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ABSTRACT

MARKETING HIGHER EDUCATION TO MEXICAN-AMERICANS: IDENTIFICATION OF SUCCESSFUL MARKETING STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

Cynthia G. Coiner
Old Dominion University, 1990
Director: Dr. Petra E. Snowden

In this study, a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities was identified. A taxonomy of findings ranging from very successful to not successful was developed. The methodology included focus groups conducted in Los Angeles, California and San Antonio, Texas to aid in the creation of survey instrument items. The resulting survey was mailed to admissions directors of four-year colleges and universities located in the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas.

The responses were analyzed by computing frequencies and crosstabulations. Subsequently, factor analysis was used for the purposes of data reduction and to identify the factors underlying the marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful.

The four P's of marketing include product, price, place, and promotion. Successful marketing strategies and
tactics were identified for each of the four P's of marketing. These successful marketing strategies and tactics were grouped through the use of factor analysis. The factors identified as underlying these successful marketing strategies and tactics are as follows: (1) on-campus programs and activities, (2) off-campus programs and activities, (3) perceptions, and (4) cost. Examples of the factor identified as on-campus programs and activities include: (1) support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus, (2) increased Mexican-American employment on campus, and (3) increased contact of Mexican-Americans by letter or telephone. Examples of off-campus programs and activities include: (1) career fair programs, (2) school and business marketing programs, and (3) transfer centers on community college campuses. Examples of the factor identified as perceptions include: (1) parent preference for college/university close to home, (2) student preference for college/university close to home, and (3) current Mexican-American students promoting college/university. Finally, examples of the factor identified as cost include: (1) financial aid increase for Mexican-Americans, (2) provision of low cost relative to other colleges and universities, and (3) cost competition with community colleges because they are cheaper.

The successful marketing strategies and tactics identified in this study can be used by four-year colleges and universities to develop recruitment plans for
Mexican-Americans. The four factors identified can also be used as a guide for future research to aid in the identification of additional marketing strategies and tactics tailored to the needs of individual institutions.
DEDICATION

To my mother, Louise Pinyon Coiner
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Higher education is a service industry. Kotler and Andreasen define a service as, "any activity or benefit that one party can offer to another that is essentially intangible and does not result in the ownership of anything."\(^1\) Colleges and universities are in the business of attempting to accommodate the needs of various student constituencies by providing educational services. The discipline of marketing applied to higher education offers a planning model which suggests ways for increasing enrollments, reducing attrition, and making college and university services more responsive to the needs of student consumers. Kotler and Fox write that:

America's colleges and universities, once the passive processors of whatever applications came their way, have been forced by a shrinking pool of traditional students to turn to more active recruitment. In addition to marketing consultants, a number of schools are hiring new admissions and financial aid personnel with marketing backgrounds. Others are training admissions officers in marketing. Many schools that have adopted marketing have experienced a marked improvement in their recruiting effectiveness.\(^2\)

Changing demographics and the significant decline in the number of college-age young people coupled with increasing competition among institutions of higher education have
caused many colleges and universities to develop and implement marketing plans. Gunnerson emphasizes that, "marketing is becoming a hotter and hotter topic among colleges nationally, especially in view of changing demographics." Colleges and universities are viewed by students as offering comparable educational services. Therefore, differentiation among institutions of higher education permits some colleges and universities to stand out over other colleges and universities. This differentiation is achieved through the use of marketing. In the process of achieving an advantage over competing colleges and universities, a college or university can use the following marketing assets: program quality, program uniqueness, price, convenience, reputation, and well-qualified faculty. Through the use of differentiation, a college or university can increase the enrollment numbers of specific segments of the market by specializing in meeting the needs of these specific market segments. The concept of serving specific market segments more effectively through differentiation strengthens the institution's position within a particular market segment. Consequently, greater consumer loyalty and repeat purchasing occurs within the segment (Kotler and Andreasen 1987).

Marketing planning includes marketing research strategies and marketing mix strategies. Marketing research involves specific needs analysis of potential students and
the evaluation of the effectiveness of marketing tactics which are implemented as a part of the marketing mix strategies. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan write that the marketing mix is made up of "the phenomena that can be altered by a marketer in order to influence the relationships a product or organization has with the market, or with specific segments of the market." Leach further explains that:

The marketing mix represents those strategies which are intended to inform, serve and satisfy the educational needs of target market populations. These variables often referred to as the 'controllables' are divided into the following four categories: product, price, place, and promotion.

These four categories of the marketing mix are also commonly referred to as the four "P's" of marketing. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain how the marketing mix relates to higher education:

In academic marketing, the marketing mix consists of a host of phenomena--curricular and extracurricular programs and activities, along with their associated personnel (product); dollar costs, financing arrangements, psychological costs associated with student effort and stress, prerequisites for admission (price); location of programs, academic calendars (place); recruiting and public relations activities (promotion).

A more detailed explanation of each of the four categories of the marketing mix as they relate to higher education follows.

As Mexican-Americans make up an increasingly larger percentage of the population of the United States, especially in the southwest, but continue to be
under-represented in four-year college and universities, it becomes increasingly important to identify successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The marketing mix serves as a guide in the identification of these successful marketing strategies and tactics.

The Marketing Mix

Product

Higher education offers intangible products and services in a nonprofit market. Because educational products and services are intangible, they cannot be shown in advertising. For example, when a tangible object is advertised on television or in a magazine, a picture of the object such as a car is usually shown. However, in a nonprofit market, the educational product and accompanying services provided by colleges and universities are usually shown indirectly either by a picture of the university or college campus itself as the producer of the educational product and services or a classroom with students as the recipients of the educational product and services as well as in the statements of successful graduates and their employers. The competence and commitment of the faculty and staff, the extent to which needed classes are available, the services available, and the type of enrollees in a given program are
all part of the product the university or college has to offer to its market. Colleges and universities can increase enrollments by modifying their educational products and services in a way to attract new users. For example, a college or university could focus upon the development of special product and service offerings to meet the educational needs and preferences of the Mexican-American market segment.

Price

All organizations face the problem of pricing their products and services to cover costs. Universities and colleges charge tuition. Pricing issues in higher education include financial aid, tuition, fees, supply costs, textbook costs, and room and board.

Place

Convenience of time and place of course offerings and general student services is an important factor to be considered in the development of the marketing mix by colleges and universities. In reference to time, courses and services should be scheduled and made available at the consumer's convenience. Off-campus courses are an example of convenience of place for student.

Promotion

The selection of media is one of the most important
decisions that must be made in the process of putting together a promotional campaign for a college or university. The basic issues include identifying who is to be reached (the target market) and which media can reach them most effectively. The identification of who is to be reached is the determination of the target market. Once the target market has been defined, all promotional efforts can be developed to appeal to that specific target market. Actually, the determination of the target market is what drives all of the four P's of marketing. In the case of marketing colleges and universities, promotional communication includes published brochures, catalogs, and leaflets; booths at college fairs; audiovisual presentations; internally and externally distributed periodicals; press releases; and information provided by college personnel by mail, telephone, and in person.

Marketing Higher Education to Minorities

While demographic changes in minority population are occurring, they are not reflected in higher education enrollments. According to Pruitt and Isaac, "total minority enrollment increased until about 1980, but by 1982 a decline was in progress, especially among Hispanic and black groups." Loo and Rolison write that:

Despite civil rights legislation, the national goal of providing ethnic minorities with equal access to quality institutions of higher education and opportunities for academic success has yet to be realized.
The interests of the United States are best served by providing all Americans with equal educational opportunity to develop their talents, skills, and abilities. This provision of equal educational opportunity serves to ensure that the United States may continue to enjoy economic growth and improve the quality of life for all of its citizens. Higher education serves to improve the quality of life by expanding employment options and ultimately contributing to the social and economic well-being of individuals. As the demographic mix of the United States changes, human resources from all sectors of the population must be developed.

Minority enrollment in higher education is important for the economy of the nation as it depends upon the educational achievement of minorities and their employability. If institutions of higher education do not effectively market to and recruit minorities, businesses and industries will be unable to fill job positions requiring higher order skills in employees. This possibility of a nation with a large underclass of undereducated, and hence unemployed, citizens could be disastrous. Resources need to be expended to prevent or minimize such outcomes or the nation will see the effects in the form of an increase in the welfare rolls, prison populations, and demand in public services.

The diversity of education and the students' potential for contributing to the occupational fields they enter are
increased by enrolling students with different cultural, experiential, and cognitive backgrounds. Loo and Rolison explain that:

Increasing minority representation provides cultural enrichment as minority students bring a broader horizon to campus and more cultural awareness. People can learn from each others' cultures. In light of the demographic changes occurring in this country, marketing higher education to minorities becomes potentially an issue of survival for colleges and universities. Collison reports that, "by the turn of the century, one in every three students will be a minority group member." Minority groups represent markets of substantial size that cannot be neglected. Hodgkinson points out that, "any surge of new enrollments during the next two decades in higher education will be led by minorities, particularly Blacks and Hispanics." Marketing by colleges and universities can significantly attract more students from minority groups to apply and attend. Consequently, colleges and universities need to take steps toward developing a comprehensive and proven marketing plan for recruiting minority students. This marketing plan requires target marketing to specific minority groups and an on-going evaluation of the strategies and tactics employed in the marketing plan.

The Mexican-American Market

At this time, Hispanics form the second-largest minority in the United States. According to the Census Bureau:
There are more than 20 million people of Hispanic origin in the United States. Hispanics constitute 8.2 percent of the U.S. population and are the fastest-growing large population group.\textsuperscript{12}

The Census Bureau also projects that Hispanics "will compose at least 11 percent of the population by the year 2010, compared to 71 percent for whites, 14 percent for blacks, and 4 percent for other races."\textsuperscript{13}

The Mexican-American population is the largest subgroup of the total Hispanic population in the United States. According to the Census Bureau:

Of the Hispanic population, 62.6 percent are of Mexican origin, 12.2 percent Puerto Rican, 11.4 percent from Central and South America, 5.3 percent Cuban, and the rest from unspecified countries.\textsuperscript{14}

Based upon data gathered by Acosta-Belen and Sjostrom, "the Mexican-American rate of 119.3 births per 1000 women aged 15-44 is the highest among the four Hispanic groups."\textsuperscript{15}

Rosaldo, Calvert, and Seligmann point out that, "today Chicanos are the fastest growing population group in the nation, and already in the southwest they constitute the largest ethnic minority."\textsuperscript{16}

Based upon the population statistics cited above, a large and growing Hispanic market not only exists in the United States but also a large and growing Mexican-American market segment. In addition, it is not suitable to use the same marketing strategies and tactics in the recruitment of different Hispanic subgroups. Hodgkinson explains that:

It is clear that there are enormous differences in lifestyles and values within the Hispanic population.
Each of these subgroups will wish to retain its own identity and values; thus a single 'Hispanic strategy' for higher education would not seem wise.17 It is for these reasons that this study focuses upon marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, the largest Hispanic subgroup in the United States.

Furthermore, research focusing upon the marketing strategies and tactics used by colleges and universities to recruit other minority groups such as Blacks and Asian-Americans cannot be overgeneralized and applied to the Mexican-American market segment. The needs and problems of Mexican-Americans differ from those of other minority groups and thus, other minority groups research findings are not applicable to Mexican-Americans.

The regional concentration of the Hispanic subgroups in the United States provides for clear market segmentation and target marketing by colleges and universities. Guernica and Kasperuk point out that:

The U.S. Hispanic population is regionally concentrated according to national Hispanic origin. Over 75 percent of the total Mexican-origin population resides in the Southwest and Pacific regions of the United States.18

**Definition of Terms**

To clarify the concepts presented in this research, the following glossary is provided.

1. **Marketing:** Kotler and Fox define marketing as, "the analysis, planning, implementation, and control of carefully formulated programs designed to
bring about voluntary exchanges of values with target markets to achieve institutional objectives. Marketing involves designing the institution's offerings to meet the target markets' needs and desires, and using effective pricing, communication, and distribution to inform, motivate, and service the market."19

2. **Market:** The definition of a market given by Kotler and Fox is, "the set of all people who have an actual or potential interest in a product or service and the ability to pay for it."20

3. **Marketing Strategy:** Kotler and Andreason define marketing strategy as, "the selection of a target market(s), the choice of a competitive position, and the development of an effective marketing mix to reach and serve the chosen customers."21

4. **Market Segment:** Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan define a market segment as, "a group of people who exhibit characteristics, behavior, desires, needs, perceptions, or other phenomena that are similar within the group but are distinct from the rest of the market or from other groups in the market."22

5. **Market Segmentation:** The definition of market segmentation given by Kotler is, "the act of dividing a market into distinct groups of buyers who might require separate products and/or
marketing mixes."^{23}

6. **Target Marketing**: Kotler explains that target marketing occurs when "the seller distinguishes among market segments, selects one or more of these segments, and develops products and marketing mixes tailored to each segment."^{24}

**Statement of the Problem**

A disparity exists between the representation of Mexican-American students enrolled in four-year colleges and universities and the representation of Mexican-Americans in the population of the United States. Gandara points out that, "higher education in the United States continues to be distributed unequally, with Mexican-Americans receiving less than their fair share."^{25} Mexican-Americans are not enrolling in four-year institutions of higher education in proportion to their numbers with the total population of the United States. This problem of disparity between the representation of Mexican-Americans in American institutions in higher education and their numbers in the population of the United States is compounded by a lack of adequate information on successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year institutions of higher education. Upon further examination of this problem, it becomes apparent that this disparity is due to the inadequacy of traditional recruitment methods in higher education.
to Mexican-Americans. Fields points out that:

Traditional methods of trying to recruit and retain minority students will not be adequate, by themselves, to move substantially greater numbers of Hispanics and other minority students into and through higher education.26

Pruitt and Isaac write that:

Affirmative steps are needed to recruit. A university must look for sources of discrimination in traditional procedures and must invest time and money in redesigning those procedures. Schools must establish new avenues to reach minority groups.27

Consequently, there is a need to identify and compile a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study aims to identify and compile a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of Mexican-Americans into four-year institutions of higher education. Once this comprehensive set of successful strategies and tactics is identified, they can be utilized by four-year colleges and universities to develop marketing plans tailored to each individual institution for more effectively recruiting Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend.

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To identify successful **product** strategies and tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the educational services and
programs designed to meet the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolled in institutions of higher education.

2. To identify successful distribution strategies and tactics for the marketing of higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the locations and scheduling of classes as well as the atmosphere necessary to meet the needs of Mexican-American students enrolled in four-year institutions of higher education.

3. To identify successful pricing strategies and tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., tuition, fees, expenses, financial aid, and time expenditure justification strategies and tactics designed to meet the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolled in four-year institutions of higher education.

4. To identify successful promotional strategies and tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the advertising, publicity, publications, and personal contact necessary to recruit Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year institutions of higher education.

Direction of the Study

In order to give meaning and context to the concepts
and methodology employed, writings on the marketing of higher education and the needs of Mexican-American college and university students are described in Chapter II, "Review of the Related Literature." An explanation of selected marketing concepts that have been applied to higher education is discussed under the heading, "Marketing Higher Education."

In Chapter III, "Research Methodology," the population of the study is defined. Also, the process used to attain the final survey instrument and the data collection method are explained. The chapter further includes a description of the use of focus groups and the pretesting of the preliminary questionnaire which were used to attain the final survey instrument.

In Chapter IV, the data analysis procedures and findings are presented.

In Chapter V, the summary and conclusions are presented.
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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to give meaning and context to the methodology, concepts, and findings of this study, a review of those concepts relevant to the marketing of higher education was undertaken. A review of the literature concerning the problems and barriers encountered specifically by prospective Mexican-American students as well as students from other minority groups was conducted. Finally, recommendations for implementation of marketing strategies and tactics by four-year colleges and universities to assist Mexican-Americans in overcoming these barriers and problems were examined.

Marketing Higher Education

The need for marketing higher education has been documented by numerous authors (Doescher 1986, Litten 1982, Leach 1984). For example, Kotler and Fox write:

The rapid post-World War II expansion of public colleges, universities, and community colleges, together with increased financial aid and loan programs, encouraged many more high school graduates to consider higher education. During the era of expansion, many institutions were flooded with applicants. The admissions office's task was to select the best applicants for admission.\(^1\)

The situation is very different for institutions of higher
education now. Schools are realizing that students will no longer simply appear at their doors. Today, there is an increasing awareness by colleges and universities that a plan for marketing their educational offerings and services is necessary to attract and retain students. Livingston explains that:

Colleges are scrambling these days to attract not only new students, but those who will stay four years and graduate. Toward that end, many institutions have sought to 'position' themselves--i.e., promote their own distinctive image and strengths.2

It is necessary for a college or university to promote its own distinctive image because colleges and universities offer essentially the same educational product. Colleges and universities often position themselves too closely together. Differentiation tactics among schools serve to increase enrollments (Portugal 1979). Blackburn further explains that, "offering differentiation is related to positioning in that this tactic emphasizes the differences between and among competing colleges and universities."3

The key to competitive positioning by colleges and universities is to identify the major attributes used by the target market to evaluate and choose among competitive institutions of higher education. Then, the college or university chooses a marketing mix that will support and reinforce its chosen competitive position.

Colleges and universities are struggling with declining enrollments, changing demographics, and increasing
competition among themselves as well as with alternatives to
going to a college or university, such as employment and
military service. Knight and Johnson point out that:

Most college leaders are aware of the changing demo­
graphics, the significant decline in the number of high
school graduates, excessive inflation, collective bar­
gaining and revenue uncertainties, and even higher
energy costs. Coupled with increasing competition among
institutions, these problems become even more acute.¹

In order to overcome these problems, they recommend that,
"one worthwhile strategy is the development and implementa­
tion of a marketing plan for colleges and universities."⁵

In order to develop a marketing plan incorporating the
concept of positioning through differentiation, a college or
university focuses upon a particular market segment to
understand and fulfill its specific needs. Ryans and
Shanklin explain that:

In this day and age, it is all but impossible for any
organization to be all things to all people. Any col­
lege or university that tries usually ends up pleasing
few. Thus, a school needs to identify and then target
the selected market segment(s) it intends to pursue.⁶

Miller and Eddy concur and write that:

Institutions that tailor their marketing 'mixes' to
specific groups having more or less homogeneous needs
within the broader and more heterogeneous total market
will have a competitive advantage.⁷

The efforts by a college or university to focus upon a
specific segment of the market through differentiation
positioning many times involves expansion into markets that
have hardly been tapped previously as well as exploration of
new markets (de los Santos 1984). A segment of the market
which has been overlooked by colleges and universities is the Mexican-American market segment to be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Presently, marketing concepts are applied by colleges and universities across the country in the student recruitment process. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain that:

Colleges and universities do exist in, and operate in, markets; they provide services in exchange for resources controlled by students. A college must conduct marketing activities if the institution is to continue to exist.\(^8\)

Consequently, college and university administrators are currently adopting and employing marketing techniques similar to those used by businesses and industries. Strang concurs with this approach and writes that:

Regardless of their reservations, most enlightened administrators tend to agree that educational institutions can use marketing research, pricing, and communication techniques.\(^9\)

Chapman offers the following rationale for the use of marketing strategies and tactics by colleges and universities:

The prospect of a sharp decline in college applications and subsequent enrollments has generated tremendous pressure on college administrators to find more effective ways to attract students. The workshops, convention programs, and journal articles devoted to the dilemmas of college recruiting bear evidence to administrators' concern that their institutions gain or maintain a competitive edge in the scramble for students. In turn, many colleges are committing substantial sums to develop more sophisticated marketing strategies, more appealing programs, and better recruitment literature.\(^10\)

This study has incorporated concepts used in marketing with
the intent of supplementing the current knowledge base with additional data on successful marketing strategies and tactics used for attracting Mexican-Americans to higher education.

Marketing Strategies and Tactics

The application of strategic marketing planning and tactical marketing planning is essential to the development of a marketing plan for a college or university. Kotler and Fox define strategic marketing planning as, "planning of the overall direction of the institution to respond to its markets and opportunities." A marketing strategy is made up of a coordinated set of decisions on (1) target markets, (2) marketing mix, and (3) expenditure level. They define tactical marketing planning as, "planning of the specific action steps needed to take advantage of the marketing opportunities identified through strategic planning." In other words, tactics are the daily activities designed to implement strategies. The development of marketing strategies and tactics as well as the action plan for their achievement are driven by goals. After goals have been established, the college or university then determines strategies and tactics that will help to obtain the goals (Kotler and Murphy 1981). An example of a goal established by a college or university could be to increase the enrollment of a particular segment of the market such as the
Mexican-American market segment.

Lewis, Leach, and Lutz point out that, "a traditional framework for developing strategies is the four P's of marketing: the product (or service), place (or distribution channel), price, and promotion." The concept was originally developed by E. Jerome McCarthy in 1960. Below follows a description of the four P's of marketing, also known as the marketing mix, with examples specifically related to higher education.

The Marketing Mix

Product

A college or university offers programs and services to its students. These programs and services make up the product offered by an educational institution. Kotler and Fox write that, "although few educators think about their programs and services as products, marketers use the word product as an all-inclusive term for what the institution offers to a customer."

Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan point out that, "higher education consists of a set of purposefully interrelated activities that build on the skills and knowledge obtained through secondary schooling." In essence, higher education is a service activity. Kotler and Fox define a service as, "any activity or benefit that one party can offer to another that is essentially intangible and does not result
in the ownership of anything."^{17} Colleges and universities provide a service which is of relatively high risk to the purchaser, i.e., the student, due to the infrequency of purchase, the high cost of acquiring the service, and the high degree of personal importance.

