

1991

## The transformation of Madison College into James Madison University: A case study

Emily Gillespie Robertson  
*College of William & Mary - School of Education*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Robertson, Emily Gillespie, "The transformation of Madison College into James Madison University: A case study" (1991). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539618874.  
<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.25774/w4-q7pf-g436>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@wm.edu](mailto:scholarworks@wm.edu).

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

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

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

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

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

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

# **U·M·I**

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



**Order Number 9127118**

**The transformation of Madison College into James Madison  
University: A case study**

**Robertson, Emily Gillespie, Ed.D.**

**The College of William and Mary, 1991**

**Copyright ©1991 by Robertson, Emily Gillespie. All rights reserved.**

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106





THE TRANSFORMATION OF MADISON COLLEGE  
INTO JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY:  
A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
The Faculty of the School of Education  
The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

by  
Emily Gillespie Robertson  
Spring, 1991

THE TRANSFORMATION OF MADISON COLLEGE  
INTO JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY:  
A CASE STUDY

by

Emily Gillespie Robertson

---

Approved Spring, 1991

*John R. Thelin*

---

John R. Thelin, Ph.D., Chair

*James M. Yankovich*

---

James M. Yankovich, Ed.D.

*Roger G. Baldwin*

---

Roger G. Baldwin, Ph.D.

Dedication

This effort is dedicated to

my late mother, Edythe Steele Gillespie, the original "Mare" who  
taught me always to stand tall,

my late father, Dennison Baldwin Gillespie, Jr., a scholar in  
his own right whose belief in me never waivered,

and

to the tens of thousands of men and women serving in  
Operation Desert Storm.

May God bless you all.

## Table of Contents

Dedication.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Preface.....	ix
Acknowledgements.....	x
List of Tables.....	xi
Abstract.....	xiii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Background.....	3
The Research Question.....	7
Subsidiary Questions.....	7
Hypotheses.....	8
Data Collection Prodecures.....	9
Resources.....	11
Method of Analysis.....	12
Connections to the Greater Higher Education Arena.....	13
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	14
Purpose.....	14
Organization of the Literature.....	14
Introduction of the Concept of Nonprofit Marketing to the Business Arena.....	15
Debate Over and Acceptance of Nonprofit Marketing.....	17
The General State of Higher Education in the 1970s.....	20

Acceptance and Use of Marketing Principles in Academe..	26
Analysis of the Status of the Research and Writing	
on the Marketing of Higher Education.....	30
Implications and Recommendations for Further Study.....	31
CHAPTER THREE: MADISON COLLEGE: 1908-1970.....	34
A Brief History of the Institution.....	34
Julius Burruss: 1908-1919.....	37
Samuel Duke: 1919-1949:.....	42
G. Tyler Miller: 1949-1970.....	47
Setting the Stage for Change.....	50
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CARRIER PRESIDENCY: 1971-The Present.....	54
His Background.....	54
The "Country Boy".....	54
His Aspirations to Teach.....	56
His First Excursion Into Administration.....	57
Presidential Preparations.....	58
"The Charismatic Leader".....	60
Characteristics.....	61
Impact of Charismatic Leadership on an Institution:	
Institutional Role and Mission.....	65
Institutional Culture and Saga.....	67
Institutional Distinctiveness.....	70
And Then, There Is Dr. Carrier.....	73
Clark Kerr's President and Dr. Carrier.....	74
Dr. Carrier on the Presidency.....	86
Dr. Carrier as the "Charismatic Leader".....	88

Preparing the Troops: His First Year.....	95
Dr. Carrier's Early Vision.....	99
The Purpose Committee.....	100
His Inaugural Address: The First Master Plan.....	102
Conclusions.....	109
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: TRANSFORMING MADISON COLLEGE.....</b>	<b>113</b>
Introduction.....	113
The Importance of Planning.....	114
Elements of the Strategic Planning Phase.....	115
Elements of an Academic Marketing Plan.....	117
The Initial Hypotheses Restated.....	120
Strategic Planning and Madison College.....	122
Goal Formulation: Mission, Goals, Objectives.....	122
Environmental Analysis: Threats and	
Opportunities.....	124
Resource Analysis: Strengths and	
Weaknesses.....	129
Strategy Formulation.....	133
Organization Design.....	134
System Design.....	136
A Marketing Orientation.....	137
Marketing and Madison College.....	139
Enrollment.....	140
Admissions Policies.....	141
Recruitment.....	144
Male Students.....	144
Consequences.....	146

Sports.....	147
Student Services and Student Life.....	153
Programs.....	157
Facilities.....	158
Conclusions.....	162
CHAPTER SIX: ENTER JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY.....	165
Steps Toward University Status.....	165
What's in a Name?.....	167
1983: Another Critical Year for JMU.....	171
National Recognition.....	172
Enrollment.....	174
Sports.....	176
Student Services and Student Life.....	179
Programs.....	180
Facilities.....	182
The "JMU Way".....	182
The "Distinctive College" Redefined: Does JMU "Measure Up"?	186
Public Image.....	187
JMU, UVa, and William and Mary.....	192
College Preps' Changing Perceptions.....	194
Graduate School for JMU Students.....	196
Today.....	196
A "Marketing" Admissions Director.....	197
Student Assessment.....	198
A New Mission Statement.....	199
The New Basketball Coach.....	200



Tomorrow.....	201
The Proposed New College.....	202
What Will Happen When Dr. Carrier Leaves?.....	204
Dr. Carrier on the State of Higher Education.....	206
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS.....	211
The Research Question Re-Stated.....	211
Subsidiary Questions Answered.....	213
Findings.....	219
The Charismatic Leader.....	220
Marketing.....	221
Changing the Image.....	223
A Marketing Orientation.....	224
Institutional Saga.....	225
Conclusions.....	225
Implications for Further Study.....	229
Glossary.....	234
Appendices.....	239
Tables.....	242
Bibliography.....	270
Vita.....	286

Preface

"An institution is the lengthened shadow of one man."

Ralph Waldo Emerson

"Look how far we've come,  
So far from where we used to be,  
But not so far that we've forgotten  
How it was before."

Neil Diamond and

Gilbert Becaud,

"September Morn," 1978

## Acknowledgements

Writing a dissertation can be a lonely process. There were times when I felt as though I was married to my computer—and I threatened to divorce it often. The computer is still intact, and I survived, due in large part to the support of my family, friends, and colleagues:

To John Thelin, James Yankovich, and Roger Baldwin I owe my sincere thanks for guidance, humor, and patience as my dissertation committee collectively and as my professors individually. I am proud to have had such a long association with you.

To Dr. Ronald Carrier and the James Madison University community, thank you for your enthusiastic cooperation for this study. The data-gathering process was much more enjoyable because of you.

To my larger family and good friends, your love, interest, and concern were invaluable to me through this seemingly unending labyrinth, particularly when my focus was so narrow.

And to Will, Martha, and David, the unofficial but no less important members of my committee, what can I say? You endured my tantrums, did your own laundry, and nuked your dinners with the best of them! Thank you for loving me anyway. And thank you for knowing that I love you, even when I forgot to tell you so. I promise I will get back to normal—if that's possible.

## List of Tables

Unless otherwise noted, the statistics included in the following Tables have been developed from information contained in the annual Admissions Reports from Madison College/James Madison University.

Table 1:	Breakdown of Students Registered.....	242
Table 2:	Breakdown of First-Time Freshmen by Sex and Residency Status.....	243
Table 3:	Total Enrollment at Madison College/ James Madison University.....	244
Table 4:	Top-Ranking States for First-Time Freshmen.....	245
Table 5:	Top-Ranking Virginia Counties for First-Time Freshmen.....	246
Table 6:	Top-Ranking Virginia Cities for First-Time Freshmen.....	247
Table 7:	Percentage of First-Time Freshmen in the First Quartile/First Third of Their Class.....	248
Table 8:	Median SAT Scores for First-Time Freshmen.....	249
Table 9:	Breakdown of Applications from Degree-Seeking Students.....	250
Table 10:	Acceptance Rates for First-Time Freshmen.....	251
Table 11:	Retention Rates.....	252
Table 12:	Transfers from Community Colleges and Two-Year Colleges in Virginia.....	253
Table 13:	Transfers from Four-Year Institutions in Virginia....	255

Table 14:	Data on Faculty Members from the 1971 SACS Self-Study.....	256
Table 15:	Data on the Teaching Experience of the 1971 Faculty..	258
Table 16:	Data on Faculty Members in 1977.....	259
Table 17:	Data on Faculty Members in 1983.....	260
Table 18:	Data on Faculty Members in 1989.....	261
Table 19:	Academic Departments for Madison College/ James Madison University.....	262
Table 20:	Notes on the Organizational Structure of Madison College.....	264
Table 21:	Notes on the Organizational Structure of James Madison University.....	266
Table 22:	Acceptance/ Enrollment Rates for Five of the Fifteen Senior Institutions in Virginia.....	268
Table 23:	SCHEV 1990-1992 Faculty Salary Benchmark Institutions for JMU.....	269

THE TRANSFORMATION OF MADISON COLLEGE  
INTO JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this qualitative study were to investigate the steps taken to transform Madison College, a small state teachers college for women in Virginia, into James Madison University in 1977, a nationally recognized fully coeducational, comprehensive university, and to examine the leadership of the president, Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, and his direct effect on the transformation.

The framework used to evaluate the plans developed to transform the college was Kotler and Fox's Strategic Planning Model as cited in Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions (1985).

Dr. Carrier's leadership style was examined using criteria developed by Burton Clark in The Distinctive College (1970) to describe the charismatic leader.

Findings confirm the importance of well-planned strategies for institutions attempting to change their images. Secondly, the impact of charismatic leadership as a catalyst for change cannot be overemphasized. A third finding is that a strong institutional culture is critical in helping the revised image to solidify. "Synergy" is the most appropriate term to describe how the varied elements coalesced in the successful transformation of Madison College into James Madison University.

EMILY GILLESPIE ROBERTSON  
HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM  
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF MADISON COLLEGE  
INTO JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY:  
A CASE STUDY**

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

I have been a rabid Washington Redskins fan for as long as I can remember. Watching their games on a Sunday afternoon was a favorite family preoccupation, even during the sixties when the only thing to cheer about was an occasional first down. Imagine my delight when the team consistently improved their game over the next two decades.

One fall Sunday afternoon in 1985, my husband and I were listening to the colorful non-stop commentary by John Madden, a notable CBS sports announcer, when he remarked on an extraordinary play by the Redskins' wide receiver Gary Clark from "little James Madison." Little did I realize then that this one comment was to change the direction of my studies from that point on.

My curiosity was aroused. I thought that Madison College, formerly a women's state teacher's college which was respected but little known beyond the Virginia boundary, had "gone co-ed" during the 1960s at approximately the same time as had my alma mater, Longwood College. I was also aware that the name of the institution had been changed to James Madison University and that the school was receiving favorable recognition, particularly by being cited in the U.S. News and World Report survey of the top 120 colleges and universities in the nation (1983, November 28). What surprised me was that, not only did the university have a football team, but one that was good enough to send a player to the Redskins. These musings raised a number of questions in my mind about this institution's transformation. But the bottom line was, just how did it happen?



### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, then, is to examine how Madison College evolved into James Madison University, an increasingly respected "up and coming" institution, and to determine what specific techniques were used to catapult the school into national recognition in the relatively short span of approximately twelve years from 1971 to 1983.

At about the same time that my interest was peaked in James Madison University, I read the newly published Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions by Kotler and Fox (1985), the first text of its kind devoted to the subject of marketing within an educational environment. The authors contend that many educational administrators have recently become interested in "how marketing ideas might be relevant to the issues they face, such as attracting more and better students, increasing student satisfaction, designing excellent programs which carry out the institution's mission, and enlisting the financial support and enthusiasm of alumni and others" (p. xiii). I, therefore, found that a logical starting point in this research endeavor was to analyze the use of marketing techniques within the larger higher education arena, with the information gleaned serving as a springboard for the more specific study. It should be noted that the definitions of marketing terms are included in the Glossary beginning on page 234.

### Background.

Until recent years the American system of higher education generally enjoyed a sacrosanct position in our national fabric,

surviving intact even as the country engaged in various skirmishes in its own growth processes. The very fact that academe existed seemed reason enough for its perpetuation and relative stability. The foundation of the system was laid with the establishment of Harvard College in 1636 only a few years after that geographical area had been settled (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961; Rudolph, 1962). As higher education evolved through the years, in large part as a response to better accommodate some of society's needs, its basic philosophy and premise have nevertheless remained unchanged—the offering of education to help ensure the nation's welfare and growth (Centra, 1979).

Although colleges and universities have used different methods by which to advertise their offerings, solicit funding, and recruit and retain appropriate students and personnel, coordinated and comprehensive marketing efforts per se have been generally eschewed as unnecessary and somehow demeaning by the administrators (Kotler & Fox, Strategic Marketing, 1985). Issues such as increased competition for applicants, a shift in student demographics, unstable national economic factors, the public demand for accountability, necessary retrenchment policies, fierce competition for funding, and an increasing intrusion by the federal and state governments and accrediting agencies (Centra; Mayhew, 1983), however, have converged and have forced these administrators to take a long hard look at the condition of higher education in general and their own institutions in particular. The academic "ivory tower" is no longer perceived as holding "favored child" status on Capitol Hill (Hartle, 1987), and the

gravity of the situation has prompted academe to turn to the business arena for solutions.

A brief discussion about marketing within the corporate environment as well as the non-profit arena is helpful in demonstrating the importance of using sound marketing strategies in higher education as well. It is critical to understand marketing to gain a better grasp of how these concepts fit into strategic planning.

In the broadest sense of the term in the for-profit corporate environment, marketing is "the study of exchange processes and relationships" which "calls for more than the ability of the organization to produce the needed goods and services" (Kotler, Marketing Management, 1980, pp. 3, 5). This key concept of exchange is based upon a positive interplay between the profitable offering of goods or services to a specifically targeted arena, thereby benefitting both the organization and the consumer. The major challenge facing corporations is to "generate those revenues by satisfying consumers' wants at a profit and in a socially responsible manner" (Stanton, 1978, p. 4).

Businesses have operated within a marketing framework for many years, realizing the importance of all the components of a comprehensive plan to facilitate the advertising and selling of their products or services successfully to meet the needs or desires of selected publics. The strategies used have been formulated and refined over time (Stanton), and much interest in the subject has been generated in academe, demonstrated in part by the relatively high rate of pay earned by business professors (Evangelauf, 1986). Corporations normally operate to make a profit, and it is that viewpoint,

unfortunately, which propagates the misconception that marketing is primarily selling and promotion (Kotler & Fox, 1985).

Increasingly in recent years, however, leaders and managers in non-profit organizations have realized the importance of using marketing techniques to reach their particular constituencies and those whom they wish to serve (Kotler, Ferrell, & Lamb, Cases and Readings, 1983), with higher education no exception (Keller, 1983; Kotler & Fox, 1985). But one of their frustrations in using these strategies has been the lack of even rudimentary knowledge about the entire marketing concept, not to mention ignorance about the intricacies of this important field. When 300 educational administrators were queried as to the meaning of the term "marketing," the overwhelming majority stated that it had to do with a combination of advertising, selling, and public relations. Only a few had some realization that "needs assessment, marketing research, product development, pricing, and distribution" are important components and that "selling" is only one facet (Kotler & Fox, pp. 6-7).

A viable solution to this dilemma is the education of educators about marketing and how a marketing orientation can be adapted and used by administrators in higher education to improve their offerings, recruit and retain students and faculty appropriate to their missions, solicit funding, and retain credibility within the various publics. No longer is it a question of whether or not "to market;" it is how well the marketing plans will be formulated and implemented (Kotler et al., Cases and Readings, 1983). Equally important to administrators is understanding how marketing concepts incorporate institutional mission and image to better meet the aforementioned goals.

### The Research Question

From the information previously supplied, there are several implicit avenues which could be explored. The issue which this qualitative research endeavor addresses is the study of a particular institution which has changed its image and appears to have marketed itself successfully. The question is posed in this manner:

How has James Madison University, formerly Madison College, attained a nationally respected reputation?

### Subsidiary Questions

To answer the research question, additional questions which need to be answered include the following:

1. What prompted the desire to change the image of Madison College?
2. What definable marketing strategies were used to change the image of the school?
3. What was the "marketing mix" used? Were some components planned and others serendipitous?
4. What kinds of data were gathered to plan the strategies necessary for the transformation?
5. What has the role of athletics played in the transformation of the institution?
6. How did the enrollment configurations change during the transformation?
7. How was funding secured for the institution?
8. What factors precipitated the change from college to university status?
9. Who were the key players in effecting the change?

10. What effect did the name change have upon the school?
11. How were the changes accepted by the university's constituencies?
12. What effect did/does the "institutional saga" of Madison College/James Madison University have on the steps which the school has taken to increase its stature on the national level?
13. How important was/is the role of Dr. Ronald Carrier, president of Madison College/James Madison University?

