

***Coverage of Various Communication Platforms:
A Guide for Marketing Universities***

Eloida Carpio Dagumboy, University of the East-Caloocan, Philippines

The Asian Conference on Media, Communication & Film 2019
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

The digital epoch has ushered the upsurge in the utilization of diverse communication platforms in integrated marketing communications (IMC). The contemporary business environment necessitates employing the right communication platforms to help sustain and further an institution's position in the industry. This research study was conducted to appraise the platforms employed by the university, with coverage as the pivotal criterion, thereby determine the right assortment of communication platforms. Coverage index (CI) was devised to identify the most efficient communication platforms taking into consideration the preference of the target audience and those that actually reach them. Descriptive and online survey study identified the communication platforms with CI in the upper quartile, in descending order of efficiency: relatives/friends, open house, social media, and university website. Through variance analysis, the paper discovered that those who graduated from the private academic institutions significantly prefer relatives/friends as a source of information about a university than those from the publicly operated high schools as evidenced by the significance value of 0.041. Additionally, having a significance value of 0.038, flyers/brochures are reaching the prospective students from the private institutions more than those from the public schools with mean values of 4.67 and 3.77 respectively. Henceforth, the subject university can develop its IMC using high CI communication platforms. Moreover, varied marketing methods can be integrated for targeting students with different profiles. Finally, this study can provide a reference to researchers and marketers in designing an IMC strategy in the academic domain and in other industries as well.

Keywords: communication platform, coverage index (CI), integrated marketing communications (IMC), university

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Marketing communications is a process by which marketers develop and provide appropriate communication stimuli to the target audience with the intention to cause certain reactions (Cant, 2006) like purchase products, avail of services, or accept ideas.

The progression of digital channels not only served as a tool for marketers to disseminate messages but also profoundly affected customer behavior. It led to a large-scale adjustment in the power relationship between brands and their consumers by enabling the latter to have more authority over the way a particular brand is conferred within the media (Munro and Richards, 2011; Yeoman and McMahon-Beattie, 2011). Recommendations from relatives, friends, colleagues, and others, expressed online, or user-generated content (UGC) has reached the utmost importance since people trust their peers significantly more than they trust corporate promotion (Munro and Richards, 2011). This overwhelming alteration of consumer behavior is caused by the “participatory culture” (Ashman, et al., 2015). In a simple context, sharing opinion online and contributing knowledge virtually can be effortless and trouble-free, since it can be done with anonymity. Correspondingly, organizations nowadays are seen by the public through three various forms of digital media such as owned media, bought media, and earned media. There are no complications with the first two, given that companies have control over the contents; however, it is the opposite of earned media. It is more of engagements and what people are voicing online about the brand, either on the organization’s website or beyond it (Munro and Richards, 2011). All these somehow transferred the power away from organizations to consumers. Thus, UGC or messages via earned media call for an equivalent response from the organization and its marketers. It is then inevitable to consider diverse communication platforms since the current target cohort of the universities for tertiary education is the protagonist of this technology-based time.

The foregoing cited phenomenon may have been one of the reasons for the increasing fame of integrated marketing communications (IMC). It is an approach where firms communicate their brands through the integration of different elements of a promotional mix, working together to create a seamless experience for the customer, and are presented with similar shades and styles that reinforce the brand’s core message (Kotler et al., 1999), and is also considered to be one of the prime marketing innovations that can be a tool in assisting professionals and managers in responding to current environmental changes (Rimkienė, 2013).

In the Philippines, universities and colleges are observed to be employing combinations of the following marketing communication tools: 1) Participating in the career orientations and/or career fairs organized by different high schools, 2) Participating in educational fairs, 3) Billboard ads 4) Favorable newspaper articles, 5) Inviting prospective students to visit for a campus tour, 6) Conducting on-campus inter-high school competitions (academics and/or sports), 7) Sponsoring on-campus events like seminars, concerts, fashion shows, etc., 8) Referrals from alumni or students (some are also tapping high school teachers and guidance counselors to refer their students to the higher educational institution), 9) Web site, social media, particularly Facebook and Twitter, 10) Sponsoring of metals and other materials needed by the high school, 11) Scholarships, 12) Participation in the University Athletic Association of the Philippines (UAAP) or National Collegiate Athletic