Services such as those offered by colleges and universities have four distinctive characteristics. According to the foremost writers on the subject (Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan 1983, Kotler 1984 1982), these characteristics are: intangibility, inseparability, variability, and high perishability. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain that, "services are intangible, that is, they cannot be seen, tasted, felt, heard, or smelled before they are bought."^{18}

A student enrolling in a course cannot see the result of having taken the course before he actually takes it. To increase the prospective student's confidence, colleges and universities need to take steps to emphasize the benefits of their services rather than just describe their features. For example, a college admissions officer can talk to prospective students about the jobs its alumni have found instead of just describing college life. In reference to inseparability, Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain that:

A service is inseparable from the source that provides it. The very act of creating the service requires that the source, whether a person or machine, be present. Thus, production and consumption occur simultaneously with services. This is in contrast to products, which continue to exist whether or not their source is present.^{19}
The production and consumption of educational programs and their auxiliary services occurs simultaneously. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan describe variability in the following manner: "Since a service is so closely linked to its source, it can be highly variable, depending on who is providing it and when it is being provided." For example, a professor teaching a course may provide instruction of higher quality than another professor teaching the same course. Students are aware of this high variability and frequently talk with other students before enrolling in a course taught by a particular professor. It is for this reason, colleges and universities must take steps toward quality control, such as hiring knowledgeable professors with proven skills in teaching and relating to students. Finally, services such as those offered by higher education are perishable and cannot be stored. Again, Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan give an example of the difference between a tangible product and an intangible service: "A car can be kept in inventory until it is sold, but the revenue of an unoccupied theatre seat is lost forever." The concept of perishability also holds true for educational services. The revenue from an unoccupied seat in a college or university classroom is also lost forever.

Instructional programs offered by colleges and universities must be responsive to the needs of students. In addition, college and university students have needs for
auxiliary services. Lewis, Leach, and Lutz classify these auxiliary services into three general categories:

(1) Entry services, including information which is targeted to their specific interests, assistance with assessment, advising and placement, and registration procedures which are conveniently accessible; (2) Support services which include personal support such as financial aid, security and child care; educational support such as skills development, tutoring and co-curricular activities, and developmental support such as counseling, career planning and leadership training; (3) Transition services such as transfer counseling and job placement.22

For example, upon admission to a college or university, a student needs assistance in appropriate placement into courses, orientation to procedures and support services, and activities that create a sense of identification and belonging.

Price

Colleges and universities charge tuition and fees to keep operating. Kotler and Fox explain that:

Educational institutions routinely make price decisions. Annually the chief financial officer will review tuition rates and room and board fees to determine needed increases. From time to time, application, registration, health-service, and other fees need to be revised.23

Therefore, price includes more than tuition. Students invest their money not only for tuition, but also for fees, books, room and board, and other expenses related to obtaining an education at a college or university. Financial aid offerings by a college or university serve as a discount to the student. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan further
explain that:

We use price to refer to published tuition, fees, and residential charges; our use of cost generally refers to net financial outlay (price minus discounts, or financial aid) by students and parents.24

Students also pay a price in the form of psychological costs. These psychological costs include the time and stress involved in studying and attending classes as well as foregoing other activities such as employment and spending time with friends and family. Knight and Johnson write that, "students invest their time in studying, commuting, and being separated from family and friends."25

Price, that is, the cost of an education at a college or university, is one of the top concerns for both students and their parents. Chapman points out that:

Cost is probably more of an influence on whether or not a student goes to college than on which particular college he or she attends. However, other research suggests that cost does make a difference in college selection.26

Financial aid serves the purpose of reducing or eliminating the price problem which is often an obstacle to potential students of a college or university. Lewis, Leach, and Lutz write that, "although tuition and fees are fixed at public institutions, price strategies promoting financial aid were used to discount the real cost to students."27 Since the price of attending a college or university and the discounts offered in the form of financial aid are important factors in the decision to enroll at
a particular school, the admissions office must work closely with the financial aid office. Knight and Johnson point out that, "a responsible financial aid staff is an important and major component in a marketing plan because these people inform students about costs."28

In addition to financial aid, the price of higher education can be reduced by student employment opportunities both on and off campus as well as through the implementation of accelerated educational programs. Kotler and Fox give an example of an accelerated educational program: "Boston University offers a six-year B.S./M.D. program for outstanding entering freshmen, who thus save two years of tuition and foregone income."29

Place

The place or distribution issue in higher education concerns the scheduling of classes, methods of delivery, and locations for the facilities where classes and auxiliary services are available. The convenience of the student as a consumer is a key factor in the selection of schedules, methods of delivery, and location. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain the issue of place or distribution relative to higher education:

This most often refers to physical locations, but it also includes when a product is available. For colleges this not only means campus locations, but also academic calendars, course scheduling, residency or fieldwork requirements.30
Colleges and universities will often have to modify their place or distribution strategies in order to accommodate new or growing markets for their educational programs and services:

Standard courses can be shortened in the evening or on weekends. For example, Alverno College, a private women's school in Milwaukee, instituted a weekend college and drew large numbers of housewives and employed women. Some colleges are beginning to offer courses in the very late evening or very early morning, having discovered a number of working people for whom these hours would be more convenient.31

Promotion

Developing education programs and services, pricing these programs and services, and making them available to students is not enough. A college or university needs to inform potential students and motivate them to attend that particular institution. Therefore, institutions of higher education use promotion. The promotion of a college or university includes the use of both public relations and advertising. Kotler and Fox define public relations as:

Efforts to obtain favorable interest in the institution and/or its programs by planting significant news about them in publications or obtaining favorable unpaid presentation on radio, television, or in other media.32

They further define advertising as:

Paid presentation and promotion of ideas, products, programs, or services—whether in magazines or newspapers, on television, radio, billboards, or bus cards, or through catalogs, direct mail, or some other medium.33

In the past, college and university counselors would
visit different high schools and present a talk, answer questions, and pass out some written materials. Today, promotion tools used by admissions counselors include audiovisual materials such as films, slides, and audio and video cassettes. For example, some colleges and universities are mailing VCR tapes to potential students so that they may learn about the school in the privacy of their homes. These VCR tapes could also be targeted to special audiences such as Mexican-Americans who are interested in Mexican-American students, organizations, and activities on campus. An audiovisual presentation delivers a much stronger promotional presentation about a college or university. A high-impact audiovisual presentation given by Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan is: "A recruiter from the University of Richmond, for example, shows a 16mm, full-color, twelve-minute film dramatizing life on the University of Richmond's campus."34

The marketing mix as a framework in the development of marketing strategies and tactics has been discussed by several authors (Buchanan and Hoy 1983, Knight and Johnson 1981, Piland 1984, and Vacarro 1979). In addition, Lewis, Leach, Lutz (1983) write on the use of the marketing mix of product, price, place, and promotion as a framework for developing marketing strategies and tactics to be implemented by colleges and universities to attract students to enroll and attend. Leach (1984) developed a marketing plan
for recruiting adult students at Prince George's Community College in Largo, Maryland. The four categories of the marketing mix served as a guide in the development of the marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting adult students. Surveys were used to identify adult student needs and preferences. The information gathered via the surveys was used to attract and serve the educational needs of adult students.

The marketing mix also served as a guide as well as a framework in this study for the identification of successful marketing strategies and tactics to recruit Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities.

Marketing Research

Colleges and universities need to conduct marketing research to make decisions regarding their marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting students (Bryant 1983, Marshall and Delman 1984, and Thompson 1979). Kotler and Fox define marketing research as, "the systematic design, collection, analysis, and reporting of data and findings relevant to a specific marketing situation or problem facing an institution." Through the use of marketing research, institutions of higher education can identify and serve student markets effectively by determining what is working and what is not working and, subsequently, make needed changes in their marketing mix strategies and tactics.
Marketing research provides a college or university with information concerning not only what the students want but who they are, how they behave, what they believe, and what influences them in these areas. For example, Navratil writes that:

The choice of a college involves a variety of different influences and previous research reflects this fact. The examined influences include: distance, pricing policy, financial aid, the college's printed materials, the personal characteristics of the student, and the perception or image of the university relative to its competitor.

Through the use of marketing research, colleges and universities can determine what influences college or university choice, what students want from a school, why and how students make the decision to attend a particular school, as well as reasons for not attending other schools.

Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan (1983) conducted marketing research to determine what attributes and characteristics of a college or university are important to both students and parents in the Six-Market Study for Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota. Open-ended questions were used in telephone interviews to develop closed-ended questions for the questionnaire. O'Neal (1984) also conducted marketing research at the University of Evansville in Indiana to develop an understanding of the college choice decision process by surveying both prospective and current students.

Marketing research was used in this study as well to
identify successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. Specifically, this writer utilized marketing research to identify marketing strategies and tactics that are successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. By using the above approaches, it was expected that the findings would add to the current knowledge base on these successful marketing strategies and tactics. In addition, the methodology employed is more sophisticated than previous marketing research, giving more credence to the validity of the findings.

Review of Related Methodologies

In 1988, Karen L. Stewart conducted a dissertation study at the University of Pittsburgh entitled, "Applying the Marketing Concept to a Higher Education Setting." The study defined the four P's of marketing in terms of events and experiences of university students. The marketing concepts of product, price, place, and promotion were applied to a higher education setting. The questionnaire used in the study was developed around students' needs and wants. The four P's of marketing were used as a guide in the development of the questionnaire items.

David Rubino also conducted a dissertation study in 1988 at the University of Pittsburgh entitled, "A Study of
Marketing as Practiced by Selected Independent Colleges and Universities.\textsuperscript{38} The major research question in this dissertation determined the specific marketing strategies employed at the selected institutions and if any of those marketing strategies were uniformly employed by all the selected institutions.

Richard Dicenza, Jeffrey M. Ferguson, and Ronald Wisner from the University of Colorado conducted a study to identify choice criteria in the selection of a college or university.\textsuperscript{39} They also attempted to show how the identification of those variables affecting a potential student's choice of a particular college or university can help an institution respond effectively to the needs of its markets. Initially, focus groups were used to collect data. The participants in the focus groups were college-bound high school seniors and high school guidance counselors from the southeastern part of Colorado. The researchers then reviewed the participants' comments to identify the issues and concerns. A survey was developed from the data gathered. The results of the survey were analyzed by a factor analysis with varimax rotation.

This study incorporates some of the related research literature. The four P's of marketing, that is, product, price, place, and promotion, are applied to a higher education setting. Focus groups are used to collect initial data. This initial gathering of data serves to identify
concerns and issues. A questionnaire was developed from the data gathered. Also, the questionnaire items were developed through the use of the four P's of marketing as a guide. The questionnaire responses were initially analyzed using descriptive statistical procedures (frequencies and cross-tabulations) to develop a listing of successful strategies and tactics. Finally, the questionnaire responses were analyzed using the data reduction technique known as factor analysis to develop groupings of related strategies and tactics.

The studies that have been carried out have not focused upon the identification of those marketing strategies and tactics which are successful in attracting students to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. Furthermore, previous studies have not dealt specifically with the marketing of higher education to Mexican-Americans. This study specifically identifies those marketing strategies and tactics which are successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities.

**Marketing Higher Education to Minorities**

Brenneman writes that, "the traditional college-age population will decline in number between now and the mid-1990s by roughly 25 percent." The result of this decline in the white, middle-class, college-age population will be
an increase in competition among colleges and universities. O'Neal concurs and points out that:

The university faces the challenge of the marketplace with an intensity never before experienced and the competition will no doubt escalate further as the pool of traditional students continues to recede.41

In order to maintain enrollment levels and avoid the increasing competition for a shrinking traditional student market, institutions of higher learning are finding it necessary to market to and adapt their educational programs and services to the needs of minority students. Maynard states that, "universities must be relevant in today's and in future societies by continually evolving and adapting to the changing needs of our multicultural population."42 Consequently, colleges and universities must market effectively to minorities.

Brenneman points out that, "black and Hispanic youngsters will make up a growing percentage of the 18-year-old population between now and the late 1990s."43 Thus, black and Hispanic youth would constitute new markets for educational programs and services offered by colleges and universities. Unquestionably, the black and Hispanic markets present potential for development because they are growing. Olson agrees and writes that, "another subgroup which has not been recruited effectively heretofore is the minority population."44 In summary, the research shows that colleges and universities need to develop and implement
marketing plans to increase the enrollment of minorities in higher education with a special emphasis placed upon increasing the enrollment of blacks and Hispanics.

Unfortunately, there is an inadequacy of traditional marketing strategies and tactics in attracting minorities. Many colleges and universities have paid little or no attention to the special needs of minority students. Fields writes that:

Some minority-group scholars and students say the bottom-line is a failure of leadership at colleges and universities, which they say have never seen the education of minority scholars as a central part of their mission.45

The majority of institutions of higher education have continued to rely on marketing mixes tailored to meet the needs of the traditional student market in order to attract minority students to enroll and attend. Fields explains that:

Traditional methods of trying to recruit and retain minority students will not be adequate, by themselves, to move substantially greater numbers of Hispanic and other minority students into and through higher education.46

Consequently, colleges and universities need to develop and implement marketing strategies and tactics that will provide minority students with educational programs and services designed to meet their unique needs. Maynard concurs and states that:

Universities must constantly remain vigilant against internal forces that attempt to keep the status quo and place constraint on the system's adaptability to meet the changing needs of the population it serves.47
In summary, many colleges and universities are still using traditional marketing strategies and tactics to recruit minorities. These traditional strategies and tactics are inadequate in attracting greater numbers of minorities to enroll and attend. Therefore, successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting minorities into colleges and universities need to be identified. An assumption of this study is that each minority group will require marketing strategies and tactics tailored to meet its specific needs. Following is a discussion of the rationale for marketing higher education specifically to Mexican-Americans.

Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans

Two issues need to be addressed before the discussion of the rationale for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans. These issues include: (1) other terms referring to the Mexican-American population and (2) the assumption that studies concerning Hispanics located in the southwest are dealing primarily with Mexican-Americans.

Astin and Buriciaga write that, "people of Mexican descent living in the United States have been referred to by a variety of terms: Hispanic, Mexican-American, Mexicano, Spanish-speaking, Latino, Raza, and Chicano." These terms are used interchangeably throughout the review of related literature. However, Rosaldo, Calvert, and Seligmann write that, "the term 'Chicano' is rapidly replacing the term
In this study, institutions of higher education as well as the United States Census Bureau do not distinguish among the various Hispanic subgroups. Acosta-Belen and Sjostrom explain that:

While 'Hispanic' has become a convenient way to refer to Americans of Spanish heritage, the catchall term masks a variety of ethnic, racial, national, and cultural backgrounds. And within the United States, the various Hispanic groups tend to be separated geographically and in their way of life.

The research report written in 1987 entitled Successful Marketing to U.S. Hispanics and Asians points out that Hispanics of different origins live in different areas of the country: Mexican-Americans in the western, southwestern, and central states; Puerto Ricans in the central and northeastern states; and Cubans in the southeastern states. Cafferty and McCready also write that, "the Hispanic population of the southwest is 86 percent Mexican origin." Therefore, a reasonable assumption is that studies concerning Hispanics located in the southwest are referring primarily to Mexican-Americans.

The Growing Hispanic Market for Higher Education

Whereas, other minority groups are now proportionately represented among college and university populations, Hispanics are not. Hodgkinson points out that, "twenty-eight percent of all Black youth age 18 to 24 enter college, but the percentage of Hispanic youth who enter college is much lower. Estimates vary from 5 percent to 15 percent."
Therefore, colleges and universities, especially those located in areas with large Hispanic populations, need to focus upon developing and implementing marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Hispanics to enroll and attend.

Miller and Eddy note that:

Although Blacks as a group have traditionally held higher education in esteem, Hispanics, the most demographically explosive sector of the U.S. population, have not looked upon a scholarly career as a matter of economic and social advancement. While there is an indication that Hispanics are increasingly turning to public postsecondary education as a means for entering the mainstream of economic life in the United States, a clear-cut pattern has not yet been established in that direction.53

Consequently, the Hispanic market constitutes not only a growing market for the programs and services offered by institutions of higher education but also a challenging market.

Finally, those colleges and universities designing and implementing marketing strategies and tactics to recruit Hispanics will develop a competitive advantage over other institutions competing for the same Hispanic market. Miller and Eddy explain that:

Institutions that tailor their marketing mixes to specific groups having more or less homogeneous needs within the broader and more heterogeneous total market will have a competitive advantage.54

A problem exists with aggregate data on Hispanics. Because institutions of higher education and the United States Census Bureau do not distinguish among the various Hispanic subgroups, it is difficult to determine exactly how
many Mexican-Americans are enrolling in and attending four-year colleges and universities and how well they are progressing once enrolled. Astin and Burciaga write that:

Reliable statistics on the college enrollments of Chicanos are sparse: the usefulness of the data collected by most federal agencies is weakened by the fact that figures on Chicanos are seldom disaggregated from figures on other subgroups of Hispanic Americans.55

However, Belen and Sjostrom point out that, "Mexican-Americans constitute the largest group of Hispanics in the United States.56 Mexican-Americans also have the highest fertility rate of all Hispanic groups. According to Belen and Sjostrom, "the Mexican-American rate of 119.3 births per 1000 women aged 15-44 is the highest among the Hispanic groups."57 Since the Mexican-American population is the largest and fastest-growing among the different Hispanic subgroups, four-year colleges and universities need to develop and implement marketing strategies and tactics for the Mexican-American subgroup. Furthermore, Gandara writes that:

As Mexican-Americans make up an increasing percentage of the Southwest's population, the undereducation of Chicanos represents a growing threat to both the functioning of higher education and economic health of the region.58

Institutions of higher education cannot afford to neglect such a large and growing Mexican-American market. This study was undertaken to assist policymakers and recruitment officers to more effectively market higher education to Mexican-Americans.
Problems and Barriers Encountered by Prospective and Current Mexican-American College and University Students

**Mexican-American Overrepresentation in Two-Year Colleges**

Research shows that Mexican-Americans are under-represented in four-year colleges and universities and overrepresented in two-year colleges. Richardson and Bender write that:

Minorities are represented in two-year colleges at levels close to their proportional representation in the population. They are underrepresented at the four-year level. Hispanics have the highest concentration (54 percent) of students in two-year colleges.59

Astin and Burciaga concur and state that, "the enrollment of Chicanos is disproportionately high."60 Mexican-Americans have extremely close family ties and, consequently, have a greater tendency to attend colleges within fifty miles of their homes so that they can continue to live at home while they attend college. Consequently, the initial enrollment at a two-year college substantially reduces the Mexican-American student's chances of completing a baccalaureate degree. Astin and Burciaga explain that, "attending a public two-year college has strongly negative effects on the Chicano student's persistence."61 Astin points out that, "students who live away from home while attending college are more likely to persist to baccalaureate completion than those who live at home with their parents; this is especially true for Blacks and Chicanos."62
Alienation Atmosphere
Cultural Shock

Loury writes, "it is still true that most college and university campuses are anglo-dominated, miniature societies that reflect all problems, prejudices, fears, and frustrations characteristic of the larger society." Research findings show that Mexican-American students feel alienated and experience culture shock on many college and university campuses. Lunneborg and Lunneborg interviewed a random sample of minority students (i.e., Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Native Americans) about their perceptions and university and/or college experience. Lunneborg and Lunneborg point out that:

Their negative comments were primarily social: (a) they felt ignored, as if they did not belong; (b) the university was cold, lacked social life, and was an unfriendly and unsociable place; and (c) they perceived prejudice, racism, and patronizing attitudes.

Fiske interviewed Mexican-American students and found that their problems included the loneliness and tensions associated with an alien culture on the campuses of colleges and universities. Fiske explains that, "Hispanic college students say that discrimination is pervasive in American colleges and universities, sometimes in subtle ways, sometimes overtly." Students interviewed by Fiske expressed feeling pressure to continually justify their presence on college and university campuses, partly because of the affirmative action programs. Also, the students felt that
the curricula did not reflect the interests of Mexican-Americans and thus contributed to a feeling of alienation.

Loo and Rolison (1986) interviewed a random sample of minority students, including Mexican-Americans, at a small public university in California. The students felt that their academic difficulties grew out of socioeconomic and cultural differences between their background and that of white students. This culture shock affected their performance academically because of the energy required to adapt to a different culture situation.

Madrazo-Peterson and Rodriguez found that, "Chicano students experienced more discomfort with the campus than did their Anglo peers."66

Absence of Mexican-American Role Models on Higher Education Faculties

A problem encountered by both prospective and current Mexican-American college and university students is the lack of Mexican-American role models on the faculties of colleges and universities. Reports on the condition of higher education for Mexican-Americans have cited the need to recruit Mexican-American faculty as a part of an overall strategy to increase the participation rate of Mexican-Americans in four-year colleges and universities. Gandara explains that:

The mentoring process wherein supportive relationships are formed between teacher and student has been found to be key in the success of many Chicano students. Further, there is reason to believe that these
relationships are most easily formed between individuals who perceive themselves to share common backgrounds. Hence, without Chicano faculty the pool of potential mentors for these students is substantially reduced. Fields (1987) also writes that there is a need for more Mexican-American faculty to help Mexican-American students adjust to the alien culture of colleges and universities. Fiske conducted research and found that, "Hispanic students say that they feel the absence of role models once they get to predominantly Anglo colleges and universities." Colleges and universities need to eliminate the atmosphere of alienation for Mexican-American faculty as well as students in order to ensure successful experiences in the mentoring process.