### Hypotheses

Sharan Merriman (1988) states that "most case studies in education are qualitative and hypothesis-generating, rather than quantitative and hypothesis-testing, studies" (p. 3). She further cites Taylor and Bogdan (1984) who contend that, in qualitative research, "'if the hypothesis does not explain the case, either reformulate the hypothesis or redefine the phenomenon'" (p. 143). Therefore, hypotheses in qualitative research are active rather than static and can be reworked throughout the research process. The initial hypotheses which are proposed are:

1. James Madison University has become a respected, nationally recognized university because of successful, well-planned marketing strategies which transformed its image from a provincial, Virginia women's college into a coeducational university with national prominence.
2. Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, President, played, and still plays, a prominent role in the school's evolution.

### Data Collection Procedures

Because of the nature of this project, I chose the case study approach for its appropriateness as it "tries to describe and analyze some entity in qualitative, complex and comprehensive terms not infrequently as it unfolds over a period of time" (Merriam, 1988, p. 11) and is "concerned with understanding and describing process more than behavioral outcomes" (p. 31).

Merriam (1988) further asserts that "qualitative case studies rely heavily upon qualitative data obtained from interviews, observations, and documents" (p. 68) which are dissimilar methods of data collection used to study one issue or situation. While quantitative data such as enrollment trends and SAT scores were used to "support findings from qualitative data," (p. 68), this case study has been developed principally using qualitative research techniques.

I made several road trips to James Madison University over the course of one year, between the summers of 1989 and 1990, primarily to delve into the information in the library and the Special Collections Room and to interview several administrators and staff members. The most frequent visits occurred during the summer months, affording uninterrupted research time and parking space without the stimulation and diversion of thousands of on-campus students. The variety of JMU documents which were examined are listed in the next section. But just as important as the papers and artifacts which were studied and analyzed was experiencing the environment of the campus itself to absorb and observe the intangible but real elements of what is known on campus as "the JMU Way."

The interviews conducted were generally beneficial in supplying insights not readily discernible in the documents studied, and the information gleaned is cited throughout this project.

The two works central to this study and around which data was gathered were Kotler and Fox's Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions (1985) and Burton Clark's work, The Distinctive College, published in 1970, coincidentally the same year in which Dr. Ronald Carrier was selected as president of Madison College.

Kotler and Fox have developed a strategic plan for educational institutions to use in formulating a concise strategy for marketing a particular program or service (Appendix A). This plan was used as a basis for evaluating the data collected on JMU to ascertain the strategies which were used by the institution's administrators to change the image of the school.

Not surprisingly, Dr. Ronald Carrier was, and continues to be, the driving force behind the elevation of James Madison University to national recognition. Because much of the data confirms this fact, a chapter devoted to his presidency is included in this study. Burton Clark's work was used as a springboard from which to evaluate Dr. Carrier's leadership within the confines of "organizational saga," "institutional distinctiveness," and the "charismatic leader."



## Resources

Several sources were examined, including, but not limited to:

### State, federal, and accrediting agency sources.

Various SCHEV reports, including "The Virginia Plan for Higher Education" for the periods during the 1960s-80s

SACS ten-year accrediting reports for 1971 and 1981

### Institutional sources.

Annual Admissions Reports, 1969-1989

Selected Board of Visitors minutes

A variety of Madison College public relations documents which give insights into the original mission and scope of the institution

Institutional self-studies

Annual statistical reports during the 1960s-80s which delineate programs, facilities built, and the like

Institutional yearbooks, catalogs, and school newspapers

Viewbooks and other admissions/recruiting publications and tools used during the 1960s-80s

Interviews with key players

Appropriate photographs, illustrations, and drawings

Annual Admissions Reports for the 1960s-80s

Documentation on the quality of the food service, facilities, extra-curricular activities, residence halls, and student life

Madison College: The First Fifty Years by Dr. Ray Dingledine, Jr.

Madison College: The Tyler Years 1949-1970 by Dr. Ray Sonner

### Method of Analysis

This project covers the period from 1971 to 1983, with excursions into the history and the current status of the school for comparisons and to highlight information about the transformation of the institution. I selected this time frame for its manageability. It became even more appropriate when I discovered that it complements the works completed by Drs. Dingleline and Sonner.

As a foci of this study, the sections concerning marketing strategies deal with the data gathered and analyzed according to the Strategic Planning Process Model (Appendix A) as outlined in Kotler and Fox (1985). This design was selected so that the seemingly disparate pieces of information could be logically categorized.

The second emphasis of the research concerned an analysis of the presidency of Dr. Ronald Carrier, current chief executive officer of the school whose tenure to date is twenty years, according to criteria set forth by Burton Clark (1970) concerning charismatic leadership. This noteworthy book also discusses a variety of elements comprising an educational institution's "organizational saga." Commenting on Clark's article (1971) which discusses the same topics, Richardson (1971) states that these variables include "a strong and preferably charismatic leader, a receptive faculty, a viable and compelling ideology that lends a sense of purpose, limited size, relative isolation, and a period of grace or freedom from the impingement of strong external influence" (pp. 516-517). While Dr. Carrier's leadership is primarily discussed with regards to charisma, other characteristics of organizational saga are analyzed as well to give a more well-rounded perspective of James Madison University.

### Connections to the Greater Higher Education Arena

This is a case study primarily about two aspects of one particular institution. Yet, research of this nature can be applicable in the higher education arena as information about one school can serve in a number of ways as a microcosm of the whole.

One of the purposes for undertaking this study was to determine the marketing techniques used by one particular institution and to judge these strategies as to their effectiveness. Implications could then be drawn about the usefulness of specific marketing strategies in higher education in general, particularly for schools that want to change their image.

Additionally, the information gathered about Dr. Ronald Carrier confirms the importance of effective leadership as a catalyst in a successful institutional transition.

While case study research is not new, its use in educational circles is fairly recent (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, a study using qualitative data gathering techniques can add to the growing body of information about this form of research.

Similarly, research concerning marketing in higher education contributes to this relatively new phenomenon in the higher education arena.

And finally, a well-written and concise case study of a particular aspect of an institution by an unbiased party can offer insights which can help the school itself to affirm its past, evaluate its present position, and determine where it is headed.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of the Literature

#### Purpose

The purpose of this literature review is to explore the relatively recent phenomenon of incorporating business marketing practices within American higher education. "Of all the classic business functions, marketing has been the last to arrive on the nonprofit scene" (Kotler, 1979, p. 38). To examine and better understand this issue requires a survey of the literature which demonstrates the evolution of the concept of nonprofit marketing first in the business sector and then within higher education.

#### Organization of the Literature

To track the development of marketing within the "important third sector [of economic activity] made up of tens of thousands of private, not-for-profit organizations" (Kotler, 1979, p. 37), I examined two key areas. Numerous journal articles and texts were read in both the educational and business arenas to determine (1) historical perspectives and (2) the processes by which the concept of nonprofit marketing was introduced and then accepted into the business and education sectors.

The literature review itself is divided into five sections: (1) the introduction of the concept of nonprofit marketing to the business arena, (2) the debate over and acceptance of this concept in the corporate environment, (3) the general state of higher education in the 1970s, (4) the introduction of nonprofit marketing to higher

education, and (5) the eventual acceptance and use of marketing principles in academe.

Introduction of the concept of nonprofit marketing to the business arena.

The controversial concept of nonprofit marketing was first introduced to the business sector in 1969 in Kotler and Levy's "now classic article" (Lovelock & Weinberg, 1978, p. 3), "Broadening the Concept of Marketing," which appeared in the Journal of Marketing in the January issue (pp. 10-15). In their discourse, they persuasively state:

It is the authors' contention that marketing is a pervasive societal activity that goes considerably beyond the selling of toothpaste, soap, and steel....Student recruitment by colleges reminds us that higher education is marketed....Yet these areas of marketing are typically ignored by the student of marketing. Or they are treated cursorily as public relations or publicity activities. No attempt is made to incorporate these phenomena in the body proper of marketing thought and theory. No attempt is made to redefine the meaning of product development, pricing, distribution, and communication in these newer contexts to see if they have a useful meaning. No attempt is made to examine whether the principles of "good" marketing in traditional product areas are transferable to the marketing of services, persons, and ideas. The authors see a great opportunity for marketing people to expand their thinking and to apply their skills to an increasingly interesting range of social activity. (p. 32)

This article sparked a heated public debate within the business arena that same year. Six months later, Luck's article, "Broadening the Concept of Marketing—Too Far," appeared in the July Journal of Marketing issue (pp. 53-55) in which the professor takes issue with Kotler and Levy's broadened and open-ended redefinition of marketing. "How can one view the enormous scope of marketing and consider it to be 'narrowly defined'?" (Luck, 1969, p. 54). Luck further states that marketers can, and should, help nonprofit organizations with their marketing needs, but that this aid should be given on an individual basis. He concludes his article with an affirmation of marketing in the business context: "Let us not apologize for being marketers in the real sense. In the understanding and improvement of the marketing system lies all the challenge that one could desire" (p. 55).

Interestingly, Kotler and Levy published a rejoinder to Luck which appeared in that same July issue of the Journal of Marketing in which they defend their stand: "Our intention is to examine the subtleties of marketing in nonbusiness organizations as an area intrinsically worthy of study, to teach those who work in such organizations, and to better appreciate the nature of business marketing" (p. 57). They further contend that "to treat marketing as a proper function of only business firms denies that managers of nonbusiness organizations have marketing responsibilities, a view that is unrealistic and a new form of marketing myopia" (p. 57).

Kotler furthered the concept in writing "A Generic Concept of Marketing" (Lazer & Kelley, 1973) in which he states, "Today marketing is facing a new challenge concerning whether its concepts apply in the nonbusiness as well as the business arena" (p. 75). Rados (1981)

affirms the early history of this movement: "In the late sixties it first dawned on teachers of marketing that non-profit organizations engaged in marketing-like activities, and since then the question of just what marketing is has engaged the curiosity of a handful of them" (p. 14).

Debate over and acceptance of nonprofit marketing.

The movement toward nonprofit marketing was launched. In 1970 the Fall Conference of the American Marketing Association centered on that theme (Lazer & Kelley, 1973), and "as a further step in the recognition of nonprofit organization marketing, the Journal of Marketing published a collection of articles in the July 1971 issue dealing with fundraising, health service marketing, family planning, and so on" (Kotler, 1982, p. 29). And Nickels (1974) conducted a survey of marketing professors, the results of which concludes that "95% [of the marketing professors] felt that the scope of marketing should be broadened to include nonbusiness organizations, and 93% believed that marketing is not concerned solely with economic goods and services" (p. 73).

There were some reservations, however. For example, in 1974 Bartels cautioned that although "marketing professionals have increasingly devoted themselves to extending their expertise into noneconomic areas" (p. 76), major drawbacks to the movement included the concentration of energy and research in this new arena while "problems of physical distribution are calling for solution" and the fact that "graduate marketing education has excluded, presuming

foreknowledge, much factual content concerning markets and product marketing" (p. 76).

In spite of sporadic dissonance and discussion, however, marketing of nonprofit organizations became a viable segment of the overall marketing arena. The first textbook devoted exclusively to this topic, Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations, was published in 1975 by Philip Kotler, with subsequent editions published in 1982 and 1987. In the preface to the 1975 edition, Kotler writes, "The purpose of this book is, precisely, to broaden and apply the conceptual system of marketing to the marketing problems of nonprofit organizations ....no comprehensive text exists on the subject" (p. x). In the third edition of this work (1987), Kotler writes, "The appearance of the second edition (1982) coincided with rapid growth in the acceptance and adaptation of marketing to fields such as postsecondary education" (p. xiii).

Other scholarly texts were subsequently published. In most of these works, the authors seem compelled to reaffirm the legitimacy of the incorporation of marketing into the nonprofit sector. In 1977, Lovelock and Weinberg published Cases in Public and Nonprofit Marketing in which they state, "increasingly...nonbusiness organizations are finding utility in a broad range of marketing concepts that includes the analysis of consumer and other markets, the development and choice of positioning and marketing mix strategies, the execution of these strategies, and the monitoring of their performance" (p. 1). Included in this text are four cases dealing specifically with higher education. The next year, in Readings in Public and Nonprofit Marketing (1978), Lovelock and Weinberg state,



"We believe that public and nonprofit marketing has come of age. Before the late 1960s, applications of marketing theory and practice outside the profit-making private sector were, if not unheard of, certainly very rare. Ten years later, a very different situation prevails" (p. 3). Donnelly and George's work, Marketing of Services, appeared in 1981, as did Rados's Marketing for Non-Profit Organizations. Kotler and his associates wrote Cases and Readings for Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations in 1983 in which there are a few cases concentrating on higher education, the most notable of which deals with Kent State University's image problems in the early 1970s. Lovelock edited Services Marketing, published in 1984, in which Berry states, "In the academic discipline, services marketing has long been a stepchild to goods marketing, although progress has been made in recent years. It is time to do some serious catching up in terms of marketing thought. Perhaps the 1980s will be the decade in which this occurs" (p. 36). Lovelock and Weinberg published Marketing for Public and Nonprofit Managers in 1984, in which they assert that until the mid-1970s, marketing in the nonbusiness sector was virtually ignored (p. 7), implying that marketing in nonprofit organizations is now more widely accepted.

By the mid-1980s, marketing in the non-corporate environment was widely accepted, and the authors in this field seemed to spend much more of their efforts discussing the nuances of strategy rather than trying to convince their readers that this arena was legitimate (Lauffer, 1984). Lovelock and Weinberg's bold assertion in 1978 had held true: Public and nonprofit marketing had come of age (p. 3).

The general state of higher education in the 1970s.

The period between 1955 and 1974 in academe has been characterized as the golden years (Keller, 1983), where enrollments burgeoned, construction of new and updated facilities could be found on numerous campuses, community colleges proliferated, faculty and staff rapidly grew to accommodate the great influx of students, and funding was seemingly unlimited. These were "the most prosperous years ever for American higher education" (Keller, 1983, p. 8). "Quality of result and equality of access" (Keeton, 1971, p. 1) were the two-fold goals of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. This grand situation was destined to be short-lived, however. A variety of demographic and economic factors combined to create a critical environment for academe (Hodgkinson, 1971, 1981). Keller (1983) commences his Academic Strategy with the foreboding statement: "A specter is haunting higher education: the specter of decline and bankruptcy....The specter lurks in colleges and universities of all sizes, public as well as private, although smaller private colleges and the academically weaker state colleges and community colleges are widely expected to be the worst hit" (p. 3). Through the 1970s, higher education was faced with high inflation, a decline of traditional-age students, public disaffection with and growing distrust of the system, high fuel prices, increased competition with the corporate environment and the government for students (Hodgkinson, 1981), and the "erosion of institutional autonomy" (Wilson, 1972, p. 264). The golden age was overshadowed and, indeed, engulfed by the grey cloud of retrenchment, and with the onset of this difficult

period, college and university administrators were faced with numerous dilemmas demanding both short-and long-term solutions.

Many presidents of colleges and universities during this period believed that growth in their respective institutions would solve many of their problems. In a survey of top higher education administrators conducted by Harold Hodgkinson in 1971, the results showed that "there is an enormous concern with growth. Almost every questionnaire mentioned the word—more students, more faculty, more facilities ....Growth is always seen as a solution, never as a creator of problems" (p. 25).

While many administrators concerned themselves with growth, there was, and still is, a segment of the higher education arena that was valiantly attempting just to maintain viability. These small, private, little-known, non-selective institutions, termed "the invisible colleges" by Astin and Lee (1972), principally competed with public four-year institutions for students and funding and have been identified by Mayhew (1983) as being among the most vulnerable. The events and trends which contributed to institutional retrenchment, combined with low visibility and rural locations (Astin & Lee, 1972), exacerbated an already tenuous situation for these schools.

Regardless of institutional size, however, nearly every institution in American higher education faced sobering problems which demanded solutions and administrative leadership. This was the beginning of the "'era for educational planning'" (Keller, 1983, p. 12) and the "management revolution" (Krachenberg, 1972, p. 369) in which academe was exhorted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) to "take the major initiative in determining its own

future" (p. 89). The stage was set for the education arena to turn more actively and purposefully to the corporate sector for effective management strategies.

Introduction of nonprofit marketing to higher education.

While the concept of nonprofit marketing sparked controversy in the corporate environment, the idea traversed an even rougher road when introduced in the higher education arena. Only a few brave scholars ventured to write on the subject until the mid-1970s. In perusing the Education Index beginning with the early 1960s, for example, one finds that marketing in relation to higher education is not mentioned until 1968, with one lone article (Vanpelt, 1968). It is not until five years later, and thereafter, that a few sporadic articles began to surface in educational journals, with the greatest number of commentaries only beginning to appear in the late-1970s through the 1980s.

As was true in the business sector, rhetoric, of necessity, had to be persuasive in order to attract and engage the attention of the higher education community. One such early article was written by Krachenberg (1972) in which he states:

Colleges and universities today are embarked on what has been called by some a management revolution....In the general administrative area, universities are adopting sound planning concepts....A major operational activity that still remains largely unappreciated by higher education, however, is marketing....To many it is synonymous with selling or advertising....Even to those who accept marketing in its broader

context...it is almost always viewed as solely a business activity. To the contrary, it is a pervasive societal activity that every kind of organization is engaged in, and generally must engage in....No matter what it is called, who does it, or where in the institution it is being done, universities are engaged in marketing activity. (pp. 369-370)

The suggestion that universities will profit by a greater appreciation for, and use of, marketing, is based on the premise that universities are moving into a new era....In the decade of the seventies, higher education will need all the administrative and operational skills that it can muster. Hopefully, marketing will be an integral and well-managed part of the skills. (pp. 379-380)

The following year, Current Issues in Higher Education included a chapter on marketing higher education by Fram in which he asserts that the use of "marketing principles may be of greater value than financial principles in solving educational problems" (p. 57).