Association (NCAA), 13)Outreach programs, 14)Television, radio, newspaper ads. 15)Distribution of flyers/brochures, and 16)Tarpaulin displays. These can be categorized under different communication channels such as advertising; sales promotion; events and experiences; PR and publicity; online and social media marketing; mobile marketing; direct and database marketing; and personal selling, as identified by Batra and Keller (2016) in their study that can be utilized by business entities in reaching prospective customers/clients. A number of researches (George, 2000; Reid, 2012; Hanover Research, 2014; Fierro, et al., 2017; Dagumboy, 2019), mostly in the academic domain, also reflected similar marketing communication programs and/or presented comparable communication options.

The K to 12 system in the Philippines, was signed into law with the passage of the Republic Act 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) recognizes that the K to 12 transitions, the five-year period between 2016 and 2021, posts considerable difficulty not only to the basic education segment, subsequently the effects ripple on other sectors. Among those inevitably affected is the higher education institutions (HEIs). As senior high school is rolled out countrywide in 2016, students are required to spend an additional two years in high school instead of going straight to college, ensuing in low enrollment in HEIs nationwide. Needless to say, universities and colleges have more reasons to be frugal in their expenditures.

The challenge now is to identify the most efficient mix of marketing communications that can send desired messages to the intended audience. There are seven considerations or 7C's when selecting platforms, namely: coverage, cost, contribution, commonality, complementarities, cross-effects, and conformability. (Keller, 2001; Keller, 2013; Batra and Keller, 2016). All of which are similarly essential; however, sans coverage the intended audience will not receive any messages, no matter how persuasive they are. Coverage is essential to the financial efficiency of the communication plan as well.

Correspondingly, Marshall and Johnston (2019) underscored the importance of establishing appropriate and effective marketing metrics. This is to identify, track, assess, and provide key benchmarks for the improvement of marketing activities. With marketing metrics, management can evaluate with ease the success degree of a firm's investment in different aspects of marketing.

Moreover, the research study was also inspired by the concept of segmentation particularly geographic and demographic. Geographic segmentation is the homogeneous grouping of an overall market based on their locations (Boone and Kurtz, 2013), while demographic pertains to the division of consumer clusters based on an assortment of readily measurable descriptive factors about the group (Marshall and Johnston, 2019). In fact, a related study (Dagumboy, 2019) already unfolded significant differences in the preferred communication platforms and the reach of communication platforms in terms of age. Thus, the type of school where the respondents graduated from and their dwelling location is considered by the researcher. Information regarding these variables' effect on the target markets' preferred platforms, as well as the platforms' access to them, can assist the university in scheming its IMC strategy through the right communication platform choice.

The next portion discusses the research methodology, research domain, population, sample size, data collection procedure, and research instrument.

This study is a descriptive and survey type, with the University of the East, Caloocan Campus, Philippines as its research domain. It has four colleges (Business Administration, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Fine Arts, Architecture and Design) and Basic Education Department (www.ue.edu.ph, 2019).

Chosen for their familiarity with the required information, the respondents are the freshmen students of the University of the East-Caloocan, Philippines for the 1st semester of the school year 2018-2019. Caloocan Campus's total freshmen population for the mentioned period is 1,431. The researcher adapted Slovin's formula ($N=n/1+N_e^2$) (Research Assignment, 2019) with 0.05 error margin to determine the acceptable sample size. 354 participated in the survey, which was administered online. Upon scrutiny, it ended up with 303 valid responses, which is equal to the specified sample size.

The research instrument, comprised of 16 communication platforms, was based largely on the observed marketing practices in the region with the greatest number of higher education institutions (HEI) - National Capital Region, Philippines. Subsequent to pre-testing and modification of the instrument, the respondents were asked of the preference rating for each communication platform using a Likert seven-point scale (Likert, 1932; Simon and Goes, 2013) wherein 1 = "totally not preferred" and 7 = "most preferred". The degree of the agreement as to the source of information regarding the university was solicited from the respondents using response anchors: 1 = "strongly disagree" and 7 = "strongly agree" (Survey Legend, 2017). An option NA or "not applicable" was incorporated to guarantee that responses were not compelled. An unstructured question was added to the instrument, "other means where you learn about the university", in order to acquire related information which might not be covered by the questionnaire.