Poor Academic Preparation in High School

Based upon research, Loo and Rolison found that, "Chicano students felt that their academic difficulties stemmed from having had less academic preparation in high school." Some reasons given for the poor preparation of Mexican-Americans for college in high school include: (1) low expectations among teachers and counselors for Mexican-Americans, (2) inadequately financed minority area schools, (3) language deficiencies, and (4) little intellectual stimulation by parents because education is not stressed.

Financial Difficulties

One of the chief barriers to higher education for
Mexican-Americans is the concern about finances. These financial concerns include difficulty in financing higher education and the need to work while attending a college or university. Based upon research conducted by Madrazo-Peterson and Rodriguez:

Students cited an inability to qualify for financial aid, the high cost of tuition, fees, and housing, and insubstantial financial assistance as major sources of financial difficulties.70

A college education is a costly purchase for many students. The concern about debt and the reluctance of Mexican-American students and their families to incur such debts inhibit the education of many Mexican-Americans. Therefore, financial aid is very important in attracting Mexican-Americans to attend colleges and universities. According to Astin, "the type of financial aid is also important. The effects of grants or scholarships are generally positive, but the effects of loans are mixed."71

There is also a lack of information about and assistance available to help Mexican-Americans apply for financial aid. Many Mexican-Americans require technical assistance in filling out and understanding the complex financial aid forms. Olivas points out that, "programs to provide technical assistance have not kept pace with the increasingly complex eligibility forms."72 Consequently, many Mexican-Americans do not attend college not only because of lack of finances and concern over incurring debt
but also because of an inability to apply for financial aid which may be available.

Holding a full-time outside job while in college has unfavorable effects. However, many Mexican-Americans must hold full-time jobs while attending college in order to live as well as to finance their education. Astin writes that, "minority students who enter college expecting to work full time at an outside job are much less likely to persist to baccalaureate completion than those who enter college with no such expectation."73

**Failure of Colleges and Universities to Recruit Mexican-Americans Early in the School Years**

Colleges and universities usually begin to recruit students during the later years of high school. Mexican-Americans need to be reached much earlier for purposes of motivation, preparation, and education regarding requirements for admission and financial aid opportunities. Fields gives an example of early outreach:

UCLA has a variety of projects under way that focus on working directly with schools to upgrade the academic quality of courses, improve counseling, and try to interest students and their parents in the possibility of attending college by the time students are in the eighth grade.74

**Inadequacy of Traditional Admissions Standards as Predictors of Mexican-American Success in College**

Lea, Sedlacek, and Stewart write that, "traditional
admissions predictors are inappropriate for culturally different students. Consequently, many minority students who could succeed in college are never admitted."75 Pruitt and Isaac (1985) conducted a study with minority groups that included Blacks, American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans. They examined the inadequacy of traditional admission standards and recommended the redesigning of those standards. Pruitt and Isaac found that discrimination is practiced through the use of objective standards for admission, e.g., standardized test scores. Furthermore, very little research has been conducted to determine the relevance of standardized test scores to performance once minorities such as Mexican-Americans are enrolled in colleges and universities. Pruitt and Isaac recommend the use of subjective screening criteria such as interviews and recommendations from teachers.

A barrier to the enrollment of Mexican-Americans in four-year colleges and universities according to Fields is:

Colleges' continued heavy reliance on admissions decisions based upon the results of standardized tests that do not predict future academic performance as well for Hispanic students as they do for Anglo students.76

Astin further explains that, "most of the debate over standardized testing centers on what is called the construct validity of these instruments. Are they culturally biased? Do they measure the academic abilities of people from other than white, middle-class backgrounds?"77
Recommendations for Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans

Of the limited number of authors who have written on the subject of marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, the following recommendations have been made.

**Reduce Atmosphere of Alienation on Campuses**

In order to reduce the atmosphere of alienation on the campuses of four-year colleges and universities, the representation of Mexican-American students, faculty, administrators, and personnel needs to be increased. Maynard recommends:

Employing ethnic minorities at all levels of university positions. Such individuals can provide diversity to the complexion of the campus, serve as role models for all students, and foster multicultural sensitization in campus curriculums and activities.70

**Increase Financial Aid Offerings to Mexican-Americans**

Mexican-Americans experience difficulty in qualifying for financial aid and finding enough financial aid to enable them to attend colleges and universities. Madrazo-Peterson and Rodriguez write that, "student recommendations for change (in financial aid) include more financial aid, a modification of needs assessment, and increased job possibilities."79 Astin explains that, "support in the form of scholarships or grants tend to facilitate undergraduate persistence and also to influence students' choice of
Astin also points out that, "part-time work seems to facilitate persistence, especially if the job is located on campus." Therefore, financial aid offerings in the form of scholarships and grants need to be increased and part-time job opportunities located on campus should be developed in order to attract Mexican-Americans.

Involve Business and Industry in the Marketing of Higher Education to Mexican-Americans

Many Mexican-Americans do not attend colleges and universities because of the desire to go to work immediately following high school, and many times they need to work in order to support themselves and often their families. Gandara writes about "the decision of many Hispanics to forego further education in favor of an immediate job opportunity." To ensure that a productive and educated workforce is available in the future, business and industry need to develop a partnership with colleges and universities to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend. Gandara points out that, "programs in which industry takes an active interest in students' progress and provides college incentives are examples of programs that work." Businesses and industries can work with institutions of higher education to provide part-time work experiences so that Mexican-American students are able to work and attend school simultaneously.
Higher Education Outreach Programs for Mexican-American Students in Secondary and Primary Schools

There are examples of activities by colleges and universities which are designed to expand the number of Mexican-American students who are interested in, and prepared for, higher education. For example, institutions of higher education are reaching down into secondary and primary schools to market to and prepare Mexican-Americans for participation in higher education. Based upon research findings, Astin and Burciaga write that:

Over half (56 percent) of the Chicano respondents recommended encouraging the college attendance of minority students by developing outreach programs to inform young people and their parents of the benefits of college and by generally improving access.34

The recommendation is that colleges and universities share the responsibility for getting Mexican-Americans into higher education with secondary and primary schools. Gunnerson (1986) explains an Early Outreach Program that offers direct services to seventh and eighth graders in an attempt to increase minority students' eligibility for college admission. The program involves counselors visiting schools and telling junior high school students what courses to take and how to qualify and apply for financial aid. This study's findings have added to the existing data base by identifying a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities.
Summary

The focus of this study is to identify successful marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The review of the related literature was conducted to assist in these efforts. Organization of the literature was intended to identify the need for marketing higher education in general, to minorities, and specifically to Mexican-Americans. Further, the review of the related literature examined marketing concepts relevant to the marketing of higher education.

The marketing of higher education to Mexican-Americans involves the implementation of strategies and tactics designed to overcome problems and barriers encountered by this particular market segment. Consequently, the review of related literature includes explanations of these problems and barriers. Finally, traditional recommendations for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans have been reviewed.

Various marketing strategies and tactics have been employed in an effort to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. However, there exists no comprehensive identification of strategies and tactics which are successful. This study aims to identify and compile a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of
Mexican-Americans into four-year institutions of higher education and build on the existing knowledge base. These marketing strategies and tactics can then be utilized by four-year colleges and universities to develop recruitment plans for Mexican-Americans tailored specifically to each individual institution.

Chapter III describes the study population, the process used to attain the final survey instrument, and the data collection method.
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CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design of this study was descriptive in nature because its purpose was to identify and describe successful marketing strategies and tactics employed by four-year colleges and universities in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend. The survey method was used to collect the descriptive data for the study. The chapter is divided into four sections detailing the research methodology used to identify and describe successful marketing strategies and tactics. The four sections include: (1) the study population, (2) instrument development and testing, (3) data collection, and (4) data analysis techniques.

The Study Population

The population chosen for the study consisted of the admissions directors of the 253 four-year colleges and universities located in the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas as identified in the 1988 edition of Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study.¹ See appendix 1 for individual
breakdown of study population. These 253 four-year colleges and universities were selected for inclusion in the study because of their proximity to the Mexican-American target market areas. Research data show that the vast majority of Mexican-Americans live in these six states. According to Guernica and Kasperuk:

The U.S. Hispanic population is regionally concentrated according to national Hispanic origin. Over 75 percent of the total U.S. Mexican-origin population resides in the Southwest and Pacific regions of the United States.\(^2\)

The admissions directors of these 253 four-year colleges and universities were chosen as respondents for the final survey instrument because of: (1) their expertise and knowledge on the subject of marketing in higher education, (2) their continuous contact with students, parents of students, and high school guidance counselors, and (3) their experience with areas of student concerns, issues, problems, and needs with regard to higher education and its auxiliary services. Students were not chosen as respondents for the final survey instrument because students frequently know only vaguely what educational benefits they want and only a little about what they need. However, they were used in the focus groups for the creation of the preliminary questionnaire. Questionnaire items that included student responses were incorporated in the final survey instrument development. Based upon research findings, Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan explain that:
Students vary in their sophistication, maturity, and desires. Often these students are not reliable sources of information about important aspects of the academic marketing mix.3

Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan also point out that, "what people want, particularly when it comes to a complex activity such as higher education, may not be everything from which they could benefit."4

**Instrument Development and Testing**

The development and testing of the research instrument, that is, the questionnaire, included two steps: (1) the use of focus groups to create the preliminary questionnaire and (2) the pretesting of the preliminary questionnaire to develop a final survey instrument.

**Step One: The Use of Focus Groups**

Focus groups are used as a method to gather data during the exploratory stage of a marketing research project. According to Kotler and Fox, focus groups:

Can be used to (1) probe deeply into consumers' underlying needs, perceptions, preferences, and satisfaction; (2) gain greater understanding of marketing problems whose causes are not known; and (3) develop ideas that can be further investigated through quantitative research.5

The information gathered through the use of focus groups serves later in the development of survey instruments.

Kotler and Fox also point out that:

Focus group interviewing is becoming one of the major marketing research tools for gaining insight into consumer thoughts and feelings. In many cases, the
results of focus group interviews guide the subsequent development of survey instruments.

Step one involved the use of a set of open-ended questions in each of eight focus groups to identify issues and areas of concern as well as to solicit recommendations for marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The data were gathered via responses to these open-ended questions which were administered to participants of the focus groups and were used later as the basis for identifying the final survey instrument questions.

Focus Group Participant Selection

In total, eight focus groups were conducted: four groups in Los Angeles, California and four groups in San Antonio, Texas. The rationale for conducting the eight focus groups in the states of California and Texas is evident in that these two states have the largest Mexican-American population of the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas. Based upon data collected by the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Gandara points out that:

The two states with the largest Mexican-American populations are California and Texas. Between them they account for approximately 73 percent of all Mexican-Americans in the United States.

Four separate groups of individuals participated in
each of the two testing sites. These groups consisted of: (1) admissions directors of four-year colleges and universities, (2) presently enrolled Mexican-American college and university students, (3) parents of presently enrolled Mexican-American college and university students, and (4) high school guidance counselors. These four different groups of individuals were selected because of the relevancy of their input to the study. See appendix 2 for a breakdown of the eight focus groups. Each of the focus groups consisted of ten individuals. In total, eighty individuals participated in the focus research. The number of individuals within each focus group ranged from six to ten. According to Kotler and Fox:

A focus group discussion with six to ten members of a key public can reveal their knowledge and feelings about an institution. Although the resulting observations may not be fully representative, they normally contribute valuable perspectives and raise questions that the institution may find worthwhile to explore more systematically.8

Participants in the focus groups were selected through the convenience sampling procedure. Individuals who were easiest to access and most available to obtain information from were selected from the target populations relevant to the study and recruited to participate in the focus groups. The use of the convenience sampling procedure for the selection of participants in the focus groups presents little handicap since this initial step of the study was exploratory for the purpose of developing the preliminary
questionnaire rather than obtaining definitive and final results.

Formulation of Open-Ended Questions

A review of the related literature on the marketing of higher education and needs of Mexican-American college and university students provided a conceptual framework for the formulation of the open-ended questions used in the focus groups. The review of the related literature identified four general categories for the grouping of open-ended questions. These four categories are known in the field of marketing as the marketing mix or the four P's of marketing: product, price, place, and promotion. Kotler and Fox explain that:

Although many variables make up the marketing mix, they can be classified into four major groups. McCarthy formulated a popular classification called the 'four P's': product, price, place, and promotion. Leach defines the relationship between higher education and the marketing mix as, "those strategies which are intended to inform, serve, and satisfy the educational needs of target market populations."10 In this study, the target market population is the Mexican-American population. Product strategies include courses, programs, and services offered to meet the needs of this target market. Place or distribution strategies include the location, format, and accessibility of educational services. Price strategies include the cost for higher education assessed in terms of
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money, time, and psychological risk. Promotion strategies include those which serve to increase the awareness in the target market of the educational opportunities and offerings. Litten, Sullivan, and Brodigan provide further illustration of the relationship between the four P's of marketing and higher education:

In academic marketing, the marketing mix consists of a host of phenomena—curricular and extracurricular programs and activities, along with their associated personnel (product); dollar costs, financing arrangements, psychological costs associated with student effort and stress; prerequisites for admission (price); location of programs, academic calendar (place); recruiting and public relations activities (promotion).11

The purpose of employing open-ended questions in the focus groups was to enable the participants in the focus groups to be less restricted in their answers while discussing the in-depth needs of Mexican-Americans in higher education. It was also important to determine what should be done to meet those needs as well as to communicate the offerings of the four-year colleges and universities to Mexican-Americans. In addition, the use of open-ended questions in the focus groups provided the researcher with unanticipated issues and recommendations which were useful in formulating the items for the final questionnaire.

The open-ended questions employed in the focus groups were formulated in keeping with the four objectives of the study:

1. To identify successful product strategies and
tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the education services and programs designed to meet the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolled in the four-year colleges and universities.

2. To identify successful distribution strategies and tactics for the marketing of higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the locations and scheduling of classes as well as the atmosphere necessary to meet the needs of Mexican-American students enrolled in four-year colleges and universities.

3. To identify successful pricing strategies and tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., tuition, fees, expenses, financial aid, and time expenditure justification strategies and tactics designed to meet the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolled in four-year colleges and universities.

4. To identify successful promotion strategies and tactics for marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans, i.e., the advertising, publicity, publications, and personal contact necessary to recruit Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend four-year colleges and universities.

A script was developed to ensure uniformity and consisted of open-ended questions to identify issues and areas
of concern as well as to solicit recommendations for marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities (see appendix 3). Expert assistance was sought to validate the open-ended questions for the focus groups. College and university admissions directors, outreach and public relations personnel, as well as high school guidance counselors in Texas and California were contacted to review and validate the questions. Prior to conducting the focus groups, the questions used were pretested with college and university students, parents of college and university students, high school guidance counselors, and college and university admissions directors.

Focus Group Modus Operandi

Market research companies have demonstrated that an effective marketing survey must ask the right questions if it is to produce usable results. To ensure that the right questions were asked, the focus group technique was used in this study to develop the final questionnaire. According to Kotler:

Focus group interviewing is a useful step to take before designing a large scale survey. It provides insight into consumer perceptions, attitudes, and satisfactions that will be important in defining the issues to be researched more formally. 

Focus group interviewing consists of inviting from six to ten people to work with a moderator to discuss a product,
service, organization, or other marketing entity of interest. The moderator encourages discussion among the participants so that group dynamics will stimulate unrestrained expression of ideas and opinions. The comments are recorded through note taking and/or on tape and later studied in order to understand certain aspects of consumer behavior and attitudes.

In this study, participants were initially contacted by telephone to enlist their participation in the focus groups. Following this contact, a letter specifying the purpose of the study along with the place, date, and time of the focus group meetings was mailed to each of the participants. Refreshments were provided, and participants were paid a stipend of twenty dollars for their time and travel expenses. Each focus group began with a brief explanation regarding the purpose of the group discussion. Participants were also requested to read and sign the Marketing Focus Group Participant Approval Form before discussion actually began (see appendix 4). The participants introduced themselves as a warm-up technique to relax them, and an open discussion then followed, employing the script as a guide. The group sessions lasted one and one-half hours to two hours. Some of the discussions focused on: (1) how potential students learn about four-year colleges and universities, (2) the factors which prompt the consideration of specific four-year colleges and universities, (3) the
importance of influencers (i.e., friends, parents, peers, guidance counselors, and teachers), and (4) the process of selecting a four-year college or university to attend. During each of the eight focus group sessions, data were collected via tape recording. In some instances, participants supplemented their responses by providing the moderator with materials such as brochures, pamphlets, or booklets.

Content Analysis of Responses to Open-ended Questions

A content analysis of the responses given by the participants was then performed. Borg and Gall define content analysis as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication." The purpose of performing a content analysis was (1) to produce descriptive information concerning the needs of Mexican-Americans in higher education, (2) to determine what colleges and universities can do to meet those needs, and (3) to find out the best way for them to communicate their offerings to Mexican-Americans. In order to accomplish this task, the tapes from each of the focus groups were reviewed, and all the responses were identified and written out. These responses were then categorized according to the four P's of marketing. A response was then developed into a questionnaire item if it met one or both of the following criteria: (1) two or more
individuals had the same or similar response to a question or (2) a response was found to be similar to findings or recommendations made in related studies.

Step Two: Pretest of Preliminary Questionnaire

Step two involved the administration of a preliminary questionnaire for purposes of developing the final survey instrument.

Pretest Sample Population

The preliminary questionnaire was pretested with ten admissions directors other than those who participated in the focus groups. These ten admissions directors were randomly selected from the total population of the study through the use of simple random sampling. Borg and Gall define simple random sampling as:

A procedure in which all the individuals in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of being selected as a member of a sample. By independent is meant that the selection of one individual does not affect in any way the selection of any other individual.\textsuperscript{14}

As mentioned earlier, a list of the 253 four-year colleges and universities located in the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas was compiled using the 1988 edition of \textit{Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study}.\textsuperscript{15} The entire list of 253 colleges and universities was arranged in alphabetical order. Each institution was assigned a number beginning
with the first college or university in the alphabetized list and continuing to the last institution on the list. Alphabetizing the 253 colleges and universities ensured the complete mixing of the institutions regardless of the state in which they are located. A table of random numbers was used to draw the pretest sample respondents from the total list of 253 colleges and universities admissions directors. The table of random numbers used to draw the sample for the pretest is located in Appendix C of Educational Research by Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall. The researcher arbitrarily selected row 1, column 7 in the table as a starting point. Using the first three digits running from left to right, the researcher selected in order the first ten numbers which matched the numbers from 1 to 253 assigned to each college or university in the alphabetized list.

Pretest Modus Operandi

Participants of the preliminary questionnaire were contacted by telephone prior to their receipt of the questionnaire and asked to review the instrument for comprehension and clarity of the instrument questions as well as instructions. The participants were also requested to make any additions they felt were needed.

After the participants had an opportunity to review the pretest instrument, they were again contacted by telephone. The researcher made notations on a copy of the preliminary
questionnaire to record the respondent's comments and suggestions. A decision to modify or revise the questionnaire items, instructions, and format based upon the comments and suggestions of the participants of the preliminary questionnaire was made if two or more of the participants made the same comments or suggestions.

Data Collection

The process of data collection involved the mailing of the final questionnaire to the entire sample population. In keeping with the conceptual framework of the study, the final questionnaire was a synthesis of the review of the related literature, the responses by the participants to the open-ended questions discussed in the focus groups, and the recommendations made by participants of both the field tests and the preliminary questionnaire. The content validity of the final questionnaire items was ensured through: (1) the review of the related literature on marketing of higher education and the needs of Mexican-American college and university students, (2) an analysis of the responses to the open-ended questions administered to the participants of the focus groups, and (3) the comments and suggestions made by the participants of the field tests and preliminary questionnaire. Borg and Gall define content validity as, "the degree to which the sample of test items represents the content that the test is designed to measure." 17
The Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire consists of fifty items (see appendix 5). Forty-three of these items are statements which respondents were asked to agree or disagree with using a seven-point Likert scale (strongly disagree - disagree - somewhat disagree - neutral - somewhat agree - agree - strongly agree). According to Greenberg:

Likert scales are extremely popular in questionnaire studies because they enable respondents to provide more than a 'yes' or 'no' answer when reporting their personal feelings and attitudes.18

Five of the final questionnaire items required ranking according to importance, and two of the questionnaire items required making a selection from several choices. Space was also provided for the listing of additional marketing strategies and tactics not mentioned in the questionnaire. Finally, demographic items that would enable the researcher to classify respondents, (i.e., education background, age, sex, and ethnic background) were added.

Final Questionnaire Modus Operandi

The final questionnaire was administered to the entire population of the study in order to collect data for analysis. The questionnaire was mailed along with a cover letter explaining the purpose and usefulness of the study to each of the admissions directors at the 253 colleges and universities (see appendix 6). Included with the questionnaire and cover letter was a stamped, self-addressed
envelope to assist the respondent in conveniently returning the questionnaire to the researcher. Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing of the questionnaire, a follow-up letter was sent along with another copy of the questionnaire and another stamped, self-addressed envelope to individuals who had not responded (see appendix 7).

Data Analysis Techniques

The responses to the final questionnaire were analyzed and all the information was presented in aggregate form so as to maintain the anonymity of the respondents. After all the data was collected, it was coded and entered into the computer. The statistical techniques which were then employed were (1) frequencies and crosstabulations and (2) factor analysis.

Frequencies and Crosstabulations

Initially, the responses to the questionnaire were analyzed by computing frequencies and crosstabulations. Crosstabulations were used to determine whether there were significant differences in responses based upon relevant variables such as age, sex, ethnic background, and level of educational attainment. The frequency data was also converted to percentages to indicate not only the number of respondents who marked a particular category but also to indicate the number of respondents who marked a particular category in relationship to the total number of respondents.
The mean of responses on each questionnaire item was also computed to assist in providing a consensus on successful marketing strategies and tactics based on the expert opinion of the admissions directors.