By the late 1970s the concept was becoming more widely accepted, with community colleges in the forefront (Hodgkinson, 1981), and several scholars addressed the subject. Murphy and McGarrity (1978) state that "universities have recently discovered marketing.... Colleges and universities are increasingly turning to marketing techniques successfully employed in the commercial private sector" (p. 249). The results of a survey of 350 admissions officers which the authors conducted reveal that marketing concepts, at that time, were not well understood by administrators, however. "Almost 90 per cent of all respondents believed marketing to be synonymous with

promotion. Less than 3 per cent of the respondents stipulated that marketing is a combination of competitive strategies" (p. 253).

In the spring of 1978, Barton served as editor of New Directions for Higher Education: Marketing Higher Education which concentrates on student recruitment and the admissions process. While these elements are crucial to institutional health, they are, nevertheless, only a part of a total marketing plan and do not represent the incorporation of a marketing orientation. Such nuances as needs analysis, the image of the school in relation to its publics, and the use of comprehensive market research are not emphasized. There is reaffirmation, however, that the top administrators must be "marketing-minded" (p. 84) if an institutional marketing plan is to succeed. To emphasize the importance of administrative leadership in marketing endeavors, Bickford (1978) asserts that the president of a college or university is the principal marketer of the institution, despite the term's negative connotation. He counters this mind-set by stating, "The discipline of marketing offers more than a new set of labels for traditional management functions. It connotes not only an attitude of responsiveness but a systematic technology for ordering responses" (p. 15). He uses the label "'marketing orientation'" (p. 14) to help persuade administrators to consider the concept seriously, the elements of which include identification of consumer needs, strategic plans for meeting those needs, and an evaluation of the results of implementing the plans, steps similar to those taken in developing educational program objectives.

Lucas edited New Directions for Institutional Research: Developing a Total Marketing Plan in 1979 in which the various

chapters represent a more well-rounded view than those in the Barton edition. The authors, however, still were compelled to convince the higher education community that marketing techniques are appropriate. Lucas asserts, despite the variety of forces railing against academe, "Major barriers still prevent higher education from becoming marketing oriented" (p. vii), some of which include the faculty's equating marketing with selling, "the lack of marketing expertise in higher education institutions" (p. vii), and a lack of a long-range commitment to planning. In that same volume, Johnson states:

If nonprofit marketing is to become an integral part of institutional operations, it must be understood, accepted as professionally sound, implemented, and continually reviewed.... Leaders committed to nonprofit marketing are essential.... A number of people in a variety of leadership roles need exposure to nonprofit marketing concepts if total marketing parameters are to become a reality. (p. 4)

And Gaither affirms that "marketing for students is going to be with us, whether we like it or not....Institutions must confront the reality of marketing in education and realize the choice is not one of doing or not doing marketing, but rather doing it well or poorly" (p. 32).

To help bridge the gap between for-profit and nonprofit marketing, Litton (Donnelly & George, 1981) proposes that two additional "P's" of the traditional marketing mix—which are price, position, product, and promotion—be included for the higher education arena: philosophy and pedagogy. The understanding of these two principles would help marketers "understand and respect the nature of

higher education's services, its firms, and its consumers" (Litton, 1981, p. 134).

And by the early 1980s, academic marketing had "taken off" (Litton, 1980, p. 42).

Acceptance and use of marketing principles in academe.

In the article, "This Little College Goes to Market," (1980), Hughes writes, "Marketing in higher education is approaching that delicate period familiar to borrowed concepts: the bridge from idea in one realm to practice in another. As resistance to the marketing concept fades, the question for colleges becomes not 'whether' but 'how' to install a marketing system" (p. 92). Marketing in academe was finally coming of age, but not without an ongoing struggle. Scholars addressing the issue still reminded college administrators that the acceptance of marketing principles was a hard-fought and ongoing battle, not yet won.

In the chapter entitled "Identifying Regional and Community Markets" in Improving Academic Management (1981), Lucas states:

Marketing, once a repugnant term in higher education, is rapidly becoming not only tolerated in these circles but being thought of as a necessity for survival. As postsecondary education moves from the 1960s toward 1990, a number of dynamic forces are at work that are pressuring institutions toward this change.

(p. 238)

The intricacies of marketing techniques, long recognized in the business arena but only an amorphous consideration in academe as the concepts were being introduced, are discussed by Lucas in this same



chapter. In the beginning, marketing was considered appropriate principally for student recruitment. Lucas, however, cites the complexities of a total marketing plan, to include comprehensive marketing research, targeting, image analysis, admissions analysis, an "understanding of demand cycles, community and student profile studies, program evaluation, and retention surveys" (p. 239). He further asserts that "many of the components of a total marketing plan have been practiced in higher education for years; but until recently, they were never referred to as marketing and were never integrated into a total package" (p. 251). Lucas then warns administrators:

If institutions fail to support or invest adequately in the marketing process, through an insufficient budget, failure to provide a trained and competent staff, or lack of cooperation by members of the institution, enrollments may decline and/or public support may diminish. In the extreme, some institutions will fail completely and will cease to exist. More commonly, colleges will become "bare bones" institutions. (p. 258)

Two of the notable works in higher education administration published in 1983, Keller's Academic Strategy and Mayhew's Surviving the Eighties, both mention the marketing of higher education as a viable tool for survival. In citing the upsurge of competitiveness for students in academe, Keller states, "Marketing is closely related to competitive strategies....Campuses should learn what positions in the higher education market and in people's minds they own, and then improve and build upon those. Comparative market strategy...is a growing concern in the face of increasingly confusing competition" (p. 147). He also reminds academe that "marketing...is not to be

confused with selling or advertising. Generally, higher education does too much selling and too little marketing" (p. 159). In chapter eight of this work, Keller lists several elements in shaping an effective academic strategy for an institution, notable in their similarities in formulating a comprehensive marketing strategy (Lay & Endo, 1987; Williford, 1987), to include analyses of strengths and weaknesses of the institution, using the BCG matrix for analyzing academic programs, forecasting, segmentation, perceptual mapping, and positioning. These and other pertinent terms are defined in the Glossary.

Mayhew (1983) furthers the concept of positioning strategy, a necessary move for institutions trying to create or maintain their respective market niches. "The most important of these [marketing] concepts is positioning....It is argued here that the search for a viable position is one of the most important activities for institutions to undertake during the rest of the twentieth century" (p. 177). As have many previous scholars, he likewise reiterates the struggle that marketing practice has encountered: "A recent development in admissions work is the increased use of marketing techniques, market research, and the key concept of positioning. These have long been used by business but had been judged inappropriate and out of character for collegiate institutions" (p. 176).

A very important work concerning strategic marketing for educational institutions was written by Kotler and Fox in 1985. Devoted exclusively to academe, this text is the first comprehensive work of its kind. Recognizing that "the unusual complexity of the

marketing mix [product/service, price, promotion, and place] and the number of diverse groups that have input into its components" (Brooker and Noble, 1985, p. 193) impede many administrators from introducing a marketing orientation into their institutions, the authors explain the various components of marketing in terminology to which educators can respond. In addition, Kotler and Fox liberally use practical examples to relate the concepts to a variety of problems which administrators face.

Although the use of marketing principles has increased considerably in higher education since its introduction some fifteen years ago, the topic is still the object of debate in academe. "Over the last ten years there has probably not been a more emotionally charged subject than that of applying the concepts and methods of marketing and market research to higher education" (Lay & Endo, 1987, p. 1). There is still discussion over terminology, with some educational administrators resisting the for-profit marketing jargon. "It is safe to say that market research is here to stay; the only problem is in keeping up with its latest labels. When we do not want to bring attention to the fact that we are using a technique developed by professional managers, we disguise the activity with labels" (Lay & Endo, 1987, p. 1). Overcoming this obstacle is very important if administrators desire to implement and utilize marketing principles effectively in their respective institutions.

And without the cooperation and support of top-level administrators, the institutional adoption of a marketing orientation is almost certainly destined to obscurity or failure. "A truly effective marketing orientation resembles strategic planning....

Strategic planning occurs at the central administrative level, where appropriate decisions about mission, program, and resource distribution are made" (Williford, 1987, pp. 53-54). While Hilpert and Alfred (1987) assert that "presidents of all types of institutions agree on certain key marketing practices to attract students" (p. 31), few of these administrators "are able to discuss strategies and outcomes [in marketing and recruitment efforts] with any degree of precision" (p. 32). Yet effective communication with prospective students and other institutional publics is critical for marketing principles to succeed (Lynton & Elman, 1987).

Clearly, the use of marketing practices by administrators in higher education institutions has gained increasing acceptance, despite academe's almost zealous resistance to change (Gaff, 1976). The end of the 1980s could be classified as a transition phase in marketing in higher education. It is inevitable that the utilization of strategic marketing principles and even the employment of marketing administrators in colleges and universities will be the "norm" rather than the exception in the 1990s and beyond.

#### Analysis of the Status of the Research and Writing on the Marketing of Higher Education

According to Lay and Endo (1987), "The literature on market research in higher education has grown almost geometrically over the last five years" (p. 113).

The writing published in this area has become increasingly sophisticated since its introduction in the higher education arena, with scholars describing the intricacies and scope of a strategic

marketing plan in greater detail and with more assurance. One such scholar states unequivocally that readers who are not already familiar with marketing concepts should not attempt to read his text unless they use other works as a cross-reference (Rados, 1981).

In spite of marketing's increasing usage in academe, however, authors addressing this subject, by and large, still feel the necessity to reaffirm that the use of these principles is not only acceptable, but necessary for institutional growth and survival. Often they recount the resistance which the concept has encountered by administrators who are yet reluctant to use tactics which they feel to be appropriate only in the business sector. These pockets of resistance are becoming fewer and less vocal, however, as the successful implementation of marketing principles in academe becomes more widely known.

While completing the research to discern the historical perspectives of nonprofit marketing in the corporate realm and in higher education, I discovered that most of the writing concentrates on various aspects of student enrollment. Although this is a primary concern in academe, there are other issues in higher education to which marketing concepts can be appropriately applied and which scholars should address more purposefully.

#### Implications and Recommendations for Further Study

In spite of the progress which the concept and practice of marketing principles in higher education have made to date, many upper-level educational administrators still require education about marketing and its viability in academe (Gaither, 1979). So long as

there are questions about and resistance to using formal marketing plans in higher education, the necessity to continue to persuade these academicians that marketing principles are, indeed, appropriate for colleges and universities should remain an important emphasis of the liberature.

Concomitantly, as this education of practicing and prospective educational administrators becomes more widespread and commonplace, academe may well accept and adopt the formalization of studies in higher education marketing within the academic disciplines, particularly as the body of research in this area expands and encompasses a larger range of critical issues with which colleges and universities are faced. Scholars generally concur that the peculiarities of higher education need to be strongly considered when formulating strategic marketing plans and that outside marketers must be sensitive to these idiosyncrasies if the concepts are to be effective (Litton, 1980; Donnelly & George, 1981). Therefore, it would seem to follow that the most beneficial method to introduce and utilize a viable marketing plan would be to educate the academicians themselves.

Related to the proposed introduction of higher education marketing in the college curriculum is the need for a text or texts devoted exclusively to academe. While cases on the marketing of higher education have been included in works which concentrate on marketing for nonprofit organizations, specific texts dedicated to higher education would allow for a wider variety of problems and possible solutions to be discussed.

An area for further study in the marketing of higher education is the importance of the involvement of the president of an institution in the adoption and use of marketing principles throughout the school. While many of the works discuss the necessity for administrative leadership in this arena, there is a need for more comprehensive research to be undertaken. Related to this topic is the lack of data concerning the effect of presidential leadership on school enrollment trends (Hilpert & Alfred, 1987).

An additional aspect of higher education marketing which needs further exploration is the compilation of research related to actual institutional implementations of strategic marketing within a variety of colleges and universities. These comprehensive published studies would be most helpful in guiding other institutions of similar types in formulating their own marketing plan.

And one of the most critical recommendations is that the growing body of literature on the many aspects of the marketing of higher education needs to be made more readily accessible to academicians and to students interested in this topic. Solutions and alternatives to a number of marketing dilemmas can be found in a plethora of publications and texts: The key is to facilitate their location.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Madison College: 1908-1970

"Look how far we've come, so far from where we used to be, But not so far that we've forgotten how it was before" (Diamond & Becaud, "September Morn," 1978).

Tracing the evolution of Madison College/James Madison University from its inception to 1971 is essential to this study so that, in addition to presenting obvious and documented factors, threads of continuity, character traits of the presidents, and some of the marketing tools used during this period can also be identified. And because an educational institution does not operate within a vacuum, examining the school within historical contexts is likewise germane in understanding just how Madison College developed. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Raymond Dingleline, Jr. and Dr. Ray Sonner, whose scholarly works relating to the history of the institution have been invaluable in the writing of this chapter.

#### A Brief History of the Institution

"Normal's Come At Last"

The Normal's come to Harrisonburg,  
And Oh! my lawsy daisy—  
All the folks around this town  
Are just a-runnin' crazy.



Snatched it 'way from Fredericksburg,  
 Knocked Manassas silly;  
 Good and Keezell are the men—  
 They got it willy-nilly.

Now they're looking for a site;  
 I wonder if they'll find it.  
 Somethin'll happen, sure as fate  
 Unless they stand behind it.

The Normal's come to Harrisonburg,  
 And how our heads are swelling!  
 Keep you mouth shut, Staunton dear  
 We know it without telling.

Nothin' more to talk about  
 Since this thing has ended;  
 Papers now will quit the biz,  
 Unless they are befriended.

(Adolph Snyder in Dingledine, 1959, p. 12)

The community of Harrisonburg, Virginia, thus excitedly greeted the news that the state legislature had finally decided, after a four-year lobbying battle, in favor of establishing a new State Normal and Industrial School for Women in that area. The normal school movement which had begun in Massachusetts in the late 1830s was well-established by the end of the nineteenth century, with "several hundred of these institutions spread across the country" (Jencks &

Riesman, 1977, p. 232), and Virginia was ready to join the procession. This effort was spearheaded by State Senator George Keezell of Rockingham County, who was then chairman of the Committee on Public Institutions and Education, along with several key citizens from Harrisonburg. Factors which Mr. Keezell and his committee used to persuade the legislature to decide in favor of Harrisonburg included an adequate water supply, an abundant supply of low-cost fresh food because of the town's location in the Shenandoah Valley agricultural region, accessibility to Harrisonburg from other areas in the state through railroad transportation, and the fact that "Rockingham County had a larger enrollment of white pupils and employed more white teachers than any other county or city in the state" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 3), thereby contributing "more tax support to the state's public school system than most counties" (p. 4). The use of these arguments could conceivably be considered to be the first rudimentary marketing strategy used by advocates on behalf of the school if the components of marketing are simplistically defined as "selling, advertising, and public relations" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 6). Because of heated debate and masterful tactics conducted in the state legislature by representatives from two Virginia counties, and because the national educational climate was increasingly in favor of the education of women (Rudolph, 1962, p. 441), funds were appropriated in 1908 for two normal schools to be established: one in Harrisonburg and the other in Fredericksburg (now Mary Washington College), with the promise of a third to be established at Radford during the next General Assembly session. By 1910, Virginia had established a

complement of four state normal schools to train her young women in teaching and homemaking.

Julian Burruss: 1909-1919

Julian A. Burruss, the thirty-three year old director of the manual training program in the Richmond city school system, was appointed the first president of Harrisonburg's normal school by the institution's Board of Trustees chaired by Senator Keezell, the members of which were selected by the governor. Burruss was chosen because of his "unusual executive ability and capacity for hard work" and "the zeal, energy, vision and practical attention to details needed to build a school" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 16). A site was selected for the school which would provide for future growth, and Burruss spent the first critical months visiting campuses and formulating the first "Master "Plan" for construction of the institution's buildings, keeping foremost in his mind the visualization of the school once enrollment had reached one thousand students. It was said of the plan that

it will be the first time since Jefferson founded the University of Virginia that a great school has been organized on strictly definite, scientific, pedagogical principles before a nail is driven or a class taught. It presents the ideals for a really great school—one worthy of the Valley of Virginia—that can be completed in ten years or less, without wasting a dime or an ounce of effort. When completed...it will be beyond comparison the most beautiful, the most comprehensive school of its kind in the South-

and indeed will have few equals anywhere. (Dingledine, 1959, p. 18)

Winston Churchill has stated, "we shape our buildings, and then they shape us" (The International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 3, 1985). Much care was taken in the plans for the campus to ensure both practicality and beauty. The early buildings, designed by Richmond, Virginia architect Charles Robinson, were constructed of blue-gray limestone quarried locally and roofed with red Spanish tiles, the latter selection of which, while "ridiculed by architectural critics" (Yankovich, 1990), rendered them relatively maintenance-free. The facilities were built in units so that future additions would merge successfully with already existing structures, and trees were left intact wherever feasible (Dingledine, 1959, p. 17). Because of the location of the institution, the "School would become familiarly and lovingly known as 'Blue Stone Hill'" (Dingledine, p. 34).