Conclusion

The succeeding section presents the findings, interpretations, and recommendations of the study.

Applying a variety of statistical methods for data analysis, this section chronicles the outcomes of the survey. The demographic and geographic data collected in Table 1 show that the majority (67%) of the respondents' age belongs to the 19 to 24 bracket and the rest belongs to generation z. A large portion (61%) of the sample is female. The respondents who graduated from privately owned high schools (93%) outnumbered those who came from the publicly operated educational institutions (7%). Additionally, the highest composition of the respondents (77%) is residing in the cities of Caloocan, Malabon, Navotas, and Valenzuela (CAMANAVA). CAMANAVA is the third, northern district of Manila and is the primary target area of the subject university given its propinquity. Other parts of NCR include respondents from Quezon City, Manila, and Muntinlupa accounting for 14%. While 9% is from region 3, specifically Bulacan and Tarlac.

CHARACTERISTICS	CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Age			
	18 years and below	100	33%
	19 to 24 years old	203	67%
Sex			
	Female	185	61%
	Male	118	39%
Type of HS			
	Private	280	93%
	Public	23	7%
Place of Residence			
	CAMANAVA	233	77%
	NCR (other parts)	43	14%
	Region 3	27	9%

Table 1. Demographic and Geographic Profile (n=303)

Provided in Table 2 is the data summary of 16 items for discussion based on 303 responses. Descriptive statistics for all variables of interest were obtained to illustrate the responses and for a convenient grasp of the transformed data.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PREFERENCE	
		MEAN	SD
1	Billboards	4.1770833	1.790382
2	Career Convocation organized by the UE Basic Education Department	4.7272727	1.765768
3	Career Orientation or career fair organized by your High School	4.8275862	1.852128
4	Events held in UE like concert, fashion show, seminar, etc.	5.1036789	1.998142
5	Flyers/Brochures	4.7364865	1.930527
6	Inter-High School Competitions held in UE (academics, sports)	4.7789116	1.924008
7	Medals and certificates of scholarships distributed by UE during graduations	4.9691781	1.978165
8	Newspaper articles	4.7346939	1.883380
9	Open House: Free College Entrance Test, campus tour, and orientation	5.2790698	1.982051
10	Relatives/friends	5.0841751	1.939016
11	Social Media (Facebook, Twitter)	5.1010101	1.965040
12	Tarpaulins/Posters	4.7272727	1.862602
13	Telephone call, text, or email coming from UE	4.2446809	1.969624
14	UAAP (Basketball, Fencing, Volleyball, etc.)	4.7491525	2.011394
15	UE's Outreach Programs (Brigada Eskwela, Bloodletting, Medical and Dental Mission, Supplementary Feeding Program, Milk Feeding Program, Computer Literacy Program, etc.)	4.8703072	1.962902
16	UE Website	4.9830508	1.908552

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranks of the Questionnaire Data (n=303)

The preference rating for each communication platform is presented in Table 2 via mean together with the standard deviation (SD). Fascinatingly, open house, events held on the campus, social media, and relatives/friends (in descending order) are the platforms highly preferred by the respondents as evidenced by the means in the upper quartile (Means > 5.008332). Inversely, those with means lower than 4.732839 are the platforms least preferred by the respondents in ascending order: billboards, telephone call, text, or email from the university, tarpaulins/posters, and career convocation

organized by the university's basic education unit. The remaining fall somewhere in between the above-cited sets and the median is 4.803249.

First and second in rank (open house and events held on the campus) in the preferred communication platforms are both categorized as events and experiences in the major platforms of the IMC, which resembles the findings of other investigations (Noel-Levitz, 2013; Hanover, 2014). Event marketing which capitalizes the power of live experiences indeed can aid achieve enrollment goals.

Social media and friends/relatives ranked third and fourth in the preferred communication platforms which are interrelated. These can be testimonies, recommendations or comments given by others who can also be friends or relatives. Earned media (Munro and Richards, 2011) certainly influence one's decision in choosing a university.

Following the top four are website, medals and certificates of scholarship distributed by the university, the university's outreach programs, and participation of the university in career orientations/fairs organized by different high schools; all having preference rating above the median. IMC truly requires consolidation of different communication platforms (events and experiences, online and social media marketing, and public relations) as shown on the preference of the respondents.