Factor Analysis

The questionnaire served to identify successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend four-year colleges and universities. After the computation of frequencies, percentages, means, and crosstabulations from the data gathered via the questionnaire, the researcher chose to use factor analysis for the purposes of data reduction and to gain a better understanding of these successful marketing strategies and tactics.

A large number of variables were measured in this study. Factor analysis was used to facilitate the data analysis by making it less unwieldy and to more clearly and concisely identify and clarify the underlying concepts of successful marketing strategies and tactics. According to Borg and Gall, "factor analysis performs the function of data reduction by grouping variables that are moderately or highly correlated with one another." By grouping or categorizing the strategies and tactics that were identified as successful through the use of factor analysis, the researcher developed an understanding of what these
strategies and tactics (i.e., the variables) had in common that gave rise to the grouping or categorizing. According to Sonquist and Dunkelberg, "the research output of a factor analysis is thus a conceptual scheme for categorizing objects or variables."²⁰

The researcher had reason to believe that there were interrelationships and commonalities among the variables measured in the study, and therefore, chose factor analysis to identify these interrelationships and commonalities. Sonquist and Dunkelberg explain that:

The typical role of factor analysis is . . . a tool to assist in determining the extent to which it is reasonable to interpret the intercorrelations among many items . . . resulting from . . . tapping of a few common underlying factors."²¹

Through the identification of the interrelationships and commonalities among the variables, that is, the marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful, underlying concepts were related to current practices and theories as reinforcement for their use and also used to generate new theories and associated hypotheses for marketing. Youngman explains that the patterns identified through the use of factor analysis "can be related to current theories, or they can be used to generate new theories and associated hypotheses."²²

The major steps used to carry out the factor analysis included:

1. Preparation of the correlation matrix.
2. Extraction of the initial factors and exploration of possible data reduction.

3. Rotation to a terminal solution and search for simple and interpretable factors. Varimax rotation was used in this study because it forced the factor scores to very high and very low levels so that interpretation was possible. Youngman explains that varimax rotation "incorporates the principle that only very high or near-zero correlations can be reliably interpreted."23

Factor analysis provides a mechanism by which the total number of questionnaire items can be reduced into smaller groupings of related items. For marketing mix strategies it would be very costly to focus on each and every item identified in trying to reach the target market. If underlying "invisible" factors are identified which can show how the groupings of items are related, then these factors (with the use of only one or two of the related items) can be cost-effectively used to reach the target market with different items focused on in each marketing mix plan.

In summary, the research methodology of the study included: (1) instrument development and testing, (2) data collection, and (3) data analysis. The process of instrument development and testing involved two steps: (1) the use of focus groups and (2) the pretest of the preliminary questionnaire. In order to collect data for analysis, the
final questionnaire was administered to the entire population of the study. Initially, the responses to the final questionnaire were analyzed through the computation of frequencies and crosstabulations. Subsequently, factor analysis was used for the purposes of data reduction and the grouping of related variables into smaller categories. In Chapter IV, the findings of this study are presented and discussed.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe successful marketing strategies and tactics employed by four-year colleges and universities in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend. Data for this study have been collected through the use of a mailed survey instrument (see appendix 5). The survey instrument was mailed to admissions directors of the 253 four-year colleges and universities located in the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas as identified in the 1988 edition of Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study. The survey instrument was completed and returned by 169 of the total 253 admissions directors included in the study population. This number represents a 68 percent rate of return. A second mailing was required to achieve this rate of return.

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) package on the IBM 3090 computer at Old Dominion University. The results of the study will be presented in three sections. First, descriptive statistics, i.e., frequencies, percentages, and means for each of the
survey items will be detailed. Second, crosstabulations will be discussed for those items where responses were significantly affected by the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Finally, the results of the factor analysis will be presented.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The survey instrument consists of fifty items. Each item represents a marketing strategy or tactic used in marketing higher education to Mexican-Americans. The expert opinions of the admissions directors determined whether or not a marketing strategy or tactic is successful.

**Likert Scale Items**

Forty-three of the survey items are statements which respondents were asked to agree or disagree with using a seven-point Likert scale (strongly agree - agree - somewhat agree - neutral - somewhat disagree - disagree - strongly disagree). A detailed visual presentation of the responses to these forty-three Likert scale items is presented in figures nine through fifty-one in appendix 8. For the purposes of clarifying and distinguishing between those strategies and tactics determined to be successful and unsuccessful, the responses were collapsed into an agree/disagree dichotomy. Figures fifty-two through ninety-four in appendix 9 are a visual presentation of these collapsed responses to the forty-three survey items employing a
seven-point Likert scale. The responses are presented in the form of frequencies and percentages. The frequency data was converted to percentages to indicate not only the number of respondents who marked a particular response but also to indicate the number of respondents who marked a particular response in relationship to the total number of respondents. The mean of responses on each survey item was also computed to assist in providing a consensus on successful marketing strategies and tactics based upon the expert opinions of the admissions directors. Table 1 is a summarization of the responses to each of the items employing a seven-point Likert scale. Table 2 is a taxonomy of the survey items (i.e., marketing strategies and tactics).

The response rate on survey items one through forty-three ranged from 88 to 100 percent. There were twenty-five survey items with a 100 percent response rate, sixteen survey items with a 99 percent response rate, and two survey items with an 88 percent response rate.

In order to summarize the responses to each of the forty-three survey items employing the Likert scale, three major categories were developed. These three categories represent a grouping of the individual survey items (i.e., marketing strategies and tactics) based upon their success in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The three categories are: very successful, successful, and somewhat successful.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase financial aid offerings to Mexican-Americans (N=169)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholarships for Mexican-Americans (N=169)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low cost of tuition (N=169)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School/business partnership in financial aid (N=169)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paid work experiences (N=169)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Technical assistance with financial aid forms (N=169)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Half-tuition for family of full-time students (N=169)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financial aid information pamphlet (N=167)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attend community college because cheaper (N=168)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Financial aid workshop for parents (N=169)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mexican-American student organizations (N=168)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mexican-American studies program (N=167)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Increase Mexican-American employment on campus (N=169)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Latino floors in dormitories (N=167)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Summer transition programs (N=169)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Faculty mentoring program (N=169)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Increase Mexican-American enrollment at college/university (N=169)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus (N=169)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer counseling for Mexican-American students (N=168)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Parent preference for college/university close to home (N=169)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>81.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mexican-American students prefer school close to home (N=169)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Provision of public transportation (N=167)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Early exposure to college/university life (N=169)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>88.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mexican-American brochure (N=169)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Bilingual recruitment (N=149)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>71.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Mexican-American newsletter (N=168)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Current Mexican-American students promote school (N=169)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>93.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Mexican-American alumni to promote school (N=169)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>95.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Emphasis on Mexican-American ethnicity is a turnoff (N=167)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Mexican-American parents more influential in school choice (N=168)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Faculty involvement in recruitment (N=169)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>79.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Sponsorship of Mexican-American events (N=169)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Public information program for Mexican-Americans to inform of offerings (N=168)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>85.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Transfer center (N=150)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>85.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Use of Spanish language media (N=169)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Career fair programs with business (N=169)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. School and business marketing to potential students (N=169)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>76.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Letter/telephone contacts by current Mexican-American students (N=168)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Famous Mexican-Americans to market college/university (N=168)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Letters to parents of eighth and tenth graders (N=168)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Bilingual counselors and admissions representatives (N=169)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Mexican-Americans do not perceive college education as necessary (N=168)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency | Percentage of Total | Frequency | Percentage of Total
Table 2.—Taxonomy of Marketing Strategies and Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree/Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Items Identified as Very Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mexican-American alumni to promote school (N=169)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Current Mexican-American students promote school (N=169)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Letter/telephone contacts by current Mexican-American students (N=168)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase financial aid offerings to Mexican-Americans (N=169)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus (N=169)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase Mexican-American enrollment at college/university (N=169)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Early exposure to college/university life (N=169)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transfer center (N=150)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Scholarships for Mexican-Americans (N=169)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public information program for Mexican-Americans to inform of offerings (N=160)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Financial aid workshop for parents (N=169)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Increase Mexican-American employment on campus (N=169)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Technical assistance with financial aid forms (N=169)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. School/business partnership in financial aid (N=169)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Financial aid information pamphlet (N=167)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Parent preference for college/university close to home (N=169)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Faculty mentoring program (N=169)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Items Identified as Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty involvement in recruitment (N=169)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>79.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mexican-American brochure (N=169)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peer counseling for Mexican-American students (N=168)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>77.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School and business marketing to potential students (N=169)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>76.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mexican-American newsletter (N=168)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mexican-American student organizations (N=168)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low cost of tuition (N=169)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>74.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Paid work experiences (N=169)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>74.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bilingual counselors and admissions representatives (N=169)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Letters to parents of eighth and tenth graders (N=168)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>73.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bilingual recruitment (N=149)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>71.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mexican-American students prefer school close to home (N=169)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Career fair programs with business (N=169)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Summer transition programs (N=169)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>68.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Attend community college because cheaper (N=168)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>66.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sponsorship of Mexican-American events (N=169)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Famous Mexican-Americans to market college/university (N=168)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Items Identified as Somewhat Successful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of Spanish language media (N=169)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Half-tuition for family of full-time students (N=169)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Items Identified as Not Successful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provision of public transportation (N=167)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mexican-American studies program (N=167)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mexican-American parents more influential in school choice (N=168)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emphasis on Mexican-American ethnicity is a turnoff (N=167)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mexican-Americans do not perceive college education as necessary (N=168)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Latino floors in dormitories (N=167)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey items with an 80 percent or more rate of agreement represent very successful marketing strategies and tactics. The survey items with a 60 to 79 percent rate of agreement represent successful marketing strategies and tactics. The survey items with a 50 to 59 percent rate of agreement represent somewhat successful marketing strategies and tactics. The survey items with less than a 50 percent rate of agreement represent marketing strategies and tactics identified as not successful.

Based upon the responses to the forty-three survey items employing the Likert scale, seventeen marketing strategies and tactics were identified as very successful. These seventeen very successful marketing strategies and tactics are as follows:

1. Increase financial aid offerings to Mexican-Americans.
2. Provide scholarships specifically for Mexican-Americans.
3. Develop a partnership program with business and industry to provide financial aid for Mexican-Americans.
4. Provide technical assistance in the completion of financial aid forms to Mexican-American students and their parents.
5. Develop and distribute an information pamphlet describing financial aid opportunities,
qualifications, and application procedures for Mexican-Americans.

6. Conduct financial aid workshops for Mexican-American students and parents.

7. Increase the employment of Mexican-Americans in faculty, staff, and administrative positions.

8. Implement faculty mentoring program.

9. Increase the enrollments of Mexican-American students.

10. Provide support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus.

11. Market to parents' preference for their son or daughter to attend a college or university close to home.

12. Provide early exposure to college life for Mexican-American junior and senior high school students through programs on campus.

13. Employ current Mexican-American college students to speak on college life to Mexican-American junior and senior high school students.

14. Employ Mexican-American alumni from a college or university to speak on college life and the benefits of a college education to Mexican-American junior and senior high school students.

15. Develop a continuing public information program to heighten Mexican-American community awareness of
the opportunities and benefits of a college education.

16. Establish "transfer centers" on community college campuses to provide counseling services and information on admissions requirements, applications procedures, and financial aid.

17. Employ currently enrolled Mexican-American college/university students to contact prospective students by letter or telephone to answer questions and provide information.

There were seventeen marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful. These seventeen successful marketing strategies and tactics are as follows:

1. Low cost of tuition.

2. Paid work experiences while attending a college or university.

3. Cost competitive with community colleges because Mexican-Americans attend community colleges which are less expensive than four-year colleges and universities.

4. Mexican-American student organizations on campus.

5. Summer transition program at a college or university.

6. Big brother/big sister program matching Mexican-American freshmen with Mexican-American upperclassmen for peer counseling.
7. Mexican-American students prefer a location of a college or university close to their home.
8. Brochure highlighting Mexican-American students, faculty, and staff at a college or university.
9. Bilingual recruitment functions and literature.
10. Newsletter mailed to potential Mexican-American students focusing on Mexican-American students, faculty, alumni, and activities on campus.
11. Involvement of faculty members in recruitment activities with potential Mexican-American students.
12. College/university sponsorship and/or participation in Mexican-American events.
13. College/university partnership with business, industry, and the community in career fair programs.
14. College/university partnership with business and corporate representatives in presenting programs on job opportunities and the need for a college education to junior and senior high school students.
15. Famous Mexican-Americans (i.e., movie, television, and sports stars) to market college/university educational opportunities and benefits.
16. Letters to eighth and tenth grade students and their parents encouraging a college education and outlining admission requirements.
17. Bilingual counselors and admissions representatives.

There were two marketing strategies and tactics identified as somewhat successful. These two somewhat successful marketing strategies and tactics are as follows:

1. Financial aid in the form of half-tuition for brothers, sisters, husbands, or wives of full-time students.
2. Using Spanish language media.

There were four marketing strategies and tactics identified as not successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. These four marketing strategies and tactics are as follows:

1. Mexican-American studies program.
2. Latino floors in dormitories.
3. Telecourses in homes.
4. Provision of public transportation services to and from a college or university.

Only 41 percent of the respondents agreed with survey item 31, i.e., Mexican-American parents are more influential in the college/university selection process than Anglo or other ethnic group parents. Also, only 28 percent of the respondents agreed with survey item 30, i.e., emphasis on Mexican-American ethnicity is a turnoff. Finally, only 27 percent of the respondents agreed with survey item 43, i.e., Mexican-Americans do not perceive a college education as necessary.
Ranking Survey Items

Five of the survey items required ranking according to importance. The ranking items were used to determine (1) importance of considerations in college/university selection process, (2) importance of factors to counter alienation, (3) obstacles to entry into colleges and universities, (4) importance of people in giving out information on colleges and universities, and (5) importance of influences on selection of college/university. A mean was computed for each response to each of the five ranking items. The responses to each of the five items were then arranged in rank order by their individual means. Figures one through five are a visual presentation of each of the response means to each of the ranking items.

In order to summarize the responses to each of the five survey items requiring the respondent to arrange the list in rank order, three categories were developed. These three categories represent a grouping of the individual responses to each of the ranking survey items based upon their importance. The three categories are as follows: very important, important, and somewhat important. The responses with a mean rank above three are very important. The responses with a mean rank above five and below three are important. The responses with a mean rank below five are somewhat important.

On survey item 44, i.e., ranking of the importance of
considerations in the college/university selection process by Mexican-Americans, availability of financial aid and cost of attending were ranked very important. All other responses were ranked as somewhat important. Responses with a mean rank above six included: distance from home, parent's preference, academic programs, and campus atmosphere. Responses with a mean rank above eight included: campus location; presence of Mexican-American faculty, staff, and administration; and social, cultural, and entertainment activities. The least important responses according to the mean ranks included: campus size, housing, and athletic programs (see figure 1).

On survey item 45, i.e., ranking of the importance of factors to counter alienation of Mexican-Americans on college and university campuses, a higher proportion of Mexican-American representation in student population and support services for Mexican-Americans were ranked very important. All other responses were ranked as important. Important responses included: more Mexican-American faculty, staff, and administration; supportive and accessible faculty; and cultural support on campus (see figure 2).

On survey item 46, i.e., ranking of the importance of obstacles which Mexican-Americans encounter when making a decision to attend a college or university, five responses were ranked as important. These five responses included: cost, poor high school preparation, lack of knowledge of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Financial Aid</td>
<td>2.72121</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Attending</td>
<td>2.98788</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Home</td>
<td>5.04242</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' Preference</td>
<td>5.47273</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td>5.81818</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Atmosphere</td>
<td>5.97576</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Location</td>
<td>7.00606</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Mexican-American Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>7.16970</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Cultural/Entertainment Activities</td>
<td>7.89091</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus size</td>
<td>8.15758</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9.66061</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic programs</td>
<td>10.51520</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Survey Item 44: Importance of Considerations in the College/University Selection Process by Mexican-Americans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher proportion of Mexican-American Representation in Student Population</td>
<td>2.458330</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services for Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>2.892860</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Mexican-American Faculty, Staff, and Administration</td>
<td>3.023810</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and Accessible Faculty</td>
<td>3.273810</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Support on Campus</td>
<td>3.458330</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Survey Item 45: Importance of Factors to Counter Alienation of Mexican-Americans on Campus
college opportunities, need or desire to go to work, family obligations, and college education is not valued by family. All other responses were ranked as somewhat important. These somewhat important responses included: low self-esteem and/or lack of confidence, admissions standards and policies, and alienation on campus (see figure 3).

On survey item 47, i.e., importance of people in giving out information on colleges and universities to Mexican-Americans, high school guidance counselors and current students, friends, and parents were ranked as important. All other responses were ranked as somewhat important. These somewhat important responses included: college representatives, alumni/previous students, and church and community leaders (see figure 4).

On survey item 48, i.e., ranking of the importance of people based upon their influence upon the decision by Mexican-Americans as to which college or university to attend, friends were ranked as very important. Parents, teachers, guidance counselors, and current students were ranked as important. Alumni, college representatives, church and community leaders, and famous personalities were ranked as somewhat important (see figure 5).

Selection Survey Items

Two of the survey items required the respondent to make a selection from several choices. Figures six and seven are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>3.437130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor High School Preparation</td>
<td>4.120480</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Knowledge of Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>4.161680</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Work</td>
<td>4.580840</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
<td>4.592810</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education Not Valued by Family</td>
<td>5.429450</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Esteem and/or Lack of Confidence</td>
<td>5.652690</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Standards</td>
<td>5.739390</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation on Campus</td>
<td>7.185630</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Survey Item 46: Obstacles for Mexican-Americans When Making the Decision to Attend a College or University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>3.384150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Students</td>
<td>3.396340</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>3.713410</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.993900</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Representatives</td>
<td>4.103660</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>4.304880</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Community Leaders</td>
<td>5.286590</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Survey Item 47: Importance of People in Giving Out Information on Colleges and Universities
# Survey Item 48: Importance of Persons Who Influence Which College/University to Attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>2.987730</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.116560</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4.171780</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselors</td>
<td>4.509200</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Students</td>
<td>4.687120</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>5.530860</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Representatives</td>
<td>5.708070</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church and Community Leaders</td>
<td>6.269940</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous Personalities</td>
<td>8.044300</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Survey Item 48: Importance of Persons Who Influence Which College/University to Attend
a visual presentation of the responses to these two survey items. An institution with 501 to 6,000 undergraduate students was perceived by 62 percent of the respondents to be the optimal size for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll and attend (see figure 6). Grades seven, eight, and nine were perceived by a majority of the respondents (i.e., 66 percent) to be the optimal grades to begin marketing a college or university to Mexican-Americans (see figure 7).

Open-Ended Responses

Space was provided on the survey instrument for respondents to list additional marketing strategies and tactics not mentioned in the survey items. These additional marketing strategies and tactics were grouped into eight categories. These eight categories are as follows: (1) outreach activities, (2) programs with churches, (3) administration, (4) conferences, (5) bilingual recruitment, (6) Hispanic organizations, (7) recruitment activities, and (8) campus programs (see appendix 10).

Respondent Demographics

Demographic items were included in the survey instrument so that the researcher could classify respondents. The demographic items for classification included: (1) sex, (2) age, (3) educational attainment level, (4) ethnic background, (5) state where employed, (6) size of school where employed, (7) percentage of Mexican-American enrollment at
### Figure 6. Survey Item 49: Perceived Best School Size for Mexican-American

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501 - 6,000</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>62.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>89.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>97.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>33.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>59.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>80.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>94.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>98.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Survey Item 50: Perceived Best Grade to Begin Marketing
Figures 95 through 102 are a visual presentation of these data and are located in appendix 11. Appendix 12 contains a breakdown of the "other" category for respondent work titles which are shown in figure 102.

The majority of respondents were male (61 percent), twenty to thirty-nine years of age (54 percent), had a bachelor's degree (49 percent), were white (66 percent), worked in the state of California (43 percent) at a school with 501 to 6,000 undergraduate students (54 percent) and a 5 to 9 percent Mexican-American enrollment (40 percent) as a dean or director of admissions (51 percent).

**Crosstabulations**

Crosstabulations were used to determine whether there were significant differences in responses to survey items based upon demographic variables of the respondents. These demographic variables included: (1) sex, (2) age, (3) educational attainment level, (4) ethnic background, (5) state where employed, (6) size of college/university where employed, (7) percentage of Mexican-American enrollment at college/university where employed, and (8) work title. The crosstabulations were subjected to the Chi-Square statistical test in order to test for significant differences in responses.

In this section, the results of testing are analyzed...
for statistical differences between selected respondent characteristics and their answers on each of the forty-three items employing the Likert scale and the two items on which the respondent makes a selection. A Chi-Square test was run on the responses to each of these items against the respondents' (1) age, (2) sex, (3) educational attainment level, (4) ethnic background, (5) state where employed, (6) size of institution where employed, (7) percentage of Mexican-American enrollment at college/university where employed, and (8) work title. The crosstabulations of the forty-five survey items and the eight demographic variables of respondents resulted in 360 tests of significance. Only those tests that indicated significant differences are presented in tables three through ten.