President Burruss developed the first "viewbook" for the school in 1909 which he titled

"A New Opportunity for Virginia Teachers," announcing that "handsome stone buildings" were being erected and that the School would open in September, 1909. The folder gave a brief description of the grounds, buildings, courses of study to be offered and living arrangements. It emphasized a well-trained faculty, special features in industrial training and low cost of attendance. (Dingledine, 1959, p. 19)

Prior to the first session, he likewise published the Normal Bulletin, the official college catalog in which course offerings, facilities,

faculty, and policies were innumeraled, as well as a map showing railroad connections between the town and localities throughout the state (Dingledine, 1959, p. 21). In this 112-page publication, President Burruss stressed the training of teachers as the primary mission of the normal school, pointing out that "while the School would not specialize in giving a liberal education, a student by carefully selecting her courses could obtain one" (Dingledine, p. 21). The cover of the Bulletin sported the newly designed school seal, one used for many decades into the 1970s.

On September 28, 1909, the school officially opened with 150 students, fifteen faculty members, and two buildings. The early curriculum offered four years of high school and two years of post-secondary work, with instruction in teaching, manual arts, homemaking, and rural arts (Images of James Madison University, 1983, p. 5). Young women attended classes from 8:30 a.m. - 4:45 p.m. Monday through Friday, with daily assemblies for singing, devotions, and announcements (Dingledine, 1959, p. 36). While President Burruss did not want to have to establish student conduct rules and regulations, his hope being that young Southern women would comport themselves in a seemly fashion at all times both on and off campus, the faculty members themselves issued edicts for proper student behavior within a month of the school's opening (Dingledine, pp. 42-43).

Extracurricular activity was an important component of student life from the beginning. Two literary societies were founded, the colors of which were merged to form the school colors of violet and gold. The violet was eventually replaced with purple as it was easier to obtain the deeper color for school paraphernalia (Dingledine, 1959,

p. 44), and these remain the institution's colors today. The Y.W.C.A. developed a campus chapter, and athletic organizations were established as well. An Honor System was initiated by the end of the first year, and rumblings for student government were heard throughout the student body. With class organizations fostering intense class loyalty, the publication of a yearbook, the establishment of an annual lyceum program to foster cultural events, living in residential dorms, and the observation of national holidays, particularly Arbor Day in which students would plant trees on the relatively bare campus grounds, the early institution showed many characteristics of what is generally visualized as "collegiate life."

During the summer of 1910, the institution started a summer session designed for those already working in the teaching profession. This was the first program of its type in the state (Dingledine, 1959, p. 115). The sessions concentrated principally on teaching methodology, with practice teaching and classroom observation integral components of the curriculum.

By 1914, the General Assembly abolished the separate governing boards for the four state normal schools, placing them under the control of a single Virginia Normal School Board composed of twelve members, "one from each congressional district and two from the state at large, all appointed by the governor with the approval of the state senate" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 49). The names of the institutions were changed, thus The State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Harrisonburg became The State Normal School for Women at Harrisonburg.

An incident in the history of the school is worth mentioning as it underscores the spirit of service which President Burruss infused into the fabric of the institution. When the United States became involved in World War I, the students held vesper services and made surgical dressings for the Red Cross. Additionally, they took courses in first aid, donated funds to the Red Cross by staging special events and foregoing the traditional exchange of gifts at Christmas, and grew vegetables and raised chickens and hogs on campus to supply food for the dining hall. Fuel consumption was kept to a minimum, and students made sweaters, hospital clothing, and candles for the war effort (Dingledine, 1959, pp. 93-94).

Throughout his tenure, President Burruss provided "hands on" leadership of the growing institution, never losing sight of his vision for the school. His faculty was most supportive and inspired by his zeal, some of whom were so stimulated by his addresses that they remained awake at night "'seeing the possibilities and rejoicing in the Virginia which was to be'" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 50). By the time that he left in 1919 to become president of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, his alma mater, the school had become "established as one of the leading educational institutions in Virginia. The enrollment reached 306 and the faculty grew to 26. There were six buildings and the campus included forty-nine acres," (Sonner, 1974, p. 18) one building which was Hillcrest, the on-campus home for the president. The enrollment conceivably could have been higher had dormitory space been available. Entrance requirements had tightened, and plans were made to award four-year degrees. While the majority of students preferred to study to become school teachers, some decided to pursue

studies in industrial or vocational education, to include courses in cooking, sewing, household management, drawing, woodworking, and the repair and maintenance of small articles (Dingledine, p. 58).

Samuel Duke: 1919-1949

Samuel P. Duke, a "young man of energy, ability and strong character," (Dingledine, 1959, p. 129) was selected to become the second president of the State Normal School for Women at Harrisonburg, assuming his position on September 1, 1919. While Burruss was the "founder president," Duke has been characterized as the "builder president" (Images, 1983, p. 25). Prior to his new post in Harrisonburg, "he had been director of the Department of Education and Training School at Farmville Normal School and had left there to serve in the State Department of Education as supervisor of high schools for Virginia" (Images, p. 25). The two most critical and immediate problems with which he had to grapple were a shortage of faculty members and the dual fiscal difficulties of operating the institution within a strict budget while trying to obtain funds to ensure the growth of the program and the facilities (Sonner, 1974, pp. 18-19; Images, p. 26). When he was unable to convince the state legislature for funding in his early years, he sought other private avenues, to include enthusiastic alumnae. Through his efforts, four major buildings, among them a gymnasium with an indoor swimming pool, were completed by the end of his first ten years in office (Images, pp. 26-27), and "the quadrangle was graded, trees and shrubbery were planted and cement walks replaced boardwalks and paths" (Images, p. 27). When the grading was completed in front of the new Alumnae House, a large



limestone rock was left, and it remains today as a traditional sentinel overseeing the expansive lawn.

In 1924, through the efforts of President Duke and the other presidents of the normal schools, the state legislature passed a bill which changed the name of the four institutions to designate them as teachers colleges, a move taken to help recruit better students for the teaching profession and to enable the institutions to secure more funding. Thus the Normal School for Women at Harrisonburg became The State Teachers College at Harrisonburg. By 1920 the high school degree was discontinued, two-year degrees were offered for elementary, junior, and senior high school, and home economics teachers, and a four-year B.S. degree was offered for home economics teachers. Along with the name change, the curriculum was expanded to include four-year degrees in a variety of teacher training fields, with Harrisonburg continuing as the center for training in home economics (Dingledine, 1959, p. 147).

The late 1920s saw a move afoot to provide for liberal education institutions to be made available for women. The O'Shea report was commissioned by the state legislature to examine all possibilities and make recommendations, one of which that "the State Teachers College at Harrisonburg be converted into a liberal arts college for women coordinated with the University of Virginia," (Dingledine, 1959, p. 151) so selected "because of its advantageous location, its excellent physical plant and its room for expansion" (p. 151). President Duke was most encouraged by this development and fought tirelessly to have his school so designated. This was not to be, however, because of lack of funding and the unwillingness of the state

legislature to move quickly on the proposal. Instead, alternative plans were studied, to include the creation of a new liberal arts institution for women. As there was no consensus in the legislature as to location, turf battles ensued, similar to those that occurred in the early 1900s when the legislature was considering the location of a new normal school (Dingledine, p. 152). These skirmishes rendered the legislature impotent because as many as one dozen localities sought the privilege of claiming the new school (p. 154). The legislature reverted back to its original premise of converting an existing teachers college into a liberal arts facility. The problems of funding and location, however, remained unchanged, and the concept was eventually shelved. Undaunted, "Duke turned for help to other Virginia [teachers] college presidents. With their assistance he secured authorization [from the state legislature] to offer the Bachelor of Arts Degree" (Sonner, 1974, p. 21) by 1935. As a result, students could then earn a four-year liberal arts degree in foreign languages, English, social science, history, mathematics, and science. The Bachelor of Science degree requirements were altered to delete the foreign language requirement and increase the required hours in the sciences (Dingledine, pp. 157-158).

Throughout his tenure, President Duke sought to have the salaries of his faculty raised to be competitive with the other colleges and to be more in line with the national norms. The ravages of the Depression years forced the state legislature to mandate a drastic reduction in faculty remuneration, however, despite his heated objections. But by 1936, salary decreases were restored, much to his faculty's delight (Dingledine, pp. 170-171).

The Great Depression created other financial problems for higher education, as well. Large capital outlay appropriations from the state legislature were virtually halted for the rest of the decade, but through scrupulously careful planning and some funding from the federal government, President Duke continued to oversee construction and renovations on his campus (Dingledine, 1959, p. 140).

On March 8, 1938, President Duke and the school saw yet another name change for the State Teachers College. "Governor James H. Price signed into a law a bill...redesignating the State Teachers College at Harrisonburg as Madison College, effective June 12" (Dingledine, p. 222).

President Duke suggested that his institution be named Madison College in honor of James Madison, "father" of the federal constitution and fourth president of the United States. Such a name would not only honor one of Virginia's greatest statesmen but an early champion of both public schools and higher education. Madison had realized the value of teacher training and had been a pioneer advocate of higher education for women. Duke deemed the name appropriate for other reasons also. It had dignity, looked good in print and sounded good when referred to orally. It was appropriate for a coeducational institution [author's emphasis to highlight marketing potential], if the School should become one, as well as a woman's college....To those in Harrisonburg who criticized the dropping of their city's name from the title of the College...He reminded those who felt Madison had no connection with the area that Rockingham had originally been part of Madison's home county of Orange. (Dingledine, 1959, pp. 222-223)

The growth of campus facilities, student life, and improved curricula continued throughout President Duke's thirty year leadership of The State Teachers College at Harrisonburg/Madison College. "A plant valued at about \$400,000 in 1919 had been expanded into one of around \$4 million" (Images, 1983, p. 33), including the addition of eight new buildings and 20 acres of land (Sonner, 1974, p. 24). "He had increased dormitory capacity more than one hundred percent, developed an auditorium that would seat the entire student body, [and] constructed a modern library" (p. 24). In 1935, fourteen courses of study were offered, by 1938, several minors could be obtained (Dingledine, pp. 173, 181), and in 1937, the Commerical Education department, the precursor of business education at the institution, was added to the curriculum (Dingledine, 1959, p. 180). Just as the students from the early years had supported the fighting troops during World War I, the student body during the 1940s World War II era likewise rose to the occasion, completing many of the same tasks as had their predecessors, except for raising livestock on the grounds. They also trained in aircraft identification and were permitted to "go on duty at the local aircraft spotting center as early as 6:00 in the morning" (Dingledine, p. 247). Student enrollment steadily increased, except during World War II, so that by the time the president retired due to failing health in 1949, enrollment surpassed the 1,200 mark (Sonner, 1974, p. 24), to include the first male day students in 1946. By 1947, the men had organized their own sports activities, and the women students "turned out in larger numbers to cheer the men's basketball team of 1947, the Madison Dukes [so named to honor the president] than they did their own" (Dingledine, p. 253). While the

small number of male students were very active, their numbers would remain low for the next several years because of limited campus facilities.

#### G. Tyler Miller: 1949-1970

On September 1, 1949, G. Tyler Miller, an alumnus of the Virginia Military Institute and the then State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was selected as the third president of Madison College. "To some he was an unlikely candidate for the position. Not the least of these was George Tyler Miller" (Sonner, 1974, p. 25) because he feared that he would not receive public approval for his selection. His misgivings were unfounded, however, as "public approval was widespread and immediate" (Sonner, p. 25). He brought with him a wide range of educational experiences, wisdom, administrative ability, and deep spiritual values (Dingledine, 1959, p. 255).

During President Miller's first year at Madison, construction began on the first dormitory built in over ten years. "That the beginning of his administration should coincide with Madison's first major building construction since before the war was symbolic of what lay ahead. The new president's first decade would be characterized by significant expansion of the College's physical facilities" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 255). He has been characterized as another "'builder president,'" (Images, 1983, p. 55), but what is perhaps more important, within the larger picture, is that his leadership provided the groundwork and foundation for what Madison College was to become.

While land acquisitions, principally the purchase of Newman Farm in 1952 which increased the physical plant by some 240 acres

(Dingledine, 1959, p. 256), and new construction were hallmarks of Miller's presidency, renovations to the existing campus sometimes lagged behind. Dr. James Yankovich, professor and former Dean of the School of Education at the College of William and Mary, recalls that during the mid-1960s, the facilities were "really in need of serious repair. I can recall torn screens on the windows and doors on broken hinges. The faculty was used to shovel snow off the walks. I even helped when I was recruiting teachers for Charlottesville" (1990).

President Miller's foremost concerns, expanding the facilities notwithstanding, were the improvement of teacher education and the strengthening of the overall academic program, missions which he zealously pursued. He was considered to be a formidable advocate for teacher education, both at his institution and on the state level as well (Spong, interview, 1990, May 15). Teacher training programs at Madison College became more cohesive, with interchangeable elements permitting students to move more easily between courses in elementary and secondary education, and elementary education studies were offered for those seeking liberal arts or secondary education degrees (Dingledine, 1959, p. 262). By 1954, the school was authorized by the State Board to offer graduate degrees in education, and liberal arts studies were expanded and diversified (Images, 1983, p. 59). To entice better students, admissions requirements were stiffened and admissions brochures and pamphlets were attractively designed as a marketing tool to promote the institution (Dingledine, p. 274).

Some may consider, however, that President Miller's most ambitious dream, with the most seemingly insurmountable obstacles to overcome, was for Madison College to become a bona fide coeducational college, a

worthy goal which he innumeraled in his inaugural address (Sonner, 1974, p. 53). He cited the dearth of male teachers and the fact that only four of the 164 tax-supported teachers' colleges in the United States, three of which were Virginia schools, were single-sex, as rationales for the state legislature to permit Madison to offer full status to male students (Sonner, p. 54). Miller faced the first of several roadblocks to his plan when the state legislature defeated the proposal during the 1950 session (Sonner, p. 55). In 1952, he opted not to present the proposal to the legislature as the General Assembly was preoccupied with legislation which would create a State Council of Higher Education, a measure which, to Miller's surprise, did not pass at that time.

In 1954, President Miller tried once again to secure coeducational status for Madison College, but the prevailing sentiment among legislators was that it was "only a matter of time until integration would come to Virginia colleges. By withholding coeducational status, they hoped to hold the line against the most unacceptable aspect of integration, the mixing of whites and blacks of the opposite sex" (Sonner, 1974, pp. 59-60). Miller, therefore, was then forced to wait patiently until pressure from the public would pave the way for the change to be made. Twelve years after he was forced to shelve, but in no way abandon, the dream, Madison College received full coeducational status in 1966 in which male students were afforded the same rights and privileges as their female counterparts.

The presidents of the state teachers colleges became increasingly insistent that each of the schools needed to be governed by separately appointed boards instead of the umbrella agency under which they had

been directed for decades. Their institutions had become complex organizations with individual concerns which required a more personal involvement by qualified appointees to oversee the issues. In 1964, the state legislature approved the proposal which had been presented by the presidents, and Madison College welcomed its first Board of Visitors in fifty years in June of that year. The foundation thus continued to be laid for the transformation that would unalterably change the direction and flavor of the school.

#### Setting the Stage for Change

The 1960s witnessed numerous extremes in higher education in the United States. Nathan Pusey, former president of Harvard, has called this period a "'golden age'" (Keller, 1983, p. 8), and statistics support this assertion. The great influx of "baby boomers," coupled with the fact that more young people believed that a college education was necessary for later advancement, caused college enrollment to triple from 2.5 million in 1955 to approximately 8.8 million by 1974, and facilities to handle this upsurge were doubled (Keller, pp. 8-9). Eight times as many blacks were enrolled in higher education in 1974 than in 1955, and "the proportion of young women, preparing for general equality, increased from one-third to one-half of all those attending colleges and universities" (Keller, p. 9). Funding for the expansion of programs and facilities was available from a variety of sources, to include philanthropic organizations, corporations, and federal grants. A number of institutional missions were changed to accommodate the increasing interest in research and technology and to prepare a new contingency of professors to teach the influx of



students, and state teachers colleges were not immune to this trend as many evolved into "colleges of arts and science" (Keller, p. 9).

"Most significantly, a whole new sector of higher education came into being: the locally sponsored two-year community colleges...a form unique to the United States" (Keller, p. 9). These schools were considered an important addition to academe because they

shielded the older four-year colleges and universities from many of the rising pressures of vocationalism and job training, from admissions for the less academically qualified, from vast increases in financial aid for the sons and daughters of the poor and minorities, and from much of the new pattern of part-time higher education and adult education. (Keller, p. 9)

Among other national trends with which higher education had to come to terms were the Viet Nam War, the women's movement, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. While the latter two created opportunities in academe for blacks and women—the first black student was admitted to Madison College in 1966—the three combined sowed insidious seeds of discord which would eventually erupt into heated, and sometimes violent, campus disruptions in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Even Madison College, tucked away in the Shenandoah Valley and seemingly out of the mainstream of campus revolt, was not exempt from the rumblings. Miller's presidency, heretofore unmarred by student dissatisfaction and, in fact, characterized by a congenial relationship with students (Sonner, 1974, p. 120), was severely tested by a small group of dissidents in the late 1960s, one of whom was dismissed because he flaunted the rules of the institution (Sonner, p. 121). In 1968, President Miller began to hold a series of monthly

meetings in which he and other administrators met with students to discuss their concerns in an open forum. "At first the meetings were informative and relaxed. A gradual deterioration began early in the 1969-70 session" (Sonner, p. 122) when the disruptive contingency would openly harrass the president.

