOS member directory. Schools will be encouraged to participate by offering a release of survey results to all participating schools. I will make contact with Dr. Dick Krajczar, executive director of EARCOS, requesting his endorsement of this study. Additionally, I hypothesize that my personal relationships with school administrators across the region built up over ten years will help facilitate survey response rate.

Response Rate to the Instrument/Questionnaire

The entire population of 150 EARCOS schools will serve as the target population for this study. I will conduct census sampling; thus, all 150 schools will be invited to participate in the study. To determine the target number of responses needed, a power analysis was conducted using the standard alpha level of .05, a critical effect size (delta) of .30, and a power level of .80. In order to achieve 80% power given the specified alpha and delta levels, I will need to enlist participation from at least 83 schools.

Instrumentation and Construct Validity

The questionnaire for this study will be The Survey for Understanding Marketing Activities and Tools of International Schools (SUMAIS) (Appendix A) and was an adaptation of the Marketing Arizona Private Schools (MAPS; Horn, 1997) surveys given in Arizona, USA that also investigated the marketing activities and tools of private (non-public) educational institutions. This instrument (MAPS) was composed of a mix of 13 questions asking demographic information, current marketing activities, marketing tools implemented, and an evaluation of both. Part 1 asks 5 questions relating to marketing activities, Part 2 asks two questions relating to the use of marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing activities, Part 3 asks 6 demographic questions about the schools. The MAP was modified to illustrate new marketing tools and activities available in the marketplace in 2016 and eliminating questions pertaining to the perception of competing local public schools. The author of the MAP, Todd Horn was contacted to gain information on the validity and reliability of the instrument. Horn indicated he did not perform a post hoc factor analysis to determine if the questions on his survey bore out what he hypothesized. Horn offered no further information or data to validate the research instrument (personal communication, Horn, 2014).

The SUMAIS instrument is designed to collect descriptive, summary data as a way of better understanding what marketing activities are being performed, which marketing tools are being used, and the perceived effectiveness of both as schools aim to reach their desired marketing objectives. These data will provide certain standardized generalizations about marketing activities and marketing tools.

Delphi Study Procedure. Since the research instrument is a new tool, the validity of the instrument will be assessed with a Delphi study before being sent out for a pilot study.

The participants for the Delphi study were chosen because of their expertise in the field of educational marketing as a practitioner or an academic (Appendix G). The Delphi study survey will be sent out in December of 2015 with a feedback sheet. Participants will be sent an email stating the purpose of the study and the research questions to read before assessing the survey (Appendix A). Participants will be given a feedback sheet on which they will assess if the questions on the survey measure what is being asked, if any question needs to be modified for accuracy, and if there are any questions that were omitted but should be asked in a survey of this kind. After a two-week period, a follow up email will be sent requesting completion of the Delphi study (Appendix B). The results of the completed Delphi study will be collated and a second round of the survey will be sent back to the original Delphi study participants to assess the changes made to the survey based on the feedback provided. Participants will use the same feedback sheet used in round 1 on which they will assess if the questions on the survey measure what is being asked, if any question needs to be modified for accuracy, and if there are any questions that were omitted but should be asked in a survey of this kind. The results of the Delphi study will be analyzed and if feedback from participants indicates that the questions indicate validity the survey will be sent to a pilot study.

Pilot Study Procedure. The survey will be piloted in January 2016 by emailing (Appendix C) the 39 heads of school in the Association of Chinese and Mongolian International Schools (ACAMIS) who are not also a member of EARCOS. ACAMIS schools have been chosen for this pilot due to the similarity to the

population of EARCOS member schools and positive relationships I have with current heads of schools. Suggestions and feedback regarding format, style, and phrasing will be solicited through an electronic survey. A follow up email (Appendix D) will be sent in early February 2016 for non-respondents. SUMAIS's parent instrument, the MAPS was piloted by eight experts in the field for content validity and revisions were made based on their suggestions before being administered to 55 schools in its study. Content validity will be established by the feedback from the 39 heads of schools from the ACAMIS region that will be piloting the SUMAIS instrument. Feedback will be gathered and the questionnaire will be amended based on suggestions from the pilot participants.

Data Collection Procedures

A cover letter email explaining the research project (Appendix E) will be sent to EARCOS heads of school requesting participation in the study by using the link provided to take a SurveyMonkey questionnaire. The survey will be anonymous and results of the entire study will be shared upon request of the participants. A second email (Appendix F) following up with non-responders will be sent two weeks after the initial email asking a second time for participation. The Head of School will be the preferred respondent, however, any administrator or staff member with a primary job responsibility in the area of marketing will be deemed appropriate and acceptable to complete the survey if the head of school should choose. Participants will not be asked invasive or sensitive questions and their responses will be coded by demographic information. Participants will not be asked to provide the name of their specific school. Data will be presented in demographic groups as to keep the identity of specific schools anonymous. All results will be sent to the participating schools.

Table 1

Timeline for Instrument Use and Development

Action	Time frame
Delphi Study of SUMAIS	December 2015
Follow up notice to non-responders	January 2016
Pilot Test of SUMAIS	January 2016
Follow up notice to non-responders	February 2016
SUMAIS completion request to EARCOS members (full dissertation sample)	February 2016
Follow up notice to non-responders	March 2016
Data Entry and Final Analysis	April 2016

Data Analysis

The SUMAIS asks general demographic questions about the school, questions about the frequency and effectiveness of marketing activities and the tools used in marketing.

For the current study, the descriptive data will be presented as means, standard deviations (SDs), frequencies, and percents. The data will be presented in tabular and graphical formats. The graphical formats will include histograms and bar graphs.

The goal of data presentation for this exploratory, descriptive study is for the reader to clearly understand current marketing tools and activities in international schools in the EARCOS region.

The data analysis for the data of the survey will include computations of standard deviations, frequencies, percents, and means. The sample standard deviation

is used to estimate the population standard deviation. This analysis will frequently be in conjunction with the use of means to summarize continuous data. Means are used to estimate the central tendency of the population. Central tendency identifies the central position of the data collected. Frequency is used to illustrate the distribution of a group of data collected from the population. Finally, correlation analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used to see whether specific pairs of variables vary together in predictable patterns and to quantify the strength of the relationships between the variables.

Table 2

Research Questions, Data Sources, and Data Analyses

Research Questions	Data Source: SUMAIS	Data analysis
Question 1. To what extent do EARCOS schools currently engage in educational marketing activities?	Part 2 Question 1,2, 3	Frequencies, percents, means, SD
Question 2. What are the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities?	Part 2 Question 4	Frequencies, percents, means, SDs
Question 3. What marketing tools do EARCOS schools currently use in their educational marketing activities?	Part 3 Questions 1	Frequencies, percents, means, SDs
Question 4. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' educational marketing activities towards reaching the schools' desired objectives?	Part 2 Question 5	Frequencies, percents, means, SDs
Question 5. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' use of marketing tools towards reaching their schools' desired objectives?	Part 3 Question 2	Frequencies, percents, means, SDs
Question 6. Is there any significant difference in use of marketing activities and tools in relation to: a. Size of school? b. Years of operation? c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?	Predictor variables are captured in Section 1. Outcome variables are captured in Section 2: Q2, Q3, Section 3: Q1	a. size of school – analyze with Pearson Correlation, b. Years of operation – analyze with Pearson correlation, c. Locations in six largest cities in EARCOS – analyze with ANOVA

Research Questions	Data Source: SUMAIS	Data analysis
<p>Question 7. Is there any significant difference in the effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Size of school? b. Years of operation? c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS? 	<p>Predictor variables are captured in Section 1. Outcome variables are captured in Part 2, Q5 and Part 3 Question 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. size of school – analyze with Pearson Correlation, b. Years of operation – analyze with Pearson correlation, c. Locations in six largest cities in EARCOS – analyze with ANOVA

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to capture knowledge about the marketing activities and tools used by International schools located in the East Asia region and the perceived effectiveness of the activities and tools in accomplishing desired school objectives as indicated by school leadership. Marketing activities may include Internal Marketing and Relationship Marketing that utilize marketing planning, marketing segmentation, and marketing positioning. Marketing Tools may include websites, printed literature, social media, open houses, and advertising. This is an exploratory and descriptive study looking at some but not all the variables that are linked to marketing activities and tools of international schools in a competitive context. A goal of this study was to provide statistical findings that help describe the actual marketing practices of international schools in a competitive context and allow generalizations to be made and postulate relationships, which can be investigated in future research.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do EARCOS schools currently engage in educational marketing activities?
2. What are the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities?
3. What marketing tools do EARCOS schools currently use in their educational marketing activities?
4. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' educational marketing activities towards reaching the schools' desired objectives?
5. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' use of marketing

tools towards reaching their schools' desired objectives?

6. Is there any significant difference in use of marketing activities and tools in relation to
 - a. Size of school?
 - b. Years of operation?
 - c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

7. Is there any significant difference in the effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to
 - a. Size of school?
 - b. Years of operation?
 - c. Location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

Responses

Data to address the research came from responses to the SUMAIS (Appendix H). The SUMAIS was sent to all EARCOS member school heads. The school head was asked to electronically complete a survey attached by a link in the invitation email. The target sample size was determined from a power analysis using the standard alpha of .05, a critical effect size (delta) of .30, and a power level of .80. In order to achieve 80% power given the specified alpha and delta levels, and the sample size of 150 schools in EARCOS, the target sample size was 83 schools. The return rate of 67 schools, 45% of the population, fell beneath the target sample size, however the demographic distribution of the respondents mirrored the population of EARCOS member schools.

Overall, the data from the sample is representative of the EARCOS member schools' population. Based on demographic factors collected from the survey regarding size and proprietary status the percentages of respondents were consistent

with the EARCOS population. The most responses came from large cities with competitive markets like Tokyo, Japan, Beijing, China, and Bangkok, Thailand. However, in the category of years of continuous operation there is a small over-representation of schools in the 21-40 years of operation group and a slight under-representation of schools in the 1-20 years of operation group.

Table 3 indicates a range of locations of the respondents from around the EACOS region. The most responses came from large cities with competitive markets like Tokyo, Japan, Beijing, China, and Bangkok, Thailand.

Table 3

Frequency and Percent of Respondents from Each City

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Number of Schools in Country
Valid	Bali, Indonesia	2	3.0	3.1	3.1	15
	Bandung, Indonesia	1	1.5	1.6	4.7	15
	Bangkok, Thailand	6	9.0	9.4	14.1	20
	Beijing, China	3	4.5	4.7	18.8	33
	Bogor, Indonesia	1	1.5	1.6	20.3	15
	Cebu, Philippines	1	1.5	1.6	21.9	6
	Chiang Mai, Thailand	1	1.5	1.6	23.4	20
	Daejeon, Korea	1	1.5	1.6	25.0	16
	Guangzhou, China	1	1.5	1.6	26.6	33
	Hanoi, Vietnam	2	3.0	3.1	29.7	4
	Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	1	1.5	1.6	31.3	4
	Hokkaido, Japan	1	1.5	1.6	32.8	21
	Hong Kong, China	2	3.0	3.1	35.9	33
	Jakarta, Indonesia	2	3.0	3.1	39.1	15
	Kaohsiung, Taiwan	1	1.5	1.6	40.6	6
	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	2	3.0	3.1	43.8	8
	Kuantan, Malaysia	1	1.5	1.6	45.3	8
	Kunming, China	1	1.5	1.6	46.9	33
	Kyoto, Japan	1	1.5	1.6	48.4	21

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Number of Schools in Country
Manila, Philippines	2	3.0	3.1	51.6	6
Medan, Indonesia	1	1.5	1.6	53.1	15
Nagoya, Japan	1	1.5	1.6	54.7	21
Nanjing, China	1	1.5	1.6	56.3	33
Osaka, Japan	1	1.5	1.6	57.8	21
Pattaya, Thailand	1	1.5	1.6	59.4	20
Penang, Malaysia	1	1.5	1.6	60.9	8
Pyongtaek, Korea	1	1.5	1.6	62.5	16
Riau, Indonesia	1	1.5	1.6	64.1	15
Seoul, Korea	2	3.0	3.1	67.2	16
Shanghai, China	2	3.0	3.1	70.3	33
Shekou, China	2	3.0	3.1	73.4	33
Singapore	2	3.0	3.1	76.6	6
Surabaya, Indonesia	1	1.5	1.6	78.1	15
Suva, Fiji	1	1.5	1.6	79.7	1
Taipei, Taiwan	1	1.5	1.6	81.3	6
Tianjin, China	1	1.5	1.6	82.8	33
Tokyo, Japan	5	7.5	7.8	90.6	21
Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia	1	1.5	1.6	92.2	1
Vientiane, Laos	1	1.5	1.6	93.8	1
Xiamen, China	1	1.5	1.6	95.3	33
Yangon, Myanmar	1	1.5	1.6	96.9	4
Yokohama, Japan	2	3.0	3.1	100.0	21
Total	64	95.5	100.0		149
Missing System	3	4.5			
Total	67	100.0			

Table 4 illustrates that that a large majority of the responding schools were not-for-profit (76.6%) and about a quarter of the schools were proprietary and for-profit (23.4%). Compared with the data from the 2015-16 EARCOS directory which lists 26% of the schools as proprietary and for-profit and 74% of the schools as not-for-profit this appears to be a representative sample.

Table 4

Frequency and Percent of Not-for-Profit Schools and For-Profit Schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not for profit	49	73.1	76.6	76.6
	For profit	15	22.4	23.4	100.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	4.5		
Total		67	100.0		

To ensure that the sample was a representation of the population regarding profit vs. not for profit, I ran a binomial test. As shown in the Table 4, the observed proportion of schools in the sample that are not-for-profit (.76656 or 76.56%) is NOT significantly different than the test proportion (.7315 or 73.15%) which represents the proportion (and also percent) of schools in the population that are not-for-profit. The probability level for the test is .324; because this value is greater than .05, we conclude that the observed and test proportions are not significantly different. The sample and the population do not differ significantly regarding the percent of schools that are not-for-profit. A parallel binomial test comparing the sample and population regarding the proportion (or percent) of schools that are for-profit would yield identical results.

Table 5

Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on For-Profit Status

Table 5. Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on For-Profit Status

		Category	N	Observed Prop.	Test Prop.	Exact Sig. (1-tailed)
My school is for-profit/not-for-profit	Group 1	Not for profit	49	.7656	.7315	.324
	Group 2	For profit	15	.2344		
	Total		64	1.0000		

Table 6 indicates that 29.7% of the respondents were from schools that run an American curriculum. This is lower than the self-reported number of 34% indicated by the EARCOS 2015-16 directory. Additionally, the 46.7% of schools who responded to the survey indicating that they provide an international curriculum is a lower percentage of schools than the 58% of schools who self-reported in the EARCOS directory 2015-16.

Table 6

Frequency and Percent of Curriculum and Program Types Provided by the Schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Other (See Table 3.1)	3	4.5	4.7	4.7
	American	19	28.4	29.7	34.4
	British	2	3.0	3.1	37.5
	International	30	44.8	46.9	84.4
	American/ International	9	13.4	14.1	98.4
	British/International	1	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	4.5		
Total		67	100.0		

Table 7 identifies the frequency tables of enrollment figures of the respondents. The majority of respondents (48.4%) came from schools with 500 or fewer students. This mirrors the EARCOS member population in 2015-16, which contained 46% of schools that size. The next largest respondent group (28%) came from schools with 5001-1000 students, which also mirrors the EARCOS member schools who have 30% of their schools identified with that enrollment figure. The next four categories of respondents were 9%, 8%, 3% and 3% which are mirrored in those same categories by EARCOS member schools 8%, 8%, 4%, and 3% respectively. These numbers

illustrated that the survey sample is a strong representative sample of EARCOS member schools based on enrollment.