The purpose of the Chi-Square test is to evaluate the probability of obtaining the observed outcome of differences between the demographically different respondent groups. If there are no differences between the groups based upon demographic characteristics, the Chi-Square procedure yields the probability that the observed outcome would be obtained. Greenberg defines the Chi-Square test as, "a nonparametric test used to measure how closely the frequencies obtained in a study match frequencies which were expected to occur if chance alone were operating." Kachigan further explains the purpose of the Chi-Square test as, "to determine whether the observed frequencies differ significantly from the
expected frequencies of occurrence."³

Since the study is exploratory, the p value was set at .10 so that the Chi-Square test of statistical significance would be less stringent. Borg and Gall explain that, "a p [value] of .10 increases the risk of a Type I error, but it also might spotlight a potentially important difference or relationship that would have been overlooked had a lower p value been set."⁴

Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square Tests on Survey Items and Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Sex

There were significant differences between female and male respondents on three of the forty-five survey items (see table 3). A higher percentage of males than females agreed with survey item 9, i.e., Mexican-Americans attend community colleges instead of four-year colleges and universities because community colleges are less expensive. On survey item 9, 43.98 percent represents the percentage of agreeing responses from males, compared to 60.84 percent total respondents who were male. The figure, 22.29 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses from females to survey item 9, compared to a 39.16 percent representation by female respondents in the study population.

On survey item 12, i.e., a Mexican-American studies program attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and
### Table 3.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Sex of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Item 9: Mexican-Americans Attend Community College Because Cheaper than Four-Year Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>66.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60.84</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 4.171 with 1df p = 0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Survey Item 12: Mexican-American Studies Program** |          |          |          |          |        |          |
| Disagree/Neutral                      | 28     | 16.97  | 61     | 36.97  | 89    | 53.94  |
| Agree                                 | 36     | 21.82  | 40     | 24.24  | 76    | 46.06  |
| TOTAL                                 | 64     | 38.79  | 101    | 61.21  | 165   | 100.00 |
| Chi-Square = 4.369 with 1df p = 0.037 |          |          |          |          |        |          |

| **Survey Item 19: Peer Counseling for Mexican-American Students** |          |          |          |          |        |          |
| Disagree/Neutral                      | 8      | 4.82   | 29     | 17.47  | 37    | 22.29  |
| Agree                                 | 57     | 34.34  | 72     | 43.37  | 129   | 77.71  |
| TOTAL                                 | 65     | 39.16  | 101    | 60.84  | 166   | 100.00 |
| Chi-Square = 6.145 with 1df p = 0.013 |          |          |          |          |        |          |
attend a college or university, 36.97 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from males, compared to 61.21 percent total respondents who were male. The figure, 16.97 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from females on survey item 12, compared to a 38.79 percent representation by female respondents in the study population.

Finally, on survey item 19, i.e., peer counseling for Mexican-American students attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university, 43.37 percent represents the percentage of responses from males, compared to 60.84 percent total respondents who were male. The figure, 4.82 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from females to survey item 19, compared to a 39.16 percent representation in the study population.

Age

There were significant differences between respondent age groups on eight of the forty-five survey items (see table 4). On survey item 7, i.e., half-tuition for family members of full-time students attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university, the majority of respondents in the 20-29 years of age group agreed while other age groups were evenly divided between agreement and disagreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>20 - 29</th>
<th>30 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 49</th>
<th>50 - 59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 14.209 with 5df p = 0.014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item 12: Mexican-American Studies Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.237 with 5df p = 0.100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item 22: Telecourses in Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.913 with 5df p = 0.078
Table 4.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 24: Early Exposure to College/University Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 12.286 with 5df p = 0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 30: Emphasis on Mexican-American Ethnicity is a Turnoff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 14.092 with 5df p = 0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 31: Parental Influence in School Choice by Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 18.517 with 5df p = 0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 32: Faculty Involvement in Recruitment</th>
<th>Age of Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing 20 - 29 30 - 39 40 - 49 50 - 59 60+ TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>7 4.14 8 4.73 7 4.14 3 1.78 8 4.74 1 0.59 34 20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12 7.10 35 20.71 41 24.26 33 19.53 13 7.69 1 0.59 135 79.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19 11.24 43 25.44 48 28.40 36 21.31 21 12.43 2 1.18 169 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 12.728 with 5df p = 0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 43: College Education not Perceived as Necessary by Mexican-Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 9.310 with 5df p = 0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of respondents in the 50-59 years of age group disagreed with survey item 12, i.e., a Mexican-American studies program attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university. However, respondents in other age groups were evenly divided between agreement and disagreement.

The significance of differences in responses to survey item 22, i.e., the provision of telecourses in homes attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, was not pronounced, but a substantially larger proportion in the 20-39 years of age group disagreed with the survey item as compared with the respondents in the other age groups.

A much larger proportion of respondents in the 30-39 years of age group agreed with survey item 24, i.e., early exposure to college/university life attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, as compared with respondents in the other age groups.

All age groups except the 20-29 years of age group overwhelmingly disagreed with survey item 30, i.e., emphasis on Mexican-American ethnicity is a turnoff to potential Mexican-American students. The number of respondents in the 20-29 years of age group disagreeing and agreeing with the statement was much closer in comparison with the other age groups.
Respondents in the 40-49 years of age group overwhelmingly agreed with survey item 31, i.e., Mexican-American parents are more influential than other ethnic groups and Anglo parents in the choice of a college or university by their child. On the other hand, the majority of respondents in both the 20-29 years of age group and the 30-39 years of age group disagreed with the statement.

Respondents in the 40-49 years of age group overwhelmingly agreed with survey item 32, i.e. faculty involvement in recruitment attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, whereas, the majority of all of the other age groups also agree but not so strongly.

Finally, on survey item 43, i.e., a college education is not perceived as necessary by Mexican-Americans, all age groups disagreed but the proportion in disagreement differs only slightly from the proportion in agreement in the 50-59 years of age group.

**Ethnic Background**

There were significant differences between the respondent groups according to the ethnic background of the respondent on eight of the forty-five survey items (see table 5). A higher percentage of respondents in the Mexican-American respondent group agreed with survey item 14, i.e., Latino floors in dormitories attract
Table 5.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Ethnic Background of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 14: Latino Floors in Dormitories</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 8.602 with 4df p = 0.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 15: Summer Transition Program</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 9.529 with 4df p = 0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 18: Support Groups for Mexican-Americans on Campus</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 13.237 with 4df p = 0.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.935 with 4df p = 0.042

| Survey Item 34: Public Information Programs to Inform Mexican-Americans of School Offerings |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree/Neutral | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 1.79 | 2 | 1.19 | 0 | 0.00 | 20 | 11.90 | 25 | 14.88 |
| Agree | 1 | 0.60 | 6 | 3.57 | 33 | 19.64 | 13 | 7.74 | 90 | 53.57 | 143 | 85.12 |
| TOTAL | 1 | 0.60 | 9 | 5.36 | 35 | 20.83 | 13 | 7.74 | 110 | 65.47 | 168 | 100.00 |

Chi-Square = 8.135 with 4df p = 0.087

| Survey Item 37: Career Fair Programs with Business |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree/Neutral | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 1.18 | 4 | 2.37 | 3 | 1.78 | 41 | 24.26 | 50 | 29.59 |
| Agree | 1 | 0.59 | 7 | 4.14 | 18 | 10.34 | 10 | 5.92 | 70 | 41.42 | 119 | 70.41 |
| TOTAL | 1 | 0.59 | 9 | 5.33 | 35 | 20.71 | 13 | 7.69 | 111 | 65.68 | 169 | 100.00 |

Chi-Square = 9.337 with 4df p = 0.053
Table 5.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 13.347 with 4df p = 0.010

Survey Item 43: College Education not Perceived as Necessary by Mexican-Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Mexican-American</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.421 with 4df p = 0.051
Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, in comparison to respondents from other ethnic background groups. On survey item 14, 7.78 percent represents the percentage of agreeing responses from Mexican-American respondents, compared to 20.95 percent total respondents who were Mexican-American. The figure, 12.58 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses from other ethnic background groups on the survey item, compared to a 79.05 percent representation by ethnic background groups other than Mexican-Americans in the total study population.

On survey item 15, i.e., summer transition programs attract Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 24.85 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from whites, compared to 65.68 percent total respondents who were white. On the other hand, 5.91 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from respondents of ethnic backgrounds other than white. However, respondents from ethnic backgrounds other than white represented 34.32 percent of the total study population.

On survey item 18, i.e., support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus attract Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 2.96 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from Mexican-Americans compared to 20.71 percent total
respondents who were Mexican-American. On the other hand, the figure, 5.92 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from respondents of ethnic backgrounds other than Mexican-American compared to their 79.29 percent representation in the study population.

On survey item 33, i.e., a school sponsoring Mexican-American events attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 27.22 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from whites, compared to a 65.68 percent representation in the total study population by whites. However, 7.1 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from all other ethnic backgrounds, compared to a 34.32 percent representation in the study population by respondents of ethnic backgrounds other than white.

On survey item 34, i.e., a public information program to inform Mexican-Americans of school offerings attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 11.90 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from whites, compared to the 65.47 percent total respondents who were white. The figure, 5.33 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses to the survey item from ethnic backgrounds other than white compared to a 34.53 percent representation in the total study population by these respondents.

On survey item 37, i.e., career fair programs with
business attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 24.26 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from whites while whites compose 65.68 percent of the sample. The respondents from all of the other ethnic background groups represent 34.32 percent of the study population. However, the figure, 5.33 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from these respondents of other ethnic backgrounds with the survey item.

On survey item 40, i.e., using famous Mexican-Americans to market a college or university attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, whites represent 66.07 percent of the study population while the figure, 29.17 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from whites on survey item 40. On the other hand, 10.72 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from respondents of all other ethnic background groups. However, these respondents compose 33.93 percent representation in the study population.

Finally, on survey item 43, i.e., a college education is not perceived as necessary by Mexican-Americans, 44.64 percent represents the percentage of agreeing responses by whites while whites represent 65.48 percent of the study population. The figure, 5.96 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by all other ethnic background groups on the survey item while these respondents compose
34.53 percent of the study population.

**Percentage of Mexican-American Student Enrollment**

There were significant differences between respondents based upon the percentage of Mexican-American students enrolled at the respondent's employing institution on three of the forty-five survey items (see table 6). A higher percentage of respondents employed at institutions with a 5 to 9 percent Mexican-American student enrollment disagreed with survey item 21, i.e., Mexican-American students prefer to attend an institution close to their home. On survey item 21, 16.57 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents employed at institutions with a 5 to 9 percent Mexican-American student enrollment. This respondent group composes 40.24 percent of the study population.

On survey item 22, i.e., telecourses in homes attract Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 15.48 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses from respondents employed at institutions with a 1 to 4 percent Mexican-American student population, compared to their 20.24 percent representation in the total study population.

On survey item 23, i.e., provision of public transportation attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 41.92 percent represents
Table 6.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Percentage of Mexican-Americans Enrolled at Respondent's Employing Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Mexican-American Students</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Less than 1</th>
<th>Less than 5</th>
<th>Less than 10</th>
<th>Less than 15</th>
<th>Less than 20</th>
<th>Less than 50</th>
<th>Less than 100</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-</td>
<td>Fre-</td>
<td>cent-</td>
<td>Fre-</td>
<td>cent-</td>
<td>Fre-</td>
<td>cent-</td>
<td>Fre-</td>
<td>cent-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quency age</td>
<td>quency</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>quency</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>quency</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>quency</td>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item 21: Students Prefer School Close to Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 14.699 with 7df p = 0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item 22: Telecourses in Home to Attract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 12.742 with 7df p = 0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item 23: Provision of Public Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square = 16.259 with 7df p = 0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents from institutions with less than a 15 percent Mexican-American student population. These respondents from institutions with less than a 15 percent Mexican-American student population represent 75.45 percent of the study population.

**Size of Institution (Number of Undergraduates)**

There were significant differences among respondents based upon the size of their employing college or university on seven of the forty-five survey items (see table 7). The size of the college or university is determined by the number of undergraduates enrolled. On survey item 12, i.e., a Mexican-American studies program attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 42.17 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents employed at colleges and universities with 6,000 or less undergraduate students. These respondents represent 72.89 percent of the study population. On the other hand, 7.23 percent represents the percentage of agreeing responses to survey item 12 by respondents employed at schools with over 20,000 undergraduates, compared to 8.43 percent total respondents from these schools.

On survey item 13, i.e., increasing Mexican-American employment on campus attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 6.55 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by
Table 7.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Size of Institution Where Respondent Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution (number of undergraduates)</th>
<th>Less than 500 Students</th>
<th>501 to 6,000 Students</th>
<th>6,001 to 10,000 Students</th>
<th>10,001 to 20,000 Students</th>
<th>Over 20,000 Students</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53.01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 10.219 with 4 df; p = 0.037

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 12: Mexican-American Studies Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 12.259 with 4 df; p = 0.016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 13: Increase Mexican-American Employment on Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 8.946 with 4 df; p = 0.062
Table 7.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution (number of undergraduates)</th>
<th>Less than 500 Students</th>
<th>501 to 6,000 Students</th>
<th>6,001 to 10,000 Students</th>
<th>10,001 to 20,000 Students</th>
<th>Over 20,000 Students</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 12.194 with 4df p = 0.016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 15: Summer Transition Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 12.194 with 4df p = 0.016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 20: Parent Preference for College/University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 11.201 with 4df p = 0.024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 31: Parental Influence in School of Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7.797 with 4df p = 0.099
Table 7.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution (number of undergraduates)</th>
<th>Less than 500 Students</th>
<th>501 to 6,000 Students</th>
<th>6,001 to 10,000 Students</th>
<th>10,001 to 20,000 Students</th>
<th>Over 20,000 Students</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Item 40: Famous Mexican-Americans to Market College/University

Chi-Square = 11.225 with 4 df, p = 0.024
respondents employed at colleges and universities with less than 500 undergraduates, compared to a 19.65 percent representation by this respondent group in the study population.

The majority of respondents from institutions with 501 to 6,000 undergraduates disagreed with survey item 14, i.e., Latino floors in dormitories attract Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university. The figure 44.58 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents from colleges and universities with 501 to 6,000 undergraduate students, compared to 53.01 percent representation by this respondent group in the study population.

The majority of respondents from schools with an undergraduate enrollment of over 500 students agreed with survey item 15, i.e., a summer transition program attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university. On the other hand, respondents employed at institutions with less than 500 undergraduate students were evenly divided between disagreeing and agreeing with the survey item. The figure, 10.12 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents employed at institutions with less than 500 undergraduates, compared to 19.64 percent representation by this group in the study population.

After a review of the responses to survey item 20, i.e., Mexican-American parents prefer that their child
attend a college or university close to home, 7.14 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents employed at colleges and universities with less than 500 undergraduate students, compared to a 19.64 percent representation by this respondent group in the study population. All respondent groups from colleges and universities other than those with less than 500 undergraduates overwhelmingly agreed with survey item 20.

On survey item 31, the respondents from institutions with over 6,000 undergraduates were evenly divided in their responses. However, the respondents from schools with 6,000 and less undergraduates overwhelmingly disagreed with survey item 31, i.e., parents of Mexican-American students are more influential in their child's selection of a college or university than Anglo parents or parents from other ethnic backgrounds. This disagreement is especially pronounced among respondents from schools with less than 500 undergraduates because 15.57 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by these respondents compared to only a 19.76 percent representation in the study population.

A larger proportion of respondents from larger schools (over 10,000 undergraduates) agree with survey item 40, i.e., using famous Mexican-Americans to promote a college or university attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend that college or university. On the other hand, a larger proportion of respondents from institutions with less
than 500 students disagree with the survey item. The figure, 10.18 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents from institutions with less than 500 undergraduates. However, this respondent group composed 19.76 percent of the study population. The figure, 16.16 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by respondents from institutions with over 10,000 undergraduates, compared to only a 19.16 percent representation by these respondents in the study population.

State

There were significant differences among respondents based upon the state where the respondent is employed on three of the forty-five survey items (see table 8). Respondents from all states agree with survey item 10, i.e., a financial workshop for Mexican-American parents attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university. The figure, 71 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by respondents from California and Texas, compared to a representation of 81.65 percent by these respondent groups in the study population.

On survey item 28, i.e., using currently enrolled Mexican-American students to promote the institution attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, only respondents in California, Colorado, and Texas disagreed with the item. These
Table 8.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and State Where Respondent Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Where Respondent Employed</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (Freq)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency (Freq)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency (Freq)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency (Freq)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Item 10: Financial Aid Workshop for Parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.270 with 5df $p = 0.099$

| **Survey Item 28: Current Mexican-American Students Promote School** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree/Neutral                | 0       | 0.00       | 2       | 1.18       | 3       | 1.78   | 0       | 0.00       | 0       | 0.00     | 6       | 3.55   | 11       | 6.51    |
| Agree                           | 8       | 4.73       | 70      | 41.42      | 10      | 5.92   | 8       | 4.73       | 2       | 1.18     | 60      | 35.50  | 158      | 93.49   |
| **TOTAL**                       | 8       | 4.73       | 72      | 42.60      | 13      | 7.70   | 8       | 4.73       | 2       | 1.18     | 66      | 39.05  | 169      | 100.00  |

Chi-Square = 9.488 with 5df $p = 0.091$

| **Survey Item 29: Mexican-American Alumni to Promote School** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disagree/Neutral                | 0       | 0.00       | 1       | 0.59       | 3       | 1.78   | 0       | 0.00       | 0       | 0.00     | 4       | 2.37   | 8        | 4.73    |
| Agree                           | 8       | 4.73       | 71      | 42.01      | 10      | 5.92   | 8       | 4.73       | 2       | 1.18     | 62      | 36.69  | 161      | 95.27   |
| **TOTAL**                       | 8       | 4.73       | 72      | 42.60      | 13      | 7.70   | 8       | 4.73       | 2       | 1.18     | 66      | 39.06  | 169      | 100.00  |

Chi-Square = 12.638 with 5df $p = 0.027$
respondents from California, Colorado, and Texas represent 100 percent of the disagreeing responses to the survey item but only 89.35 percent of the study population.

Again, only respondents from California, Colorado, and Texas disagree with survey item 29, i.e., using Mexican-American alumni to promote a college or university attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university. These respondents represent 100 percent of the disagreeing responses but only 89.35 percent of the total sample.

**Level of Educational Attainment**

There were significant differences among respondents based upon their level of educational attainment on three of the forty-five survey items (see table 9). All of the respondents had a minimum of a bachelor's degree.

There is a significant difference between responses given by those respondents with master's degrees and those respondents with bachelor's degrees on survey item 7, i.e., half-tuition for a family of a full-time student attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university. The figure, 28.99 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by respondents with bachelor's degrees, compared to their 49.11 percent representation in the study population. On the other hand, the figure, 24.26 percent, represents the percentage of
Table 9.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Level of Educational Attainment of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Master's Degree</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 5.764 with 2df p = 0.056

Survey Item 25: Mexican-American Brochure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 5.330 with 2df p = 0.070

Survey Item 42: Bilingual Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 4.625 with 2df p = 0.099
disagreeing responses by respondents with master's degrees, compared to their 40.24 percent representation in the study population.

On survey item 25, i.e., a brochure highlighting Mexican-American faculty, staff, and students attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 4.14 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents with doctorates, compared to a representation of 10.65 percent by this group in the study population.

On survey item 42, i.e., bilingual counseling attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, 4.73 percent represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents with doctoral degrees. These respondents with doctorates represent only 10.65 percent of the study population.

**Work Titles**

There were significant differences among respondents based upon the respondents' work titles on six of the forty-five survey items (see table 10). The respondents with the work title of vice president represent the only respondent group with a majority of its members who disagree with survey item 5, i.e., the provision of paid work experience while attending a college or university attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university.
Table 10.—Analysis of Crosstabulations and Chi-Square on Survey Items and Title of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Respondent</th>
<th>Director/Dean</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
<th>Counselor/Representative</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 9.111 with 4df p = 0.058

Survey Item 6: Technical Assistance with Financial Aid Forms

| Disagree/Neutral    | 12           | 6              | 4                        | 1         | 6     | 29    |
| Agree               | 73           | 5              | 25                       | 3         | 33    | 139   |
| TOTAL               | 85           | 11             | 29                       | 4         | 39    | 168   |

Chi-Square = 11.803 with 4df p = 0.019

Survey Item II: Mexican-American Student Organizations

| Disagree/Neutral    | 15           | 3              | 7                        | 3         | 13    | 41    |
| Agree               | 69           | 8              | 22                       | 1         | 26    | 126   |
| TOTAL               | 84           | 11             | 29                       | 4         | 39    | 167   |

Chi-Square = 9.198 with 4df p = 0.056
Table 10.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 20: Parent Preference for College/University</th>
<th>Director/Dean</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
<th>Counselor/Representative</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 11.255 with 4df p = 0.024

Survey Item 34: Public Information Programs to Inform University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 34: Public Information Programs to Inform University</th>
<th>Director/Dean</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
<th>Counselor/Representative</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7.823 with 4df p = 0.098

Survey Item 39: Letter/Telephone Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item 39: Letter/Telephone Contacts</th>
<th>Director/Dean</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
<th>Counselor/Representative</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree/Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7.979 with 4df p = 0.092
The figure, 4.17 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by respondents with the work title of vice president. These respondents with the work title of vice president represent 6.55 percent of the study population.

Again, on survey item 6, i.e., the provision of technical assistance with financial aid forms for Mexican-Americans attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university, the respondents with the work title of vice president represent the only respondent group with a majority of its members disagreeing. The figure, 3.57 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by vice presidents who compose 6.55 percent of the study population.

The percentage of respondents with the work title of director or dean of admissions who agree with survey item 11, i.e., the presence of Mexican-American organizations on campus attracts Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend a college or university, is high in proportion to the other respondent groups. The figure, 41.32 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by directors or deans, compared to only a 50.30 percent representation by this respondent group in the study population.