There were students and faculty who believed his age precluded his understanding the issues on the American college campus in the late 60's and early 70's. There were those who believed that Madison College had never really accepted men on its campus and that President Miller knew nothing of the problems faced by men on a college campus [author's note: while the assimilation of males into a previously female institution contained its own set of peculiar problems, it nevertheless seems logical to conclude that President Miller was well-aware of the difficulties that college men faced as he had attended the Virginia Military Institute] ....In retrospect, he might be charged with acting harshly in dealing with the students who defied his orders and scoffed at rules he had influenced the governing board to establish.

(Sonner, p. 130)

The situation on campus deteriorated to the point that several students were arrested by local authorities for demonstrating and taking over the administration building. Hearings were held in the United States District Court in Richmond concerning whether or not Madison College's policy on campus demonstrations was constitutional. While the policy was eventually upheld, the long court battle took a heavy toll on President Miller; and although he had received wide support for his stand against the dissidents, he decided upon an early

retirement in 1970.

From the early years of the State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Harrisonburg to the Madison College of 1970, threads of continuity were woven into the fabric of its rich sixty-one year history. Following the examples set by the presidents, the students developed and maintained a spirit of friendliness and of service to the institution and to the wider community. Academic programs continually evolved to satisfy both the state's increasing demands for better teachers and a national trend toward a more liberal education. The school grew from 150 students, 42 acres, and two buildings to a student body numbering more than 4,000 and a physical plant worth approximately \$30 million (Images, 1983, p. 61) by 1970.

Perhaps the most important thread, however, was the continuity of leadership for the institution. Each president brought his own brand of zeal and individual sense of purpose and mission to the school and a dogged determination to work toward, and occasionally fight for, the advancement of the college, building upon the solid foundation laid before. Within this context, the most noteworthy factor is that the institution had had only three presidents at its helm, thereby effectively avoiding the problems inherent in frequent changes in administrative leadership.

With President Miller's retirement, Madison College was poised for—what? A change? The status quo? This would be the question and the challenge for his successor to face. While the college had evolved into a "major institution of higher learning in Virginia...an atmosphere of unrest was present on the Madison College campus" (Sonner, 1974, p. 126).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### The Carrier Presidency: 1971 - The Present

#### His Background

For the first time in the school's history, the newly created Board of Visitors was faced with the task of finding a new president for Madison College. Since the institution was at a crossroads, the selection of the new president was an important assignment. Russell M. Weaver, Harrisonburg attorney serving as rector of the board, chose a presidential search committee of board members, faculty, and students, to find the successor for Dr. Miller. After an intensive screening of over fifty applicants, the Board of Visitors offered the position to Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, the youthful thirty-eight year old Vice President for Academic Affairs at Memphis State University (Breeze, 1970, November 20, p. 1). Dr. Carrier accepted the position, and he assumed the presidency on January 1, 1971. This chapter concentrates on his background, examines his leadership style by comparing it with an analysis of the "charismatic leader," and discusses his vision for the school. Some of his accomplishments will be discussed in subsequent chapters as they relate to strategic planning and marketing of the institution.

#### The "Country Boy."

Dr. Carrier, characterized as a "populist" by one board member (First Decade of the Carrier Presidency, 1981, p. 13), brought youth, passion, vision, and extraordinary energy to the post, embodied in a stimulating style of presidential leadership that would soon become

well-known to the institution's constituencies from parents, to whom he has said "'don't worry about your kids, I've got them now'" (p. 13) to state legislators, whom he has petitioned with "'I'm just a country boy with a school to run'" (p. 13).

This "country boy" was born and reared on a farm in Bluff City, Tennessee, the tenth of eleven children, none of whom was expected to attend college (Carrier, interview, 1990, April 10). According to Dr. Carrier,

We literally lived off the earth. We had no material wealth. We had a small farm, we had hogs, cows, chickens, and vegetables, and if we didn't grow it, we didn't eat it....I can remember carrying bags of corn and wheat which we had harvested to have it ground into [meal and] flour. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

Priceless family values of honesty, hard work, sharing, unselfishness, faith, and belief in the family that were instilled, however, were invaluable in shaping his early years and in establishing a substantial foundation. He credits his desire for a college education with a broken hoe handle:

My older brother [Lavon] and I were hoeing tobacco. Our hoes became tangled in the morning glories, and finally he walked over to the fence and broke the handle of his hoe. I asked, "Why did you do that?" "Be damned if I'm going to do this all my life," Dr. Carrier said his brother replied. (Murphy, late 1970)

Mrs. Carrier, the matriarch of the clan, always wanted her son Ron to be the preacher in the family, and he entertained that idea for some time (Carrier, interview, 1990, April 10). Many who hear him address a gathering today can attest that he often exhibits an

exegetical style of delivery, reminiscent of the evangelist in Neil Diamond's song, "Brother Love's Traveling Salvation Show" (1969).

His aspirations to teach.

Brother Lavon did, indeed, retire his hoe to attend college, eventually graduating from Duke University, financially aided by the G.I. Bill. He, in turn, supported Carrier through his undergraduate years at East Tennessee State University and graduate school at the University of Illinois. While at East Tennessee State, he was given the opportunity by Dr. Lloyd Pierce, professor of economics and son of his high school principal, to help Dr. Pierce in his classes and with projects. This catalytic relationship inspired Carrier to become a teacher; thus, Dr. Pierce helped the young Carrier to obtain a scholarship and teaching assistantship at the University of Illinois. After completing his doctorate, he accepted his first teaching assignment, at "Ole Miss," where he taught in the College of Business. Dr. Carrier has fond recollections of those early halcyon days:

I enjoyed teaching, and I really enjoyed being in front of the class....I planned to spend my life teaching....The race situation wasn't a major issue my first year of teaching in '60. Race was always an issue, but it wasn't a burning issue yet [until the James Meredith situation erupted]. What a delightful place to teach—trees, lawn, old lyceum buildings, and really good students [his subjective opinion] and a good athletic program....I was voted the best teacher in the college of business. Worked hard, made some friends, had two young children, and enjoyed it very much. (Interview, 1990, April 10).

In 1961 Dr. Carrier was asked to serve on a commission created by the Mississippi Chamber of Commerce to develop a blueprint for progress for the state. The work which he accomplished on this task brought him to the attention of powerful Mississippi state legislators the next year, and they asked him to serve as the director from "Ole Miss," along with a representative from Mississippi State University, on a project to make recommendations on how the state universities of Mississippi could become actively involved in the national space program. Some schools eventually received NASA grants toward that end. This study and his work for the Mississippi Chamber of Commerce were precursors to what would become Dr. Carrier's continuing involvement in and willingness to serve on peripheral educational projects throughout his academic career.

His first excursion into administration.

During 1962, the provost of "Ole Miss," Dr. Charles Haywood, decided to leave mid-year, and the Chancellor appointed Dr. Carrier as assistant to the new provost to work with him on the university policies and budgets. Dr. Carrier viewed this as a temporary excursion into administration, and he fully intended on returning to the classroom. Along with his own office, he also used the office of his predecessor so that he would have easy access to the data and information therein. In the spring of 1963, the gentleman who had previously held that position contacted Dr. Carrier and "said that he wanted something out of his office. "[Dr. Carrier] said, 'fine, what do you want?' He said, 'I want you. I want you to help with the

research program at Memphis State'" (Carrier, interview, 1990, April 10).

Thus, the Carriers moved to Memphis State University in 1963 where he founded and directed the Bureau of Business and Economics in addition to teaching and writing. Dr. Charles Haywood, now dean at the University of Kentucky, contacted him to consider a professorship at the university and to become the director of the Center for Developmental Change, a department which worked university-wide as a change agent. While the offer was alluring, Dr. Carrier withheld his decision until he could discuss it with his president, a gentleman who he liked and respected and who had been a major support for the development of the research program. And even though he enjoyed his work at the university, the thirty-three year old professor was also looking ahead, believing that the position at the University of Kentucky could serve as a springboard to major institutions in Indiana, Illinois, or Michigan (Carrier, interview, 1990, April 10). The president of Memphis State countered the offer by creating the position of provost specifically for Dr. Carrier. He accepted the post and was launched into a permanent administrative career.

#### Presidential preparations.

During his tenure in which he served as provost for three years and then was "selected the university's first academic vice president in 1969" (Breeze, 1970, November 20), Dr. Carrier initiated several new programs at Memphis State, including doctoral programs, the law school, and the school of engineering. Then, Dr. Carrier recalls, he began to get restless and felt like the time had come for him to



tackle a presidency. "I interviewed at [and was offered the presidency of] a new college that was just being formed in Covington, Kentucky....but we [he and Mrs. Carrier] didn't want to be there for ten years riding around in the empty fields. Actually, it turned out to be a nice college" (Carrier, interview, 1990, April 10). Soon thereafter, Felix Robb, then the head of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, called Dr. Carrier to inform him that he had recommended Dr. Carrier to become president of Madison College.

Dr. and Mrs. Carrier traveled to Harrisonburg for an interview on a "dismal October day" (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24) and were not overly impressed. The ground was a quagmire, and the parking lot was not paved. They completed the interview process and, while they enjoyed meeting the committee, administrators, and students, he had already decided that he did not want to accept the presidency. Upon leaving campus, the public relations officer at Madison, an individual with whom Dr. Carrier had developed little rapport through the afternoon, drove the Carriers to the airport. During our second interview, he related:

I got out of the car and said, "don't bother to get out. I can carry the bags to the plane. I appreciate you bringing us out. We look forward to seeing you sometime." And Edith will tell you, I was carrying the bags, and she was walking along side me. And I said, "Edith, I'm not coming here. But if I did, that would be the first person I'd fire." (1990, January 24)

Dr. Carrier was persuaded to accept the presidency, however, and he assumed the position without reservations on January 1, 1971 and was inaugurated eleven months later. Among his first acts were to

pave the parking lot and to dismiss the unsupportive public relations officer.

### "The Charismatic Leader"

As one of the components of this two-pronged study, an appraisal of charisma and how this attribute relates to leadership is germane to the evaluation of Dr. Carrier's presidency. This emphasis was decided upon before I began the research effort, to afford a manageable framework within which to examine this aspect of his tenure to date. And after having talked with several key personnel members and selected other individuals about Dr. Carrier's leadership style, I found that one adjective often used to encapsulate his style was, indeed, "charismatic."

While Birnbaum (1988) asserts that "little is actually known about the phenomenon we refer to as 'leadership'" and "there is still no agreement on how leadership can be defined, measured, assessed, or linked to outcomes" (p. 22), and Kouzes and Posner (1987) state that "charisma has become such an overused and misused term that it is almost useless as a descriptor of leaders" (p. 123), the literature on this topic is, nevertheless, considerable. In recent years, several scholars have attempted to examine dynamic leadership by purposefully evaluating characteristics of the charismatic leader, to include works by Jay Conger (1989) and Gary Yukl (1989). Through these and other sources, leadership and, more specifically, charismatic leadership will be examined.

### Characteristics.

Before discussing various characteristics related to charismatic leaders in particular, it seems logical, first, to identify general traits of academic CEOs as a foundation. Over thirty years ago, Harold W. Stoke (1959) wrote that college presidents

display noticeable distinctions and similarities. They are...above average in their physical vigor, their "capacity to take it"....More skillfully than most men, they can make words do their bidding....They are alert....They tend to be extroverts.... "Personable" and "charming" are descriptive words that come to mind, for these qualities are more frequently present than absent. (pp. 14-15)

Harold W. Dodds (1962) has indentified "political savoir faire" (p. 20) as an important characteristic for college and university presidents. Perhaps the most comprehensive compilation of characteristics of presidents in American higher education, however, can be found in Clark Kerr's The Uses of the University (1982) in which he contends that the university president

is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a

devotee of the opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies. No one can be all of these things. Some succeed at being none. (pp. 29-30)

Dr. Kerr further purports that the academic president should be firm, yet gentle; sensitive to others, insensitive to himself; look to the past and the future, yet be firmly planted in the present; both visionary and sound; affable, yet reflective; know the value of a dollar and realize that ideas cannot be bought; inspiring in his visions yet cautious in what he does; a man of principle yet able to make a deal; a man with broad perspective who will follow the details conscientiously; a good American but ready to criticize the status quo fearlessly; a seeker of truth where the truth may not hurt too much; a source of public policy pronouncements when they do not reflect on his own institution. He should sound like a mouse at home and look like a lion abroad. He is one of the marginal men in a democratic society—of whom there are many others—on the margin of many groups, many ideas, many endeavors, many characteristics. He is a marginal man but at the very center of the total process. (p. 30)

While Kouzes and Posner principally examine leadership in the business sector in The Leadership Challenge (1987), they have identified several generic traits which are desirable in academic leadership as well, to include the ability to "challenge, inspire, enable, model and encourage" (p. 1). They also state that "our research shows that the majority of us want leaders who are honest,

competent, forward-looking, and inspiring. In short, we want leaders who are credible and who have a clear sense of direction" (p. 1).

Charismatic leaders demonstrate many of the aforementioned traits, but there are others which set them apart. Drawing upon the Greek definition of the term, Clark (1970) asserts that "leadership sometimes resides in a man who holds 'specific gifts of the body and spirit'" (p. 240) which make him "appear somewhat mysterious and larger than life" (Yukl, 1989, p. 25). Charismatics are change agents, they are dissatisfied with the status quo, opportunistic, conceptualizers, preachers, promoters, and "have always personified the forces of change, unconventionality, vision, and an entrepreneurial spirit" (Conger, 1989, pp. 4-7, 17). They are sensitive to the needs of their constituents, and persuasive communicators, using a variety of metaphors and styles of delivery by which to emphasize their ideas. The "ability to foresee strategic opportunities when combined with powerful communication skills is one of the unique features of these leaders" (Conger, p. 37). Gary Yukl (1989) identifies additional qualities, such as "personal magnetism, a dramatic...manner of speaking, strong enthusiasm, and strong convictions" (p. 25).

There is a rather dark side to charisma as well, however. Many charismatic leaders exhibit a "total intolerance for things that don't fit the vision" and will "reject them out of hand" (Conger, 1989, p. 6). Additionally, some are considered to be "excessively impulsive and autocratic....disruptive in their unconventional behavior....[and] poor managers of relations with peers and superiors. In many cases,

some of the very management practices that make these leaders unique are also responsible for their downfall" (Conger, p. 153).

Underpinning all of these characteristics, however, is the fact that charisma is in the eye of the beholder. Charismatic leaders do not operate in a vacuum. "Charisma is a function of the... perspectives of the rank and file as well as of a man's personal qualities....If others do not attribute charisma, then in that context the man does not have it" (Clark, 1970, pp. 241-242). Yukl (1989) concurs by stating, "charisma is believed to result from follower perceptions of leader qualities and behavior" (p. 205). Conger (1989) devotes a great deal of attention to analyzing the characteristics of the subordinates of charismatic leaders because of their importance in ascribing this characteristic. His research shows that "followers will exhibit willing obedience to the leader, high trust in the leader and attachment to him, a sense of empowerment, and a greater sense of group cohesion around shared beliefs as well as less internal group conflict. These are rather remarkable findings" (pp. 127-128). Subordinates also identify strongly with the charismatic leader, emulate his strengths and values, and develop such a deep emotional bond that their self-worth is often determined by their association with him (Conger, 1989, pp. 129-133). "While the outward aspects of motivating may appear similar to those of other leaders (setting high expectations, expressing confidence, delegating difficult challenges), the critical difference with charismatic leadership is the degree to which the leader's personal approval becomes the supreme reward and sign of acceptance" (Conger, p. 133). The effectiveness, then, of

charismatic leadership depends upon not only the leader, but the sentiments, and even the capriciousness, of the followers as well.

With this discussion of charismatic leadership to lay the foundation, the next three sections of this chapter cover the logical progression from an institution's role to the formulation of a mission, to the development of culture, on towards saga/ethos, and then the move toward distinctiveness, and the impact of charismatic leadership on the whole process.

Impact of charismatic leadership on an institution: Institutional role and mission.

On the surface, it would seem that an institution's role and an institution's mission are so similar as to be interchangeable definitions. This, however, is an erroneous and simplistic conclusion. Generally, every college and university has a role in the larger fabric of higher education, if one agrees with Clark's definition which states that "an organizational role entails both a basic method or way of performing and a place among organizations that carry on related activities" (1970, p. 234). There are three basic avenues by which an institutional role is developed: by outside forces which have authority over the administration, by inertia, or by strong leadership from within the institution itself (Clark, p. 234). It is the aggressiveness with which the role is pursued that helps to determine the actual presence of an institutional mission, a cause celebre.