Table 7

Frequency and Percent of Schools in Each Enrollment Figure Category

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-500	31	46.3	48.4	48.4
	501-1000	18	26.9	28.1	76.6
	1001-1500	6	9.0	9.4	85.9
	1501-2000	5	7.5	7.8	93.8
	2001-2500	2	3.0	3.1	96.9
	2501+	2	3.0	3.1	100.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	4.5		
Total		67	100.0		

To ensure that the sample was a representation of the population, I ran an ANOVA test. Table 8 demonstrates that there is no statistical difference comparing the peak enrollment size of schools from the population and the sample.

Table 8

Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on School Population Size

What is the peak enrollment figure currently for your entire school?	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.006	.937
Within Groups	364.984	211	1.730		
Total	364.995	212			

Table 9 identifies the frequency tables of the years of operation of the respondent schools. The majority of respondents (29.7.4%) came from schools that have been open 21-30 years. This number mirrors the 2015-16 EARCOS member schools population that has 23% of its population in the same category. The respondents of the survey mirrored the EARCOS member population within 2.5% on

all categories except schools who report having been in operation for 11-20 years (12%) while EARCOS member schools identified the same years of operation at 23%.

Table 9

Frequency and Percent of Schools in Each Category of Number of Years in Operation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-10	7	10.4	10.9	10.9
	11-20	8	11.9	12.5	23.4
	21-30	19	28.4	29.7	53.1
	31-40	4	6.0	6.3	59.4
	41-50	6	9.0	9.4	68.8
	51-60	6	9.0	9.4	78.1
	61-70	6	9.0	9.4	87.5
	71-80	1	1.5	1.6	89.1
	81-90	1	1.5	1.6	90.6
	91-100	3	4.5	4.7	95.3
	100+	3	4.5	4.7	100.0
	Total		64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5		
Total		67	100.0		

To ensure that the sample was a representation of the population, I ran an ANOVA test. Table 10 demonstrates that there is no statistical difference comparing the years of operation of schools from the population and the sample.

Table 10

Binomial Test Comparing Sample and Population on Continuous Years of Operation

How many years has your school been in continuous operation?	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.550	1	7.550	1.054	.306
Within Groups	1511.643	211	7.164		
Total	1519.192	212			

Table 11 is a frequency table of the number of competitor schools that EARCOS members identified that exist in their markets for recruiting students. Fifty two and one half percent (52.5%) of all schools reporting indicate that they have at least 5 or more schools that they view as competition for recruiting students. Though 48% of schools identified having 4 or less competitors, with the majority of EARCOS schools indicating enrollments of under 1000, the existence of even one competitor school would have an impact on recruitment and enrollment of schools.

Table 11

Frequency and Percent of Number of Schools Respondent Identified as Competitors in their Market for Recruiting Students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	7.5	7.8	7.8
	2	10	14.9	15.6	23.4
	3	8	11.9	12.5	35.9
	4	8	11.9	12.5	48.4
	5	9	13.4	14.1	62.5
	6	6	9.0	9.4	71.9
	7	5	7.5	7.8	79.7
	8	2	3.0	3.1	82.8
	9	1	1.5	1.6	84.4
	10	3	4.5	4.7	89.1
	11+	7	10.4	10.9	100.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	4.5		
Total		67	100.0		

Data Analysis

Question 1. To what extent do EARCOS schools currently engage in educational marketing activities?

To address this research question I analyzed the individual item scores from the SUMAIS using the descriptive statistics of frequencies, mean, and standard

deviations. Table 12 presents the listing of mean scores and standard deviation of current marketing activities as reported by EARCOS member schools. Respondents answered by indicating their level of participation in the marketing activities by choosing the answer “1” for never, “2” for sometimes, “3” for often, and “4” for always. Thus a mean score like 3.79 would indicate the schools tend to participate in this activity almost always.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Current Use of Marketing Activities Organized from Highest to Lowest Mean

	N	Missing	Mean	SD
During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school’s strengths.	67	0	3.79	0.57
During the admissions process, we claim the faculty is a strength of the school	67	0	3.79	0.41
We provide parents direct access to administrators (such as parent coffees, special lectures, book studies, open forums, webinars, etc.)	67	0	3.45	0.78
During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school’s strengths.	67	0	3.31	0.72
Head of school meets with current faculty to understand employee satisfaction	66	1	3.14	0.74
We hold events aimed toward specific subgroups of our parent and student population who have specific concerns (such as, parent coffees, discussion groups, book groups, town hall, etc.)	67	0	2.97	0.89
Admissions director invites prospective families to apply.	66	1	2.86	1.05
During admissions process, we claim the location of the school is a strength of the school	67	0	2.84	0.95
Head of school meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction	66	1	2.73	0.87

	N	Missing	Mean	SD
During the admissions process, we provide applicants contact information of current families as resources to answer questions	67	0	2.63	1
During the admissions process, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.	67	0	2.61	1.21
Head of school meets with current students to understand student satisfaction	67	0	2.49	0.96
School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current families to understand customer perception of areas of school strength	66	1	2.41	0.93
Parent representative invites prospective families to apply.	65	2	2.4	0.77
To what extent does your school use a formal marketing plan?	67	0	2.24	1
Head of school invites prospective families to apply.	67	0	2.24	0.95
During parent coffees, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.	67	0	2.18	1.01
Division Principal invites prospective families to apply.	67	0	2.12	0.88
School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current faculty to understand employee perception of areas of school strength	67	0	2.12	0.91
School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current students to understand student perception of areas of school strength	67	0	1.96	0.84

Results demonstrate that EARCOS schools are engaged in marketing activities, however it is worth noting that the use of a formal marketing plan had a mean score of only 2.24. Only 14.9% of respondents indicated that they always had a formal marketing plan. This indicates that schools are not regularly using formal marketing plans when planning their marketing activities. The activities that had the highest

mean scores and also the lowest standard deviations were activities that align with the traditional marketing mix and act of selling.

Activities that are found in the top 1/3 of mean score responses are activities that would be associated with the traditional marketing mix and concept of product sales. The remaining 2/3 of activities were activities that focused on relationship marketing and internal marketing. The bottom two lowest scores were activities where the person in charge of marketing at the school meet with internal stakeholder and brand ambassadors, current teachers and students. The mean score of respondents for this activity with teachers was 2.12 and with students 1.96. The bottom 1/3 of mean scores were almost exclusively dealing with activities that can be defined as internal marketing. Tables 11-30 found in Appendix A provided frequencies and percent about the specific activities the respondents were asked about on the survey. It is also important to understand what the priority is for schools engaged in marketing activities.

Question 2. What are the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities?

To address this research question I analyzed the individual item scores from the SUMAIS using descriptive statistics frequencies, mean, and standard deviations. Table 13 shows the listing of mean scores and standard deviation of the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities concerning the topics of student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness. Respondents answered by indicating their level of priority by choosing the answer “1” for a very low degree of importance, “2” for a moderately low degree of importance, “3” for a moderately high degree of importance, and “4” for a very high degree of

importance. Thus a mean score like 3.64 would indicate the schools tend to prioritize the objective of student recruitment being of very high importance.

Table 13

Extent to which EARCOS Schools Desire to Achieve the Marketing Objectives of Recruitment, Retention, and Brand Awareness

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
Recruitment	64	3	3.64	.72
Retention	64	3	3.58	.61
Brand Awareness	64	3	3.33	.76

Table 13 indicates that respondents rate the recruitment of students and retention of students as a very high degree of importance when identifying objectives of their marketing activities. Brand awareness by schools is not as high a priority as recruitment and retention but still would be considered of having a moderately high degree of importance. All three topics indicate that schools make them high degrees of importance when engaging in marketing activities. Tables 32-33 present the frequency and percent of respondents who considered the three marketing objectives to be important.

Table 14 presents the respondent schools level of priority of recruiting new students. Respondents prioritize student recruitment in their desired objectives while engaging in marketing activities. Over 90% of all schools indicated an answer of “3” or “4” on the survey. The one respondent who indicated a very low priority may be assumed to have a strong market position in their city.

Table 14

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Student Recruitment as an Important Marketing Objective

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	A very low degree of importance	1	1.5	1.6
	A moderately low degree of importance	6	9.0	9.4
	A moderately high degree of importance	8	11.9	12.5
	A very high degree of importance	49	73.1	76.6
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table 15 presents the respondent schools level of priority of retaining current students. A majority of schools indicated that they give student retention a very high degree of importance when conducting market activities. The number of schools that indicated their moderate degree of importance was much larger than the previous topic of student recruitment. This practice and priority though high overall does show a greater difference with schools' priority by the number of respondents who indicated a score of "3" on this question.

Table 15

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Student Retention as an Important Marketing Objective

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	A moderately low degree of importance	4	6.0	6.3
	A moderately high degree of importance	19	28.4	29.7
	A very high degree of importance	41	61.2	64.1
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table 16 presents the respondent schools level of priority of marketing for the purpose of brand awareness. Though the answer indicated a mean score of 3.33 the distribution of scores is spread in a larger way among schools than the scores concerning student recruitment and student retention. This may indicate varying attitudes towards marketing for the purpose of brand awareness. However, it should not be discounted that a score of 3.33 does illustrate a slightly above moderate degree of importance. Schools indicated marketing as being a priority and it is important to understand what tools they use to engage in marketing activities.

Table 16

Frequency and Percent of Respondents Who Considered Brand Awareness as an Important Marketing Objective

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	A moderately low degree of importance	11	16.4	17.2
	A moderately high degree of importance	21	31.3	32.8
	A very high degree of importance	32	47.8	50.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Question 3. What marketing tools do EARCOS schools currently use in their educational marketing activities?

To address this research question I analyzed the individual item scores from the SUMAIS using the descriptive statistics of frequencies, mean, and standard deviations. Table 17 presents the descriptive statistics showing the frequency of use of various marketing tools. The response options are “1” = Never, “2” = Sometimes, “3” = Often, and “4” = Always.

The marketing tools are organized from highest mean to lowest mean. So, for example, the marketing tool with the highest mean was “school website,” with a mean score of 3.78, which is between “3” (Often) and “4” (Always), but closer to “4” (Always). Activities that are related to promotion and advertising like print advertising, promotional videos, promotional gifts, attending educational fairs and the use of Twitter all have means ranging from 2.0 to 2.78. So, these marketing tools tend to be used sometimes. While school websites, school tours, and school profiles/brochures all have means ranging from 3.36 to 3.78 indicating these are used

often. Social media such as Instagram, LinkedIn, and Pinterest, in addition to traditional local media outlets in a student's hometown have means ranging from 1.22 to 1.56 indicating they are never used.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for Frequency of Use of Various Marketing Tools from Highest Mean to Lowest Mean

	<i>N</i>	Missing	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
School Website	64	3	3.78	0.52
School Tours	64	3	3.66	0.57
School Profile/Brochure	64	3	3.36	0.78
Parent/Student Referrals	64	3	2.97	0.82
Facebook	63	4	2.81	1.15
Print Advertising	64	3	2.78	0.92
Promotional Video	63	4	2.78	1.13
Open House	64	3	2.5	1.11
Faculty Hiring Websites	64	3	2.48	1.04
Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc.)	63	4	2.44	0.82
YouTube	64	3	2.33	1.07
Relocation Agency Outreach	64	3	2.22	1.05
Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)	64	3	2.19	0.94
Local Media Outlets	64	3	2.17	0.92
Twitter	62	5	2.16	1.19

	<i>N</i>	Missing	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Corporate Human Resource Outreach	63	4	2.1	0.82
Attending Educational Fairs	64	3	2	0.93
Educational Websites	64	3	1.88	0.88
Focus Groups	64	3	1.67	0.71
Instagram	63	4	1.56	0.96
LinkedIn	61	6	1.43	0.76
Pinterest	62	5	1.23	0.64
Media Outlets in Student's Hometown	63	4	1.22	0.55

Tables A21 to A43 found in Appendix A show how frequently EARCOS schools use each type of marketing tool.

Question 4. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools' educational marketing activities towards reaching the schools' desired objectives?

The descriptive statistics for the extent to which marketing activities are perceived to be effective toward reaching marketing objectives are presented on Table 60. The scale is reversed on these scores because it was more logical for higher scores (3s and 4s) to be aligned with perceptions of greater effectiveness. The legend for these scores is as follows: 1 = very low in effectiveness, 2 = moderately low in effectiveness, 3 = moderately high in effectiveness, and 4 = very high in effectiveness. Of the three marketing objectives, the highest mean score was aligned with student retention. The mean score for this objective was, 2.90 which is between a 2 (moderately low in effectiveness) and a 3 (moderately high in effectiveness) and quite

close to 3. So, in general, the respondents perceived that marketing activities were moderately high in effectiveness for achieving the objective of student retention.

Student recruitment had the second highest mean score of 2.71 which indicates less of a perceived effectiveness than retention but it still shows a high degree of perceived effectiveness. The mean score for brand awareness was 2.65 which placed it lowest in perceived effectiveness of marketing activities reaching marketing objectives.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective Toward Reaching Marketing Objectives

	N		M	SD
	Valid	Missing		
Student Recruitment	63	4	2.71	.77
Student Retention	62	5	2.90	.76
Brand Awareness	63	4	2.65	.85

Tables 19 to 21 show the frequency and percent in each response category regarding the extent to which educational marketing activities are perceived to be effective for achieving each marketing objective. Table 19 shows that most respondents (52.4%) perceived marketing activities to be moderately high in effectiveness for achieving the objective of student recruitment. However, about a third of respondents (34.9%) perceived marketing activities to be very low or moderately low in effectiveness for achieving the objective of student recruitment. Only 12% of respondents perceived marketing activities to be highly effective for student recruitment.

Table 20 shows that most respondents (51.6%) perceived marketing activities to be moderately high in effectiveness for achieving the objective of student retention. However, about a third of respondents (37.4%) perceived marketing activities to be

very low or moderately low in effectiveness for achieving the objective of student retention. However, 21% of respondents did perceive marketing activities to be highly effective for student retention.

Table 19

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Student Recruitment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	4	6.0	6.3
	Moderately low in effectiveness	18	26.9	28.6
	Moderately high in effectiveness	33	49.3	52.4
	Very high in effectiveness	8	11.9	12.7
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table 20

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Student Retention

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	2	3.0	3.2
	Moderately low in effectiveness	15	22.4	24.2
	Moderately high in effectiveness	32	47.8	51.6
	Very high in effectiveness	13	19.4	21.0
	Total	62	92.5	100.0
Missing	System	5	7.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table 21 shows that 41.3% of respondents perceived marketing activities to be moderately high in effectiveness for achieving the objective of brand awareness. A

larger percentage of respondents (42.8%) perceived marketing activities to be very low or moderately low in effectiveness for achieving the objective of brand awareness. Only 15.9% of respondents perceived marketing activities to be highly effective for student recruitment.

Table 21

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category Regarding the Extent to which Educational Marketing Activities Are Perceived to be Effective for Promoting Brand Awareness

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	5	7.5	7.9
	Moderately low in effectiveness	22	32.8	34.9
	Moderately high in effectiveness	26	38.8	41.3
	Very high in effectiveness	10	14.9	15.9
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Question 5. What is the perceived effectiveness of EARCOS schools’ use of marketing tools towards reaching their schools’ desired objectives?