A large proportion of the disagreeing responses for survey item 20, i.e., Mexican-American parents prefer their
child to attend a college or university close to home, are from the admissions counselor/representative respondent group. The figure, 6.55 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by admissions counselor/representative respondents. This respondent group composed only 17.26 percent of the study population.

On survey item 34, i.e., a public information program for Mexican-Americans attracts Mexican-American students, the figure, 45.51 percent, represents the percentage of agreeing responses by respondents with the work title of director or dean of admissions, compared to a 50.30 percent representation of this respondent group in the population.

On survey item 39, i.e., letter or telephone contacts with Mexican-Americans attracts Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend a college or university, the figure, 3.59 percent, represents the percentage of disagreeing responses by the respondent group with the work title, admissions counselor or representative. However, admissions counselors or representatives make up only 17.37 percent of the study population.

Factor Analysis

In this study, factor analysis was used for the purpose of data reduction. Initially, fifty variables (i.e., survey items) were studied in order to identify specific marketing strategies and tactics which are successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges.
and universities. Factor analysis was used to reduce the forty-three variables measured on a Likert scale to a few general factors underlying Mexican-American students' decisions to enroll in and attend colleges and universities. By grouping a large number of variables into a few factors, the data is made more manageable and a better understanding of the college or university selection process by Mexican-American students is possible.

Initially, a factor analysis was run to identify underlying intangible factors associated with the forty-three tangible marketing strategies and tactics. These marketing strategies and tactics were identified through the use of the survey instrument as successful in attracting Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The factor analysis program in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) manual was used with the standard 1.00 minimum eigenvalue setting. An eigenvalue corresponds to the equivalent number of variables which the factor represents. Principal components factor extraction was used, and eleven different factors were identified as shown in table 11.

After a scree plot was done, it was determined that the optimal number of factors would be four. Kachigan explains:

The idea of the scree test is that the factors along the tail of the curve represent mostly random error variance and therefore we should select the factor solution just prior to the leveling of the curve.5 (see figure 8)
Table 11

Principal Components Factor Extraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.535957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.375387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.059889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.897891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.618338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.441958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.206468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.147656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.108536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.070002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.011265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon this rationale, the four-factor solution was selected. The varimax rotation was applied to the specified four factors in order to produce an interpretable solution. The factors produced had high factor loadings on at least three associated tangible marketing strategies and tactics.

The rotated factor loadings and the corresponding associated marketing strategies and tactics are shown in table 12. As a result of the factor loadings and combinations of marketing strategies and tactics, the first factor was identified as "On-Campus Programs and Activities" since these marketing strategies and tactics performed on campus were seen as successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend colleges and universities. The second factor was identified as "Off-Campus Programs and Activities" since these marketing strategies and tactics performed off-campus were seen as successful in attracting
Figure 8. Scree Plot of Eigenvalues
Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The third factor was identified as "Perceptions" because the marketing strategies and tactics were based upon parent and student preferences. The final factor was identified as "Cost" because the marketing strategies and tactics associated with the factor included financial aid and pricing considerations.

Table 12.--Identified Factors and Corresponding Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Strategy or Tactic</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: On-Campus Programs and Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus</td>
<td>0.72935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Mexican-Americans employed on campus</td>
<td>0.71453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/telephone contacts with Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>0.70173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Mexican-American enrollment at college/university</td>
<td>0.69394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American newsletter</td>
<td>0.68647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American brochure</td>
<td>0.65467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American student organizations</td>
<td>0.65428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer transition program</td>
<td>0.63001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer counseling for Mexican-American students</td>
<td>0.62936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty mentoring program</td>
<td>0.62216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American studies program</td>
<td>0.60800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Strategy or Tactic</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American alumni to promote school</td>
<td>0.55914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Mexican-American students to promote school</td>
<td>0.54029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early exposure to college/university life</td>
<td>0.52371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase financial aid for Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>0.50991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>0.50828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance with financial aid forms</td>
<td>0.50693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Off-Campus Programs and Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career fair program</td>
<td>0.77374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and business marketing program</td>
<td>0.68014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer center on community college campuses</td>
<td>0.63109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship of Mexican-American events</td>
<td>0.62007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-tuition for family of full-time students</td>
<td>0.61606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous Mexican-Americans to market college/university</td>
<td>0.57159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public information program to inform Mexican-Americans of school offerings</td>
<td>0.53583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty involvement in recruitment</td>
<td>0.50335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent preference for college/university</td>
<td>0.72812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students prefer school close to home</td>
<td>0.71413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Strategy or Tactic</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Mexican-American students to promote school</td>
<td>0.53172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase financial aid for Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>0.63124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost</td>
<td>0.60832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend community college because cheaper</td>
<td>0.56921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for Mexican-Americans</td>
<td>0.56730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the results of the study regarding the identification of successful marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-American students to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The data gathered via the survey instrument served to identify these successful marketing strategies and tactics. The data and data analysis procedures used in this identification process were described.

The final chapter of this study will present the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
NOTES


2Barry Greenberg, Using Microcomputers and Mainframes for Data Analysis in the Social Sciences (Merrill Publishing Company: Columbus, Ohio, 1987), 271.


5Kachigan, Statistical Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Introduction to Univariate and Multivariate Methods, 388.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Mexican-Americans are not enrolling in four-year institutions of higher education in proportion to their numbers within the total population of the United States. This problem of disparity between the representation of Mexican-Americans and their numbers in the population of the United States is compounded by the lack of a comprehensive identification of those marketing strategies and tactics which are successful in attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. This study identified and compiled a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-American students.

Initially, for the purposes of this study, focus groups were conducted to identify issues and to solicit recommendations for marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The review of the related literature on the marketing of higher education and the needs of Mexican-American students served in the development of the open-ended questions which were asked in the focus groups.
Participants in the focus groups included: Mexican-American college and university students, parents of Mexican-American college and university students, high school guidance counselors, and admissions directors from four-year colleges and universities. A total of eight focus groups were conducted in the states of California and Texas.

The information gathered through a review of the related literature and the responses by participants in the focus groups to the open-ended questions served in the development of the pilot survey instrument. The pilot survey instrument was administered to a random sample consisting of ten admissions directors from the total study population. The results, comments, and recommendations from the pilot survey instrument were used to further refine and develop the final survey instrument.

The final survey instrument was administered to the admissions directors of the 253 four-year colleges and universities located in the six southwestern states of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas. Each survey item served to identify successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities.

First, the responses to the final survey instrument were analyzed by computing frequencies and percentages. Crosstabulations were used to determine whether there were
significant differences in the responses based upon the following demographic characteristics of the respondents: sex, age, ethnic background, level of educational attainment, size of college/university where employed, percentage of Mexican-American enrollment at institution where employed, and work title. Finally, factor analysis was used for data reduction purposes and to identify the factors underlying the marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The four P's of marketing (i.e., product, price, place, and promotion)¹ are used to organize and present the conclusions and accompanying recommendations resulting from this study. The reader is referred to table 1 and figures 1 through 7 in Chapter IV for a detailed analysis and visual summary presentation of the findings. All of the conclusions and recommendations presented in this chapter are based upon the findings of this study.

The conclusions regarding the identification of successful marketing strategies and tactics and accompanying recommendations are presented below in rank order according to their success under each of the headings of the four P's of marketing. That is, very successful marketing strategies and tactics will be presented first, then successful marketing strategies and tactics, and, finally, those
marketing strategies and tactics identified as somewhat successful. Those marketing strategies and tactics identified as not successful will be presented at the end of each of the four sections.

**Product**

The results of this study suggest that an increase in the employment of Mexican-Americans in faculty, staff, and administrative positions and an increase in the percentage of Mexican-American students enrolled at the institution are very successful marketing tactics that should be used to attract Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. Consequently, it is strongly recommended that four-year institutions of higher education increase the employment and enrollment of Mexican-Americans. Maynard (1980) also makes this recommendation in an earlier study. Furthermore, these marketing tactics were identified in survey item 45 as very important factors to counter the alienation of Mexican-Americans on college and university campuses.

The provision of support groups for Mexican-Americans on college and university campuses was identified in this study as another very successful marketing tactic which should be used to attract Mexican-Americans. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that four-year institutions provide support services for Mexican-Americans in the form of
counseling and tutoring. This tactic was also identified as a very important factor in countering the alienation of Mexican-American students in survey item 45.

Finally, a faculty mentoring program was identified through this study as a very successful marketing tactic to be used to attract Mexican-Americans. It is highly recommended that colleges and universities implement this type of program especially for Mexican-American students. This finding is also supported by Fields (1987).

It is a conclusion of this study that the presence of Mexican-American student organizations on college and university campuses is a successful marketing tactic for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year institutions of higher education. Subsequently, it is recommended that colleges and universities establish Mexican-American student organizations because these organizations provide support and counter alienation.

A big brother/big sister program matching Mexican-American freshmen with Mexican-American upperclassmen for peer counseling is another marketing tactic identified as successful by respondents in this study. Thus, it is recommended that four-year colleges and universities develop this type of program because it also provides support and counters alienation.

Finally, a summer transition program was identified as a successful marketing tactic by responses to the survey
instrument. Hence, this program is recommended because it provides support and eases the transition into college life for Mexican-American students. Summer transition programs for incoming Mexican-American freshmen have proven successful at the University of Southern California and California State University.

Those product tactics identified by respondents in the study as not successful include the provision of a Mexican-American studies program and Latino floors in dormitories. These tactics are not recommended for implementation by four-year colleges and universities. This conclusion of the study disproves recommendations made by Cabrera (1978).

Price

A conclusion of this study is that price strategies and tactics are the most important of the four P's of marketing in attracting Mexican-Americans to attend four-year colleges and universities. The availability of financial aid and the cost of attending a college or university were ranked on survey item 44 as the most important considerations by Mexican-Americans in the selection of an institution. Furthermore, cost was ranked on survey item 46 as a primary obstacle to Mexican-Americans desiring to attend a college or university. Therefore, it is highly recommended that four-year colleges and universities provide an increased amount of financial aid specifically for
Mexican-American students and preferably in the form of scholarships. Scholarships are preferable to student loans because Mexican-Americans tend to be especially apprehensive about incurring debt to pay for a college education (Gandara 1986). The development of a partnership program by a college or university with business and industry to provide financial aid especially for Mexican-Americans was identified as a successful marketing tactic by respondents to the survey instrument. These financial aid offerings could take the form of scholarships, grants, tuition stipends, and internships.

In addition to the provision of financial aid for Mexican-American students, another marketing tactic identified as very successful in the study is the provision of technical assistance in the completion of financial aid forms to Mexican-American students and their parents. Consequently, it is highly recommended that four-year colleges and universities provide this technical assistance in the form of financial aid workshops for Mexican-American students and their parents. This recommendation was also made by Olivas (1982). Responses to the survey instrument indicate that Mexican-Americans perceive a college education as necessary but are often unaware of financial aid opportunities, qualifications, and application procedures. Therefore, it is recommended that four-year colleges and universities develop and distribute an information pamphlet.
describing financial aid offerings as well as qualifications and application procedures. This pamphlet should be developed specifically for Mexican-Americans and printed in both English and Spanish. These recommendations are supported by Fields (1987).

Based upon the responses to the survey instrument, it is concluded that Mexican-Americans attend community colleges because they are less expensive than four-year colleges and universities. Thus, methods of reducing the cost of attending a four-year college or university are very important in the development of marketing strategies and tactics to attract Mexican-Americans. As mentioned earlier, scholarships were identified as very successful tactics to be used in reducing the cost of attending a college or university whereas paid work experiences for Mexican-Americans while attending school were identified as successful tactics. These conclusions concur with the research findings of Astin (1982). Finally, some colleges and universities may experiment with the concept of providing financial aid in the form of half-tuition for brothers, sisters, husbands, or wives of full-time students. Respondents to the survey instrument identified this marketing tactic as somewhat successful.

Place

The results of the survey instrument indicate that the
proximity of a college or university to the home of a Mexican-American student is very important to his or her parents. Mexican-American parents prefer their son or daughter to attend a college or university close to their home (Astin and Burciaga 1981). However, this study concludes that Mexican-American students do not have a preference to attend a school close to their home that is as strong as their parents' preference. In addition, the findings of the study indicate that Mexican-American parents are no more influential in their child's choice of a college or university than Anglo parents or parents from other ethnic backgrounds. This finding refutes previous findings by Astin and Burciaga (1981) who write that Mexican-American parents are more influential in their child's choice of a college or university than Anglo parents or parents of other ethnic backgrounds. Finally, the results of this study suggest that telecourses in homes and the provision of public transportation services to and from a college or university are not successful marketing tactics to be used by colleges and universities in attracting Mexican-American students. The concepts of providing telecourses in homes and public transportation services to and from a college or university were suggested by students participating in the focus groups. These provisions would supposedly allow for easier access to four-year institutions of higher education by Mexican-Americans. However, Mexican-Americans value the
ownership of a car and social settings such as college and university campuses provide (Fiske 1988). Therefore, these marketing strategies and tactics were identified as not successful in attracting Mexican-Americans.

Promotion

Based upon the responses to the survey instrument, a conclusion of this study is that marketing strategies and tactics in the area of promotion are very important for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities. The findings of this study indicate that many Mexican-Americans are not aware of the benefits, opportunities, and values of a college education. Furthermore, the results of this study suggest that Mexican-Americans are not aware of the requirements for admission to a college or university and application procedures. Therefore, a recommendation is that four-year colleges and universities begin to promote their offerings to Mexican-American students somewhere between the seventh and ninth grades of school. The provision of early exposure to college life for Mexican-American students is very important (Gandara 1986). Based upon responses to the survey instrument, a recommendation is that this exposure involve programs such as field trips, summer camps, and education programs which bring Mexican-American youth on college and university campuses. These types of programs have been
implemented by Stanford University, California State University, and the University of California at Los Angeles.

These findings of the study strongly suggest that Mexican-American students who are currently enrolled in colleges and universities are very important in the process of promoting an institution to prospective Mexican-American students. To that end, it is highly recommended that current Mexican-American college and university students travel to junior and senior high schools with large enrollments of Mexican-Americans and speak about the opportunities, benefits, admissions requirements, financial aid offerings, and application procedures. It is also recommended that Mexican-American alumni travel to these junior and senior high schools and speak on college life and the benefits of higher education. Both Mexican-American alumni and currently enrolled Mexican-American students should be used in promotion programs to contact prospective Mexican-American students by letter or telephone.

In addition, a conclusion based upon the findings of this study is that a continuing public information program is a successful tactic and should be developed to heighten the awareness by Mexican-Americans of the opportunities and benefits provided by a college education. Responses to the survey instrument indicate that an awareness program is a successful marketing tactic and should also be established on community college campuses in the form of "transfer
centers." These "transfer centers" would provide counseling services and information on admissions requirements, application procedures, and financial aid to Mexican-American students who are preparing to transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges and universities.

Other marketing strategies and tactics in the area of promotion that were identified as successful by respondents to the survey instrument include the recognition of Mexican-American students, faculty, staff, alumni, and activities on campus. Based upon these responses, it is recommended that brochures be developed and newsletters mailed out to highlight these individuals and activities. Also, letters should be sent specifically to both students in the eighth and tenth grades and their parents. These letters should promote the benefits of a college education and outline admission requirements. This contact with eighth and tenth graders would assist in alleviating the problem of poor preparation in high school for college by specifying necessary courses to take for admission as well as retention in four-year colleges and universities. California State University has implemented this recommendation successfully.

A college/university partnership with business and industry was identified as a successful marketing tactic and should be used to develop not only price strategies but also to develop promotion strategies. These promotion strategies
and tactics should take the form of career fair programs with an emphasis upon job opportunities and the need for a college education.

Other recommended promotion strategies and tactics based upon the findings of this study include involving faculty members in recruitment activities with potential Mexican-American students, using famous Mexican-Americans (i.e., movie, television, and sports stars) to market the opportunities and benefits of a college education, and sponsorship or participation in Mexican-American cultural events.

The results of the survey instrument identified parents as important influencers in the selection of a college or university by Mexican-American students. Also, the Mexican-American parents tend to be more fluent in Spanish than English. This fact was identified by a review of the related literature and reinforced by findings of the focus groups. Therefore, a final recommendation based upon responses to the survey instrument is that promotional literature and mailings be printed in both Spanish and English. Also, the findings of this study indicate that bilingual counselors and admissions representatives should be used in working with Mexican-Americans. In addition, some institutions may want to try using Spanish language media in promotional efforts.
Factor Analysis

Successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend four-year colleges and universities were identified in this study. These marketing strategies and tactics were grouped through the use of factor analysis. The four factors identified in the factor analysis are as follows: (1) On-Campus Programs and Activities, (2) Off-Campus Programs and Activities, (3) Perceptions, and (4) Cost. For example, on Factor 1, i.e., On-Campus Programs and Activities, the three marketing strategies and tactics with the highest loadings include: support groups for Mexican-Americans on campus, increase Mexican-Americans employed on campus, and letter/telephone contacts with Mexican-Americans. On Factor 2, i.e., Off-Campus Programs and Activities, the three marketing strategies and tactics with the highest loadings include: career fair program, school and business marketing program, and transfer center on community college campuses. The three marketing strategies and tactics with the highest loadings on Factor 3, i.e., Perceptions, include: parent preference for college/university, students prefer school close to home, and current Mexican-American students to promote school. Finally, on Factor 4, i.e., Cost, the three marketing strategies and tactics with the highest loadings include: increase financial aid for Mexican-Americans, low cost, and attend community college
because [it is] cheaper. A more detailed explanation of the factor analysis findings is presented in Chapter IV. These four factors can be used in future studies as a guide to aid in the identification of additional successful marketing strategies and tactics.

In conclusion, given the data base generated in this study, along with the conclusions and recommendations derived, a college or university could implement these successful marketing strategies and tactics for attracting Mexican-Americans to enroll in and attend their particular institution. These marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful may be modified and tailored to fit the needs of individual colleges and universities. Future research could include studies of the effects upon the enrollment of Mexican-American students as a result of the implementation of these marketing strategies and tactics identified in this study. Furthermore, the research methodology and the survey instrument developed and used in this study can be utilized to replicate the efforts made in this study on a periodic basis in order to update, modify, and determine if the marketing strategies and tactics identified as successful are still relevant. Finally, future studies could focus upon a smaller geographic area using the same research methodology in an effort to focus upon the needs of Mexican-Americans based upon their specific state of residence.
NOTES

APPENDIX 1

THE STUDY POPULATION
Arizona

1. American Indian Bible College
   Nadine Waldrop

2. Arizona College of the Bible
   Dr. Vernon D. Doerksen

3. Arizona State University
   Ms. Susan R. Clouse

4. DeVry Institute of Technology
   Brad Douglas

5. Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, Prescott
   Campus
   Darryl W. Niemeyer

6. Grand Canyon College
   Jeff Dinkel

7. Northern Arizona University
   Mr. Don Browning

8. Prescott College
   Mr. C. Derk Janssen

9. Southwestern College
   Miss Lori Behrendt

10. University of Arizona
    Mr. Jerome A. Lucido

11. University of Phoenix
    Ms. Eloise K. Young

12. Western International University
    Elena Pattison
California

1. Academy of Art College
   Jan Schroeder

2. Antioch University - Los Angeles
   Ms. Abigayle Lawrence

3. Antioch University - San Francisco
   Sharon Maxwell

4. Antioch University - Santa Barbara
   Marion H. Taylor

5. Armstrong University
   Ms. Peggy A. Rathart

6. Art Center College of Design
   Steven C. Weir

7. Art Institute of Southern California
   Ms. Lisa Stanton

8. Azuza Pacific University
   Guy Adams - Dean of Admissions

9. Bethany Bible College
   Carmine H. Wilson

10. Biola University
    Greg Vaughn

11. Brooks Institute of Photography
    Shirley Conley

12. California Baptist College
    John E. Potter

13. California College of Arts and Crafts
    Virginia Porter

14. California Institute of Technology
    Daniel T. Langdale

15. California Institute of the Arts
    Kenneth Young

16. California Lutheran University
    Ernie Sandlin

17. California Maritime Academy
    David G. Buchanan
18. California Polytechnic State University
   Dave Snyder

19. California State College
   Dr. Homer S. Motalvo

20. California Polytechnic University
   Arthur G. Covarrubias

21. California State University - Chico
   Caroline Aldrich

22. California State University - Carson
   Anita Gash

23. California State University - Fresno
   Dr. T. Russell Mitchell

24. California State University - Fullerton
   William Gowler

25. California State University - Hayward
   Glen Perry

26. California State University - Long Beach
   James F. Menzel

27. California State University - Los Angeles
   David Godoy

28. California State University - Northridge
   Lorraine Newlon

29. California State University - Sacramento
   Mr. Richard J. Warren

30. California State University - San Bernardino
   Cheryl Weese

31. California State University - Turlock
   Dr. Frances Jeffries Cook

32. Chapman College
   Mr. C. Dougherty

33. Christ College
   W. Stan Meyer

34. Christian Heritage College
   Paul Berry
35. Claremont McKenna College
   Robert G. Rogers

36. Cleveland Chiropractic College
   Barbi Forsythe

37. Cogswell Polytechnic College
   Paul A. Schreivogel

38. Coleman College
   Bob Wall

39. College of Notre Dame
   Joanne Berridge

40. Columbia College
   Bernard Hunt

41. DeVry Institute of Technology
   Irv Thomas

42. Dominican College of San Rafael
   Mrs. Jan Tomsky

43. Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology
   Joan Athenian

44. Fresno Pacific College
   Cary W. Templeton

45. Golden Gate University
   Archie Porter

46. Grantham College of Engineering
   Arnold Akers

47. Harvey Mudd College
   Ms. Jean Rutherford

48. Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institution of
   Religion
   Sara Grace Brown