When the leaders attempt to seize a role (or have forced upon them a dynamic social assignment that requires strong effort to define

and establish purpose), we may usefully speak of an organizational mission. When roles are fought for and actively assumed, the organization has the plan, the will, and then finally the capability to perform in certain ways that allow it to develop a niche in a larger social mosaic. In these terms, all colleges have roles, but only some have missions. (Clark, 1970, p. 234)

Before the administrative team can develop a plan to propel the institution into a new or revised mission, however, there must be a vision or dream of what can be, what is most desired. Kouzes and Posner (1987) assert that "every organization, every social movement begins with a dream. The dream or vision is the force that invents the future" (p. 9). "Not much happens without a dream. And for something great to happen, there must be a great dream. Behind every great achievement is a dreamer of great dreams. Much more than a dreamer is required to bring it to reality; but the dream must be there first" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 16). Most often, the president of the institution is the individual who is expected to be the "dreamer of great dreams." And it is the charismatic leader who is usually most successful at marshalling the forces to make the dream a reality. Clark (1970) proposes:

The great-man theory of history has a specific version in education in the frequent claim that the institution, especially the noteworthy one, is the lengthened shadow of one man. In the history of the successful college, so the interpretation goes, lurks the forceful president (or regent) who made it what it is today. Therefore, the personality of an individual is the



ultimate factor in institution-building; the key to success is to find the strong leader. (p. 240)

All schools have roles, some institutions have missions, and the strength of the mission is principally effected by the president in whom the initial dream or vision rests.

#### Institutional culture and saga.

Most institutions typically have a history, usually real and somewhat fabricated, around which their constituents rally. Kuh and Whitt (1988) describe this as "culture," which they define as being the "persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus" (p. iv). These elements, "when thought of as nested patterns of cultural behavior, have a pervasive, far-reaching influence on institutional life" (p. iii). They further contend that the nuances of institutional culture are often difficult to understand and that unraveling the complexities of this phenomenon is much like peeling an onion, the layers of which merge in such a way that "it is not always obvious where one layer ends and the next begins" (p. 41). Schein (1985) states that organizational culture should be taught to new members of the group to give them a proper context within which to evaluate the problems with which the institution is faced.

Methodology used to study culture in discreet segments include "observing participants, interviewing key informants, conducting autobiographical interviews, and analyzing documents" (Schein, 1985,

p. viii), research techniques which are also used in developing case studies. While the institutional documents analyzed normally represent mainstream publications and reports, John Thelin (1976, 1982) makes a persuasive case for also perusing such items as public relations materials, college souvenirs and memorabilia, and other non-traditional elements—which historians typically ignore—as "serious and useful indicators of institutional life" (1976, p. 1). Examining stories, myths, symbols, rites and rituals can also reveal interesting aspects of institutional culture which may not be uncovered through more overt avenues (Birnbaum, 1988; Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Institutional sagas propel the phenomenon of culture one step further. Clark (1970) states:

Initially, the mission [of an institution] is simply purpose, something men in the organization hold before themselves. But the mission tested and successfully embodied through the work of a number of years does not remain a statement of intent, a direction, a guidepost. It becomes a saga that tells what the organization has been and what it is today—and hence by extension what it will be tomorrow....The institutional saga is a historically based, somewhat embellished understanding of a unique organizational development. It offers in the present a particular definition of the organization as a whole and suggests common characteristics of members. Its definitions are deeply institutionalized by many members, thereby becoming a part, even an unconscious part, of individual motive....A saga is then a mission made total across a system in space and time.

(pp. 234-235)

There is a sense of romance and mystery attached to an institution's saga (Clark, 1970). It is that amorphous but pervasive quality, an "'air about the place'" (Clark, 1970, p. 254), that compels even shy members of the organization to wax eloquently about the virtues of their beloved school and provides a larger, more magnificent framework within which they view their day to day activities. "Emotion is invested to the point where many participants significantly define themselves by the central theme of the organization" (Clark, p. 235). Kuh and Whitt (1988) describe saga as "ethos" in which "deeply held beliefs and guiding principles [are] the moral and aesthetic aspects of culture that reflect and set the tone, character, and quality of institutional life" (p. 47). They eloquently term this integration of an institution's history, values, traditions, and individual personalities as the "invisible tapestry or cultural web" (p. 98) that binds the participants together into a cohesive whole.

Just what is the role of institutional leadership in either the creating or the sustaining of a school's saga? Some purport that "individuals often loom larger than life [note that Yukl (1989, p. 25) uses this phrase to describe the charismatic leader] in the making of an organizational saga and sustaining a campus culture. Some have described the college president as the symbolic embodiment of the institution" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. 72). While numerous histories of colleges and universities recount stories about important individuals whose strong personalities helped to shape the culture and saga of an institution, "only in some has a man or group of men had the opportunity and the will to devise a plan, test and reform it actively

over a number of years, and have it reflected in the thought and style [saga, if you will] of the organization" (Clark, 1970, p. 234).

Richardson (1971) also affirms the importance of the "strong and preferably charismatic leader" (p. 516) as one of the key elements in the development of a strong institutional saga.

Leadership and the development of a viable culture and saga are inextricably intertwined. Culture "'causes' the organization to be predisposed to certain kinds of leadership. In that sense, the mature [organization], through its culture...creates its own leaders.... Leaders create culture, but cultures, in turn, create their next generation of leaders" (Schein, 1985, p. 313).

#### Institutional distinctiveness.

With any number of avenues open to a discussion of "institutional distinctiveness"—that which sets a school favorably apart from its peers—it would be tempting, but not particularly germane, to examine this topic from a variety of angles. This section will, therefore, be limited to a brief analysis of distinctiveness as it relates to saga, conditions under which a goal of distinctiveness can be initiated, and the importance of the charismatic leader in this endeavor.

To recap briefly, all schools have roles, some have missions, and of those, some then develop compelling cultures and sagas. Clark (1970) cites "a strong organizational saga or legend as the central ingredient of the distinctive college" (p. 234), aided by the institution's internal and particularly the external publics's enthusiastic endorsement of the saga to help ensure its validation and perpetuation. "To the extent that outsiders believe in it, a college

achieves a differentiated, protected position in the markets and organizational complexes that allocate money, personnel, and students....The idea of the distinctive college is also present in its public image, in the impressions held by outsiders" (Clark, 1970, pp. 250, 254). But a college or university usually does not arrive at this pinnacle of respect by accident.

There are three general scenarios in which a distinctive character is pursued: it can be a new institution with no previous history which, therefore, has the opportunity to create its own unique saga; it can be an existing college in crisis; or it can be a school that exhibits "evolutionary openness" (Clark, 1970, p. 237) to change. While the first two conditions would be interesting to explore, a discussion of the third is more appropriate to this study, particularly with emphasis upon the leader's contribution, as the third more aptly describes Madison College at its critical crossroads in 1970.

One can surmise that any number of institutions in American higher education would covet the label "distinctive," but wishing for as opposed to pursuing conscientiously that designation are, obviously, quite different. It is at this point that the "dreamer of great dreams," usually the president, must build upon the skeleton of the notion with the flesh and sinew of actions designed to make it so.

When we look for how distinctive emphasis gets under way, we find typically a single individual, usually the president, or a very small group. The innovator formulates a new idea, a mission; he has, with varying degrees of deliberateness, found his way to a particular college that is in a particular stage of development

and that is structurally open, and he starts to design appropriate means of embodying his idea in the organization and to enhance the conduciveness of the setting. (Clark, 1970, p. 255)

Additionally, a situation for change is helped when the "followers are otherwise dissatisfied with the status quo" (Yukl, 1989, p. 209) and, therefore, more amenable to change, particularly when they can adopt the leader's vision or dream as their own (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, pp. 9-10). When an institution is at a major turning point, the situation is then ripe for charismatic leadership to emerge (Yukl, p. 207).

In most cases, the leader of the institution formulates the vision for the direction of the school and the means by which to proceed toward the goal of distinctiveness, and factors which he should consider include the geographic location, the size of the institution, "traditional clientele, entrenched personnel, and fixed reputation" (Clark, 1970, p. 236). But "simply having a vision is itself insufficient to motivate and inspire a work force. It is the words chosen to describe the vision and the manner of communicating that give the vision its power" (Conger, 1989, p. 67). Charismatic leaders are most adept at the art of persuasion, particularly on the emotional level, structuring their talks "like symphonies, and [using] their personal energy to radiate excitement about their plans" (Conger, p. 69). Through their delivery, body language, enthusiasm, and exhibiting "an extraordinary level of personal commitment to the vision" (Conger, p. 94), these charismatics build a deep sense of trust resulting in their subordinates "buying into" their concepts. It takes all of the constituencies to make the dream of distinction a

reality, but it also requires an astute leader to conduct the orchestra and keep them playing on the same sheet of music.

#### And Then, There is Dr. Carrier

Scholars differ as to whether or not a college or university is, indeed, the lengthened shadow of one man. Walker (1984) asserts:

The view of the university as the shadow of a strong president is unrealistic now...if indeed it was ever accurate....Of course, the president is and should be an important part of the process of change. But campuses simply do not change permanently in response to the decisions and the will of a single person. (p. 118)

Birnbaum (1988), however, views institutions as "the long shadow of great leaders" (p. 21), and Clark (1970) affirms that in the history of the noteworthy school "lurks the forceful president (or regent) who made it what it is today....The key to success is to find the strong leader" (p. 240).

Based upon a variety of resources, to include the comments made by the majority of individuals interviewed formally and informally for this study, from administrators and students at James Madison University to others associated peripherally with the school, the safe assumption can be made that these individuals would disagree with Walker's assertion. They would argue that Dr. Carrier, "Uncle Ron" to the students, is indeed the embodiment of all that JMU is today. Wallace Chandler, a member of the Board of Visitors which hired Dr. Carrier and former rector of the board, states that Dr. Carrier "IS JMU" (First Decade, 1981, p. 13). This section of Chapter Four examines Dr. Carrier's presidency by comparing it with selected

characteristics drawn from Clark Kerr's analysis and by examining his leadership style in light of the charismatic leader. Discussion of the effect of his leadership on Madison/James Madison University's institutional role, mission, culture, saga, and road to distinctiveness will be covered in subsequent chapters which focus on marketing strategies.

Clark Kerr's president and Dr. Carrier.

In the lengthy quotation from Kerr's The Uses of the University (1982) cited earlier in this chapter on pages 61-62, he cites numerous characteristics which the "ideal" college or university president should exhibit, with the caveat added that "no one can be all of these things. Some succeed at being none" (p. 30). A perusal of Dr. Carrier's presidency in light of a number of these characteristics is one viable framework within which to examine his leadership of Madison/James Madison University. Although the format I have selected for this section and the section titled "Dr. Carrier as the 'Charismatic Leader'" (pp. 88-95) may be considered unorthodox, my judgment is that it best highlights the characteristics and responses.

Friend of the students: Dr. Carrier is affectionately called "Uncle Ron" by the student body, a designation which he instituted and encouraged upon assuming the presidency of Madison and which is still intact to a large degree today. In the early years, he prided himself on knowing every student by name, a fact which he regrets is now precluded by the size of enrollment at the institution. He is quick to respond to students' needs, even in situations which to some, at a cursory glance, would seem unimportant. Gary Beatty, Associate



Director of Admissions, relates:

We were having trouble administratively getting microcomputers, and the students were complaining about not having enough of them. Dr. Carrier found out about it, and they got their computers almost instantaneously ....I don't know of any other president in this state who serves hamburgers in the dining hall on certain days. He knows what the menus are, and if students don't like a particular menu, he'll get it changed....There were students working in the dining hall, and there was a cash register there where students had to stand up to take money and tickets. There wasn't any seating there, and they griped about it. And he took care of it. (Interview, 1990, August 4)

Two years ago, students held a raffle to raise funds, the winner of which switched places for a day with Dr. Carrier. The student who won the prize became president for the day, to include conversing with the governor's office, and the president attended the student's classes and stayed in the dorm. The story goes that Dr. Carrier supplied a pizza party for the entire dormitory.

Colleague of the faculty: Dr. Russell Warren, former Vice President for Academic Affairs and now president of Northeast Missouri State University, supplied the results a recent survey conducted by the Faculty Senate of Virginia in which faculty members at a number of the state's colleges and universities were asked to respond to a variety of statements related to their teaching conditions. The answers elicited from JMU's faculty were compared with the combined responses from the other institutions, and the answers were ranked from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied." In response to the

statement "quality of chief administrative officers at this campus," 71.4 percent of the JMU faculty were somewhat or very satisfied as compared with 57.6 percent of the other schools. Also, 72.1 percent of JMU's faculty were somewhat or very satisfied with the relationship between administration and faculty as compared with 48.6 percent of the faculty at brother institutions. Using the results of this survey as a guideline, the JMU faculty members were generally much more satisfied with their overall teaching conditions than their colleagues at other schools in the state. Dr. William Nelson (Inspiration to Excellence, 1986) also affirms this view. "He's always been supportive of the faculty. He understands their interests, their problems and their motivations. I think he's the best practicing psychologist I've ever seen" (p. 17). Dr. Lin Rose, Vice President for Administration and Finance at James Madison, relates that Dr. Carrier has "set a tone with the faculty that while we don't always have all the resources that we need to do the job, that no one is going to work harder to get additional resources than he does" (Interview, 1990, April 10), even circumventing the administrative bureaucracy if necessary.

Sound administrator with trustees: Traditionally, the most important activity of a Board of Trustees at a college or university is to hire and fire the president of the institution. The fact that Dr. Carrier has remained president of Madison/James Madison University for twenty years, when the usual tenure of the office is less than five years and "college presidents change almost as frequently as football coaches" (Stokes, 1959, p. 15), attests to the confidence placed in him by the school's Board of Visitors.

Good speaker with the public: Dr. Carrier is sought after as a speaker and must decline more invitations than he can accept. In November, 1989, for instance, the Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce called upon him at the last moment to address a luncheon at which a top Soviet official was to speak but was unable to do so. Donning his hat as economist, he spoke of Virginia's position within the framework of world economic conditions into the twenty-first century, his thoughts laced with the humor that has become a trademark. When his speech was concluded, the moderator stated that Dr. Carrier should have been a preacher.

Politician with the state legislature: When Dr. Carrier assumed the presidency of Madison College in 1970, he was young and a virtual unknown to state legislators. That factor, along with the fact that Madison did not have a strong legislative constituency, created large obstacles for the new president. Although Tyler Miller had been well-respected in Richmond for his work toward the teaching profession, Dr. Carrier had to make his own way and create his own opportunities for the institution. And he lost no time in getting acquainted with the various legislators. When asked how he managed to gain favor with the state legislature, he responded:

You have to be clear on what you want, and you tell them, and you don't deviate from that....It's clear what you want, and clear who you are, and that you are honest with them....I don't see these people just in the General Assembly. I take these people to dinner. I call them and ask them how they are, how their families are. I send them a note to see if there's anything I can do. I call them to see if there's anything I can do all year long. So

it is a personal relationship....I give legislators problems they can solve and then work with them....I think alot like a legislator. I guess that's the reason why I get along with them....I tell people that I'm sitting [in Richmond] having dinner with a legislator at seven o'clock and hell, I could be home. Then I really say I love it, though. I really like doing that. There are people who don't like it, but I enjoy it. (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10).

Administrators at James Madison and colleagues in higher education and the state legislature alike attest to his political accumen as being one of his strongest qualities. Dr. Frank Doherty, Assistant Director of Planning and Analysis, believes that "as a politician, he's a master" (Interview, 1989, November 10). Dr. Russell Warren states, "He's a common man that is a university president, and I mean that as a compliment. He's not an Ivy League kind of person that is untouchable. The legislature especially knows that" (Interview, 1990, April 10). Alan Cerveny, Director of Admissions, asserts that "he is an excellent politician" (Interview, 1989, July 19), and Dr. Linwood Rose likewise affirms the president's expertise by stating:

He is the dean of college presidents [in Virginia], he has been around the longest, he has the most experience with the legislature, and I think he is respected for that. I think the other presidents respect him for that....He is able to talk with any of the staff members of the governor's staff, such as budget analysts and the Department of Planning and Budget, whereas I think other presidents are probably a little uncomfortable dealing at all with those various levels of government. Most of the

presidents prefer to deal with the Secretary of Education or Gordon Davies rather than some of their staff people. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

William B. Spong, Jr., whose former positions include the presidency of Old Dominion University, U.S. Senator for Virginia, and dean of the William and Mary law school, attributes Dr. Carrier's longevity at James Madison to "good humor, acute political perception, and understanding of how the political system operates. He doesn't need any help in knowing where to go or who to talk to about certain problems. I think that much of that is something that you are born with" (Interview, 1990, May 17). Dr. Carrier has also been courted to run for both the senate and the governorship of Virginia by the major political parties and was asked to run against United States Senator John Warner as the Democratic candidate by then Governor Charles Robb. In support of this action, "Alan Diamonstein, chairman of the state Democratic party, praised Carrier's intelligence and speaking talents. 'Ron Carrier is a name that has been bounced around [to run for office] as a fantastic name for the last six months'" (Breeze, 1984, February 13, p. 2). But he declined the offer, stating that he was still content to serve as president of James Madison University and that as a non-elected public official, he did not want to reveal his political affiliation (p. 1).

Friend of industry, labor, and agriculture: An emphasis of Dr. Carrier's presidency has been to foster and maintain amiable ties with the Harrisonburg community, and one way he has accomplished this by serving on numerous commissions created by the city and Rockbridge County to study various economic factors relating to the area. His

activities include his appointments to the Appalachian Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development in 1977 and the Downtown Development Corporation for Harrisonburg in 1982, created to "generate business and services in the downtown area" (Breeze, 1982, March 16, p. 5). His expertise has been sought on the state and national levels as well. In 1975, he was appointed by Governor Mills Godwin to chair the Governor's Electricity Cost Commission, a group comprised of diverse constituencies created to study all aspects of Virginia's energy situation. In the article appearing in the April 4, 1975 Breeze, Dr. Carrier states that "the commission is a landmark study in the U.S.....People all over the nation will be watching us because this is the first study of its kind" (p. 1). In 1978, Governor Godwin selected Dr. Carrier as one of eight Virginians, and the only academic president, to attend the White House Conference on Balanced National Growth and Economic Development. And in 1986, Dr. Carrier took a one year leave of absence from the institution to serve as president of the Center for Innovative Technology, an organization for which he is currently Chairman of the Board.