On the opposite end, students are least attracted to billboards and they despise receiving calls/messages from universities. This is substantiated by the phony telephone/cellphone numbers students affix in the info sheets, as experienced by other university marketers.

Of the four least preferred, career convocation organized by the university's basic education unit, billboards, and tarpaulins/posters have standard deviations below 1.878186 which signify certainty in the responses. Conversely, the University Athletic Association of the Philippines (UAAP) recorded the highest standard deviation of 2.011394 denoting that the respondents do not regard it similarly relative to the other communication options.

NO.	DESCRIPTION	REACH RATING	MAX S	WGT S	CI
1	Billboards	3.60526	29.23958	15.05948	0.51504
2	Career Convocation organized by the UE Basic Education Department	4.23345	33.09091	20.01267	0.60478
3	Career Orientation or career fair organized by your High School	4.32500	33.79310	20.87931	0.61786
4	Events held in UE like concert, fashion show, seminar, etc.	4.71918	35.72575	24.08517	0.67417
5	Flyers/Brochures	4.59722	33.15541	21.77468	0.65675
6	Inter-High School Competitions held in UE (academics, sports)	4.36713	33.45238	20.87014	0.62388
7	Medals and certificates of scholarships distributed by UE during graduations	4.67133	34.78425	23.21266	0.66733
8	Newspaper articles	4.26667	33.14286	20.20136	0.60952
9	Open House: Free College Entrance Test, campus tour, and orientation	5.00000	36.95349	26.39535	0.71429
10	Relatives/friends	5.13559	35.58923	26.11026	0.73366
11	Social Media (Facebook, Twitter)	4.97966	35.70707	25.40130	0.71138
12	Tarpaulins/Posters	4.51736	33.09091	21.35480	0.64534
13	Telephone call, text, or email coming from UE	3.95290	29.71277	16.77879	0.56470
14	UAAP (Basketball, Fencing, Volleyball, etc.)	4.56207	33.24407	21.66596	0.65172
15	UE's Outreach Programs (Brigada Eskwela, Bloodletting, Medical and Dental Mission, Supplementary Feeding Program, Milk Feeding Program, Computer Literacy Program, etc.)	4.40714	34.09215	21.46414	0.62959
16	UE Website	4.82007	34.88136	24.01865	0.68858

Table 3. Coverage Indices and Rank of the Communication Platforms (n=303)
(Reach Rating, Maximum Score, and Weighted Score)

Table 3 presents the weighted score that permits accentuating the differences in the degree of preference of the respondents for each platform. It is the reach rating for each communication platform multiplied by the preference (Table 2, Mean) attached to it by the respondents. For a better view of the platform's effectiveness in reaching the target audience, the weighted score is indexed against the possible maximum score. The highest possible score that a platform can acquire is the preference means from Table 2 multiplied by 7. While the Coverage Index (CI) is computed by dividing the weighted score (WGT S) by the maximum score (Max S). According to the coverage indices (CI) in Table 3, the following in the upper quartile (CI>0.677772 or 67.78%) are the most efficient communication platforms in descending arrangement: relatives/friends, open house, social media, and university website. Contrariwise, the least efficient are billboards, telephone call, text, or email coming from the university, career convocation organized by the university's basic education unit, and newspaper articles (CI below 0.615774 or 61.58% in ascending order). The other platforms are in between the two mentioned groups and the median is 0.648531 or 64.85%.

CI wise, those platforms preferred by the respondents have maintained the top spots with minor order modification. With relatives/friends and social media ranking first and third, it is apparent that word of mouth marketing or oral/written recommendation by a delighted customer to the prospective customers indeed is considered the most effective form of promotion (Nielsen, 2012; Business Dictionary). Whereas the presence of social media and university website in the top spots validates that the

tech-savviness of generations Y and Z greatly influence the appropriate medium for the two youngest cohorts.

Ranking fifth to eighth with the highest CI are events held on the campus, medals and certificates of scholarships given by the university, flyers/brochures, and UAAP (or university athletic leagues); along with the top 4 platforms, uphold the IMC concept of commissioning blend of major communication platforms such as online and social media marketing, events and experiences, and PR in sending desired messages to the target audience.