49. Holy Names College
   Sister Carol Sellman

50. Humboldt State University
   Chris Munoz

51. Humphreys College
   Pamela Knapp
52. ITT Technical Institute  
    David Dickerson
53. John F. Kennedy University  
    Karen Sloma
54. LIFE Bible College  
    Sharon Bleitz
55. Loma Linda University  
    Dr. Wayne Juda
56. Los Angeles College of Chiropractic  
    Dr. Joseph R. Laurin
57. Louise Salinger Academy of Fashion  
    John H. Roedel
58. Loyola Marymount University  
    Mr. M. E. L'Heureux
59. Master's College  
    Mr. Don Gilmore
60. Menlo College  
    Judith M. McCoy
61. Mills College  
    Zina Jacque
62. Monterey Institute of International Studies  
    Jane Roberts
63. Mount St. Mary's College  
    Ted Rowland
64. National University  
    Janice Culver
65. New College of California  
    Michael McAvoy
66. New School for Social Research, Otis Art  
    Institution of Parson School of Design  
    Jane Buckman
67. Northrop University  
    Ms. Pat Lukas
68. Occidental College  
    (Ms. Charlene Liebau) Lisa Duran
69. Pacific Christian College
   Bruce Gallaher

70. Pacific Coast Baptist Bible College
   Dr. Roger E. Howse

71. Pacific Oaks College
   Sandy Jahiel

72. Pacific Union College
   Dick Duerksen

73. Patten College
   Mrs. Sharon Hendricks

74. Pepperdine University - Culver City
   Tom Flood

75. Pepperdine University - Malibu
   Robert L. Fraley

76. Fitzer College
   Dr. Paul Ranslow

77. Point Loma Nazarene College
   Bill Young

78. Pamona College
   Bruce J. Poch

79. St. John's Seminary College
   Rev. Thomas Anslow

80. St. Joseph's College
   Rev. Stephen Barrett

81. Saint Mary's College of California
   Peter J. Mohorko

82. Samuel Merritt College of Nursing
   Caroline Gregg

83. San Diego State University
   Nancy C. Sprotte

84. San Francisco Art Institute
   Ann Reiniger

85. San Francisco Conservatory of Music
   Colleen Katzowitz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>Dr. Corwin Bjonerud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>San Jose Bible College</td>
<td>Mrs. Dandy Connolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Edgar A. Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Santa Clara University</td>
<td>Daniel J. Saracino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Scripps College</td>
<td>Leslie Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Sierra University: A University Without Walls</td>
<td>Richard Bibbau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Simpson College</td>
<td>Greg Collard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
<td>Dr. Frank Tansey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Southern California College</td>
<td>Richard Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Southern California College of Optometry</td>
<td>Dr. Lorraine Voorhees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Southern California Institute of Architecture</td>
<td>Kathleen Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>John Bunnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Thomas Aquinas College</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas J. Susanka, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>United States International University</td>
<td>Dr. Joseph A. Merante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>Dr. Robert L. Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>University of California - Davis</td>
<td>Dr. Gary Tudor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>University of California - Irvine</td>
<td>Dr. James E. Dunning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
103. University of California - Los Angeles
Dr. Rae Lee Siporin

104. University of California - Riverside
Marion McCarthy

105. University of California - San Diego
Mrs. Gwyneth Cooper

106. University of California - San Francisco
Lillian Lemon

107. University of California - Santa Barbara
William Villa

108. University of California - Santa Cruz
Joseph P. Allen

109. University of Judaism
Miriam Prum

110. University of LaVerne
Mark Bornholdt

111. University of Redlands
Steven Hankins

112. University of San Diego - Alcala Park
Warren Muller

113. University of San Francisco - San Francisco
William Henley

114. University of Southern California
Kathryn Forte

115. University of the Pacific
Ms. Pat Peters

116. University of West Los Angeles
Ellen Westernman

117. West Coast Christian College
Carl Hobbs

118. West Coast University
Roger Miller

119. Western State University College of Law of Orange County
Mr. Joel H. Goodman
120. Western State University College of Law of San Diego
   Ms. Jennifer Keller

121. Westmont College
   David A. Morley

122. Whittier College
   Jeff Ernst (Doug Locker)

123. Woodbury College
   Pat Coleman

124. World College West
   Ben M. Snyder
Colorado

1. Adams State College
   Cheryl Billingsley

2. Colorado Christian College
   Tammy Charles

3. Colorado College
   Richard E. Wood

4. Colorado School of Mines
   A. William Young

5. Colorado State University
   Mary Ontireros

6. Colorado Technical College
   Sandi Miller

7. Denver Technical College
   Raul Valdes

8. Fort Lewis College
   Sheri Rochford

9. Loretto Heights College
   Doraleen Huller

10. Mesa College
    Sherr Pe'a

11. Metropolitan State College
    Thomas R. Gray

12. Naropa Institute
    Cynthia C. Cunningham

13. Regis College
    Dr. Domenic N. Teti

    Lt. Col. John Swiney

15. University of Colorado at Boulder
    Mr. Millard Storey

16. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
    Randy Kouba

17. University of Colorado at Denver
    Alice Holman
18. University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
   Dr. David P. Sorenson

19. University of Denver
   Susan Hunt

20. University of Northern Colorado
    Ben Gullickson

21. University of Southern Colorado
    Carl A. Melin

22. Western State College of Colorado
    Monica Bruning
Nevada

1. Old College
   Debra Canon

2. Reno Business College
   Angie Debraga

3. Sierra Nevada College
   Lura Whitelaw

4. University of Nevada - Las Vegas
   Carl D. Cook

5. University of Nevada - Reno
   Dr. Barry S. Davidson
**New Mexico**

1. College of Santa Fe  
   Mr. Leary O'Gorman

2. College of the Southwest  
   Glenna O'Haver

3. Eastern New Mexico University  
   Larry Fuqua

4. New Mexico Highlands University  
   Ms. Christina Griego

5. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology  
   Louise E. Chamberlin

6. New Mexico State University  
   Bill J. Bruner

7. St. John's College  
   Larry Clendenin

8. University of New Mexico  
   Mrs. Cynthia Stuart

9. Western New Mexico University  
   Mr. Eric Gunnink
Texas

1. Abilene Christian University
   Don Harrison

2. Amber University
   Dr. Algia Allen

3. American Technological University
   Laura Vargas

4. Angelo State University
   William G. Bowen

5. Arlington Baptist College
   Helen Sullivan

6. Austin College
   Charles B. Wharton

7. Baylor College of Dentistry
   Betty Scott

8. Baylor University
   Mr. Herman D. Thomas

9. Concordia Lutheran College
   Kevin Pieper

10. Corpus Christi State University
    Dr. Ernesto Ramiriz, Jr.

11. Criswell Center for Biblical Studies
    Dr. Luis L. Pantoja, Jr.

12. Dallas Baptist University
    Jill Lewis

13. Dallas Christian College
    Mark Worley

14. DeVry Institute of Technology
    Vijay Shah

15. East Texas Baptist University
    Joyce Ellis

16. East Texas State University
    Randy McDonald

17. East Texas State University of Texarkana
    Sandra Rogers
18. Hardin-Simmons University  
   Jim W. Trammell

19. Houston Baptist University  
   Pamela Wilhite

20. Howard Payne University  
   Cheryl Mangrum

21. Huston-Tillotson College  
   Terry Smith

22. Incarnate Word College  
   Brian Keese

23. Jarvis Christian College  
   M. Edward Thomas

24. Lamar University  
   James Rush, Jr.

25. Laredo State University  
   Mary Trevino

26. LeTourneau College  
   Roger Kieffer

27. Lubbock Christian University  
   Steve Garman

28. McMurray College  
   Tim Crane

29. Midwestern State University  
   Shirley Wilson

30. North Texas State University  
   Don C. Palermo

31. Northwood Institute  
   Teri Melton

32. Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio  
   Loretta Schlegel

33. Pan American University  
   Mr. David Zuniga

34. Paul Quinn College  
   Maryilyn Marshall
35. Prairie View
   Mrs. Mary Gooch

36. Rice University
   Ron W. Moss

37. St. Edward's University
   Megan Murphy

38. St. Mary's University of San Antonio
   Candace J. Kuebker

39. Sam Houston State University
   Mr. H. A. Bass

40. Schreiner College
    Dewayne Bannister

41. Southern Methodist College
    Andrew L. Bryant

42. Southwestern Adventist College
    Mr. W. G. Nelson

43. Southwestern Assemblies of God College
    Terry Phipps

44. Southwestern Christian College
    Garald Lee

45. Southwestern University
    John W. Lind - Vice President for Admissions

46. Southwestern Texas State University
    Debra Bratcher

47. Stephen F. Austin State University
    Dr. Clyde Iglinsky

48. Sul Ross State University
    Bob Hardin

49. Tarleton State University
    John Whiting

50. Texas A & I University
    Mr. Raymond Broglie

51. Texas A & M University
    Dr. Billy G. Lay
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52. Texas A & M University at Galveston
   John Merritt

53. Texas Christian University
    Janel George Herald

54. Texas College
    Sandy L. Smith

55. Texas Lutheran College
    Robert A. Miller

56. Texas Southern University
    Mr. Collie Chambers

57. Texas Technical University
    Dr. Gene Medley

58. Texas Wesleyan College
    Tim Martinez

59. Texas Women's University
    Cythia Johnson

60. Trinity University
    Sarah Krause

61. University of Dallas
    William A. Henley

62. University of Houston - Clearlake
    Mike Henry

63. University of Houston - Downtown Houston
    Stalla Musick

64. University of Houston - Houston
    Jim Whittaker

65. University of Houston - Victoria
    Claude F. Gibson

66. University of Mary Hardin - Baylor
    Diane Stanford

67. University of St. Thomas
    Elsie D. Parsons

68. University of Texas at Arlington
    R. Zack Price
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69. University of Texas at Austin
   Shirley Binder

70. University of Texas at Dallas
    Betty Garrett

71. University of Texas at El Paso
    Diana Guerero

72. University of Texas at San Antonio
    Roger Bilow

73. University of Texas at Tyler
    Martha Wheat

74. University of Texas Health Science Center at Dallas
    Laura Jarnigan

75. University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
    Ms. Toya Candelari

76. University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
    Jim Peak

77. University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
    Dr. Betty McAshan

78. University of Texas of the Permian Basin
    Miss Vickie Gomez

79. Wayland Baptist University
    Mike Newsome

80. West Texas State University
    Ms. Lila Vars

81. Wiley College
    Mr. Edward Morgan
APPENDIX 2

BREAKDOWN OF THE EIGHT FOCUS GROUPS IN THE STUDY
Four Focus Groups in Los Angeles, California:

**Group 1**: Ten presently enrolled Mexican-American college or university students.

**Group 2**: Ten parents of Mexican-American students.

**Group 3**: Ten admissions directors from ten different four-year colleges or universities located in California.

**Group 4**: Ten high school guidance counselors from ten different high schools located in California.

Four Focus Groups in San Antonio, Texas:

**Group 1**: Ten presently enrolled Mexican-American college or university students.

**Group 2**: Ten parents of Mexican-American students.

**Group 3**: Ten admissions directors from ten different four-year colleges or universities located in Texas.

**Group 4**: Ten high school guidance counselors from ten different high schools located in Texas.
FOCUS GROUP: Mexican-American College Student

Moderator's Guide

Hello. My name is Cindy Coiner. I am a doctoral student from Old Dominion University in Virginia. I want to welcome you to the discussion group. I am conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics." The study will attempt to identify those methods for recruitment which are successful in attracting Mexican-American students to attend colleges and universities. Once these successful methods for recruitment have been identified, they can be used by colleges and universities to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolling and/or considering enrolling. Your participation in the discussion group is of great importance and is appreciated very much. Let's open by introducing ourselves. (Introduction of participants.)

First, let's talk about the information needs when you were considering enrollment in a college or university.

1. What do you need to know when you are considering enrollment in a college or university?

2. In talking with others who are of Mexican-American descent, what do you perceive to be their information needs (i.e., what they need to know about)
when considering what college or university to attend?

3. Based upon your experiences, what types of course offerings should colleges and universities develop in order to be more responsive to your special needs?

4. Do you have any special needs with regard to scheduling and location of class offerings?

5. Based upon your experiences, what types of services (i.e., acts of assistance, aid, or help) should colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to your needs?

6. What types of co-curricular and extracurricular activities should colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to your needs?

7. How did you learn about your particular college or university?

8. Who influenced your decision to attend your particular college or university?

9. What factors influenced your decision to enroll at your particular college or university?

10. What has made it difficult for you to attend college?

11. In talking with others who are of Mexican-American descent, what has made it difficult for them to attend college?
12. In your opinion, what can be done to overcome these obstacles which have made it difficult for you and others to attend college?

13. How do you think colleges and universities could better present (i.e., market) themselves to you as Mexican-Americans?

14. Was there anything in particular that your college or university did to attract you?

15. Do you know of any current recruitment methods that are successfully attracting Mexican-Americans to attend four-year colleges or universities?

16. What types of information sources (i.e., newspaper, television, radio, brochures) did your university or college use to attract you?

17. What types of information sources (i.e., newspaper, television, radio, brochures) should be used by four-year colleges and universities to reach (i.e., market to) Mexican-Americans?

18. Should both Spanish and English be used by four-year colleges and universities in recruiting students?

19. Why do you think so?

20. What are the main reasons that you chose to attend your particular college or university?

This concludes our discussion group meeting. Again, thank you very much for your attendance and participation.
Moderator's Guide

Hello. My name is Cindy Coiner. I am a doctoral student from Old Dominion University in Virginia. I want to welcome you to the discussion group. I am conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics." The study will attempt to identify those methods for recruitment which are successful in attracting Mexican-American students to attend colleges and universities. Once these successful methods for recruitment have been identified, they can be used by colleges and universities to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolling and/or considering enrolling. Your participation in the discussion group is of great importance and is appreciated very much. Let's open by introducing ourselves. (Introduction of participants.)

First, I would like to start out by asking you about the information needs you had when your son or daughter was considering which college or university to attend.

1. What did you need to know about colleges and universities when your son or daughter was considering which college or university to attend?
2. If your son or daughter needed assistance, what types of special courses should colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to their needs?

3. Does your son or daughter have any special needs in regard to scheduling and location of classes? Tell me about them please.

4. What types of services (i.e., acts of assistance, aid, or help) should colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to the needs of your son or daughter?

5. How did your son or daughter learn about their particular college or university?

6. What influenced your son or daughter to choose the college or university that they are currently attending?

7. What has made it difficult for your son or daughter to attend college?

8. What should be done to overcome these obstacles which have made it difficult for your son or daughter to attend college?

9. How do you think colleges and universities can better present (i.e., market) themselves to you as Mexican-Americans?

10. Do you know of any current recruitment methods that are successfully attracting Mexican-Americans to
attend four-year colleges and universities?

11. What types of information sources (i.e., newspapers, television, radio, brochures) should be used by four-year colleges and universities to recruit Mexican-Americans?

12. Should both Spanish and English be used by four-year colleges and universities in reaching Mexican-Americans?

13. What are the main reasons that your son or daughter had for choosing to attend their particular school?

This concludes our discussion group meeting. Again, thank you for your participation and attendance.
Moderator's Guide

Hello. My name is Cindy Coiner. I am a doctoral student from Old Dominion University in Virginia. I want to welcome you to the discussion group. I am conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics." The study will attempt to identify those methods for recruitment which are successful in attracting Mexican-American students to attend colleges and universities. Once these successful methods for recruitment have been identified, they can be used by colleges and universities to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolling and/or considering enrolling. Your participation in the discussion group is of great importance and is appreciated very much. Let's open by introducing ourselves. (Introduction of participants.)

First, let's talk about the information needs of Mexican-Americans considering enrollment in colleges and universities.

1. What do Mexican-Americans need to know about when they are considering enrollment in colleges and universities?
2. Based upon your experiences in working with Mexican-American students, what types of services (i.e., acts of assistance, help, or aid) should four-year colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans who are considering enrollment?

3. What is your school currently offering in the area of special courses that impacts positively upon the recruitment of Mexican-Americans?

4. Please describe a service (i.e., acts of assistance, aid, or help) or services provided by your school that impacts positively upon the recruitment of Mexican-Americans.

5. Please describe extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities that impact positively upon the recruitment of Mexican-Americans.

6. What do you think are the factors that influence a Mexican-American student to attend your college or university?

7. What may be some obstacles that make it difficult for Mexican-Americans to attend your college or university?

8. What do you think should be done to overcome these obstacles?

9. What types of information sources should be used by your college or university to effectively market
(i.e., present) your school to Mexican-Americans?
By information sources, I am referring to newspapers, television, radio, and brochures.

10. Should both Spanish and English be used by four-year colleges and universities in marketing to Mexican-Americans?

11. Why do Mexican-Americans choose to attend your college or university?

12. What do you feel should be done to successfully reach (i.e., market to) Mexican-Americans who are considering enrolling in a college or university?

13. Do you have a recruitment program directed toward Mexican-Americans?

14. Are you auditing your Mexican-American recruitment program?

15. Could you describe the auditing methodology?

16. Do you see an increase in the enrollment of Mexican-Americans at your college or university?

17. What do you attribute this growth to?

This concludes our discussion group meeting. Again, thank you very much for your attendance and participation.
FOCUS GROUP: High School Guidance Counselors

Moderator's Guide

Hello. My name is Cindy Coiner. I am a doctoral student from Old Dominion University in Virginia. I want to welcome you to the discussion group. I am conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics." The study will attempt to identify those methods for recruitment which are successful in attracting Mexican-American students to attend colleges and universities. Once these successful methods for recruitment have been identified, they can be used by colleges and universities to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans enrolling and/or considering enrolling. Your participation in the discussion group is of great importance and is appreciated very much. Let's open by introducing ourselves. (Introduction of participants.)

First, let's talk about the information needs of Mexican-Americans considering enrollment in colleges and universities.

1. What do Mexican-Americans need to know about when they are considering enrollment in colleges and universities?
2. Based upon your experiences in working with Mexican-American students, what types of services (i.e., acts of assistance, help, or aid) should four-year colleges and universities develop in order to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans who are considering enrollment?

3. How do Mexican-Americans learn about a particular college or university?

4. Who influences the decisions of Mexican-Americans to attend a particular college or university?

5. What factors influence the choice by Mexican-Americans to enroll at a particular four-year college or university?

6. In your opinion, what are the obstacles that make it difficult for Mexican-Americans to attend four-year colleges and universities?

7. What do you think can be done to overcome these obstacles?

8. What should be done to more effectively present (i.e., market) four-year colleges and universities to Mexican-Americans?

9. Are you aware of any current methods for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities that are successfully attracting Mexican-Americans?

10. What types of information sources (i.e., news-
papers, television, brochures, radio) should be used by four-year Mexican-Americans?

11. Should both Spanish and English be used to reach (i.e., market to) Mexican-Americans?

12. Is there anything else that we may not have mentioned to assist Mexican-Americans in their choice of a college or university?

This concludes our discussion group meeting. Again, thank you very much for your attendance and participation.
APPENDIX 4

MARKETING FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT APPROVAL FORM
The Study

This study will attempt to identify those successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities. Once these successful marketing strategies and tactics are identified, they can be utilized by four-year institutions of higher education to recruit Mexican-Americans and address the needs of this particular market segment for higher education. The findings of the study should be of benefit to both admissions directors of four-year colleges and universities and Mexican-Americans enrolling in these institutions.

Focus Group Participant Agreement

Your participation will be greatly appreciated because the results will help in the identification of successful marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities. Your responses to questions asked in the focus group will not place you at any criminal or financial risk. All information gathered via the focus group will be presented in an anonymous form and no institution or individual will be identified in the reports. You will also have access to the findings of the study. You are free to withdraw from participation in the focus group at any time.
APPENDIX 5

SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES FOR MEXICAN-AMERICANS
SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES FOR MEXICAN-AMERICANS

This is a survey to identify successful marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of Mexican-American students into four-year colleges and universities.

PART ONE: INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

Please read and answer the following:

1. What is the size of the college or university where you are currently employed? (Please check (Y) one.)
   - under 500 undergraduate students
   - 501 to 6,000 undergraduate students
   - 6,001 to 10,000 undergraduate students
   - over 10,000 undergraduate students
   - 10,001 to 20,000 undergraduate students

2. Please estimate the percentage (%) of Mexican-American enrollment at the college or university where you are employed.

3. If there are no Mexican-American students presently enrolled at your employing college or university, does the institution have a marketing plan or policy for the recruitment of Mexican-Americans? Yes No

If you answered no to question two and no to question three, please do not continue to fill out this survey but return it in the enclosed envelope.

PART TWO: MARKETING STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

Please read the following statements and respond to each by circling whether you strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, (neither agree nor disagree) neutral, somewhat agree, agree, or strongly agree.

1. An increase in financial aid offerings for Mexican-Americans attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

2. The offering of scholarships specifically for Mexican-Americans is an important marketing tactic in the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to a college or university.

3. The low cost of tuition at a college or university is an important factor in the decision of a Mexican-American to attend a particular college or university.

4. A partnership program between a college or university and business and industry to develop scholarships, grants, tuition stipends, or internships for Mexican-Americans attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

5. The provision of paid work experiences while attending a college or university is an important marketing tactic in the recruitment of Mexican-Americans.