Persuasive diplomat with donors: Steve Smith, former Alumni Director at JMU and now Director of Development at Bridgewater College, relates a story which illustrates this presidential characteristic (Interview, 1989, August 17). In the mid-1980s, Dr. Carrier wandered into a university committee meeting and, much to the surprise of the participants, announced that he wanted the school to hold an art auction, the works for which were to be solicited donations, to raise money to fund art scholarships. What began as a simple proposal escalated quickly into a "black tie" affair which drew

500 people and raised \$30,000. Because the first two auctions were successful, the fete is now held annually in the spring at the Homestead resort in West Virginia. Additionally, when he assumed his post in 1970, total gifts to the institution totalled just over \$70,000 (Madison College Catalog, 1970-71), an amount which increased to \$341,451 by 1980, \$1,127,425 in 1985, and \$2,313,116 in the 1989-90 fiscal year, a 23 percent increase over the previous year (Rooney, personal communication, 1990, October 29). Glenda Rooney, Director of Information Services in the Development Office, reports that financial support from the parents is "right at 50 percent" (Personal communication).

A good fellow with the alumni: Although James Madison University had had an alumni association for many years, Steve Smith relates that until the mid-1980s when he was hired as the Alumni Director from his position in the Admissions Office, the contact with alumni was limited to five or six mailings per year for donations. Glenda Rooney adds that when Steve Smith was hired, it was the strongest statement from the president's office that alumni were important to the university (Personal communication, 1990, October 29). With full support from Dr. Carrier, Mr. Smith instituted a number of changes within the Alumni Association, to include the first publication of an alumni directory and newspaper, invitations to special on-campus events, the JMU license plate which was the first of its kind in the state, and the acquisition of a full set of yearbooks (Interview, 1989, August 17). There were also alumni chapters all along, but it was not until Sarah Milan was hired as the Associate Alumni Director in 1987 that these groups became truly organized. Ms. Milan recently was

selected as the Alumni Director when Mr. Smith assumed his new role as Development Director of Bridgewater College. Perhaps the most important statistic that can be given regarding the alumni, and one which underscores their attachment to their school, is that 34.19 percent donated funds during the last fiscal year, a percentage exceeded only by the alumni of the University of Virginia on the national level (Rooney, personal communication, 1990, October 29).

Champion of education generally: Dr. Carrier's educational concerns are nonparochial, and his activities in the state legislature during the 1989-90 session support this assertion. Governor Wilder had inherited state fiscal problems which would affect funding for higher education as well as other agencies, and the presidents of the state institutions were busy revamping their own budgets and lobbying legislators for their own projects. Recognizing the immediate need for the presidents to speak with one voice to the legislators concerning budget restorations, Dr. Carrier spearheaded the effort to come to some common ground and understanding....And for the first time in a long time the presidents have come to agreement on what we should do in the budget....I was probably as good as I've ever been in mobilizing every one of those presidents. I had every one of them, all fifteen, going in the same direction, all agreeing to meet and agreeing to an agenda. Now, part of that is the fact of desperation, but no one would step forward. I'm not the chairman of the group [but Dr. Hockaday and I] made a good team because I sort of forced things, and he then chaired and provided the processing skills....I had people say...that it would have never happened if I hadn't taken hold of it and done it, and no one else



was doing it....We didn't let any institutional priorities enter [the negotiations for funding for higher education as a whole].

(Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24)

William B. Spong, Jr. affirms that Dr. Carrier "is not only an effective advocate of his own institution, but he has been fairly constructive in taking a general view of higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia. And I found him constructive and not petty" (Interview, 1990, May 17). He further adds that he believes that the president has been "in front of most developments in Virginia that have lifted the level of the colleges in general" (Interview).

Supporter of the professions: Early in his presidency, Dr. Carrier recognized the need to offer pre-professional courses to maintain a competitive edge in academe and to attract more male students to the campus. The end result were programs which appealed to both male and female students alike.

Instead of [just] teaching chemistry teachers, we had to start teaching pre-med programs....We added alot of programs that were geared toward coeducational institutions but [which] certainly benefitted the women because now we have more accounting majors in women than we have in men. We probably have more women going to law school than men. We probably have more women going to med school than men. (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 11)

And one of the most important courses of study for which Dr. Carrier actively lobbied for several years and which was eventually established in 1980 was the nursing program.

Scholar in his own right: The president keeps abreast of his chosen field of economics. As has been stated previously, Virginia governors have sought his expertise and leadership on commissions dealing with economic and energy issues which have faced the state over the years. In addition to writing the book Plant Locations: A Theory and Explanations (1968), Dr. Carrier has published approximately thirty-five articles and monographs on economics and education.

Devotee of opera and football equally: While Dr. Carrier's personal passion is baseball, along with his credible showing on the tennis court from time to time, he can be found cheering for the Dukes' and Duchesses' various teams when he is on campus. Chuck Cunningham, JMU Class of 1981, states, "not only was he accessible to students in his office and around campus, but he also managed to attend sporting events and visit all the legislators in Richmond. We used to joke that there must be more than one Ronald Carrier. He was everywhere!" (Inspiration, 1986, p. 9). He has been known to participate as an athlete in halftime activities in addition to tossing out the traditional first ball of the baseball season. Dr. Carrier likewise supports the arts at James Madison, recognizing that the institution represents an important cultural center for the community, with the school sponsoring the Fine Arts Series and the Festival of the Arts in addition to student productions and concerts. Also, the total music program expanded under his leadership, and the marching band has been asked on a number of occasions to play for the Redskins' halftime program. And as part of the wholistic approach to student development espoused by the president, students are encouraged

to participate in dramatic productions, art shows, and other artistic endeavors.

Decent human being: When asked if he could include only one item about himself in this dissertation, Dr. Carrier paused and then replied:

What would it be? About me? I'm a real good human being, and I run a school like that. I run the institution like that. The school runs on the basis of that human element. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

If I have any strength, it's in making people feel good about things. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

Many others perceive him in the same way, primarily because his decency lies in the fact that he treats them with respect, regardless of society-imposed station. "He was as comfortable in meeting with President Ford as he is with one of our building and grounds men who is planting rose bushes, and they're equally comfortable with him" (Dr. Julius Roberson in Inspiration, 1986, p. 17). Whether he is striding through the halls of the legislature or on his own campus, he speaks with virtually everyone, and usually by name. He is often late for his appointments because of extemporaneous conversations.

Dr. Carrier keeps his finger on the pulsebeat of the institution, finding it particularly important to assess the atmosphere of the campus after he returns from a lengthy trip. After one such excursion earlier in 1990, he walked through the dining hall to let people know, by his presence there, that he was back on campus and to sense the morale.

I can pick it [morale] up. I can sense it. I can feel it when I touch people. When I touch people, I can sense if they are happy. If they are sad, I can tell, and I know. (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24)

Dr. Carrier on the presidency.

While it is necessary for this study to examine Dr. Carrier's leadership through a variety of "third person" comparisons and with scholarly sources as a springboard, valuable insights about the man himself can also be gleaned through his own thoughts on the nature of the academic presidency.

On the overall qualities which presidents should exhibit, he responded characteristically, "if you go to UVa or William and Mary or any of the schools in the country, and you can describe the president and the qualities he has to have, hell, I don't fall into any of them. I am not the typical college president, and I think that's why I've survived so long" (Interview, 1989, November 10). During a later conversation, Dr. Carrier related that the presidential search committee for the University of Virginia had asked him to submit a resume. In typical Carrier fashion, he quipped that if they wanted him badly enough, they could drive the forty minutes up the interstate to talk with him personally. As to whether or not he would have accepted the position, he guffawed and said, "that would be like asking Andrew Jackson to take Thomas Jefferson's place!" (Interview, 1990, January 24).

In response to the question of how he would characterize his administrative style, Dr. Carrier stated that his style is "sort of

the appearance of alot of hands on, but not much hands on. I appear that I'm running things, that I'm in charge of everything, but I'm not. I really am not....I have good people, and they have plans" (Interview, 1989, November 10). He further added:

My style is one of decisiveness....My job as president is to set the tone so that people realize that there are things that have to be done....It's the job of the president to anticipate, to be visionary, and to make people feel good about the changes....I tell the staff that the worst thing that could happen to this institution is not that Ron Carrier leaves. It [would be] that he doesn't change and he doesn't accomodate change. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

When asked during our first interview the advice he would give to an individual assuming an academic presidency for the first time, Dr. Carrier offered revealing insights, delineating, perhaps inadvertently, several characteristics associated with charismatic leadership, a fitting lead-in to the next section:

Be a great leader. Always make people feel good about themselves. Make them feel like that can do [the job]....Be visionary. Keep people focused on the greatness and not just on the everyday problems....Be inspirational. Make them feel good about themselves. Make them feel that [the goal] is going to come....If you keep telling people good things, ultimately, it will pay off. So I would suggest that you be visionary, that you always have a vision of what the institution could be, and always hold that out, and always talk about that, and always inspire people...to do better than they are doing....You should have some

academic credentials ...and have a high energy level. If you don't have alot of energy, you can't do it. You cannot do it. I mean, I work here all day and then I'll go home and stand at a door and greet people coming for a reception, or I'll go out to dinner or cocktails or go to a basketball game or another event....The other thing is to have a sense of humor. I mean, don't take yourself too damn seriously. (1989, November 10)

Dr. Carrier is very prone to laugh at himself and take himself lightly, but he is "all business" and focused where his institution is concerned.

Dr. Carrier as the "charismatic leader".

Because research has established that charisma is viable only insofar as this attribute is perceived by others, particularly the leader's peers, followers or subordinates, several characteristics extrapolated from this chapter's section discussing charismatic leadership are examined below in relation to Dr. Carrier's leadership style from the points of view of his own staff members. Their comments are responses to the simple question posed to each of these individuals during their interviews: "How would you assess Dr. Carrier's leadership style?" The comments are taken from personal interviews conducted from 1989 and 1990, the dates for which are listed in the bibliography and, therefore, not included in this section so as not to interrupt the flow of the commentary.

Change agent/dissatisfied with the status quo: Dr. Robert Scott, acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, relates:

One of the things that [people at JMU] find so appealing is the receptiveness to change. My theory is that one of the important reasons why it's possible is because there has been a continuity of leadership here....Change is just sort of a way of life among the administrators....The president is one of the reasons why we have change.

Dr. Russell Warren states that Dr. Carrier "does not get attached to his old agenda....We get a 'different' president periodically which I think is, in fact, his greatest strength." Dr. Linwood Rose and Gary Beatty likewise confirm this penchant for change. "We move pretty quickly. I think the faculty and staff would confirm that" (Rose). "[Dr. Carrier] will establish something, but if he finds that it's not working, he doesn't mind changing it and going in another direction. That causes a little concern, but that's dynamic leadership. He keeps everybody on their toes" (Beatty).

Opportunistic/conceptualizer: Dr. Al Menard, acting Vice President for Student Affairs, states that he does not think that "anyone doubted that Dr. Carrier has an idea of where we should be heading. Many of the ideas that are unfolding now...are ideas that are ten years old." Dr. Warren relates that "he does not let folks stay in their job so long that they get stale....The positions turn over almost before people get a chance to get stale."

Visionary: Both Steve Smith and Dr. Menard affirm that Dr. Carrier leads as a visionary. Dean Ehlers, Athletic Director for nearly twenty years and part of the "Memphis Mafia/Carrier's Pidgeons," the contingency so designated by the student underground newspaper and which Dr. Carrier ostensibly brought with him to Madison

from Memphis State, likewise states that "the man has extraordinary long-term vision. It seems that he can see what is down the road and see the big picture to determine what needs to be done as well as anybody I've ever known."

Entrepreneurial spirit: In discussing Dr. Carrier's style of leadership, Dr. Doherty encapsulates his thoughts in one concise term, "entrepreneurial," offering this evaluation with some frustration. It seems that, because of the nature of this administrative division which deals with statistics and which requires thoughtful and sometimes time-consuming analysis, a "monkey wrench" has been thrown into the system occasionally when the president has requested an immediate report or piece of information.

Unconventional behavior: Gary Beatty states that he is not aware of "any other president in this state that serves hamburgers in the dining hall on certain days....You can [even] see him walking around campus picking up trash....He makes policies and then circumvents them! But that's dynamic leadership."

Less interested in details: This is an intriguing characteristic to include in the list because in many ways, this trait does fit. But by the same token, Dr. Carrier also becomes very involved with minutiae. Dr. Rose relates that the president

has no fondness at all for memos and stating positions. He doesn't like memos flying back and forth from one administrator to another. If it's important enough to sit down and write a memo about it, then go and see the person and talk about it and work out the differences....If you look at a lot of leadership literature these days...what most people are saying is "don't get



bogged down with bureaucracy and don't lose sight of what you want to accomplish, and deal with people." He's been doing that for years. So I think that is one of his primary strengths....He just has no appreciation at all for, I'll say "immediate tasks."

Dr. Doherty observes that Dr. Carrier does not want to be "paralyzed by planning," and Dr. Scott states that the reason why the president is "less of a 'hands on' kind of administrator" is because of the quality and flexibility of the administrative staff that he has assembled over the years. Dr. Daniel adds that the president "doesn't look for another strong magnetic personality who is a creative thinker or an idea person. What we need are people who can carry out ideas and who can implement new things and follow through, and who can take a rough stone and make a shiny rock out of it. That's the kind of people he surrounds himself with." On the other hand, Gary Beatty reports that if, on one of Dr. Carrier's walks through the campus, he notes an area which needs a tree, two days later a tree will have been planted in that spot. Likewise, he relates that "[Dr. Carrier] came over to this office three years ago, and this place was looking shabby. And he wanted it totally redecorated in a first class fashion. And it was." Beatty adds that, while the administrators have been given "a free hand to do their own thing, [Dr. Carrier] is also going to be, at times, the Director of Admissions, the Director of Financial Aid, the Director of Food Services, and the Director of Security." It would seem, then, that the president generally becomes involved in those details or concerns which can be quickly solved and usually tends to leave larger departmental concerns to the appropriate administrators.

Persuasive communicator: Comments made by Dr. Rose and Dr. Henry Willett, former president of Longwood College and longtime colleague of Dr. Carrier, best describe his style of communication. "He has an ability to relate in a one-to-one fashion with whoever his audience is....He comes across as a very 'down to earth' person who is able to talk with anyone" (Rose). Dr. Willett affirms that he "cannot overemphasize his ability to talk with varied groups and to use that homespun humor and philosophy to captivate an audience," also adding that he thoroughly enjoyed the tales with which Dr. Carrier would regale the other presidents when they would meet together.

Sensitive to the needs of constituents: Dr. Rose says that "if somebody desperately needs something to do their job, [Dr. Carrier] is not going to run the request back through every level of bureaucracy ....Sometimes that creates problems for administration, but that's our job." He also adds, "no matter how busy he is, no matter what is going on around him, he still has this uncanny ability to be out on the campus and know what is going on."

Confidence builder: Dr. Menard relates a story that illustrates the fact that Dr. Carrier's administrators have a great deal of confidence in his leadership. When the new Associate Director of Student Activities was hired in 1989, she immediately took notice that the institution was lacking appropriate recreational facilities. She asked whether or not a recommendation had been made to the president for a new building.

We all looked at her like she was crazy! "No, of course not."  
She thought, "what are you people doing? Have you fallen asleep here? You pride yourself, and you haven't made a recommendation

when there is so much needed?" And we said, "we don't need to....Our president will take care of us. He knows without us telling him, he knows the needs, and at the right time the proposals will come forward." It was within a month that we made a believer of her because the proposal came out for an \$18 million recreational facility just southwest of the Convocation Center. Now, there was never a written recommendation for that, but we didn't need to send it to him. He knew that. (Menard)

Personal magnetism: While the administrators interviewed did not use this term per se, evidence that Dr. Carrier draws people to himself and to the institution with which he is so closely identified is apparent in the large number of his staff members who have remained at the school for more than fifteen years. While it cannot be overlooked that lack of mobility in the academic profession contributes to this phenomenon, these individuals nevertheless exude a quiet, and sometimes very vocal, enthusiasm for their president and their university which is clear in many of their other comments related in this study.

Strong enthusiasm/convictions: Dr. Menard states that Dr. Carrier is a "tremendous source of optimism....Over the years [he] and [other administrators] have selected people with that enthusiasm and that positive nature." He adds that the president's "commitment to this institution is almost all-consuming." Gary Beatty relates that "this [institution] is Dr. Carrier's 'baby,' and he doesn't want anybody messing with it. And I'm delighted that he has taken that viewpoint." According to Dean Ehlers's observations, the president

has a very strong sense of what he wants and has a way of making all his subordinates see that that is the best way so that you really believe that you are a part of it....He makes you so aware of the fact that what he is projecting is so good, that you join in and agree that it's a great idea...and was able to get the resources to make it possible. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

There are also characteristics of the charismatic leader which are not so flattering and which have a tendency to unnerve the constituents from time to time.