SOURCE OF INFORMATION		FREQUENCY	TOTAL
WOM	Alumni	6	32
	Family	12	
	Friends	9	
	Former teacher	1	
	Batchmate	1	
	Schoolmate	1	
	Neighbor	1	
	Previous school	1	
Internet	Website	2	8
	Social media (including UE Gags, memes)	4	
	Portal	1	
	Google	1	
Reading Materials			
	Handbook	1	2
	UE Dawn	1	
Proximity and visibility of the campus			3
Scholarship			1
			46

Table 4. Other Sources of Information About the University

The last item on the questionnaire, purposely to learn other platforms or sources of information that are not included in the selection, revealed that the majority or 32 of the 46 knew about the university through “word of mouth”. Though relatives or friends, website, social media, and scholarships are specified in the questionnaire 28 reiterated their sources as shown in Table 4. In addition to information from other people/institutions and the internet, some of the respondents learned about the university through reading materials and because of the campus’s proximity/visibility.

To process the data into the desired analyses in line with the research hypotheses, the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS, IBM 24) was used. The significant differences in the communication platforms preferred by the respondents and in their reach to the respondents when classified according to the type of high school origin were tested using independent sample t-test. On one hand, when the respondents were clustered according to the place of residence, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the significant differences.

Displayed in Table 5.1, the t-test results revealed that the respondents have similar communication platform preferences when classified according to the type of high school where they graduated from, except for item 10 (relatives/friends) that registered a significance value of 0.041 which is below the alpha value of 0.050.

Albeit it has the highest CI, those who graduated from the private academic institutions with a preference rating mean of 5.15 regard this particular platform more than those from the publicly operated high schools with a preference rating of only 4.27.

	Variable	Mean	SD	t	Sig	Remarks
P1	Public	4.19	2.112	0.036	0.972	Not Significant
	Private	4.18	1.767			
P2	Public	4.50	1.970	-.627	0.531	Not Significant
	Private	4.75	1.751			
P3	Public	4.95	1.812	0.334	0.739	Not Significant
	Private	4.82	1.858			
P4	Public	5.14	2.189	0.080	0.937	Not Significant
	Private	5.10	1.987			
P5	Public	4.09	2.136	-1.635	0.103	Not Significant
	Private	4.79	1.908			
P6	Public	4.80	1.936	0.051	0.960	Not Significant
	Private	4.78	1.927			
P7	Public	5.00	2.000	0.072	0.943	Not Significant
	Private	4.97	1.980			
P8	Public	4.73	1.882	-.019	0.985	Not Significant
	Private	4.74	1.887			
P9	Public	5.00	1.927	-.685	0.494	Not Significant
	Private	5.30	1.988			
P10	Public	4.27	1.980	-2.051	0.041*	Significant
	Private	5.15	1.925			
P11	Public	4.73	2.272	-.927	0.355	Not Significant
	Private	5.13	1.940			
P12	Public	4.68	2.056	-.119	0.906	Not Significant
	Private	4.73	1.850			
P13	Public	4.41	2.197	0.407	0.684	Not Significant
	Private	4.23	1.953			
P14	Public	4.73	2.120	-.053	0.958	Not Significant
	Private	4.75	2.006			
P15	Public	4.77	2.181	-.242	0.809	Not Significant
	Private	4.88	1.948			
P16	Public	5.14	2.145	0.391	0.696	Not Significant
	Private	4.97	1.892			

*Analyzed Under 95% Confidence Level

Table 5.1. Independent Samples T-Test Based on Type of School Origin (Preference)

The geographic characteristic of the respondents does not influence their communication platform preferences as suggested by the ANOVA results in table 5.2. Regardless of whether they live in CAMANAVA, other parts of NCR, or region 3, the significant values are all higher than 0.050. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the communication platforms preferred by the respondents based on their place of residence is accepted.