6. The provision of technical assistance, by a college or university to Mexican-American students and their parents, in the completion of financial aid forms attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

7. Financial aid in the form of half-tuition for brothers, sisters, husbands, or wives of full-time students attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.
8. The development and distribution of a pamphlet describing financial aid opportunities by type, amount, qualification, and application process for Mexican-Americans attracts more Mexican-Americans to a college or university.

9. Mexican-Americans attend a community college first because it is less expensive than a four-year college or university.

10. Meetings sponsored by a college or university to educate parents on financial aid and assist in financial planning for college attract more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

11. The presence of Mexican-American student organizations on campus is a factor in the decision of a Mexican-American to attend a particular college or university.

12. A Mexican-American studies program attracts Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

13. An increase in the employment of Mexican-Americans in faculty, staff, and administrative positions attracts Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

14. Latino floors in dorms on campus positively influences the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to a college or university.

15. A summer transition program at a college or university positively influences the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to that college or university.

16. A faculty mentoring program at a college or university positively influences the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to that college or university.

17. Increasing the enrollment of Mexican-Americans at a college or university attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

18. The provision of support groups for Mexican-Americans on the campus of a college or university positively influences the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to that college or university.

19. A big brother/big sister program matching Mexican-American freshmen with Mexican-American upperclassmen for peer counseling attracts Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

20. Parents of Mexican-American students prefer their son or daughter to attend a college or university close to home.

21. Mexican-American students prefer to attend a college or university located close to their home.

22. College or university telecourses in the home attract Mexican-Americans to that college or university.

23. The provision of public transportation services to and from a college or university attracts Mexican-Americans to that college or university.
24. Early exposure to college life where high school and junior high school students can stay in dorms, attend classes, and talk with college students positively influences and attracts Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

25. A brochure highlighting Mexican-American students, faculty, and staff at a college or university attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

26. Bilingual recruitment functions and literature attract Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

27. A newsletter focusing on Mexican-American students, faculty, alumni, activities on the campus of a college or university, and mailing it out to potential Mexican-American enrollees attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

28. Currently enrolled Mexican-American college students speaking on college life to Mexican-American junior and senior high school students attracts Mexican-Americans to attend a college or university.

29. Mexican-American alumni from a college or university conveying their college experience and success after graduation to Mexican-American high school and junior high school students attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

30. A marketing approach by a college or university concentrating on Mexican-American ethnicity is a "turnoff" to Mexican-Americans.

31. Parents of Mexican-Americans are more influential in the college/university selection process than Anglo or other ethnic group parents.

32. Involving faculty members in the marketing of a college or university through interaction with potential Mexican-American students is important in the recruitment of Mexican-Americans to that college or university.

33. A college or university sponsoring or participating in Mexican-American events (i.e., concerts, festivals, parades, fairs, or special holidays) attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

34. A college or university that develops a continuing public information program to heighten Mexican-American community awareness of the opportunities and benefits of a college education attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

35. The establishment of a "transfer center" on community college campuses by a college or university to provide counseling services and information about admissions requirements, application procedures, and financial aid options attracts Mexican-Americans to transfer and attend that college or university.

36. The use of Spanish language media by a college or university to market to Mexican-Americans attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

37. A college or university partnership program with business and the community to develop community-based, career fair programs to enhance the awareness of the opportunities provided by a college education would attract more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

38. Comments:
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38. A college or university working with business and corporate representatives (i.e., presentations to junior and senior high school students about opportunities in the business world and the need for higher education) attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

39. Currently enrolled Mexican-American college students contacting prospective Mexican-American students by letter or telephone to offer their services in answering questions about the college or university or about other related concerns attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

40. A college or university using famous Mexican-Americans (i.e., movie, television, and sports stars) urging Mexican-Americans to go to college attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

41. A college or university sending letters to 8th and 10th grade students and to their parents encouraging them to think about college and outlining requirements for admission attracts Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

42. A college or university that provides bilingual counselors and admissions representatives attracts more Mexican-Americans to attend that college or university.

43. Mexican-Americans do not perceive a college education as necessary.

44. Please rank from 1 to 12 (1 representing most important and 12 representing least important) the importance of the following considerations in the college/university selection process by Mexican-Americans.

   1. athletic programs and facilities
   2. availability of financial aid
   3. basic cost of attending
   4. campus atmosphere
   5. campus size (number of undergraduate students)
   6. distance from home
   7. social/cultural/entertainment activities
   8. parents' preference
   9. presence of Mexican-American faculty and staff
   10. specific academic programs
   11. location of campus
   12. housing

Please rank the following lists according to your opinions.

45. Please rank from 1 to 5 (1 representing most important and 5 representing least important) the importance of the following factors to counter alienation of Mexican-Americans on college and university campuses.

   1. cultural support on campus
   2. higher proportion of Mexican-American representation in student population
   3. more Mexican-American faculty, staff, and administration
   4. strong student support services to serve Mexican-Americans
   5. supportive and accessible faculty
   6. any other? (specify)

Comments:

46. Please rank from 1 to 9 (1 representing the greatest and 9 representing the least) the following obstacles which Mexican-Americans encounter when making the decision to attend a college or university.

   1. admissions standards and policies
   2. alienation on campus
   3. cost
   4. family obligations
   5. need or desire to go to work
   6. low self-esteem and/or lack of confidence
   7. lack of knowledge of college opportunities
   8. college education is not valued by family
   9. poor high school preparation
   10. any other? (specify)

Comments:
47. Please rank from 1 to 7 (1 representing the most important and 7 the least important) the importance of the following people in giving out information on colleges and universities to Mexican-Americans.

1. alumni/previous students
2. current students
3. church and community leaders
4. friends
5. high school guidance counselors
6. parents
7. college representatives
8. any other? (specify)

Comments:

48. Please rank from 1 to 9 (1 representing the most influential and 9 representing the least influential) the following persons according to the strength of their influence upon the decision by Mexican-Americans as to which college or university to attend.

1. alumni/previous students
2. church and community leaders
3. college representatives
4. current students
5. famous personalities
6. friends/peers
7. high school guidance counselors
8. high school teachers
9. parents
10. any other? (specify)

Comments:

Please read and answer the following.

49. Please check (✓) the college or university size which you perceive as the most favorable in attracting Mexican-Americans.

- vary small (under 500 undergraduate students)
- small (501 to 6,000 undergraduate students)
- medium (6,001 to 10,000 undergraduate students)
- large (10,001 to 20,000 undergraduate students)
- very large (over 20,000 undergraduate students)

Comments:

50. Please check (✓) one grade level that you perceive as most appropriate to begin marketing a college or university to Mexican-American youth.

- 12th
- 11th
- 9th
- 8th
- 6th
- 5th
- 4th
- 3rd
- 2nd
- 1st

Comments:

51. Please list ways in which your college or university is marketing to Mexican-Americans.

PART THREE: INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

Your current work title: ________________________________

Sex: (Please check ✓ one.) Female  Male

Your age: _____

Your highest level of education completed: (Please check ✓ one.)

- high school
- some college
- bachelor's degree
- master's degree
- doctoral degree

Ethnic background: (Please check ✓ one.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Black (Non-Hispanic)
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Puerto Rican
- Cuban
- Mexican-American
- Hispanic other than those mentioned above
- White
- Other (please specify)

Thank you for your time and participation in this survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (804) 460-0884.

Cynthia G. Coiner
APPENDIX 6

SURVEY COVER LETTER
November 10, 1989

Dear Admissions Director:

I am a doctoral student in the Urban Services Ph.D. program at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics."

My ultimate goal for this research is to identify and compile a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities. I anticipate my findings will help four-year institutions of higher education to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans.

Your participation is essential to this research. Approximately fifteen minutes are needed to complete this survey. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and no individual or institution will be identified.

Please complete the survey and return it by November 27, 1989, in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Upon your request, you will receive a summary of the results of this study. As an added incentive, by returning the completed survey, you will be eligible to win a $100 bill.

I deeply appreciate your time and contribution to this study. If you have any questions, please call me at (804) 460-0884.

Sincerely,

Cynthia G. Coiner

CGC/jwk

Enclosure
APPENDIX 7

SURVEY FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER
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Dear Admissions Director:

A few weeks ago, I requested your cooperation in responding to a survey regarding marketing strategies and tactics for the recruitment of Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities. To date, I have not received your response. Your participation is essential to this research.

Please take approximately fifteen minutes to complete the survey and return it by December 19, 1989. For your convenience, I have enclosed another copy of the survey along with a self-addressed return envelope. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and no individual or institution will be identified. Upon your request, you will receive a summary of the results of this study.

As I mentioned, I am a doctoral student in the Urban Services Ph.D. program at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. My dissertation is entitled, "Marketing Higher Education to Mexican-Americans: Identifying Successful Marketing Strategies and Tactics."

My ultimate goal for this research is to identify and compile a comprehensive set of successful marketing strategies and tactics for recruiting Mexican-Americans into four-year colleges and universities. I anticipate my findings will help four-year institutions of higher education to become more responsive to the needs of Mexican-Americans.

I deeply appreciate your time and contribution to this study. If you have any questions, please call me at (804) 460-0884.

Sincerely,

Cynthia G. Coiner

CGC/jwk

Enclosure
APPENDIX 8

RESPONSES TO SURVEY ITEMS 1 THROUGH 43
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Figure 9. Survey Item 1: Increase Financial Aid Offerings to Mexican-Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>26.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>62.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FREQUENCY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>********</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>37.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>62.72</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Survey Item 2: Scholarships for Mexican-Americans
| STRONGLY DISAGRE | ** | 2 | 2 | 1.18 | 1.18 |
| DISAGREE | ***** | 5 | 7 | 2.96 | 4.14 |
| SOMewhat DISAGRE | ******** | 9 | 16 | 5.33 | 9.47 |
| NEUTRAL | ************************** | 27 | 43 | 15.98 | 25.44 |
| SOMewhat AGREE | ***************************************** | 37 | 80 | 21.89 | 47.34 |
| AGREE | ****************************************** | 56 | 136 | 33.14 | 80.47 |
| STRONGLY AGREE | ************************************************* | 33 | 169 | 19.53 | 100.00 |

**Figure 11. Survey Item 3: Low Cost of Tuition**
Figure 12. Survey Item 4: School/Business Partnership in Financial Aid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>25.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>54.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>85.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Survey Item 5: Paid Work Experiences
Figure 14. Survey Item 6: Technical Assistance with Financial Aid Forms
Figure 15. Survey Item 7: Half-Tuition for Family of Full-Time Students
Figure 16. Survey Item 8: Financial Aid Information Pamphlet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Level</th>
<th>Frequency (Freq)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (Cum. Freq)</th>
<th>Percentage (Percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage (Cum. Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>33.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17. Survey Item 9: Mexican-Americans Attend Community Colleges Because of Cheaper Cost**
Figure 18. Survey Item 10: Financial Aid Workshop for Parents
Figure 19. Survey Item 11: Mexican-American Student Organizations on Campus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGRE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>53.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>78.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>93.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Survey Item 12: Mexican-American Studies Program
Figure 21. Survey Item 13: Increase Mexican-American Employment on Campus
Figure 22. Survey Item 14: Latino Floors in Dormitories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>31.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>56.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>81.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23. Survey Item 15: Summer Transition Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>19.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>52.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24. Survey Item 16: Faculty Mentoring Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>62.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Survey Item 17: Increase Mexican-American Enrollment at College/University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGRE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>41.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>80.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26. Survey Item 18: Support Groups for Mexican-Americans on Campus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>54.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>85.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27.** Survey Item 19: Peer Counseling for Mexican-American Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>18.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>34.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>74.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. Survey Item 20: Parent Preference for College/University Close to Home
Figure 29. Survey Item 21: Students Prefer School Close to Home
Figure 30. Survey Item 22: Telecourses in Home Attract Mexican-Americans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>50.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>78.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>94.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 31. Survey Item 23: Provision of Public Transportation**
Figure 32. Survey Item 24: Early Exposure to College/University Life
Figure 33. Survey Item 25: Mexican-American Brochure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGRE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>27.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>60.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>88.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 34. Survey Item 26: Bilingual Recruitment**
**Figure 35. Survey Item 27: Mexican-American Newsletter**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someewhat Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>20.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>64.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36. Survey Item 28: Current Mexican-American Students Promote College/University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>CUM. FREQ</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>CUM. PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>68.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37. Survey Item 29: Mexican-American Alumni to Promote College/University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>21.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>38.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td>71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>85.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>94.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 38. Survey Item 30: Emphasis on Mexican-American Ethnicity is a Turnoff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREED</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>58.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>72.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>89.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 39. Survey Item 31: Parental Influence in Choice of College/University
Figure 40. Survey Item 32: Faculty Involvement in Recruitment
**Figure 41. Survey Item 33. Sponsorship of Mexican-American Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>34.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>68.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>90.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 42. Survey Item 34: Public Information Program to Inform of College/University Offerings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>48.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>81.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 43. Survey Item 35: Transfer Center**
Figure 44. Survey Item 36: Use of Spanish Language Media
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>59.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>88.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 45. Survey Item 37: Career Fair Program
Figure 46. Survey Item 38: School/Business Marketing Program to Attract Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Cum. Freq</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>30.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>70.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 47. Survey Item 39: Letter/Telephone Contacts by Current Mexican-American Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREED</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUM. FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>39.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>92.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 48. Survey Item 40: Use Famous Mexican-Americans to Market College/University
Figure 49. Survey Item 41: Mail Letters to Parents of Eighth and Tenth Grade Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>CUM FREQ</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>CUM PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>52.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>84.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50. Survey Item 42: Bilingual Counseling
**Figure 51.** Survey Item 43: A College Education is not Perceived as Necessary by Mexican-Americans
### Figure 52. Collapsed Survey Item 1: Increase Financial Aid to Mexican-Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE/NEUTRAL</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>91.12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FREQUENCY
Figure 53. Collapsed Survey Item 2: Scholarships for Mexican-Americans
Figure 54.Collapsed Survey Item 3: Low Cost of Tuition
Figure 55. Collapsed Survey Item 4: School/Business Partnership in Financial Aid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE/NEUTRAL</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>74.56%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 56.** Collapsed Survey Item 5: Paid Work Experiences
Figure 57. Collapsed Survey Item 6: Technical Assistance with Financial Aid Forms
Figure 58. Collapsed Survey Item 7: Half-Tuition for Family of Full-Time Students
Figure 59. Collapsed Survey Item 8: Financial Aid Information Pamphlet
Figure 60. Collapsed Survey Item 9: Mexican-Americans Attend Community Colleges Because of Cheaper Cost
Figure 61. Collapsed Survey Item 10: Financial Aid Workshop for Parents
Figure 62. Collapsed Survey Item 11: Mexican-American Student Organizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Disagree/Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>53.89</td>
<td>46.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum. Percent</td>
<td>53.89</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 63: Collapsed Survey Item 12: Mexican-American Studies Program
Figure 64. Collapsed Survey Item 13: Increase Mexican-American Employment on Campus
Figure 65. Collapsed Survey Item 14: Latino Floors in Dormitories
Figure 66. Collapsed Survey Item 15: Summer Transition Program
Figure 67. Collapsed Survey Item 16: Faculty Mentoring Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>89.94</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 68. Collapsed Survey Item 17: Increase Mexican-American Enrollment at College/University
Figure 69. Collapsed Survey Item 18: Support Groups for Mexican-Americans on Campus
Figure 70.Collapsed Survey Item 19: Peer Counseling for Mexican-American Students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE/NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>18.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 71.** Collapsed Survey Item 20: Parent Preference for College/University Close to Home
Figure 72. Collapsed Survey Item 21: Mexican-American Students Prefer College/University Close to Home
Figure 73. Collapsed Survey Item 22: Telecourses in Home Attract Mexican-Americans
Figure 74. Collapsed Survey Item 23: Provision of Public Transportation
Figure 75. Collapsed Survey Item 24: Early Exposure to College/University Life
Figure 76. Collapsed Survey Item 25: Mexican-American Brochure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE/NEUTRAL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>71.14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 77. Collapsed Survey Item 26: Bilingual Recruitment
Figure 78. Collapsed Survey Item 27: Mexican-American Newsletter
Figure 79. Collapsed Survey Item 28: Current Mexican-American Students Promote School
Figure 80. Collapsed Survey Item 29: Mexican-American Alumni to Promote School
Figure 81. Collapsed Survey Item 30: Emphasis on Mexican-American Ethnicity is a Turnoff
Figure 82. Collapsed Survey Item 31: Mexican-American Parental Influence in Choice of College/University
Figure 83. Collapsed Survey Item 32: Faculty Involvement in Recruitment
Figure 84. Collapsed Survey Item 33: Sponsorship of Mexican-American Events
Figure 85. Collapsed Survey Item 34: Public Information Program to Inform Mexican-Americans of College/University Offerings
Figure 86. Collapsed Survey Item 35: Transfer Centers on Community College Campuses
Disagree/Neutral

Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>44.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 87. Collapsed Survey Item 36: Use of Spanish Language Media
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>CUM. FREQ</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 88. Collapsed Survey Item 37: Career Fair Program**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE/NEUTRAL</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>CUM. FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>23.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 89. Collapsed Survey Item 38: School and Business Marketing to Potential Students
Figure 90.Collapsed Survey Item 39: Letter/Telephone Contacts by Mexican-American Students
Figure 91. Collapsed Survey Item 40: Using Famous Mexican-Americans to Market College/University
Figure 92. Collapsed Survey Item 41: Letters to Parents of Mexican-American Eighth and Tenth Grade Students
Figure 93. Collapsed Survey Item 42: Bilingual Counseling
Figure 94. Collapsed Survey Item 43: College Education Not Perceived as Necessary by Mexican-Americans
APPENDIX 10

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES
I. Outreach activities
   A. Contact parents and counselors of sixth through eighth graders
   B. Partnerships with Latino-populated high schools
   C. Community recruitment network

II. Programs with churches
   A. Recruitment activities at Congresso—Christian Mexican—American Youth Congress Meeting Annually
   B. Outreach to Latino churches
   C. Attend college nights at Hispanic churches

III. Administration
   A. Assistant Dean of Hispanic Student Affairs
   B. Special Assistant to the President for Cultural Diversity
   C. Mandatory attendance at Cultural Diversity Workshop for administrators
   D. Hispanic Recruitment Task Force
   E. Minority Recruitment Unit of Office of Admissions

IV. Conferences
   A. Sponsor Youth Leadership Conferences for Chicanos
   B. Sponsor National Hispanic Institute on Campus

V. Bilingual
   A. Bilingual materials
B. Bilingual parent orientation
C. Bilingual parent conference
D. Parent financial aid workshops in Spanish
E. Bilingual public service announcements
F. Bilingual admissions counselor to work in homes
G. Mexican-American recruiters

VI. Hispanic organizations
A. Membership in Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)
B. Hispanic fraternity
C. Hispanic alumni club

VII. Recruitment activities
A. Hispanic college fairs
B. Parent nights
C. Alumni/current student symposium
D. Community leaders in ad campaigns
E. Receptions with Mexican-American alumni
F. College Board Search Service—Target Mexican-American areas
G. College choice card deck, "Opportunities," for Mexican-Americans

VIII. Campus programs
A. Academic support services
B. Early enrollment programs
C. Mexican-American Center on campus
APPENDIX 11

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS
Figure 95. Respondent's Work Title
Figure 96. Sex of Respondent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Freq)</th>
<th>CUM. PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>49.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>40.24</td>
<td>89.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 97.** Respondent's Educational Level

Bachelor's  
Master's  
Doctorate

---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 98. Respondent's State
| Size of Respondent's Employing College/University (Number of Undergraduates) |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Under 500                       | 33     | 33     | 19.64  |
| 501-6,000                       | 90     | 123    | 53.57  |
| 6,001-10,000                    | 13     | 136    | 7.74   |
| 10,001-20,000                   | 18     | 154    | 10.71  |
| Over 20,000                     | 41     | 168    | 8.33   |
Figure 100. Age of Respondent
Figure 102. Mexican-American Enrollment Percentage at Respondent's College/University
APPENDIX 12

RESPONDENT TITLES ("OTHER" CATEGORY)
Dean of Enrollment Services
Director of Enrollment Services
Director of Enrollment Management
Enrollment Manager
Director of Recruitment
Chairman of Admissions Committee
Provost
Director of Outreach Services
Director High School/Community Relations
Director of School Relations
Academic Vice President
Associate Vice President for Student Life
Vice President for Student Affairs
Director of Student Services
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Autobiographical Statement
Cynthia Gale Coiner

Place and Date of Birth:
Waynesboro, Virginia
July 27, 1956

Academic Training:

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University,
Blacksburg, Virginia
Bachelor of Science, March 1978

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia
Master of Science, December 1984

Honors:

Phi Kappa Phi Honorary Society

Professional:

1988 - Present  Virginia Beach City Public Schools
   Visiting Teacher
   Virginia Beach, Virginia

1987  Old Dominion University
   Research Assistant, Educational
   Leadership Department
   Norfolk, Virginia

1987  Old Dominion University
   Office of Admissions
   Administrative Intern
   Norfolk, Virginia

1986  Goodman Segar Hogan
   Real Estate Salesperson
   Virginia Beach, Virginia

1985  Family Services
   Director, Consumer Credit Counseling
   Division
   Norfolk, Virginia

1984  Virginia Beach City Public Schools
   Administrative Intern
Virginia Beach, Virginia

1983-84  Tidewater Community College
         Faculty, Cooperative Education Program
         Virginia Beach, Virginia

1980-82  Augusta County Public Schools
         Marketing and Distributive Education
         Teacher, Coordinator
         Fishersville, Virginia

1978-80  Franklin County Public Schools
         Marketing and Distributive Education
         Teacher, Coordinator
         Rocky Mount, Virginia