These data were more logically reverse scored so that higher scores aligned with greater perceived effectiveness, the variables as follows: 1 = very low in effectiveness, 2 = moderately low in effectiveness, 3 = moderately high in effectiveness, and 4 = very high in effectiveness. The marketing tool with the highest perceived effectiveness was school tours, with a mean of 3.69, which is between 3 (moderately high in effectiveness) and 4 (very high in effectiveness), but closer to 4. The perceived effectiveness of using school website (3.37) and parent/student referrals (3.32) were the next two highest in perceived effectiveness in reaching marketing objectives. Social media such as Instagram, LinkedIn, Twitter, and Pintrest,

in addition to traditional local media outlets in a student's hometown have means ranging from 1.95 to 2.38 indicating a low to very low level of perceived effectiveness in reaching marketing objectives.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools Organized from Highest Mean to Lowest Mean

	<i>N</i>	Missing	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
School Tours	62	5	3.69	0.5
School Website	63	4	3.37	0.79
Parent/student Referrals	60	7	3.32	0.81
Open House	48	19	2.98	0.91
Promotional Video	50	17	2.84	0.68
Facebook	48	19	2.79	0.85
School Profile/Brochure	61	6	2.64	0.8
Corporate Human Resource Outreach	40	27	2.45	0.9
Relocation Agency Outreach	47	20	2.43	0.99
Pinterest	8	59	2.38	0.74
Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc.)	51	16	2.31	0.95
YouTube	44	23	2.3	0.93
Faculty Hiring Websites	50	17	2.28	1.01
Print Advertising	61	6	2.26	0.79
Twitter	34	33	2.24	0.78

	<i>N</i>	Missing	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Instagram	18	49	2	0.69
Media Outlets in Student's Hometown	13	54	2	0.82
Focus Groups	35	32	2	0.8
Local Media Outlets	43	24	1.95	0.87
Attending Educational Fairs	39	28	1.77	0.93
Educational Websites	39	28	1.67	0.77
Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)	50	17	1.66	0.66

Appendix A includes Tables A45 to A65, which present the frequencies and percent in each response category for the 22 marketing tools.

Question 6. Is there any significant difference in use of marketing activities and tools in relation to: a) size of school, b) years of operation, c) location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

Are marketing activities linked to school size and years of operation?

I used multivariate regression to examine the link between marketing activities and school size and years in operation. The predictors were school size and years of operation. The outcome variables were the 7 marketing activities in Part 2, Question 2 and the 12 marketing activities in Part 2, Question 3. Table 23 shows that school size (Pillai's trace = .43, $p = ns$) and years in operation (Pillai's trace = .37, $p = ns$) were not significant predictors of the marketing activities, taken as a group.

Table 23

Results of the Multivariate Regression of Marketing Activities on School Size and Years in Operation

Effect		Value	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.98	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.02	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	51.97	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	51.97	.000
School Size	Pillai's Trace	.43	.146
	Wilks' Lambda	.57	.146
	Hotelling's Trace	.74	.146
	Roy's Largest Root	.74	.146
Years in Operation	Pillai's Trace	.37	.341
	Wilks' Lambda	.63	.341
	Hotelling's Trace	.58	.341
	Roy's Largest Root	.58	.341

Are marketing activities linked to location in the six largest cities in EARCOS?

Table 24 shows that there were 17 schools who responded from the six largest cities of Bangkok, Beijing, Hong Kong, Seoul, Shanghai, and Singapore. And, there were 50 schools who responded from all the other cities in the EARCOS region.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics for the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All others	50	74.6	74.6	74.6
	Six largest cities	17	25.4	25.4	100.0
	Total	67	100.0	100.0	

Table 25 shows that there were not differences in use of marketing activities for the schools in the six largest cities versus all other cities. The outcome variables for this analysis were the 7 items in Part 2, Question 2, and the 12 items in Part 2,

Question 3. It should be noted that due to missing data on some variables, the sample size for this analysis was only 62 schools. The result could be a type 2 error due to low power caused by the small sample size.

Table 25

Multivariate Test of the Difference Between Schools in the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on Use of Marketing Activities

Effect		Value	<i>p</i>
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.994	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.006	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	164.478	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	164.478	.000
Six Largest Cities Versus All Others	Pillai's Trace	.414	.114
	Wilks' Lambda	.586	.114
	Hotelling's Trace	.705	.114
	Roy's Largest Root	.705	.114

Are marketing tools linked to school size and years of operation?

For this analysis, I regressed the 23 marketing tools in section 3, Question 1 on school size and years in operation. As shown on Table 26, school size (Pillai's trace = .48, *p* = ns) and years in operation (Pillai's trace = .40, *p* = ns) were not significant predictors of the use of marketing tools.

Table 26

Results of the Multivariate Regression of Marketing Tools on School Size and Years in Operation

Effect		Value	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.95	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.05	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	17.68	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	17.68	.000
School size	Pillai's Trace	.48	.216
	Wilks' Lambda	.52	.216
	Hotelling's Trace	.93	.216
	Roy's Largest Root	.93	.216
Years in Operation	Pillai's Trace	.40	.549
	Wilks' Lambda	.60	.549
	Hotelling's Trace	.66	.549
	Roy's Largest Root	.66	.549

Are marketing tools linked to location in the six largest cities in EARCOS?

Table 27 pertains to the link between city size and use of 23 marketing tools. Table 27 shows that there were no differences between responses from the six largest cities versus all other cities. It should also be noted that due to missing data on some variables, the sample size for this analysis was only 58 schools. The result could be a type 2 error due to low power caused by the small sample size.

Table 27

Multivariate Test of the Difference Between Schools in the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on Use of Marketing Tools

Effect		Value	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.99	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.01	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	81.82	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	81.82	.000
Six Largest Cities Versus All Others	Pillai's Trace	.52	.105
	Wilks' Lambda	.48	.105
	Hotelling's Trace	1.08	.105
	Roy's Largest Root	1.08	.105

Question 7. Is there any significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to: a) size of school, b) years of operation, or c) location in six largest cities in EARCOS?

What is the link between perceived effectiveness of marketing activities and school size and years in operation?

I regressed effectiveness of marketing activities (the three variables from Part 2, Question 5) on school size and years in operation. The results are presented in Table 28, which shows a significant multivariate effect associated with school size (Pillai's Trace = .13, $p < .04$). Whenever a predictor has a significant multivariate effect, this allows the analyst to take a closer look at the univariate effects. However, none of the univariate effects for school size were significant as shown in Table 28. The effect of years in operation was not significant (Pillai's trace = .10, $p = ns$).

Table 28

Results of the Multivariate Regression of the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities on School Size and Years in Operation

Effect		Value	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.85	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.15	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	5.52	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	5.52	.000
School size	Pillai's Trace	.13	.04
	Wilks' Lambda	.87	.04
	Hotelling's Trace	.15	.04
	Roy's Largest Root	.15	.04
Years in Operation	Pillai's Trace	.10	.10
	Wilks' Lambda	.90	.10
	Hotelling's Trace	.12	.10
	Roy's Largest Root	.12	.10

Table 29

Univariate Effects of the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools on School Size

Source	Dependent Variable	df	F	Sig.
School Size	Student Recruitment	1	.05	.816
	Student Retention	1	1.65	.204
	Brand Awareness	1	2.36	.130

What is the link between perceived effectiveness of marketing activities and location in the six largest cities?

To address this research question I analyzed the individual item scores from the SUMAIS using descriptive statistics mean and standard deviations. Table 30 shows the listing of mean scores and standard deviation of the desired objectives of EARCOS schools engaging in educational marketing activities concerning the topics of student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness in comparison to

schools located in the six largest cities in EARCOS. Respondents answered by indicating their level of priority by choosing the answer “1” for a very low degree of importance, “2” for a moderately low degree of importance, “3” for a moderately high degree of importance, and “4” for a very high degree of importance. The schools in the six largest cities scored a higher mean score across all three categories of student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness in comparison to the rest of the region. The means for the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities for respondents from the six largest cities and all other cities are presented in Table 29.

Table 30

Descriptive Statistics for Respondents from the Six Largest Cities Versus All Other Cities on the Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities

Six Largest Cities Versus All Others		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Student Recruitment	All others	2.62	.72	45
	Six largest cities	2.94	.90	17
	Total	2.71	.78	62
Student Retention	All others	2.87	.79	45
	Six largest cities	3.00	.71	17
	Total	2.90	.76	62
Brand Awareness	All others	2.49	.82	45
	Six largest cities	3.06	.83	17
	Total	2.65	.85	62

There are three different marketing activities, student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness which necessitated using the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests of a single hypothesis. This created a new alpha criterion by dividing alpha by three ($.05/3 = .017$). Thus, the new criterion for a significant effect was .017. The results of the three ANOVA tests are presented on Table 31. City size was not linked to perceived effectiveness of marketing activities to achieve Student

Recruitment or Student Retention, but city size was linked to perceived effectiveness of marketing activities to promote brand awareness. The respondents from the six largest cities perceived marketing activities were more effective for promoting brand awareness than did the respondents from the other cities. The mean score on this variable was 3.06 for respondents from the six largest cities, which corresponds to a perception that marketing activities are “often” effective for promoting brand awareness. In contrast, for the other cities, the mean score was 2.49, which translates as respondents tending to perceive marketing activities as promoting brand awareness “sometimes” or “often.”

Table 31

ANOVA Results for the Links Between City Size and the perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Activities

Source	Outcome Variable	df	F	Sig.
Six Largest Cities Versus All Others	Student Recruitment	1	2.120	.151
	Student Retention	1	.374	.543
	Brand Awareness	1	5.984	.017*

What is the link between perceived effectiveness of marketing tools and school size and years in operation?

Conducting a multivariate analysis was very difficult because the sample size of respondents who had valid data for all 22 outcome variables was small ($n = 3$). I addressed the problem of small sample size by conducting the analyses for each marketing tool separately, as 22 univariate tests. This approach maximized the sample sizes for each analysis and maximized power. By running multiple comparisons the Bonferroni correction was used to avoid the errors that result from error in sampling so many individual tests. I want to keep the alpha level at .05 and by dividing by the

number of tests $.05/22=.002$ as the new alpha level. This is a very low alpha level and a difficult criterion to reach. Tables 96 to 117 (Appendix A) show that none of the tests were significant at the alpha level of $.002$.

What is the link between perceived effectiveness of marketing tools and location in the six largest cities?

Table 32 shows the ANOVA results of the link between city size and perceived effectiveness of marketing tools. A series of univariate ANOVAS tests were conducted instead of a MANOVA because there were so many missing data. For example, because only eight schools used Pinterest, the remaining 59 schools had missing data on this variable. So, these 59 schools would have been eliminated from a multivariate analysis. Instead, the Bonferroni adjustment was used to control for type 1 error. 22 tests were conducted. Thus, the Bonferroni adjustment is $\alpha/\text{number of tests}$ or $.05/22 = .0023$. As shown on Table 117 none of the effects was significant.

Table 32

ANOVA Results of the Link Between City Size and Perceived Effectiveness of Marketing Tools

		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
School Tours	Between Groups	1	2.94	.091
	Within Groups	60		
	Total	61		
Open House	Between Groups	1	2.39	.129
	Within Groups	46		
	Total	47		
Print Advertising	Between Groups	1	.83	.365
	Within Groups	59		
	Total	60		
School	Between	1	1.93	.170

		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Profile/Brochure	Groups			
	Within Groups	59		
	Total	60		
School Website	Between Groups	1	1.89	.174
	Within Groups	61		
	Total	62		
Facebook	Between Groups	1	1.19	.280
	Within Groups	46		
	Total	47		
Twitter	Between Groups	1	.29	.596
	Within Groups	32		
	Total	33		
Instagram	Between Groups	1	.46	.506
	Within Groups	16		
	Total	17		
Pinterest	Between Groups	1	2.21	.188
	Within Groups	6		
	Total	7		
YouTube	Between Groups	1	1.51	.226
	Within Groups	42		
	Total	43		
Promotional Video	Between Groups	1	.40	.531
	Within Groups	48		
	Total	49		
Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc.)	Between Groups	1	.28	.600
	Within Groups	49		
	Total	50		
Parent/student Referrals	Between Groups	1	4.13	.047
	Within Groups	58		
	Total	59		

		<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Corporate Human Resource Outreach	Between Groups	1	1.40	.245
	Within Groups	38		
	Total	39		
Relocation Agency Outreach	Between Groups	1	.98	.329
	Within Groups	45		
	Total	46		
Media Outlets in Student's Hometown	Between Groups	1	2.42	.148
	Within Groups	11		
	Total	12		
Attending Educational Fairs	Between Groups	1	2.03	.163
	Within Groups	37		
	Total	38		
Educational Websites	Between Groups	1	.08	.774
	Within Groups	37		
	Total	38		
Faculty Hiring Websites	Between Groups	1	.35	.555
	Within Groups	48		
	Total	49		
Focus Groups	Between Groups	1	.00	1.000
	Within Groups	33		
	Total	34		
Local Media Outlets	Between Groups	1	.37	.547
	Within Groups	41		
	Total	42		
Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)	Between Groups	1	.13	.720
	Within Groups	48		
	Total	49		

I ran an additional ANOVA to test the hypothesis that the respondents from the six largest cities were more likely to use a formal marketing plan. As shown in Tables 33 and 34 the hypothesis was supported. Respondents in the six largest cities' mean response was 2.71 which is between 2, "sometimes," and 3, "often," but closer to 3, "often." And, the mean response for respondents from all other cities was 2.08 which is close to "sometimes."

Table 33

Descriptive Statistics for the Answer to the Question: To What Extent Does Your School Use a Formal Marketing Plan?

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
All others	50	2.08	.92
Six largest cities	17	2.71	1.10
Total	67	2.24	1.00

Table 34

ANOVA Results of the Link Between City Size and the Extent to Which the School Uses a Formal Marketing Plan

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1	5.277	.025
Within Groups	65		
Total	66		

Summary

International schools located in East Asia conduct a variety of marketing activities and use a variety of marketing tools in an effort to accomplish desired school objectives. The perceived effectiveness to reach organization objectives varied by marketing activities but not in the use of marketing tools.

Schools identified that they most engage in marketing activities that are associated with the traditional marketing mix and act of selling. The act of selling using the traditional marketing mix is associated with objective of student recruitment. The two marketing activities reported as being used the least by schools were activities that focused on meeting with school stakeholders, both students and parents. Meeting with stakeholders are acts associated with the objectives of student retention and brand awareness. The marketing activities that scored the lowest are activities related to internal marketing which is also associated with the objectives of student retention and brand awareness.

The three marketing objectives identified by EARCOS schools as being most important were student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness. It is congruent that schools, which used marketing activities related to selling, also had a higher indication of student recruitment as a desired objective. Though the objective of student retention may have scored slightly below student recruitment by schools as a desired objective, a larger percent of schools indicated that student retention was of moderately high degree and a very high degree of importance than that of student recruitment. Brand awareness scored lower than the other two objectives, which is congruent with the schools that indicated a low use of marketing activities associated with brand awareness.

There were 22 marketing tools schools identified as using to achieve their desired objectives. Three tools ranked much higher than all others, school website, school tours, and school profile/brochure. These tools can be used to achieve the marketing objectives of student recruitment and brand awareness, however based on the reported marketing activities and reported marketing objectives, it would appear

these three tools were used in the aim of student recruitment and selling, rather than building brand awareness.

Schools perceived the effectiveness of their marketing tools to be the greatest in the area of student retention and less so with student recruitment and brand awareness. Though student recruitment and brand awareness scored similar means, the percentage of schools who claimed their tools were moderately and very high in effectiveness in reaching their goals regarding recruitment was much higher than brand awareness.

There were 22 marketing tools schools used that contributed to their perceived effectiveness in reaching schools' desired marketing objectives. The three most indicated were school tours, school website, and parent/student referrals. School profile/brochure, which was one of the most used marketing tools by schools was seen less effective than many other tools in achieving desired objectives. Additionally, print advertising indicated as one of the top six marketing tools used by schools was identified in the bottom 1/3 of tools seen as effective in reaching schools' desired objectives.

There was no significant difference in the use of marketing activities and marketing tools based on the size of school, the age of the institution or if it was located in one of the six largest cities in EARCOS. Additionally, there was no significant difference in perceived effectiveness of marketing activities and tools in relation to the size of a school and the age of the institution. However, respondents from the six largest cities perceived marketing activities were more effective for promoting brand awareness than respondents from other cities. Finally, I ran an additional ANOVA to test the hypothesis that respondents from the six largest cities

were more likely to use formal marketing plans than other cities in EARCOS and it proved to be true.