		SS	df	MS	F	Sig	Remarks
P1	Between Groups	1.203	2	0.601	0.187	0.830	Not Significant
	Within Groups	918.766	285	3.224			
	Total	919.969	287				
P2	Between Groups	4.199	2	2.100	0.672	0.512	Not Significant
	Within Groups	918.710	294	3.125			
	Total	922.909	296				
P3	Between Groups	1.812	2	0.906	0.263	0.769	Not Significant
	Within Groups	989.568	287	3.448			
	Total	991.379	289				
P4	Between Groups	0.378	2	0.189	0.047	0.954	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1189.408	296	4.018			
	Total	1189.786	298				
P5	Between Groups	7.386	2	3.693	0.991	0.373	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1092.060	293	3.727			
	Total	1099.446	295				
P6	Between Groups	14.491	2	7.245	1.970	0.141	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1070.138	291	3.677			
	Total	1084.629	293				
P7	Between Groups	9.188	2	4.594	1.175	0.310	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1129.535	289	3.908			
	Total	1138.723	291				
P8	Between Groups	4.006	2	2.003	0.563	0.570	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1035.300	291	3.558			
	Total	1039.306	293				
P9	Between Groups	5.641	2	2.820	0.717	0.489	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1172.917	298	3.936			
	Total	1178.558	300				
P10	Between Groups	1.394	2	0.697	0.184	0.832	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1111.501	294	3.781			
	Total	1112.896	296				
P11	Between Groups	2.752	2	1.376	0.355	0.702	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1140.217	294	3.878			
	Total	1142.970	296				
P12	Between Groups	2.300	2	1.150	0.330	0.719	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1024.609	294	3.485			
	Total	1026.909	296				
P13	Between Groups	5.262	2	2.631	0.677	0.509	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1084.855	279	3.888			
	Total	1090.117	281				
P14	Between Groups	16.164	2	8.082	2.011	0.136	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1173.273	292	4.018			
	Total	1189.437	294				
P15	Between Groups	4.458	2	2.229	0.577	0.562	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1120.614	290	3.864			
	Total	1125.072	292				
P16	Between Groups	0.110	2	0.055	0.015	0.985	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1070.805	292	3.667			
	Total	1070.915	294				

*Analyzed Under 95% Confidence Level

Table 5.2. ANOVA Based on Place of Residence (Preference)

As seen in Table 6.1, T-test results revealed that only item 5 garnered a significance value (0.038) less than the assigned alpha of 0.05. It can be inferred that flyers/brochures are reaching the two age groups at a significantly dissimilar extent. This particular platform is reaching the prospective students from the private schools

more than those of the public schools as suggested by their mean values of 4.67 and 3.77 respectively. Whereas for the other 15 items, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the communication platforms' reach to the respondents based on the type of school where they graduated from is accepted.

	Variable	Mean	SD	t	Sig	Remarks
R1	Public	3.24	1.972	-.967	0.335	Not Significant
	Private	3.64	1.800			
R2	Public	3.68	2.191	-1.466	0.144	Not Significant
	Private	4.28	1.806			
R3	Public	4.41	2.197	0.207	0.836	Not Significant
	Private	4.32	1.965			
R4	Public	4.41	2.384	-.720	0.472	Not Significant
	Private	4.74	2.078			
R5	Public	3.77	2.137	-2.079	0.038*	Significant
	Private	4.67	1.918			
R6	Public	4.52	2.400	0.361	0.718	Not Significant
	Private	4.35	2.03			
R7	Public	4.15	2.207	-1.171	0.243	Not Significant
	Private	4.71	2.055			
R8	Public	4.14	2.232	-.327	0.744	Not Significant
	Private	4.28	1.919			
R9	Public	4.18	2.363	-1.938	0.054	Not Significant
	Private	5.07	2.034			
R10	Public	4.36	2.060	-1.960	0.051	Not Significant
	Private	5.20	1.909			
R11	Public	4.55	2.345	-.914	0.370	Not Significant
	Private	5.01	1.942			
R12	Public	4.09	2.045	-1.111	0.267	Not Significant
	Private	4.55	1.859			
R13	Public	3.77	2.308	-.442	0.659	Not Significant
	Private	3.97	1.966			
R14	Public	4.14	2.210	-1.001	0.317	Not Significant
	Private	4.60	2.063			
R15	Public	4.00	2.390	-.970	0.333	Not Significant
	Private	4.44	2.021			
R16	Public	4.77	2.369	-.099	0.922	Not Significant
	Private	4.82	1.902			

*Analyzed Under 95% Confidence Level

Table 6.1 Independent Samples T-Test Based on Type of School Origin (Reach)

ANOVA results for the significant differences in the responses, sorted according to the respondent's place of residence, posted in Table 6.2 are all above the assigned alpha of 0.050. This palpably shows that each communication platform is reaching the respondents to the same extent regardless of the latter's location of abode. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig	Remarks
R1	Between Groups	0.965	2	0.482	0.146	0.864	Not Significant
	Within Groups	870.588	263	3.310			
	Total	871.553	265				
R2	Between Groups	5.605	2	2.803	0.826	0.439	Not Significant
	Within Groups	963.754	284	3.393			
	Total	969.359	286				
R3	Between Groups	1.897	2	0.949	0.241	0.786	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1091.528	277	3.941			
	Total	1093.425	279				
R4	Between Groups	1.138	2	0.569	0.128	0.880	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1281.835	289	4.435			
	Total	1282.973	291				
R5	Between Groups	7.674	2	3.837	1.013	0.364	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1079.604	285	3.788			
	Total	1087.278	287				
R6	Between Groups	9.957	2	4.978	1.174	0.311	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1200.494	283	4.242			
	Total	1210.451	285				
R7	Between Groups	7.692	2	3.846	0.900	0.408	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1209.413	283	4.274			
	Total	1217.105	285				
R8	Between Groups	8.994	2	4.497	1.195	0.304	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1060.740	282	3.761			
	Total	1069.733	284				
R9	Between Groups	2.925	2	1.462	0.340	0.712	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1255.075	292	4.298			
	Total	1258.000	294				
R10	Between Groups	0.385	2	0.193	0.051	0.950	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1094.191	292	3.747			
	Total	1094.576	294				
R11	Between Groups	2.504	2	1.252	0.320	0.727	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1143.374	292	3.916			
	Total	1145.878	294				
R12	Between Groups	1.316	2	0.658	0.186	0.830	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1006.598	285	3.532			
	Total	1007.913	287				
R13	Between Groups	4.242	2	2.121	0.533	0.587	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1086.146	273	3.979			
	Total	1090.388	275				
R14	Between Groups	18.646	2	9.323	2.185	0.114	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1224.737	287	4.267			
	Total	1243.383	289				
R15	Between Groups	6.073	2	3.037	0.720	0.487	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1167.512	277	4.215			
	Total	1173.586	279				
R16	Between Groups	0.704	2	0.352	0.093	0.911	Not Significant
	Within Groups	1079.939	286	3.776			
	Total	1080.644	288				

*Analyzed Under 95% Confidence Level

Table 6.2. ANOVA Based Place of Residence (Reach)

In view of the foregoing, the paper recommends the following:

Online and social media marketing, events and experiences, and public relations should be given the highest regard when developing IMC for a university since the communication platforms that gathered the highest CI fall under these categories.

Universities should take advantage of social media, their website, and word of mouth. More so for the universities targeting those from the private academic institutions. This can be done through: programs promoting “participatory culture” to generate more positive comments and stories which can uplift the university’s brand and image; conduct of activities that can incite students’ interest in the university’s programs and services, thereby reflecting such in their daily personal dialogs or via social media; and programs that can strengthen the university’s ties with its alumni to further resonate “word of mouth”.

Improve prospective students’ familiarity with the university and its culture through an open house, events held on campus and university participation in athletic leagues. These mentioned activities which can be classified as events and experiences are much welcomed by and are reaching the potential tertiary students.

Fewer resources and efforts should be rendered to billboards and directly contacting the prospective students via telephone, text, or email.

Universities should find a way to send flyers/brochures to prospective students from publicly operated high schools. With its CI above the median, it should be rendered importance, especially for universities that include this characteristic in their target market.

University marketers targeting the cities of CAMANAVA, other areas in the NCR, and Region 3 especially Bulacan can approach their prospective students in the same manner since the latter’s place of residence is irrelevant when it comes to their preferred sources of information about a university. Furthermore, there is no need for varying communication platform mix to reach prospective students from the abovementioned areas.

In order to craft a more flexible segmented approach to university marketing, it is recommended to widen the scope of the study. It could be in terms of the domain (universities located in different areas) and/or consider other traits of the respondents.