Chapter 5

Discussions

The purpose of this study was to capture knowledge about the marketing activities and tools used by international schools located in the East Asia region and the perceived effectiveness of the activities and tools in accomplishing desired school objectives as indicated by school leadership. The findings from this research will be added to the existing but sparse body of research that addresses the marketing practices of international schools. Demographic data, identified marketing practices, and the perceived effectiveness of the marketing practices was gathered from the 150 international schools in East Asia who are members of the East Asia Region Council of Overseas Schools (EARCOS). These data provide valuable information to help schools identify their current practices, to compare their own practices to practices of other schools in a competitive market, and to implement changes to better position their own school in the future marketplace.

The literature on international education talks about the increase in competition for schools and the need to secure a strong position in the marketplace (Bunnell, 2005; Foskett, 2002; Oplatka, 2002, 2004, 2007; Oplatka and Brown, 2006). In the last decade of the 20th century there was an increase in competition in educational markets around the world. Around the world national school systems changed practices to address reform movement's insistence on competition, choice, and decentralization (Ball, 2000). For example, in the United Kingdom the introduction of open enrollment and per-capita (per student) funding established quasi-markets within the educational system (Maguire, Ball & McRae, 2001). Poetter and Knight-Abowitz (2001) report that in the United States these choices include: public schools (including magnet schools), alternative schools, charter schools,

private schools, and religious schools. In Croatia, drastic changes in the socio-economic and political landscape post communism in the late 1990s allowed for the creation of private high schools in reaction to the state-sponsored high schools (Ozretic-Dosen and Martinovic, 2003). In Israel, school choice took root in the late 1990s when public schools that previously only competed against religious-based private schools now had to compete against other public schools (Oplatka, 2007). Taiwan has dealt with the issue (Li & Hung, 2008), India (Gauatm, 2011) and even the tiny country of Mauritius has seen the introduction of private secondary schools change the competitive landscape for public schools (Ramseeok-Munhurrun, Naidoo, Bhiwajee & Beejmohun, 2010). Where schools in the past did not have to rely on marketing to attract students or funding, this is no longer the case. Increased competition in current markets for international education warrants a better understanding of how marketing can influence schools' success.

Limitations to the Study

The literature addressing the practice of marketing using numerous strategies is well covered in the field of for-profit businesses. The literature concerning marketing practices of volunteer non-profit organizations has grown in the past two decades with a better understanding of the concept of service marketing (Esteban et al, 2002; Cervera, Molla, & Sanchez, 2001; Shoham et al, 2006, Mortland, 2010). What is noteworthy in the research is the omission of education as a service marketing industry within the realm of non-profit organizations. Education Marketing, outside of Service Marketing, is a field studied quite heavily since the late 1990s due to changes in national policies around the world that have created private competition for publically funded secondary schools through the concept of school choice.

Though the studies cited in chapter 2 are predominately qualitative in nature, meant to

gauge the perceptions of administrators and teachers inquiring into their feelings about the concept of marketing, few studies cited previously examine the current marketing practices of secondary schools and their effectiveness in reaching the institutional goals of attracting new students, retaining current students or promoting brand awareness. The demographic of international schools is almost completely absent in this literature except for the lone study by Bunnell in 2003. Bunnell's study, though an important foundational piece in the study of marketing practices in international schools, is very narrow in scope as it covers only 34 schools scattered across 22 different countries. The study, aimed to investigate the nature and extent of marketing activities in international schools, spent as much time trying to identify and qualify the definition of international schools as a demographic as it did identifying the marketing practices of a mere 34 schools. The vast difference in size of the global international school community at the time of Bunnell's study and the relative lack of marketplace competition compared to the current environment necessitates a reexamination of the marketing practices and perceived effectiveness of those practices.

Though EARCOS is one of nine regional organizations operating around the globe, there has been no research done at the regional organizational level to help establish what are the marketing practices of international schools. The data gathered in this study highlighted the current marketing activities, marketing goals and perceived effectiveness in reaching the marketing objectives of international schools. Although marketing literature and studies researching practices in secondary schools around the world exist (Optlatka, 2007; Li and Hung, 2008; Gauatm, 2011; Ramseeok-Munhurrun, Naidoo, Bhiwajee, & Beejmohun, 2010), there is scant

literature pertaining specifically to international schools, a branch of primary and secondary education that has been in existence for over 100 years.

Findings

Leaders of EARCOS schools ranked three major marketing objectives and then self-reported the perceived effectiveness of reaching these goals through the use of specified activities and tools. The significant findings are that the most used tools and activities tend to fall low in perceived effectiveness in reaching their stated marketing goals. Additionally, the lesser used activities and tools tended to rank high in self-reported effectiveness in reaching stated marketing goals. Finally, the tools and activities that ranked higher in perceived success are associated with relationship marketing and internal marketing while the higher-used but less-effective are associated with the traditional concepts and activities surrounding the narrow concept of buying and selling. Thus, their actions show that the activities are off base to meet their objectives, the tools are off base to maximize the activity, so consequently there is a low return on desired objectives. These results are in line with the research surrounding nonprofit organizations (NPO). In 1979, Kotler wrote specifically how a nonprofit organization could introduce marketing to their organization. Almost 40 years later NPOs have remained skeptical about adopting marketing philosophies and practices like relationship and internal marketing (Modi and Mishra, 2010). NPOs are finding it difficult to move through the various eras of marketing that focus on product to the more sophisticated understanding of market orientation (Lee and Markham, 2015). This is because NPOs continue to have a limited understanding and knowledge in which to adopt marketing practices like relationship and internal marketing (Rey, Alvarez, & Acebron, 2013). Educational organizations, specifically schools in the EARCOS region, appear to mirror this trend.

The schools in the EARCOS regions identified their marketing objectives as being student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness. Student recruitment scored highest relative of the three objectives (3.64): higher than retention (3.58) and much higher than brand awareness (3.33). It should be noted that all three scored high enough to be considered having a moderately to a very high degree of importance. Simply, schools valued all three as important. Though recruitment had a higher “very high degree” of importance rating over retention, retention had a higher combined “moderately high degree” to “very high degree” rating. Both of these issues, unsurprisingly, were important to schools. Brand awareness showed the greatest spread in responses from schools indicating varied level of attitude towards the topic. Though brand awareness scored lower than the other two it should not be discounted that a mean score of 3.33 shows a moderately high degree of importance. On a whole these results present that schools do value the marketing objectives of educational marketing. It is very interesting to note that of the respondent schools who self-report the high degree of importance of these marketing objectives only 15% of them identify having a formal marketing plan. This is consistent with the work of Oplatka and Brown (2004) that indicated educational institutions neglect marketing orientations in part because educators perceive marketing to be incompatible with the moral value and idealism of education.

EARCOS schools identified a high level of importance to reach marketing goals but what activities did they employ to reach these objectives? Activities with the highest mean scores and lowest standard deviations are activities associated with traditional buying and selling activities: telling parents about the school’s strengths (3.79), claiming the faculty is a strength (3.79). Activities that scored a mean in the top 1/3 can be considered focusing on the traditional marketing mix of buying and

selling (Keith, 1960; Kotler & Levy, 1969). The bottom 2/3 of marketing activities with lower mean scores were activities that can be associated with the concept of relationship marketing and internal marketing (Kerin, Hartley, & Rudelius, 2007): school personnel in charge of marketing meets with current students (1.96), school personnel in charge of marketing meets with current faculty (2.12) holding parent coffees (2.18), parent representatives encourage prospective families to apply (2.4). The lowest mean score for all the marketing activities was having a person in charge of marketing meet with internal stakeholders, brand ambassadors, current teachers and students, an activity that is exclusively internal marketing. This may be explained as schools either don't have a person in charge of marketing or they do and they don't value internal marketing. Since the early 1990's the literature has suggested that marketing has been the responsibility of the principal alone. In James' and Phillips' 1995 study, none of the schools researched had anyone but the principal as the lead marketer. As principals' job descriptions grow larger and larger, it is unrealistic to ask them to take on yet another role, and even less realistic to ask them to take on a role for which they are not trained nor have the time to accomplish. Tristan Bunnell, one of the few researchers to tackle this subject in international schools, found that of the 34 international schools he investigated in 22 countries, 33% of those responsible for marketing are current school heads, 41% have no previous PR or marketing experience, 47% have no formal marketing qualifications, and 47% are the first person in their school to ever do the job (Bunnell, 2003). It appears that EARCOS schools show similar attitudes towards a schoolwide marketing leader focusing on the activities associated with relationship marketing. This represent a lost opportunity for EARCOS schools to reach desired objectives of student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness.

Schools indicate a high level of interest in marketing objectives, but the marketing activities they choose to pursue have shown a traditional view that does not leverage the modern concepts of relationship marketing and internal marketing. Are these activities supported by the proper marketing tools?

EARCOS schools have indicated that the three most used tools determined by mean score were using websites (3.78), school tours (3.66), and making brochures (3.36). All of these tools can be defined in the marketing mix of buying and selling. The next four highest tools used were promotion video, Facebook, print advertising and parent/student referral. These tools are heavily skewed towards the traditional understanding of buying and selling. The relationship and internal marketing tools in the form of open house (2.5), hosting events (2.44), reaching out to stakeholders and holding focus group (1.67) all ranked much lower than the selling tools. These relational marketing activities can work towards achieving all three marketing objectives but were utilized much less. It is not surprising, based on the activities that EARCOS schools identified as being most used, that the tools implemented during these activities focused on buying and selling. It is important to note that the tools most associated with relationship and internal marketing were found to be the least used as identified by EARCOS schools. This is not a surprising finding as international school practices parallel current practices in the greater NPO arena. NPOs are hesitant to adopt modern marketing techniques like relationship and internal as they are perceived as antithetical to the traditional concept of marketing and business (Andreasen, 2012). The current research about these techniques is geared towards for-profit companies and only 15% of the market orientation literature covers the practices of NPOs (Chad, Kyriazos, & Motion, 2013). Schools and NPOs alike

operate in fields that offers little research to serve as guidance towards future behaviors.

EARCOS schools indicate a high interest in marketing objectives and implement marketing activities and marketing tools that focus on narrow concepts of marketing, the act of buying and selling. Schools reported that the perceived effectiveness of reaching marketing goals to be lower than the reported degree of importance. Respondents indicated perceived effectiveness of marketing activities to reach marketing objectives was low. Bunnell's (2003) work indicated the self-reported level of importance of marketing objectives for schools to be on a scale of primary, secondary, fairly important, and minor. Of the three major objectives EARCOS schools ranked, Bunnell's European schools indicated activities surrounding Recruitment and Brand Awareness were considered primary while Student Retention was found in the lower category of fairly important. EARCOS schools scored the objectives of student retention (2.90) followed by student recruitment (2.71) and brand awareness (2.65). It is interesting to note that student recruitment scored higher as an important marketing objective but was perceived to be less effective than student retention. All three of these objectives scored high (3.33 or higher) as being important but scored lower (2.9 or lower) in perceived effectiveness. Simply, schools place great value on these marketing objectives but indicate less-than-great effectiveness. Previous studies and literature did not indicate the perceived level of effectiveness of these activities in reaching goals, only studying the activities employed by schools. Furthermore, research surrounding the evolution of marketing activities indicates that the activities related to buying and selling tend to be found in the early stages of marketing evolution (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969). Since EARCOS schools most-used marketing activities focus on the concept of buying and

selling, it appears that they are engaging in the wrong activities. It is not surprising to find that the perceived effectiveness of marketing tools towards reaching marketing goals was similar.

EARCOS schools reported their level of usage of 23 marketing tools. It can be assumed that if a school chooses to engage in using a tool that they assume the tool will help bring about intended success. However, of the 23 marketing tools reported to be used by schools that were perceived to be most effective were actually the least used tools by schools, while the most frequently used tools were self-reported as being less effective. These low ranking in usage but high ranking in perceived effectiveness are tools associated with relationship and internal marketing and less towards buying and selling. Ten of the 23 tools had a higher mean score of perceived effectiveness than usage, meaning schools are able to identify effective practices but use them less. The tools that had the smallest change from frequency of usage to perceived effectiveness came from activities associated with selling. While the greatest change in rankings (minus Pinterest with an unusually small sample size of 6 schools) came from HR outreach, media in hometown, open house, and Instagram, all activities associated with relationship and internal marketing. It is interesting to note that tools with the highest rate of perceived effectiveness are generally considered low cost and high human interaction while the tools reported to have a lower perceived effectiveness are more expensive tools associated with advertising or the traditional act of buying and selling. Schools show an immature understanding of marketing activities and marketing tools by illustrating behaviors associated with Product Orientation and Promotion Orientation (Keith, 1960; Kotler and Levy, 1969) both associated with early eras of marketing even though they self-report that they have high interest in meeting marketing objectives. Simply, the least used activities and

tools, which are related to relationship and internal marketing, are self-reported as being the most effective in reaching desired marketing goals. Furthermore, because EARCOS schools illustrate a stunted and immature view of the process they don't have formal marketing plans. Their actions show that the activities are off base to meet their objectives, the tools are off base to maximize the activity, and consequently there is a low return on desired objectives. Bunnell (2003) noted that in his study 41% of respondents had no previous marketing experience and 47% had no formal marketing qualifications showing a lack of experience in the field. It appears by the behavior of EARCOS schools it would be interesting to note what experience or training, if any, school marketing leaders possess.

In a hyper competitive environment, it is important for schools to understand what strengths and advantages they have as an institution. To gain a competitive edge in the market, is it better for a school to be large or to have many years of operation under their belt? Are there differences in behavior of schools in the EARCOS region based on the relative size and age of the institution in the marketing activities, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of both?

The results of the SUMAIS indicate that size of the school and the age of the school offer no significant difference in the marketing activities that schools conduct nor the marketing tools used in those activities. Schools appear to behave in very similar ways and there is no difference in this behavior based on age or size of the school. Big schools, small schools, old schools, and recent schools alike participate in marketing in very similar ways and report a similar level of perceived effectiveness. This is new information as the only other study related to international schools looked at a broad demographic of schools in Europe and did not disaggregate the data about marketing activities based on school size (Bunnell, 2003).

Though as a region there appears to be no difference in practices among schools, this study analyzed the results of schools in the 6 biggest markets in EARCOS: Bangkok, Tokyo, Beijing, Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Singapore. The results showed that compared to the other schools in the region as a group, these six cities did not conduct marketing activities or use marketing tools any differently. The behavior was consistent regardless of the location. A test was run on each individual marketing tool to see if there was a difference in the specific tool used and the location of the school in the “big six cities” or not. The results again showed there was no significant difference. Schools have similar marketing objectives and participate in similar marketing activities regardless of the size of the market.

The age of the school showed no significance nor the size of the school. The only variation that illustrated that the location of the school in a large city made a difference was in the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities in achieving the goal of brand awareness. In competitive markets with schools marketing themselves in a crowded field, schools in the big six cities perceived a different level of effectiveness in this area. This indicates a higher level of awareness of educational marketing by schools in the large 6 cities. As stated before 14.9% of respondents indicated they were a school that had a formal marketing plan. A final ANOVA was conducted to see if the schools in the 6 largest cities are more likely to have a formal marketing plan than schools in the EARCOS region in other cities. The results indicated that schools located in large cities scored a mean of 2.71 which is closer to “often” than all other schools that scored 2.08 which is closer to “sometimes” when answering the question of using a formal marketing plan.

Educators show low level of understanding of the philosophy of marketing because their choices in use of marketing activities and marketing tools is affirmed by their low level of perceived effectiveness due in part because they focus on buying and selling and not the service orientation of relationship and internal marketing. This behavior is consistent with volunteer nonprofit organizations not fully embracing marketing orientation like profit minded organizations (Kotler, 1969; Cervera, Molla, & Sanchez, 2001; Esteban, Á, Millán, Á, Molina, A., & Martín-Consuegra, D., 2002; Arnett, Wittman, and Wilson, 2003; Shalom, 2006). These findings are not terrible news for schools because the results of this study show schools are all marketing poorly across EARCOS. However, if a school wants to leverage success in the marketplace by increasing the effectiveness of reaching their goals they should look to the more self-reported successful practices that fall under relationship and internal marketing. This work supports the findings of Bunnell (2005), Oplatka, Brown & Foskett (2002), Cuthbert (2010), James & Phillips (1995), and Schuller & Chalupsky (2011) that concluded educators have a misunderstanding of marketing philosophy and successful practices. This has been evident since the late 1990s and it appears that it is consistent in the EARCOS region. Simply, in EARCOS, school size, school age, and school location didn't give any school a competitive marketing advantage as they all appear to market in the same bad way.