References

- Ashman, R., Solomon, M.R., and Wolny, J. (2015). An old model for a new age: consumer decision making in participatory digital culture. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*. Retrieved February 26, 2019 from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=edbb25c9-45de-4375-8dd9-b74bb758c843%40sessionmgr4003&vid=2&hid=4103>
- Batra, Rajeev and Keller, Kevin Lane. (2016). Integrating marketing communications: new findings, new lessons and new ideas. *Journal of Marketing*, July 2016. Retrieved October 31, 2018 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305079910>
- Boone, L.E. and Kurtz, D.L. (2013). *Principles of marketing*. Cengage Learning Asia Pte Ltd, Philippines. P355, 356, 359, 372.
- Cant, M. (2006). *Marketing management*. South Africa. Shumani Printers. CHED K to 12 Transition Program. (n.d.) Retrieved November 4, 2019 from <https://ched.gov.ph/k-12-project-management-unit/>
- Dagumboy, Eloida Carpio. (2019). Coverage index of various communication platforms: a segmented approach to philippine university marketing. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 3(3), 287-315. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.25139/jsk.v3i3.1842>
- Fierro, I., Arbelaez, D., and Gavilanez, J. (2017). Digital marketing: a new tool for international education. Retrieved March 26, 2018 from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=128122216&site=ehost-live>
- George, Amiso M. (2000). The new public relations: integrating marketing and public relations strategies for student recruitment and institutional image building—a case study of the university of texas at san antonio. Retrieved November 12, 2018 from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=5200970&site=ehost-live>
- Hanover Research. (2014). Trends in higher education marketing, recruitment, and technology. Retrieved March 26, 2018 from <http://www.hanoverresearch.com/media/Trends-in-Higher-Education-Marketing-Recruitment-and-Technology-2.pdf>
- Keller, K. L. (2001). Mastering the marketing communications mix: micro and macro perspectives on integrated marketing communication programs. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5482275&site=ehost-live>.
- Keller, Kevin Lane. (2013). *Strategic Brand Management*. 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., Saunders, J., and Wong, V. (1999). *Principles of Marketing*. 2nd ed. Europe: Prentice-Hall.

Likert-type scale response anchors. (n.d.) In Survey legend. Retrieved December 12, 2017 from <https://www.surveylegend.com/likert-type-scale-responses-examples-with-examples/>

Likert, Rensis. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*. Vol 140.

Marshall, G.W., and Johnston, Mark W. (2019). *Marketing Management*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill Education, pp. 16, 358.

Munro, J. and Richards, B. (2011). The digital challenge. In: Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. and Pride, R. *Destination Brands*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Nielsen. (2012). Global consumers' trust in 'earned' advertising grows in importance. Retrieved August 3, 2019 from <https://www.nielsen.com/us/en/press-releases/2012/nielsen-global-consumers-trust-in-earned-advertising-grows/>

Noel Levitz. (2013). 2013 marketing and student recruitment practices benchmark report. Retrieved March 26, 2018 from <https://www.noellevitz.com/papers/research/higher-education/2013/marketing-student-recruitment-practicesbenchmark-report>

Reid, M. (2012). Building strong brands through the management of integrated marketing communications. *International Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41.

Rimkienė, Indrė. (2013). Integrated marketing communication: theoretical approach. *Rural Development 2013*. ISSN 2345-0916. Retrieved November 12, 2018 from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=100423340&site=ehost-live>

Simon, M.K. and Goes, J. (2013). Dissertation and scholarly research: recipes for success. Seattle, WA, Dissertation Success, LLC. Retrieved November 14, 2018 from <http://dissertationrecipes.com/>

Slovin's Formula. (n.d.) In Research assignment. Retrieved February 13, 2019 from <https://prudencexd.weebly.com/> University of the East-Caloocan course offerings. (n.d.) Retrieved November 12, 2018 from <http://www.ue.edu.ph>

Word of Mouth Marketing. (n.d.) In Business dictionary. Retrieved August 13, 2019 from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/word-of-mouth-marketing.html>

Yeoman, I., and McMahon-Beattie U. (2011). The future challenge. In: Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. and Pride, R. *Destination Brands*. 3rd Ed. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd. pp. 141-154.

Contact email: eloida.dagumboy@ue.edu.ph, dagumboyeloida@gmail.com