Recommendation for Practice

The findings of this study offer a number of areas that would relate directly to practice to help EARCOS schools most effectively use marketing activities and tools to be successful in reaching their greater marketing objectives.

1. The educational marketplace in the EARCOS region is competitive. Schools who engage in marketing need to reassess their practices and goals. The

concept of student recruitment is an easy objective for a school to set, as students equal tuition and tuition equals revenue. For zero sum budgeting that exists at many schools, this revenue stream is important. However, what is the cost of losing students and having to recruit new ones to take their places?

Student retention may be an area for growth that schools should look into.

Relationship marketing and internal marketing are geared towards developing stronger bonds with current customers. The results of this study indicate that schools identify these practices as being effective but not used as frequently as other marketing practices. Being intentional about retention would help schools keep a strong student and tuition base that is the foundation for fiscal health. It is a recommendation for practitioners to create focus groups to better understand the current customer base and to actively follow up with families who leave the school. To gather data about both these groups will better inform current and future practices.

2. In addition to gathering data on families, an internal audit of a school's relationship and internal marketing would help isolate current successful practices and establish a baseline from which to grow related marketing practices geared towards student recruitment and retention.
3. To grow internal and relationship marketing especially with an aim towards student retention, schools need to educate their internal stakeholders towards the purpose of these marketing activities. Changing the traditional mindset about the purpose and application of educational marketing would help a school move towards stronger marketing activities. Schools need to educate stakeholders about the evolution of marketing to change internal perceptions and break the selling mindset. To create schoolwide buy in with stakeholders,

avoid framing marketing as selling; instead, promote the evolution of marketing to be customer-experience focused. Educate the educators.

Recommendations for Future Study

The findings of this study offer a number of areas that would be important to study which may help EARCOS schools and international schools around the world most effectively use marketing activities and tools to be successful in reaching their greater marketing objectives.

1. There are nine major regional organizations in the world that represent hundreds of international schools. This study presented the schools using marketing activities and tools in the EARCOS region, but what about other regions? Does being in Europe, South America, Africa, or Mid East affect how they conduct marketing practices? Are the attitudes similar?
2. Do regional differences affect how successful relationship marketing and internal marketing activities can be? Is one region using best practices more than other regions? Does location affect practice?
3. Why don't many schools have formal marketing plans? How many schools have a position in charge of marketing for the school? Is that person professionally trained for the role or does s/he have an education background and was placed in the role? What do the schools that have marketing plans perceive as effective towards reaching institutional marketing goals? Do they rank higher in student recruitment, student retention, and brand awareness? Are there people with marketing expertise that know the evolution of marketing in those positions?
4. How do schools approach internal marketing of stakeholders who belong to different demographic groups? What are the marketing strategies and how are

they customized to reach different stakeholders (i.e. differing passport holders, teachers vs. parents)?

5. Does the status of a school being proprietary or non-proprietary make a significant difference in the school's marketing objectives, marketing activities and use of marketing tools?
6. It would be helpful to investigate a set of case studies on schools that are identified as "lighthouse organizations", those having highly effective marketing plans, to better understand the goals, activities, and tools that have been implemented.
7. Having a full-time staff member in charge of marketing may be difficult financially for a medium or small sized school. It would be beneficial if regional organizations created strands of marketing education for administrators in their workshops and annual meetings. Additionally, higher education should place an importance in school leadership training around the topic of marketing in their graduate school programs.

Final Reflection

Many schools are faced with competition in their marketplace in forms of independent, self-directed education, online alternatives, or the traditional rival school down the street. Although further research is necessary to improve the marketing activities of international schools, this study can serve as a baseline of the activities and perceived effectiveness of reaching institutional goals in EARCOS member schools. These schools have indicated that their actions, aims, and expectations are aligned with the existing literature discussing marketing practices of schools. The size of a school, its years of operation, and location in a competitive marketplace have no significant difference with how schools currently practice marketing activities and

perceive the effectiveness. Understanding these results can be helpful for schools to understand the relative state of marketing affairs in their school and others and specifically target areas for increased activity and perceived effectiveness.

References

- Allard, L. A. (1996). Managing globe-trotting expatriates. *Management Review*, 85, 38-43.
- Arenson, K. W. (2004, November 7). Branded Nation. *New York Times*, p. 10.
- Arnett, D. B., Wittmann, C. M., & Wilson, B. J. (2003). Encouraging future helping behaviors: The role of student-faculty relationships in higher education marketing. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 12(1/2), 127-156.
- Baruch, Y. (2004). *Managing careers: Theory and practice*. Harlow, Essex, England: FT Prentice Hall.
- Bell, L., & Rowley, A. (2002). The impact of educational policy on headship in primary schools in England, 1994-2001. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(3), 195-210.
- Bell, L. (1999). Primary schools and the nature of the education marketplace. *Educational Management: Redefining Theory, Policy, Practice*, 59-75.
- Berry, L. L. (2002). Relationship Marketing of Services Perspectives from 1983 and 2000. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 1(1), 59-77.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Bowe, R., Ball, S. J., & Gold, A. (1992). *Reforming Education and Changing Schools*. London: Rutledge.
- Boyd, W. L., Leonard, M., & White, C. (1994). Customer Preferences for Financial Services: An Analysis. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 12(1), 9-15.

- Brown, S. W., Fisk, R. P., & Bitner, M. J. (1994). The Development and Emergence of Services Marketing Thought. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 5(1), 21-48. doi:10.1108/09564239410051894
- Bryant, A. (2013, June 19). In Head-Hunting, Big Data May Not Be Such a Big Deal. *New York Times*.
- Bunnell, T. (2003) 'A Study of Public Relations Activity in International Schools and its use as an indicator of their Distinct Character' (unpublished PhD thesis). University of Southampton, Great Britain.
- Bunnell, T. (2005). Perspectives on public relations training in international schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 480-499.
- Bunnell, T. (2005). Strategic marketing planning in international schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(1), 59-66.
- Burgess, S., McConnell, B., Propper, C., & Wilson, D. (2004). *Sorting and Choice in English Secondary Schools* (pp. 2-32, Working paper No. 04/111). Bristol: Center for Market and Public Organization.
- Burggraf, H. (2015, April 1). On the Trail of the Elusive U.S. Expat Taxpayer. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved June 7, 2015, from blogs.wsj.com/expat/2015/04/01/on-the-trail-of-the-elusive-u-s-expat-taxpayer
- Celuch, K. G., Robinson, N. M., & Walz, A. M. (2011). In Search of the Gift of Feedback: The Moderating Role of Trust on Retailer-Customer Communication. *American Marketing Association*, 494-501.
- Cervera, A., Molla, A., & Sanchez, M. (2001). Antecedents and consequences of market orientation in public organizations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(11/12), 1259-1286.
- Cowell, D. W. (1984). *The marketing of services*. London: Heinemann.

- Crosier, K. (1975). What Exactly is Marketing? *Quarterly Review of Marketing*, 28, 32-65.
- Dall'Olmo Riley, F., & De Chernatony, L. (2000). The service brand as a relationship builder. *British Journal of Management*, 11, 137-150.
- Davies, B., & Ellison, L. (1997). *Strategic marketing for schools: How to harmonise marketing and strategic development for an effective school*. London: Pitman.
- Davies, E. (1995). PR- Promoting the Best. *Management in Education*, 9(3), 8.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Dolby, N., & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in International Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 676-726.
- Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- The East Asia Regional Council of Schools. (2014, November 7). Retrieved from <http://earcos.org/about.php>
- East Asia Regional Council of Schools Member Directory 2013-2014*. (2013). Manila: EARCOS.
- Esteban, Á, Millán, Á, Molina, A., & Martín-Consuegra, D. (2002). Market orientation in service: A review and analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(9/10), 1003-1021.
- Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. B. (1985). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Firat, A. F., Dholakia, N., & Venkatesh, A. (1995). Marketing in a postmodern world. *European Journal of Marketing*, 29(1), 40-56.

- Foskett, N. (1992). *Managing external relations in schools: A practical guide*. London: Routledge.
- Foskett, N. (1995). *Marketing, Management and Schools: A Study of a Developing Marketing Culture in Secondary Schools* (PhD thesis). University of Southampton.
- Foskett, N. (1997). Relationships, Recruitment and Quality, or 'Why Bother with Marketing'? *Management in Education*, 11(5), 29-30.
- Foskett, N. H. (1998). Schools and Marketization. *Educational Management & Administration*, 26(2), 197-210.
- Fowler, F. C. (2002). Introduction: The Great School Choice Debate. *The Clearing House*, 76(1), 4-7.
- Fox, J. (1989). Creating a marketing plan that works: The eight basic elements. *Applied Marketing Research*, 29(2), 57-60.
- Gauatm, V. (2011). The Impact of Promotion on Enrollment of Students into Private Schools. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, 7(2), 63-69.
- George, W. R. (1990). Internal marketing and organizational behavior: A partnership in developing customer-conscious employees at every level. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(1), 63-70.
- Gewirtz, S., Ball, S. J., & Bowe, R. (1995). *Markets, choice, and equity in education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gibbs, P. (2001). Higher education as a market: A problem or a solution? *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1), 85-94.
- Gibbs, P. (2002). From the invisible hand to the invisible handshake: Marketing higher education. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 7(3), 325-338.

- Gibbs, P. (2007). Does Advertising Pervert Higher Education? Is There a Case for Resistance? *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 17(1), 3-11.
- Gibbs, P. (2011). An Aristotelian model for ethical higher education marketing: The role of practical wisdom. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 21(2), 203-214.
- Giles, C. (1995). Marketing, Parental Choice, and Strategic Planning: An Opportunity of Dilemma for UK Schools? *The International Journal of Educational Reform*, 4(1), 25-28.
- Gordon, I. (1998). *Relationship marketing: New strategies, techniques, and technologies to win the customers you want and keep them forever*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Canada.
- Grady, S., Bielick, S., & Aud, S. (2010). *Trends in the Use of School Choice: 1993-2007* (4th ed., pp. 1-34, Rep.). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Gray, L. (1991). *Marketing education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Griffin, C. R. (1999). *The Changing Role and Responsibilities of an Independent School Headmaster* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Washington.
- Guo, C. (2002). Market orientation and business performance: A framework for service organizations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(9/10), 1154-1163.
- Gylling, C., & Lindberg-Repo, K. (2006). Investigating the links between a corporate brand and a customer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 13(4-5), 257-267.
- Halverson, J. (1999). *A Study of Marketing in Small School Districts in Central and Northern California, as Perceived by the Superintendent* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of La Verne.

- Hanushek, E. A. (1994). *Making schools work: Improving performance and controlling costs*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Harris, L. (2002). Measuring market orientation: Exploring market orientation approach. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 5, 239-270.
- Harvey, J. A., & Busher, H. (1996). Marketing schools and consumer choice. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(4), 26-32.
- Harvey, J. A. (1996). Marketing schools and consumer choice. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(4), 26-32.
- Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (1995). International Schools and international education: A relationship reviewed. *Oxford Review of Education*, 21, 327-345.
- Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (2013). International Schools: Antecedents, Current Issues, and Metaphors for the Future. In *International Education and Schools: Moving Beyond the First 40 Years* (pp. 3-24). London: Bloomsbury.
- Helfert, G., Ritter, T., & Walter, A. (2002). European Journal of Marketing. *Redefining Market Orientation from a Relationship Perspective, Theoretical Consideration, and Empirical Results*, 36(9/10), 1119-1139.
- Hemsley-Brown, J., & Oplatka, I. (2006). Universities in a competitive global marketplace: A systematic review of the literature on higher education marketing. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 19(4), 316-338.
- Horn, T. R. (1997). *The role and perceived effectiveness of marketing tools and planning activities in Arizona's private schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Northern Arizona.
- Interview with International Head of School [E-mail interview]. (2015, June 1).

- ISC Research: The Market. (2017, January 20). Retrieved February 02, 2017, from <http://www.isc-r.com/market/>
- James, C., & Phillips, P. (1995). The Practice of Educational Marketing in Schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 23(2), 75-88.
- Jaworski, B., & Kohli, A. (1993). Marketing orientation: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(3), 53-72.
- Johnsson, M., & Lindgren, J. (2010). *Great Location, Beautiful Surroundings!* Making Sense of Information Materials Intended as Guidance for School Choice. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 54(2), 173-187.
- Jones, H. (2002, September 18). Cost pressures cause corporations to rethink their expatriate approach. *Wall Street Journal*, p. D5.
- Kerin, R. A., Hartley, S. W., & Rudelius, W. (2004). *Marketing: The core*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Kerin, R. A., Hartley, S. W., & Rudelius, W. (2007). *Marketing: The core* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Kieth, R. J. (1960). The Marketing Revolution. *Journal of Marketing*, Jan, 35-38.
- Kohli, A., & Jaworski, B. (1990). Marketing orientation: The construct, research, propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 1-18.
- Kotler, P., & Andreasen, A. R. (1996). *Strategic marketing for nonprofit organizations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. F. (1995). *Strategic marketing for educational institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., & Levy, S. (1969). Broadening the concept of Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 33, 10-15.

- Kotler, P., & Zaltman, G. (1971). Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change. *Journal of Marketing*, 35(3), 3.
- Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for Introducing Marketing into Nonprofit Organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 43(1), 37.
- Kotler, P. (1994). *Marketing management: Analysis, planning, and control* (8th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lee, D., & Markham, P. (2015). Fundraising-Related Market Orientation among Non-Profit Organizations in Hong Kong: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Hong Kong Community College Working Paper Series*, 7 (3), 1-9.
- Leggate, P., & Thompson, J. (1997). The management of development planning in international schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(6), 268-273.
- Levin, B. (2001). *Reforming Education: From Origins to Outcomes*. London: Routledge.
- Li, C., & Hung, C. (2009). Marketing tactics and parents' loyalty: The mediating role of school image. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(4), 477-489.
- Lowe, K. B., Milliman, J., Cieri, H. D., & Dowling, P. J. (2002). International Compensation Practices: A Ten-Country Comparative Analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 40(1), 55-80.
- Lubienski, C. (2007). Marketing Schools: Consumer Goods and Competitive Incentives for Consumer Information. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(1), 118-141.
- Maguire, M., Ball, S. J., & Macrae, S. (2001). 'In All Our Interests': Internal marketing at Northwark Park School. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(1), 35-50.

- Massnick, F. (1997). Customer Service Can Kill You. *Management Review*, 86(3), 33-35.
- McAlister, D. R. (2005). *A Marketing Strategy for Independent Schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Johannesburg.
- McCallum, B., & Olson, D. (2004). Advising potential expatriate clients: A case study. *Journal of Financial Planning*, 17, 72-79.
- McCarthy, E. J., & Perreault, W. D. (1993). *Basic marketing: A global-managerial approach*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Mercer, D. (1998). *Marketing for managers* (p. 94). London: Orion Business.
- Modi, P. & Mishra, D. (2010). Conceptualizing Market Orientation in Nonprofit Organizations: Definition, Performance, and Preliminary Construction of Scale. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26(5/6), 548-569.
- Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: The marketization of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(3), 277-287.
- Mortland, S. (2010, June 21). Private schools face tough sell when pursuing potential students. *Crain's Cleveland Business*, 31(25), 15.
- Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Empowering participants or corroding learning? Towards a research agenda on the impact of student consumerism in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 267-281.
- Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 20-35.
- Nazir, T., Shah, S. F., & Zaman, K. (2014). Review of Literature of Expatriate Compensation and its Implication for Offshore Workforce. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 7(2), 203-221.

- Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (2001). Image and reputation of education institutions in student's retention decisions. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 15*(6), 303-311.
- Oemig, D. R. (1999). When You Say, "We'll Keep You Whole," Do You Mean It? *Compensation & Benefits Review, 31*(4), 40-47.
- Oplatka, I., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2004). The research on school marketing: Current issues and future directions. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 375-400.
- Oplatka, I., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2007). The incorporation of market orientation in the school culture: An essential aspect of school marketing. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(4), 292-305.
- Oplatka, I. (2002). The Emergence of Educational Marketing: Lessons from the experiences of Israeli Principals. *Comparative Education Review, 46*(2), 211-233.
- Oplatka, I. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of their role in educational marketing: Insights from the case of Edmonton, Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, (51)*, 1-23.
- Oplatka, I. (2007). The Principal's Role in Marketing the School: Subjective Interpretations and Personal Influences. *Planning and Changing, 38*(3&4), 208-221.
- Oplatka, I., Hemsley-Brown, J., & Foskett, N. (2002). The Voice of Teachers in Marketing their School: Personal perspectives in competitive environments. *School Leadership and Management, 22*(2), 177-196.
- Ozretic-Dosen, D., & Martinovic, M. (2003). Marketing of services in secondary schools in the Republic of Croatia. *Educational Studies, 39*, 373-386.

- Pardey, D. (1991). *Marketing for Schools*. London: Kogan Page.
- Parker, R. S., Cook, S., & Pettijohn, C. E. (2007). School Choice Attributes. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 28(4), 21-33.
- Patton, M. Q., & Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peterson, R. B., Sargent, J., Napier, N. K., & Shim, W. S. (1996). Corporate expatriate HRM policies, internationalization, and performance in the world's largest MNCs. *MIR: Management International Review*, 215-230.
- Poetter, T. S., & Knight-Abowitz, K. (2001). Possibilities and Problems of School Choice. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 37(2), 58-62.
- Pritchett, L. (2003). "When will they ever learn"? *Why all governments produce schooling* (Bread Working Paper No. 31). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Bureau of Research in Economic Analysis of Development.
- Punnett, B. J. (1997). Towards effective management of expatriate spouses. *Journal of World Business*, 32(3), 243-257.
- Ramseeok-Munhurrun, P., Naidoo, P., Bhiwajee, S., & Beejmohun, S. K. (2010). Marketing Practices in Secondary Education: A Focus on Private Secondary Schools. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 6(12), 2089-2095.
- Re: Greetings from Shanghai [E-mail to N. B. Kent]. (2014, November 13).
- Rey Garcia, M., Alvarez Gonzalez, L., & Acebron, L. (2013). The untapped potential of marketing for evaluating the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations: A framework proposal. *International Review on Public and Non-Profit Marketing*, 10(2), 87-102.
- Richardson, L. (2013). *School Choice & Competition: What is the impact on school leadership?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University.

- Riley, F. D., & Chernatony, L. D. (2000). The Service Brand as Relationships Builder. *British Journal of Management, 11*(2), 137-150.
- Robenstine, C. (2000). School Choice and Administrators: Will principals be marketers? *The Clearing House, 74*(2), 95-98.
- Rossello, P. (Ed.). (1965). *International yearbook of education, v. 26, 1964* (Vol. 274). Geneva: International Bureau of Education.
- Rushton, A. M., & Carson, D. J. (1985). The Marketing of Services: Managing the Intangibles. *European Journal of Marketing, 19*(3), 19-40.
- Rushton, A. M., & Carson, D. J. (1989). The marketing of services: Managing the intangibles. *European Journal of Marketing, 23*, 23-44.
- Shapiro, B. (1973). Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations. *Harvard Business Review, (September/October)*, 223-233.
- Shoham, A. (2006). Market Orientations in the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector: A Meta-Analysis of Their Relationships with Organizational Performance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*(3), 453-476.
- Sylvester, R. (2002). The "first" international school. In *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for national & international schools* (pp. 3-17). London: Kogan Page.
- Taylor, A. (2001). Fellow travelers and true believers: A case study of religion politics in Alberta schools. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(1), 15-37.
- Unique Request from Shanghai [E-mail to M. Rivard]. (2015, September 3).
- Veloutsou, C., Paton, R. A., & Lewis, J. (2005). Consultation and reliability of information sources pertaining to university selection: Some questions answered? *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(4), 279-291.
- Vermond, K. (2001). Expatriates come home. *CMA Management, 75*, 30-34.

- Von Maltzahn, H. C. (2006). *An investigation of how three private schools in the Midlands KwaZulu-Natal positions and market themselves in the private school market* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Wentland, D. M. (2003). A new practical guide for determining expatriate compensation: The comprehensive model. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 35, 45.
- Wickenden, J. W. (2008, January). Rethinking the Head's Role: Administrative restructuring as a tool to promote visionary leadership. *Wickenden Associates*.
- Wolfsmann, L. (2007). International Evidence on School Competition, Autonomy, and Accountability: A Review. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(2-3), 473-497.
- Zeithaml, V. A., & Bitner, M. J. (1996). *Services marketing*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Appendices

Appendix A

(Tables A1–A20)

Table A1

*Frequencies for each Response to the item,
“To what extent does your school use a
formal marketing plan?”*

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	17	25.4
	Sometimes	27	40.3
	Often	13	19.4
	Always	10	14.9
	Total	67	100.0

Table A2

*During the admissions process, we tell
parents about the school’s strengths.*

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.5
	Sometimes	2	3.0
	Often	7	10.4
	Always	57	85.1
	Total	67	100.0

Table A3

During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school's strengths.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.5
	Sometimes	7	10.4
	Often	29	43.3
	Always	30	44.8
	Total	67	100.0

Table A4

During the admissions process, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	17	25.4
	Sometimes	15	22.4
	Often	12	17.9
	Always	23	34.3
	Total	67	100.0

Table A5

During parent coffees, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	20	29.9
	Sometimes	24	35.8
	Often	14	20.9
	Always	9	13.4
	Total	67	100.0

Table A6

During the admissions process, we provide applicants contact information of current families as resources to answer questions

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	10	14.9
	Sometimes	20	29.9
	Often	22	32.8
	Always	15	22.4
	Total	67	100.0

Table A7

During admissions process, we claim the location of the school is a strength of the school

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	6	9.0
	Sometimes	18	26.9
	Often	24	35.8
	Always	19	28.4
	Total	67	100.0

Table A8

During the admissions process, we claim the faculty is a strength of the school

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Often	14	20.9
	Always	53	79.1
	Total	67	100.0

Table A9

Head of school invites prospective families to apply.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	14	20.9
	Sometimes	33	49.3
	Often	10	14.9
	Always	10	14.9
	Total	67	100.0

Table A10

Division Principal invites prospective families to apply.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	15	22.4
	Sometimes	36	53.7
	Often	9	13.4
	Always	7	10.4
	Total	67	100.0

Table A11

Admissions director invites prospective families to apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	9	13.4	13.6
	Sometimes	14	20.9	21.2
	Often	20	29.9	30.3
	Always	23	34.3	34.8
	Total	66	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A12

Parent representative invites prospective families to apply.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	7	10.4	10.8
	Sometimes	29	43.3	44.6
	Often	25	37.3	38.5
	Always	4	6.0	6.2
	Total	65	97.0	100.0
Missing	System	2	3.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A13

We provide parents direct access to administrators (such as parent coffees, special lectures, book studies, open forums, webinars, etc.)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.5
	Sometimes	9	13.4
	Often	16	23.9
	Always	41	61.2
	Total	67	100.0

Table A14

We hold events aimed toward specific subgroups of our parent and student population who have specific concerns (such as, parent coffees, discussion groups, book groups, town hall, etc.)

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	2	3.0
	Sometimes	21	31.3
	Often	21	31.3
	Always	23	34.3
	Total	67	100.0

Table A15

Head of school meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	4	6.0	6.1
	Sometimes	24	35.8	36.4
	Often	24	35.8	36.4
	Always	14	20.9	21.2
	Total	66	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A16

Head of school meets with current faculty to understand employee satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.5	1.5
	Sometimes	11	16.4	16.7
	Often	32	47.8	48.5
	Always	22	32.8	33.3
	Total	66	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A17

Head of school meets with current students to understand student satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	9	13.4
	Sometimes	29	43.3
	Often	16	23.9
	Always	13	19.4
	Total	67	100.0

Table A18

School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current families to understand customer perception of areas of school strength

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	12	17.9	18.2
	Sometimes	23	34.3	34.8
	Often	23	34.3	34.8
	Always	8	11.9	12.1
	Total	66	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	1	1.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A19

School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current faculty to understand employee perception of areas of school strength

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	19	28.4
	Sometimes	26	38.8
	Often	17	25.4
	Always	5	7.5
	Total	67	100.0

Table A20

School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current students to understand student perception of areas of school strength

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Never	22	32.8
	Sometimes	29	43.3
	Often	13	19.4
	Always	3	4.5
Total		67	100.0

(Tables A21–A44)

Table A21

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Tours for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Sometimes	3	4.5	4.7
	Often	16	23.9	25.0
	Always	45	67.2	70.3
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A22

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Open Houses for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	15	22.4	23.4
	Sometimes	18	26.9	28.1
	Often	15	22.4	23.4
	Always	16	23.9	25.0
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A23

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Print Advertising for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	4	6.0	6.3
	Sometimes	23	34.3	35.9
	Often	20	29.9	31.3
	Always	17	25.4	26.6
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A24

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Profiles/Brochures for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
	Never	2	3.0	3.1
	Sometimes	6	9.0	9.4
	Often	23	34.3	35.9
	Always	33	49.3	51.6
Valid	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A25

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use School Websites for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Sometimes	3	4.5	4.7
	Often	8	11.9	12.5
	Always	53	79.1	82.8
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A26

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use LinkedIn for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	43	64.2	70.5
	Sometimes	12	17.9	19.7
	Often	4	6.0	6.6
	Always	2	3.0	3.3
	Total	61	91.0	100.0
Missing	System	6	9.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A27

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Facebook for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	11	16.4	17.5
	Sometimes	15	22.4	23.8
	Often	12	17.9	19.0
	Always	25	37.3	39.7
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A28

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Twitter for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	26	38.8	41.9
	Sometimes	13	19.4	21.0
	Often	10	14.9	16.1
	Always	13	19.4	21.0
	Total	62	92.5	100.0
Missing	System	5	7.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A29

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Instagram for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	44	65.7	69.8
	Sometimes	8	11.9	12.7
	Often	6	9.0	9.5
	Always	5	7.5	7.9
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A30

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Pinterest for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	53	79.1	85.5
	Sometimes	6	9.0	9.7
	Often	1	1.5	1.6
	Always	2	3.0	3.2
	Total	62	92.5	100.0
Missing	System	5	7.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A31

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use YouTube for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	18	26.9	28.1
	Sometimes	18	26.9	28.1
	Often	17	25.4	26.6
	Always	11	16.4	17.2
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A32

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Promotional Videos for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	13	19.4	20.6
	Sometimes	9	13.4	14.3
	Often	20	29.9	31.7
	Always	21	31.3	33.3
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A33

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Hosting Events for Outside Public for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	6	9.0	9.5
	Sometimes	30	44.8	47.6
	Often	20	29.9	31.7
	Always	7	10.4	11.1
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A34

*Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use
Parent/Student Referrals for Marketing*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	3	4.5	4.7
	Sometimes	13	19.4	20.3
	Often	31	46.3	48.4
	Always	17	25.4	26.6
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A35

*Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Corporate
Human Resource Outreach for Marketing*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	16	23.9	25.4
	Sometimes	27	40.3	42.9
	Often	18	26.9	28.6
	Always	2	3.0	3.2
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A36

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Relocation Agency Outreach for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	21	31.3	32.8
	Sometimes	16	23.9	25.0
	Often	19	28.4	29.7
	Always	8	11.9	12.5
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A37

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Media Outlets in Students' Hometowns for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	52	77.6	82.5
	Sometimes	9	13.4	14.3
	Often	1	1.5	1.6
	Always	1	1.5	1.6
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A38

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Attending Educational Fairs for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	22	32.8	34.4
	Sometimes	25	37.3	39.1
	Often	12	17.9	18.8
	Always	5	7.5	7.8
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A39

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Educational Websites for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	25	37.3	39.1
	Sometimes	26	38.8	40.6
	Often	9	13.4	14.1
	Always	4	6.0	6.3
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A40

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Faculty Hiring Websites for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	12	17.9	18.8
	Sometimes	23	34.3	35.9
	Often	15	22.4	23.4
	Always	14	20.9	21.9
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A41

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Focus Groups for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	30	44.8	46.9
	Sometimes	25	37.3	39.1
	Often	9	13.4	14.1
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A42

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Local Media Outlets for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	17	25.4	26.6
	Sometimes	24	35.8	37.5
	Often	18	26.9	28.1
	Always	5	7.5	7.8
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A43

Frequency with which EARCOS Schools Use Promotional Gifts for Marketing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Never	16	23.9	25.0
	Sometimes	27	40.3	42.2
	Often	14	20.9	21.9
	Always	7	10.4	10.9
	Total	64	95.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	4.5	
Total		67	100.0	

As shown on Table A44, five people mentioned “other” marketing tools. One person mentioned his or her family’s blog. Two people mentioned WeChat. One person mentioned Weibo. And, one person said word of mouth was their biggest marketing tool.

Table A44

Other Marketing Tools Mentioned by Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid No Other Tools Mentioned	62	92.5	92.5
My family's blog is often commented on by prospective faculty and students.	1	1.5	1.5
WeChat	2	3.0	3.0
Weibo	1	1.5	1.5
Word of mouth is our biggest marketing tool.	1	1.5	1.5
Total	67	100.0	100.0

(Tables A45–A66)

Table A45

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Tours

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid Moderately low in effectiveness	1	1.5	1.6
Moderately high in effectiveness	17	25.4	27.4
Very high in effectiveness	44	65.7	71.0
Total	62	92.5	100.0
Missing Do not use	1	1.5	
System	4	6.0	
Total	5	7.5	
Total	67	100.0	

Table A46

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Open House

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	4	6.0	8.3
	Moderately low in effectiveness	8	11.9	16.7
	Moderately high in effectiveness	21	31.3	43.8
	Very high in effectiveness	15	22.4	31.3
	Total	48	71.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	15	22.4	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	19	28.4	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A47

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Open House

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	10	14.9	16.4
	Moderately low in effectiveness	28	41.8	45.9
	Moderately high in effectiveness	20	29.9	32.8
	Very high in effectiveness	3	4.5	4.9
	Total	61	91.0	100.0
Missing	Do not use	2	3.0	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	6	9.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A48

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Profile/Brochure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	4	6.0	6.6
	Moderately low in effectiveness	22	32.8	36.1
	Moderately high in effectiveness	27	40.3	44.3
	Very high in effectiveness	8	11.9	13.1
	Total	61	91.0	100.0
Missing	Do not use	1	1.5	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	6	9.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A49

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for School Website

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	2	3.0	3.2
	Moderately low in effectiveness	6	9.0	9.5
	Moderately high in effectiveness	22	32.8	34.9
	Very high in effectiveness	33	49.3	52.4
	Total	63	94.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	6.0	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A50

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Facebook

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	2	3.0	4.2
	Moderately low in effectiveness	17	25.4	35.4
	Moderately high in effectiveness	18	26.9	37.5
	Very high in effectiveness	11	16.4	22.9
	Total	48	71.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	15	22.4	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	19	28.4	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A51

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Twitter

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	6	9.0	17.6
	Moderately low in effectiveness	15	22.4	44.1
	Moderately high in effectiveness	12	17.9	35.3
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.9
	Total	34	50.7	100.0
Missing	Do not use	28	41.8	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	33	49.3	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A52

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Instagram

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	4	6.0	22.2
	Moderately low in effectiveness	10	14.9	55.6
	Moderately high in effectiveness	4	6.0	22.2
	Total	18	26.9	100.0
Missing	Do not use	44	65.7	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	49	73.1	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A53

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Pinterest

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	1	1.5	12.5
	Moderately low in effectiveness	3	4.5	37.5
	Moderately high in effectiveness	4	6.0	50.0
	Total	8	11.9	100.0
Missing	Do not use	53	79.1	
	System	6	9.0	
	Total	59	88.1	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A54

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for YouTube

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	11	16.4	25.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	12	17.9	27.3
	Moderately high in effectiveness	18	26.9	40.9
	Very high in effectiveness	3	4.5	6.8
	Total	44	65.7	100.0
Missing	Do not use	19	28.4	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	23	34.3	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A55

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Promotional Video

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	13	19.4	26.0
	Moderately high in effectiveness	29	43.3	58.0
	Very high in effectiveness	7	10.4	14.0
	Total	50	74.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	12	17.9	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	17	25.4	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A56

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Hosting Events for Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	12	17.9	23.5
	Moderately low in effectiveness	16	23.9	31.4
	Moderately high in effectiveness	18	26.9	35.3
	Very high in effectiveness	5	7.5	9.8
	Total	51	76.1	100.0
Missing	Do not use	11	16.4	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	16	23.9	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A57

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Parent and Student Referrals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	3	4.5	5.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	4	6.0	6.7
	Moderately high in effectiveness	24	35.8	40.0
	Very high in effectiveness	29	43.3	48.3
	Total	60	89.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	2	3.0	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	7	10.4	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A58

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Corporate Human Resource Outreach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	6	9.0	15.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	15	22.4	37.5
	Moderately high in effectiveness	14	20.9	35.0
	Very high in effectiveness	5	7.5	12.5
	Total	40	59.7	100.0
Missing	Do not use	23	34.3	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	27	40.3	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A59

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Relocation Agency Outreach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	10	14.9	21.3
	Moderately low in effectiveness	14	20.9	29.8
	Moderately high in effectiveness	16	23.9	34.0
	Very high in effectiveness	7	10.4	14.9
	Total	47	70.1	100.0
Missing	Do not use	15	22.4	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	20	29.9	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A60

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Media Outlets in Student's Hometown

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	3	4.5	23.1
	Moderately low in effectiveness	8	11.9	61.5
	Moderately high in effectiveness	1	1.5	7.7
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	7.7
	Total	13	19.4	100.0
Missing	Do not use	48	71.6	
	System	6	9.0	
	Total	54	80.6	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A61

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Attending Educational Fairs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	21	31.3	53.8
	Moderately low in effectiveness	7	10.4	17.9
	Moderately high in effectiveness	10	14.9	25.6
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.6
	Total	39	58.2	100.0
Missing	Do not use	23	34.3	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	28	41.8	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A62

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Educational Websites

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	19	28.4	48.7
	Moderately low in effectiveness	15	22.4	38.5
	Moderately high in effectiveness	4	6.0	10.3
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.6
	Total	39	58.2	100.0
Missing	Do not use	22	32.8	
	System	6	9.0	
	Total	28	41.8	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A63

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Faculty Hiring Websites

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	13	19.4	26.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	17	25.4	34.0
	Moderately high in effectiveness	13	19.4	26.0
	Very high in effectiveness	7	10.4	14.0
	Total	50	74.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	11	16.4	
	System	6	9.0	
	Total	17	25.4	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A64

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Focus Groups

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	9	13.4	25.7
	Moderately low in effectiveness	19	28.4	54.3
	Moderately high in effectiveness	5	7.5	14.3
	Very high in effectiveness	2	3.0	5.7
	Total	35	52.2	100.0
Missing	Do not use	27	40.3	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	32	47.8	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A65

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Local Media Outlets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	16	23.9	37.2
	Moderately low in effectiveness	14	20.9	32.6
	Moderately high in effectiveness	12	17.9	27.9
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.3
	Total	43	64.2	100.0
Missing	Do not use	19	28.4	
	System	5	7.5	
	Total	24	35.8	
Total		67	100.0	

Table A66

Frequency and Percent in Each Response Category of Effectiveness for Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Very low in effectiveness	21	31.3	42.0
	Moderately low in effectiveness	26	38.8	52.0
	Moderately high in effectiveness	2	3.0	4.0
	Very high in effectiveness	1	1.5	2.0
	Total	50	74.6	100.0
Missing	Do not use	13	19.4	
	System	4	6.0	
	Total	17	25.4	
Total		67	100.0	

(Table A67–A88)

Table A67

Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Tours on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.586	.147	24.374	.000
School size	.046	.049	.932	.355
Years in operation	.003	.023	.146	.884

Table A68

Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Open House on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.676	.287	9.313	.000
School size	.131	.093	1.401	.168
Years in operation	.006	.046	.141	.888

Table A69

Parameter Estimate: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Print Advertising on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.308	.231	9.999	.000
School size	.101	.078	1.300	.199
Years in operation	-.057	.037	-1.545	.128

Table A70

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Profile/Brochure on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.659	.236	11.284	.000
School size	.134	.079	1.703	.094
Years in operation	-.064	.037	-1.745	.086

Table A71

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of School Website on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	3.305	.228	14.507	.000
School size	.116	.077	1.511	.136
Years in operation	-.039	.036	-1.069	.289

Table A72

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Facebook on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	3.065	.296	10.345	.000
School size	-.050	.093	-.541	.591
Years in operation	-.040	.046	-.866	.391

Table A73

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Twitter on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.524	.308	8.199	.000
School size	-.043	.092	-.461	.648
Years in operation	-.046	.048	-.959	.345

Table A74

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Instagram on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.593	.369	7.032	.000
School size	-.001	.094	-.013	.990
Years in operation	-.159	.074	-2.153	.048

Table A75

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Pintrest on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.881	.478	6.030	.002
School size	-.405	.196	-2.061	.094
Years in operation	.255	.276	.925	.397

Table A76

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of YouTube on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.104	.317	6.630	.000
School size	.125	.103	1.207	.234
Years in operation	-.015	.053	-.288	.775

Table A77

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Promotional Video on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.536	.210	12.099	.000
School size	.164	.069	2.370	.022
Years in operation	-.010	.033	-.297	.768

Table A78

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Hosting Events For Outside Public (lecture, musical performance, etc) on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.137	.303	7.062	.000
School size	.146	.100	1.461	.150
Years in operation	-.026	.045	-.568	.573

Table A79

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Parent/Student Referrals on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	3.570	.242	14.778	.000
School size	.001	.080	.018	.986
Years in operation	-.057	.038	-1.518	.135

Table A80

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Corporate Human Resources outreach on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.447	.334	7.326	.000
School size	.125	.109	1.149	.258
Years in operation	-.063	.051	-1.219	.231

Table A81

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Relocation Agency Outreach on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.276	.332	6.846	.000
School size	.186	.105	1.761	.085
Years in operation	-.057	.050	-1.137	.262

Table A82

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Media Outlets in Student's Hometown on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.121	.648	3.272	.008
School size	.061	.324	.187	.855
Years in operation	-.071	.094	-.747	.472

Table A83

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Attending Educational Fairs on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	1.494	.332	4.497	.000
School size	.201	.104	1.937	.061
Years in operation	-.042	.057	-.732	.469

Table A84

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Educational Website on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	1.867	.289	6.454	.000
School size	-.005	.091	-.058	.954
Years in operation	-.045	.044	-1.024	.313

Table A85

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Faculty Hiring Website on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.454	.338	7.252	.000
School size	.041	.105	.395	.695
Years in operation	-.059	.053	-1.125	.266

Table A86

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Focus Groups on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.153	.305	7.069	.000
School size	-.051	.097	-.527	.602
Years in operation	-.011	.050	-.213	.833

Table A87

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Local Media Outlets on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	2.448	.283	8.657	.000
School size	-.022	.092	-.245	.808
Years in operation	-.102	.045	-2.256	.030

Table A88

Parameter Estimates: Results of the Regression of Perceived Effectiveness of Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc) on School Size and Years in Operation

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
Intercept	1.673	.220	7.616	.000
School size	-.008	.073	-.108	.915
Years in operation	.001	.033	.018	.986

Appendix B

Subject: Delphi Study – Please participate in Delphi study

December, 2015

My name is Nicholas Kent and I am the High School Principal at Concordia International School Shanghai. As a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Lehigh University, I am conducting a research study that will investigate the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. As the market place becomes more competitive worldwide, it is helpful to understand factors that could affect student enrollment.

The population of the study will be the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). I have you because of your research in the field of educational, your response will have a big impact on the validity of the instrument used in the study.

I understand that you are very busy, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment to respond to this request. This should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete. Included is a feedback sheet for you to assess the validity and reliability of the questions. Please return this sheet to me electronically when you are finished. You can write directly on the word document.

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education. This study will be two rounds. I will amend the questions based on the feedback provided by you and send out a second and final round that should be even quicker to complete.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

High School Principal Concordia International School Shanghai

Appendix C

Subject: Delphi Study – Reminder to participate in round 2 of Delphi study

March, 2016

Dear XXXXXX,

This is an email to thank you for participating in the second round of the Delphi study sent to you two months ago investigating the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. Your continued participation in this study will help me determine the reliability and validity of my survey instrument.

The population of the study will be the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). I have you because of your research in the field of educational marketing; your response will have a big impact on the validity of the instrument used in the study.

I understand that you are very busy, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment to respond to round 2. There are only two questions that at least 2/5 respondents answered negatively. This should take no longer than 9 minutes to complete. Included is a feedback sheet for you to assess the validity and reliability of those two questions. Please read the instructions and provide feedback directly on the document. Please return this document to me electronically when you are finished.

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

High School Principal Concordia International School Shanghai

Appendix D

Subject: Heads of School Study – Please participate in pilot study

January, 2016

Dear XXXXXX,

My name is Nicholas Kent and I am the High School Principal at Concordia International School Shanghai. As a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Lehigh University, I am conducting a research study that will investigate the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. As the market place becomes more competitive worldwide, it is helpful to understand factors that could affect student enrollment.

The population of the study will be the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). I have selected the schools of ACAMIS as a pilot group because of the similarities. Because there are only 39 schools in the pilot study, each response that I receive will have a big impact on the validity of the instrument used in the study.

I understand that you are very busy, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment to respond to this short survey. This should take no longer than 13 minutes to complete.

Please click on the link below. It will take you to the informed consent page of the survey that will provide you with more detailed information on the survey and how I will maintain the confidentiality of your responses.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/pilotsurveyforgreatness>

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

High School Principal Concordia International School Shanghai

Appendix E

Subject: Heads of School Study – Reminder to participate in pilot study

February, 2016

Dear XXXXXX,

You are receiving this second request to participate in a doctoral dissertation pilot study of the current educational marketing practices of international schools because of your role as head of school in ACAMIS. To date, I have received XX responses from your colleagues in ACAMIS, however, with a population of only 39 school heads, your participation would add to the robustness of this study and its results.

I am conducting a research study that will investigate the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. As the market place becomes more competitive worldwide, it is helpful to understand the factors that could affect student enrollment.

The population of the study will be the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). I have selected the schools of ACAMIS who are not in EARCOS as a pilot group because the similarities in schools.

I understand that you are very busy, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment to respond to this short survey. This should take no longer than 13 minutes to complete.

Please click on the link below. It will take you to the informed consent page of the survey that will provide you with more detailed information on the survey and how I will maintain the confidentiality of your responses.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/pilotsurveyforgreatness>

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

High School Principal Concordia International School Shanghai

Appendix F

Subject: Heads of School Study – Please participate in doctoral dissertation study

March, 2016

Dear XXXXXX,

My name is Nicholas Kent and I am the High School Principal at Concordia International School Shanghai. As a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Lehigh University, I am conducting a research study that will investigate the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. As the market place becomes more competitive worldwide, it is helpful to understand the factors that could affect student enrollment.

The population of the study will be the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). I have selected the schools of EARCOS as a population because the dynamic growth and competition in this region. Because there are only 143 schools in the region, each response that I receive will have a big impact on the validity of the results provided by the study.

I understand that you are very busy, and I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment to respond to this short survey. The Head of School will be the preferred respondent, however, any administrator or staff member with a primary job responsibility in the area of marketing will be deemed appropriate and acceptable to complete the survey. This should take no longer than 13 minutes to complete. The information collected will be anonymous and I will only read the data. No school indicators will be asked that would easily identify participating schools. It is possible through extensive digging that a specific school could be determined by location and size. However, the risk is minimal as the data will be stored in a password-protected file. No individual data will be reported only aggregated data.

Please click on the link below to take the survey. By participating in the survey below you are giving notice that you consent to have this data analyzed for the purpose of my dissertation research.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/SUMPIS>

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education. The study is being conducted under the direction of Dr.

George White of Lehigh University, and if you should wish to contact Lehigh IRB to speak to someone other than the researcher please contact Susan Disidore at 610-758-3020 or sus5@lehigh.edu.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

Appendix G

Subject: Heads of School Study – Reminder to participate in doctoral dissertation study

April, 2016

Dear XXXXXX,

You are receiving this second request to participate in a doctoral dissertation study of the current educational marketing practices of international schools because of your role as head of school in EARCOS. To date, I have received XX responses from your colleagues, however, with a population of only 143 school heads, your participation would add to the robustness of this study and its results.

I am conducting a research study that will investigate the current marketing practices, marketing tools, and perceived effectiveness of marketing at international schools. As the market place becomes more competitive worldwide, it is helpful to understand the factors that could affect student enrollment.

The population of the study comprises the member schools of East Asia Region Council of Oversea Schools (EARCOS). Because of the dynamic growth and competition in this region, marketing is an important reality in our jobs as international administrators. Because there are only 144 schools in the study, each response that I receive will have a big impact on the validity of the results I find with the study.

I understand that this time of year is busy and I do not want to be a burden, however, I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a moment today to respond to this short survey. The Head of School will be the preferred respondent, however, any administrator or staff member with a primary job responsibility in the area of marketing will be deemed appropriate and acceptable to complete the survey. This should take no longer than 13 minutes to complete.

Please click on the link below. It will take you to the informed consent page of the survey that will provide you with more detailed information on the survey and how I will maintain the confidentiality of your responses. (I recommend changing the name of the link to reflect the fact that this is the questionnaire for the main study, not the pilot study.)

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/SUMPIS>

I greatly appreciate your time and thank you for contributing to the advocacy of international education.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kent

Doctoral Candidate, Lehigh University

High School Principal Concordia International School Shanghai

Appendix H

Members of the Delphi Study

Peter Baron- Is senior product marketing manager at Blackbaud, Peter Baron is focused on illustrating how Blackbaud K-12's software builds deeper connections among key school community stakeholders, including parents, teachers and students. Peter regularly contributes to various online communities and education conferences like NAIS, CASE/NAIS & SSATB to explain the importance of providing modern, user-friendly experiences for school constituents. Peter hosts Blackbaud K-12's Get Connected Podcast and is the founder of edSocialMedia, a community-driven site dedicated to exploring the role of social media in education.

Richard Gaskell- International Director of ISC Research Ltd. The International School Consultancy (ISC) is the leading source of market intelligence on the world of international English-speaking schools. It has been a specialist in the sector for more than 25 years. ISC is the only organization that has continuously operated in the market place to collect international school data, resulting in a unique set of current and historical information plus up-to-date market intelligence.

Todd Horn- is an Expert in Residence at the Harvard Innovation Lab (iLab) and stays active as a trustee of several leading schools and a national organization that focuses on character and ethical education. A life-long learner, Todd has degrees from Dartmouth College (B.A.), Harvard University (Ed.M.), the University of Colorado (M.B.A), and Northern Arizona University (Ed.D.). Dr. Horn wrote his dissertation on the marketing practices of independent school in Arizona.

Izhar Oplatka- is a senior lecturer in the Department of Education, Division of Educational Administration, Ben-Gurion University, Israel. His current research interests include the lives and careers of teachers and principals, gender in educational administration, and educational marketing.

Lindsay Thierry- Director of Advancement at Shanghai American School, he has vast experience in marketing and admissions practices in China's largest international school. Lindsay has held various roles in marketing, admissions, and external relations in North America and Asia.

Appendix I

Section One Marketing Activities

The goal of this section is to collect data about the marketing activities used by schools being surveyed. These data will not be used to identify specific schools and shall remain anonymous.

I would like for you, the members of the Delphi team, to consider whether the items and questions on the survey, in fact, do provide the appropriate information for the goal of each question. You can provide your opinion by marking either “Yes” or “No” in the space provided. If you answered “No” please explain your rationale and provide recommendations for revisions. You may type directly onto the word document. Please only provide your feedback in the right hand column.

<p>Q1. The goal of the question is to understand the use of formal marketing plans of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school use a formal marketing plan?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>a. During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school’s strengths.</p>

	Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>b. During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school's strengths.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>c. During the admissions process, we claim the school's tuition is worth the value they receive.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p>

	<p>Always</p> <p>d. During parent coffees, we claim school's tuition is worth the value they receive.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>e. During the admissions process, we provide applicants contact information of current families as a resource to answer questions.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>f. During the admissions process, we claim the location of the school is a strength of the school.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in</p>

<p>understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>g. During the admissions process, we claim the faculty is a strength of a school.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>a. Head of School invites prospective families to apply.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>b. Division principal invites prospective families to apply.</p>

	Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>c. Admissions Director invites prospective families to apply.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>d. Parent representatives invites prospective families to apply.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p>

	<p>e. During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school's strengths.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>f. We provide parents direct access to administrators (town hall meetings, parent coffees, special lectures, book studies, webinars, etc).</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>g. Head of School meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes___ No___</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p>

<p>activities of schools</p>	<p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>h. Head of School meets with current faculty to understand employee satisfaction.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>i. Head of School meets with current students to understand student satisfaction.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>j. School personal in charge of marketing meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction.</p>

	Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>k. School personal in charge of marketing meets with current employees to understand employee satisfaction.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>l. School personal in charge of marketing meets with current students to understand student satisfaction.</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q4. The goal of the question is to understand the objectives of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>Please rate the following marketing objectives in term of importance</p> <p>1= a very high degree of importance</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of importance</p>

	<p>3= a moderately low degree of importance</p> <p>4= a very low degree of importance</p> <p>a. Student Recruitment</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q4. The goal of the question is to understand the objectives of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>Please rate the following marketing objectives in term of importance</p> <p>1= a very high degree of importance</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of importance</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of importance</p> <p>4= a very low degree of importance</p> <p>b. Student Retention</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q4. The goal of the question is to understand the objectives of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>Please rate the following marketing objectives in term of importance</p> <p>1= a very high degree of importance</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of importance</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of importance</p> <p>4= a very low degree of importance</p> <p>c. Brand Awareness</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q5. The goal of the question is to understand the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent do you perceive the marketing activities in your school to be effective for achieving the following objectives?</p>

	<p>1= a very high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>4= a very low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>a. Student Recruitment</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q5. The goal of the question is to understand the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent do you perceive the marketing activities in your school to be effective for achieving the following objectives?</p> <p>1= a very high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>4= a very low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>b. Student Retention</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q5. The goal of the question is to understand the perceived effectiveness of marketing activities of schools</p>	<p>To what extent do you perceive the marketing activities in your school to be effective for achieving the following objectives?</p> <p>1= a very high degree of effectiveness</p>

	<p>2=a moderately high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>4= a very low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>c. Brand Awareness</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
--	---

Section Two Marketing Tools

The goal of this section is to collect data of the marketing tools used by schools being surveyed. These data will not be used to identify specific schools and shall remain anonymous.

I would like for you, the members of the Delphi team, to consider whether the items and questions on the survey, in fact, do provide the appropriate information for the goal of each question. You can provide your opinion by marking either “Yes” or “No” in the space provided. If you answered “No” please explain your rationale and provide recommendations for revisions. You may type directly onto the word document. Please only provide your feedback in the right hand column.

<p>Q1. The goal of the question is to understand the use of marketing tools of schools</p>	<p>To what extent does your school use the following marketing tools?</p> <p>Never</p> <p>Sometimes</p> <p>Often</p> <p>Always</p> <p>School Tours</p> <p>Open House</p> <p>Print Advertising</p> <p>School Profile/Brochure</p>
---	--

	<p>School Website</p> <p>LinkedIn</p> <p>Facebook</p> <p>Twitter</p> <p>Instagram</p> <p>Pinterest</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>Promotional Video</p> <p>Hosting Events for the outside public (Lecture, musical performance, etc)</p> <p>Parent/Student Referrals</p> <p>Corporate Human Resources Office Outreach</p> <p>Relocation Agency Outreach</p> <p>Media Outlets in Student's Hometown</p> <p>Attending Educational Fairs</p> <p>Educational Websites</p> <p>Faculty Hiring Websites</p> <p>Focus Groups</p> <p>Local Media Outlets</p> <p>Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.)</p> <p>other</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the perceived effectiveness of marketing tools of schools</p>	<p>If you have used any of the following, please indicate the perceived effectiveness of using these tools to meet your marketing objectives.</p>

	<p>1= a very high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>2=a moderately high degree of effectiveness</p> <p>3= a moderately low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>4= a very low degree of effectiveness</p> <p>School Tours</p> <p>Open House</p> <p>Print Advertising</p> <p>School Profile/Brochure</p> <p>School Website</p> <p>LinkedIn</p> <p>Facebook</p> <p>Twitter</p> <p>Instagram</p> <p>Pinterest</p> <p>YouTube</p> <p>Promotional Video</p> <p>Hosting Events for the outside public (Lecture, musical performance, etc)</p> <p>Parent/Student Referrals</p> <p>Corporate Human Resources Office Outreach</p> <p>Relocation Agency Outreach</p> <p>Media Outlets in Student's Hometown</p> <p>Attending Educational Fairs</p> <p>Educational Websites</p>
--	---

	Faculty Hiring Websites Focus Groups Local Media Outlets Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc.) other Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
--	--

Section Three Demographic Data

The goal of this section is to collect demographic data of the schools being surveyed. This data will not be used to identify specific schools and shall remain anonymous.

I would like for you, the members of the Delphi team, to consider whether the items and questions on the survey, in fact, do provide the appropriate information for the goal of each question. You can provide your opinion by marking either “Yes” or “No” in the space provided. If you answered “No” please explain your rationale and provide recommendations for revisions. You may type directly onto the word document. Please only provide your feedback on in the right hand column.

Q1. The goal of the question is to understand where in EARCOS the respondents are located	In which city is your school located? Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
Q2. The goal of the question is to understand the sizes of the schools of the respondents	What is the peak enrollment figure currently for your entire school? Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
Q3. The goal of the question is to understand the age of the institution	How many years has your school been in continuous operation? Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__
Q4. The goal of the question is to understand the operating structure of	My school is (choose one)

<p>the institution</p>	<p>Not for profit</p> <p>For profit</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q5. The goal of the question is to understand the number of competitors in the institution's marketplace</p>	<p>How many schools do you identify in your marketplace as competition for students?</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>
<p>Q6. The goal of the question is to understand the curriculum of the schools</p>	<p>Which curricular program would you most identify as your school providing?</p> <p>American</p> <p>British</p> <p>International</p> <p>American/International</p> <p>British/International</p> <p>Other</p> <p>Is this question worthwhile? Yes__ No__</p>

Appendix J

CONFIDENTIAL

Survey for Understanding Marketing Practices in International Schools

Dear Head of School (mail merge)

Let me thank you in advance for helping me collect data pertaining to the marketing practices of EARCOS member schools. These data currently do not exist and your participation will help inform the association and specifically your school regarding current marketing practices. A summary report from the findings of this survey will be sent to you as a thank you gift for spending 13 minutes of your time taking this survey. I expect that you will find the results informative and interesting.

Nicholas Kent
High School Principal
Concordia International School Shanghai
Doctoral Candidate Lehigh University

PART 1

Question 1. To what extent does your school use a formal marketing plan?

- _____ never
- _____ sometimes
- _____ often
- _____ always

Question 2. To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?
(never, sometimes, often, always)

- a. During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school's strengths.
- b. During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school's strengths.
- c. During the admissions process, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.
- d. During parent coffees, we claim the schools' tuition is worth the value they receive.
- e. During the admissions process, we provide applicants contact information of current families as resources to answer questions
- f. During admissions process, we claim the location of the school is a strength of the school
- g. During the admissions process, we claim the faculty is a strength of the school

Question 3. To what extent does your school engage in the following activities?
(never, sometimes, often, always)

- a. Head of school invites prospective families to apply.
- b. Division Principal invites prospective families to apply.
- c. Admissions director invites prospective families to apply.
- d. Parent representative invites prospective families to apply.
- e. We provide parents direct access to administrators (such as parent coffees, special lectures, book studies, open forums, webinars, etc.)
- f. We hold events aimed toward specific subgroups of our parent and student population who have specific concerns (such as, parent coffees, discussion groups, book groups, town hall, etc.)
- g. Head of school meets with current families to understand customer satisfaction
- h. Head of school meets with current faculty to understand employee satisfaction
- i. Head of school meets with current students to understand student satisfaction
- j. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current families to understand customer perception of areas of school strength
- k. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current faculty to understand employee perception of areas of school strength
- l. School personnel in charge of marketing meets with current students to understand student perception of areas of school strength

Question 4. Please rate the following marketing objectives in terms of importance

- 1 = a very high degree of importance,
- 2 = a moderately high degree of importance,
- 3 = a moderately low degree of importance,
- 4 = a very low degree of importance

Student Recruitment

Student Retention

Brand Awareness

Question 5. To what extent do you perceive the marketing activities in your school to be effective for achieving the following objectives?

- 1 = very high in effectiveness,
- 2 = moderately high in effectiveness,
- 3 = moderately low in effectiveness,
- 4 = very low in effectiveness

Student Recruitment

Student Retention

Brand awareness

PART 2

1. To what extent does your school use the following Marketing Tools? (never, sometimes, often, always)

School Tours

Open House

Print Advertising

School Profile/Brochure

School Website

LinkedIn

Facebook

Twitter

Instagram

Pintrest

YouTube

Promotional Video

Hosting Events for outside public (lecture, musical performance, etc)

Parent/student referrals

Corporate Human Resource outreach

Relocation Agency outreach

Media Outlets in Student's hometown

Attending Educational Fairs

Educational Websites

Faculty Hiring Websites

Focus Groups

Local Media Outlets

Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc)

Other ____

2. If you have used any of the following, please indicate the perceived effectiveness of using these tools to meet your marketing objectives. (very high in effectiveness, moderately high in effectiveness, moderately low in effectiveness, very low in effectiveness)

School Tours

Open House

Print Advertising

School Profile/Brochure

School Website

Facebook

Twitter

Instagram
Pinterest
YouTube
Promotional Video
Hosting Events for outside public (lecture, musical performance, etc)
Parent/student referrals
Corporate Human Resource outreach
Relocation Agency outreach
Media Outlets in Student's hometown
Attending Educational Fairs
Educational Websites
Faculty Hiring Websites
Focus Groups
Local Media Outlets
Promotional Gifts (hats, pens, USB drives, cups, stickers, etc)
Other ____

PART 3

Demographic Data

1. In which city is your school located?

2. What is the peak enrollment figure currently for your entire school?

3. How many years has your school been in continuous operation?

4. My school is

_____ for profit

_____ not for-profit

5. How many schools do you identify in your market as competition for students?

6. Which curriculum or program would you most identify your school as providing?

_____ American

_____ British

_____ International

_____ American/International

_____ British/International

_____ other

Appendix K

Delphi Study Round 2

Directions: The questions listed on this Round 2 questionnaire had at least 2 of the 5 members of the Delphi team mark the question negatively on the Round 1 questionnaire, suggesting there might be a content validity issue. Please review all Delphi team responses and reconsider each question in light of the ideas expressed by Delphi team members. After considering Delphi team responses, provide your own feedback by adding additional comments and possibly recommending changes to the survey instrument prompts.

The goal of Round 2 is to reach as much consensus as possible and provide recommendations to improve the instrument.

Example: Section 2, Question #3e. reads “To what extent does your school engage in the following activities? E. During the admissions process, we tell parents about the school’s strengths”. After reading two negative responses, you may view the question and its purpose in a new light. Here are two sample responses:

Sample Feedback and Suggestions Response 1:

I might be wrong, but are there schools that don't do this? That said you might need this as baseline to other responses.

Sample Feedback and Suggestions Response 2:

I believe the question could be ok gathering that baseline data, but

maybe ask another question about the extent of negative

recruiting that happens at a school. Not simply focusing on school strengths but pointing out competitors' weakness might be helpful.

PLEASE ONLY WRITE COMMENTS IN THE RIGHT HAND COLUMN
LBELED FEEDBACK AND SUGGESTIONS.

Original Question: Section 2, Question 2b. **To what extent does your school engage in the following activities? During parent coffees, we tell parents about the school's strengths.**

2 out of 5 responses to this question were negative

Response 1: No response given but simply marked *no* when asked if the question is worthwhile.

Response 2: No response given but simply marked *no* when asked if the question is worthwhile.

Feedback and Suggestions:

1. What is parent coffees? It is very contextualized.
2. Valid question from my perspective. Focus on the schools successes at each coffee meeting. Extends info to parents to do external marketing to their social group.
3. I'm ok w/this.
4. Yes this question could work, but you might also layout school's strengths and at same time point out competitors weakness.
5. This seems obvious and a core reason to have a coffee, but I could easily

	<p>change my answer to positive as I may not know what the coffees typically includes. I thought all coffees were an opportunity to share strengths. – but I am always thinking marketing.</p>
<p>Original Question: Section 2, Question 3c. To what extent does your school engage in the following activities? Admissions Director invites prospective families to apply.</p> <p>2 out of 5 responses to this question were negative</p>	
<p>Response 1: I may be wrong, but isn't this the core job dimension?</p> <p>Response 2: No response given but simply marked <i>no</i> when asked if the question is worthwhile.</p>	<p>Feedback and Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This sentence is unclear: Admissions Director invites prospective families to apply. 2. Valid question. 3. "Admission director nurtures families via personal conversations, emails, etc. to the application stage of the admission process." 4. This is a core aspect of the job to encourage families to apply. 5. Again, I thought this was obvious so perhaps not worthwhile. I assume that this is part of the job description, but maybe not. I could easily change my answer to positive.
<p>Thank you for your time and effort. Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated!</p>	

Vita

Nicholas B. Kent

Jl. Anggrek 40c, Cilandak, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia

Email:nicholasbkent@gmail.com

Biography

Nicholas was born in Albany, NY and moved around the United States living in Washington (twice), Iowa, Nebraska, Rhode Island (twice), and Washington, DC before moving abroad to China in 2009 to begin his life as an expat teacher with his wife Erin. During their time overseas, they have served students in Shanghai, China and Jakarta, Indonesia. Nicholas taught high school History and English before assuming the role of assistant high school principal and high school principal before assuming his current role of Deputy Head of School in Jakarta, Indonesia. Nicholas is the proud father of his only daughter Alice, who was born in Shanghai, and currently living in Jakarta attending her second international school.

Professional Experience

Jakarta Intercultural School; Jakarta, Indonesia Deputy Head of School	2016-
Concordia International School; Shanghai, China HS History & Literature teacher, HS Assistant Principal, HS Principal, Head of Marketing and Admissions	2006-2016
Seattle Preparatory School; Seattle, Washington Humanities Teacher	2002-2006
The Bullis School; Potomac, Maryland History & Literature Teacher	2000-2002
The Culver Academies; Culver, Indiana Faculty Intern History Department	1998-1999

Academic Degrees

Providence College, Providence; Rhode Island Master of Arts; American History	2003
Providence College, Providence; Rhode Island Bachelor of Arts; History	1997