Intolerance: Dr. Rose poses the question, "is he impatient with things that get in the way? That is true," and Dr. Daniel states very simply, "he is a perfectionist." He further adds that Dr. Carrier is "tough but he's flexible. He can bawl people out and he can pick them up when they've fallen down."

Autocratic manner: Several administrators comment about Dr. Carrier's sometimes overbearing manner. Dr. Scott says that "sometimes he's more 'hands on' than you want him to be, but if you understand where he's coming from, then that's acceptable," and Gary Beatty relates that "he's in charge, and occasionally he'll let people now he's in charge." According to Dr. Warren, "alot of people immediately around the president occasionally operate under fear. You never know when that attack might break loose from the president's office. I can't tell you that it's healthy; I can only tell you that it's effective." Dr. Menard states that he believes that there are some individuals who would say that Dr. Carrier is "a 'benevolent dictator.' I think that was probably much more appropriate in the early years when he truly had a 'hands on' approach to everything,"

and he prefers to characterize the president as being more of a "benevolent father." Dr. Rose likewise believes that "'dictator' is too strong a word" to use to describe Dr. Carrier. Perhaps the most comical, but telling, statement comes from Dean Ehlers, who has known Dr. Carrier for more than twenty-five years, and who laughingly relates: "I think [Dr. Carrier] described [his leadership style] best one time when he said, 'we have a democracy, and I'm it!'"

To summarize, more often than not, individuals identify Dr. Carrier as being the primary force behind the transformation of Madison College into James Madison University. Wallace Chandler states that the presidential search committee was seeking out a "dynamic leader" who could capitalize on the opportunities facing Madison College in 1970 (First Decade, 1982, p. 1). Dean Ehlers asserts that the transformation is "because of him [Dr. Carrier]. It's as simple as that" (Interview, 1990, April 10). Additionally, from 1970 until 1982, the editors of the school's yearbook, the Bluestone, opted not to dedicate the publication to a specific individual. The tradition was resurrected with the Diamond Edition in 1983, however, with the book honoring Dr. Carrier who "has had perhaps more impact on this institution than any president before him" (p. 3). Dr. Daniel appropriately sums up the feelings: "He's dynamic, he's effective, he's organized, he's energetic, and he epitomizes what people think of leadership."

#### Preparing the Troops: His First Year

Even before his arrival at the campus, Dr. Carrier recognized the need to evaluate both the role and future mission of Madison College,

particularly in light of the campus unrest, changing student values, and the uncertainty that necessarily accompanies a new regime. But he also realized that if changes were to be instituted successfully, he had to win the confidence, trust, and loyalty of his constituents, the faculty in particular. "A single leader, a college president, can initiate change, but the idea does not go far unless ranking and powerful members of the faculty swing into line and remain committed" (Clark, 1970, p. 246).

Sensing that the window of opportunity was open to charting a different course because the tone of the campus was "structurally open," (Clark, 1970, p. 255), Dr. Carrier was determined to get to know as many individuals as possible during his first year in order to build rapport and to seek out their ideas and concerns as to the direction Madison College should take. The president relates that the faculty was essentially divided into three camps in 1970: those who would support the system, no matter who was at the helm, those who were unhappy with the Miller years because they did not feel that necessary program changes were accommodated properly, and those that would not support any changes to the school.

I tried to deal with [the disparate groups] by meeting with the faculty members. Every week I had a group of faculty members over for drinks together in the president's dining room in which I talked to them and answered questions about where we were going so as to keep them informed. (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24)

Dr. Carrier also made an effort to become acquainted with the students, wanting to reinforce the fact that he was going to be visible, accessible, caring, and their "Uncle Ron." In addition to

eating in the dining hall regularly, attending student events, and talking with students as he took walks on campus, he also "had students at the house twice a week. They'd sit on the floor and eat Reuben sandwiches. The first semester I went through every dormitory twice" (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24). Dr. Carrier did not detect any resistance in these meetings, even though "there probably was, but when you were young like that [referring to himself], you didn't pay any attention" (Interview, 1990, January 24).

The president also realized that his relationship with the members of his administrative staff whom he had inherited from his predecessor had to be evaluated, and appropriate, though hard, actions taken to solidify the team. One of the areas in which Dr. Carrier required unity that first year was in enrollment increases and the building of dormitories to accommodate that growth. Two top administrators, at least, were dismissed and subsequently replaced because of their reluctance to support this plan. When each of these men was dismissed, Dr. Carrier used a phrase which, to observant administrators, should be disquieting if ever used on them: "Oh, by the way, why don't you come over to my office for a minute...." (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24). After musing for a moment, he added:

I can go through the whole list of things I handled that way, but the matter of fact is that there are some that I probably should have [dismissed] that I didn't, and some today that I should. Not because I dislike them, because I like them. They just haven't

kept pace. They don't have new energy for the institution. They have an energy that relates to a different time.

And energy and enthusiasm are two traits which Dr. Carrier highly values in his team members.

Offering another viewpoint on the matter of personnel problems throughout the years, Dr. Warren observes:

We have been wealthy enough to buy out some of our personnel problems....If you have an institution, you're going to have some personnel problems, and we have been wealthy enough to put those people aside and put other people in their job and keep going rather than being poor as an institution and having to keep them or go through the unpleasantness of firing them. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

This study must also include the fact that Dr. Carrier brought, or soon sent for, several staff members with him when he assumed the presidency. Even though the student underground newspaper derisively referred to these individuals as the "Memphis Mafia" and "Carrier's Pidgeons" (Ehlers, interview, 1990, April 10), this contingency formed a supportive nucleus for the president which helped to usher in the changes which Dr. Carrier sought. Dr. Daniel reminisces about those early days:

We brought in people that could communicate and were interested in communication and were empathetic to the needs of that generation [early 1970s], and we were all pretty young....And we all kind of grew up together, really, from there. We were molded with the times because many of us were just coming out of graduate school ourselves. (Interview, 1990, August 4)



Dr. Carrier invested a great deal of time developing a close, working relationship with the institution's various constituencies while unequivocally establishing the fact that a new leader was in charge. It is an interesting note that his secretary, Alice Leggett, was the niece of Evelyn Liggett, long-time secretary to the institution's first president, Julius Burruss.

#### Dr. Carrier's Early Vision

Even though the institution became coeducational in 1966, the "flavor" and image of Madison College was still essentially single-sex when Dr. Carrier began his tenure. In reminiscing about his first year, he relates:

In 1971 we were a women's institution. Now, you say we had men. We did. But philosophically we were a women's institution. Psychologically we were a women's institution. Emotionally we were a women's institution. The greatest task I had was to change psychologically the campus to be coeducational. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

Most of his efforts were devoted to bringing about that change in institutional image during the first several years of his presidency because he believed that the psychological and emotional outlook of the university had to be altered considerably before the curriculum could be revamped. As the substance of these activities relates primarily to strategic planning and marketing techniques, they are more fully discussed in subsequent chapters of this study. The first major action which Dr. Carrier initiated to study the steps necessary to bring about this desired transformation and to examine the fiscal

inefficiency which he had found (Breeze, 1983, March 14, p. 26) was the establishment of the Purpose Committee, the participants of which included administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the school. The configuration of this group was so selected to emphasize collegiality among the constituents and unite them in a common cause.

#### The Purpose Committee.

After a year of intensive study and deliberations, the Purpose Committee "returned with recommendations...in the areas of constituency, curricula, extracurricular activities, educational technology, and services" (A Journey Into Eminence, 1975, p. 5). The mission delineated within the document was quite different from the first Statement of Purpose developed by President Burruss in which he emphasized the importance of teacher training as the primary role of the new institution (Dingledine, 1959, pp. 20-22), the premise of which was reworded to reflect the times but which remained relatively unchanged until 1971. The new Statement of Purpose was aligned with what the president and the committee envisioned as the mission of a regional, residential, comprehensive, coeducational institution with a "small college" atmosphere, a niche which Dr. Carrier believed had not yet been adequately filled in Virginia. Much of the text is included herein because it underscores the new direction in which the school would be heading under Dr. Carrier's leadership:

The primary purpose of Madison College is to develop citizens who can make positive contributions to society. In order to achieve this purpose, the College is committed to excellence in the intellectual, professional, cultural and social growth of its

students. Madison also serves the citizens of the region in which it is located through its instructional, research, and public service efforts. The College offers majors in most of the academic disciplines and in numerous pre-professional and professional programs. It has a major responsibility to educate teachers, particularly for the schools of Virginia....It is our responsibility to make something happen in the educational development of each person entrusted to our care....It is our fervent desire that we maintain an atmosphere on campus in which all will grow more wise and more humble before the mystery of the universe. A basic goal is that students, before they leave, will learn to continue to educate themselves. Madison College must be an open community committed to a partnership in professional endeavors....We must strive for diversity rather than uniformity....We are dedicated to broadening the bounds of knowledge, committed to making it possible for our constituency to live more meaningful lives, determined to aid those we serve, gain the competencies with which to reach their full potential, and obligated to help develop productive citizens who have the skills needed to enrich the society in which they live. To meet these responsibilities we must identify those we serve, determine how we should serve, and plan imaginative innovative ways to utilize every feasible method of delivery that modern technology offers.

(Journey, 1975, p. 7)

These were lofty goals, more comprehensively stated than in previous documents, but Dr. Carrier believed that they were attainable. More importantly, they served as a common rallying point for his

constituencies. Through his enthusiasm and continuous articulation of the vision, he marshalled his troops around him in a unified front to pursue these objectives, and by the time that he delivered his inaugural address several months later, general acceptance of the vision was inevitable.

His inaugural address: His first master plan.

On December 4, 1971, Dr. Carrier was formally inaugurated as the President of Madison College, and his address was his first "Master Plan" for the institution (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10). Through his remarks, he formally stated what the constituencies of the college had been aware of for many months: The hallmark of Dr. Carrier's presidency would be Change.

Higher education, like all institutions today, is caught up in the whirlwind of re-examination....The ever-accelerating pace with which change is proceeding is unprecedented in recorded history....Whether or not we agree upon the rate, directions, or desirability of change, three facts stand forth unequivocally: (1) Change is taking place rapidly; (2) it requires continuing efforts at adaptation on the part of every person and every institution that hopes to survive in the face of its onslaught, and (3) it is taking us somewhere. (Carrier, Inaugural Address, 1971, December 4, p. 2)

He further stated that societal change rarely occurs in an orderly fashion, saying that "a society experiencing change is like a piece of untempered glass that has stresses and strains set up within it by uneven heating....Change within one component [of society] requires

adjustment within itself, and adjustments on the part of many other components" (p. 3). He cautioned against whimsical changes and those which occur without forethought and deliberation, emphasizing that "if changes do not have goals by design, then they will have ends by chance, and some of these may not be the ends we would deliberately choose" (p. 4).

After developing this framework, Dr. Carrier then stressed:

Intelligence, wisdom, and caution must be exercised in making the fine discriminations between the worthless and the worthy changes, between those that share the transience of fads and those with real meaning and substance....Substantiality may, on occasion, be attributed to a decision or an action only after we have the benefit of historic perspective. This fact demands continual planning and flexibility that allow for the necessary adjustment to constantly changing circumstances, as knowledge of goals, means, and consequences accumulates. Also, a change must not be crystallized to the extent that it becomes immune to correction or further change. (pp. 4-5)

Building on this theme, the president listed several diverse areas about which a responsive institution of higher learning should be cognizant so as to accommodate appropriate changes, including a growing college population comprised of traditional age students, minorities, and older students; higher costs for the operation of facilities and the implications thereof; the pressure of accountability to institutional publics (pp. 5-7); changing national personnel requirements in technological areas; students' vocational interests and their demand for relevance in their studies; the burgeoning body

of knowledge in all arenas and the subsequent effect upon educational programs; the need for an educational institution to develop the "whole man;" and the importance of student/faculty relationships within the context of an educational partnership (pp. 8-13).

To manage effectively the demands placed upon a college or university by these intra- and inter-environmental stresses, Dr. Carrier asserted that the school must be "anchored by a strong sense of institutional identity and integrity" (p. 14) and "must clarify its role and mission" (p. 15) "in order to determine where it is going and how it might best get there" (p. 15). He underscored the importance of having highly visible goals and mission so that students and faculty could not only make an informed commitment to the institution, but could critically examine the goals as well.

Setting the tone of shared governance which would characterize many, but not all, aspects of his administration, the president assured his constituencies that

in the self-determination function, students, faculty, and staff must participate in any matter that directly and demonstrably affects them and their interests. Such participation does not necessarily mean that they have to be present on all the governing bodies, but they must be properly represented there, and must be afforded opportunities to ensure that their level of participation is commensurate with their level of interest. (p. 16)

Dr. Carrier had prepared his remarks so that, metaphorically, they seemed to be decreasing layers, much like the building of a pyramid. He laid the foundation by discussing the inevitability of change and the effects of change on society and higher education in general. He then

proceeded to enumerate the reasons why change should be planned and not capricious, and built upon that premise by citing environmental stresses, both internal and external, which have a catalytic impact upon a higher education institution. The next and more narrow level was created with the president's remarks that the most effective way for an institution to respond to and to manage necessary changes was through a clear concept of mission and goals, coupled with his assurance that the college's purpose would be clearly publicized to its constituencies. Once he had reassured the varied groups that he welcomed involvement from the college community in institutional concerns, Dr. Carrier was ready to set the pinnacle stones in place by proposing his specific plans and goals for Madison College.

Dr. Carrier had served as president for nearly a year, and he was well-aware of the direction which he wanted the college to take. By using the recommendations of the Purpose Committee as a springboard, he affirmed some of the institution's practices and then set forth additional goals for Madison College:

Student Body Configuration:

1. The constituency of the College will continue to be comprised of a large number of residential students between the ages of 18 and 21.
2. Student enrollment should reach 7,000 by 1980.
3. Programs should be developed to attract more male students, more adult students, and, in general, representatives of all levels of economic and social status.

4. 40 percent of the student population should be male students by 1980.
5. Counseling programs should be established to provide students with more information on the college's educational programs.

Community Services:

6. The College should conduct outreach programs for the community through the use of the media, seminars, short courses, and workshops, with a Division of Continuing Education established to achieve these objectives.

The Role of the College:

7. The bulk of the College's resources, talents, and energies must be dedicated to the primary mission of teaching and to the improvement and expansion of the learning environment.
8. The College will continue its role as a liberal arts institution.
9. The College will continue its function of preparing teachers by offering courses in the liberal arts and in specialized fields of education.

Proposed New Programs/Improvement of Existing Programs:

10. More attention needs to be devoted to transfer students, and to educational, professional, and personal guidelines for students.
11. Procedures should be developed to provide ease of admission and matriculation for adult and special students.



12. Greater emphasis must be placed on professional and pre-professional studies in business, computer science, pre-medical, pre-law, and the applied arts.
13. The feasibility of new programs such as paramedical programs and a General College needs to be explored.
14. The inter-disciplinary synthesis of knowledge between fields of study must be reflected in the organization of the College for the future in professional and non-professional studies, at every level of the student's college career.
15. Summer grants must be made available for faculty members who wish to further their skills in improved teaching and learning.
16. The College must study future cooperative arrangements with sister institutions in the development of program delivery systems, particularly at the graduate level.
17. Curriculum planners should be flexible in the development of programs to maximize the learning experience for each student.
18. The College shall continue to offer programs at times and in ways that provide the greatest benefit to residential students, but more thought should be given to the special needs of commuting students and others who live off-campus.
19. Research must be conducted on improved teaching and improved teaching techniques. To this end, a Center for

Improved Teaching and Learning, with an expanded media center, is proposed.

Graduate Studies:

20. The College shall continue to provide graduate studies for students who cannot afford to leave the region.
21. The graduate program shall continue to serve as a springboard into doctoral programs at other universities.
22. New graduate programs shall be developed at the College, but not at the expense of undergraduate programs and only when they meet a demonstrable demand and can be adequately funded.

Research Activities:

23. Research will be encouraged at the College, but not at the expense of quality teaching.
24. The major thrust of College-wide research will be service-oriented. (Inaugural Address, pp. 17-22)

In delivering his concluding remarks, Dr. Carrier reiterated the theme of Change:

We should never cease to be our own most severe critic. Room for change is still enormous. Every institution has its own adjustments and balance to establish. We cannot avoid criticism, but we can avoid deserving it. Only then can we say that our action outruns our rhetoric. (p. 22)

Through these proposals, Dr. Carrier announced to the external publics that which his immediate institutional constituencies already

knew and had accepted: Madison College was already on the course of Change, the Change was planned, and the Change, if implemented properly, would propel Madison College into a very competitive position in higher education in Virginia.

### Conclusions

This chapter recounts Dr. Carrier's early beginnings, included because the information therein provides insights into his character, discusses elements of his first year as president of Madison College, and, more importantly, examines his leadership style in light of research on leadership as a whole and charismatic leadership in particular as one of the two emphases of this study. Several nuances of academic leadership are analyzed with data supplied to support the president's effectiveness in his role. Characteristics extracted from the section on charismatic leadership are examined in relation to comments elicited from Dr. Carrier's administrators and others to substantiate or refute the notion that Dr. Carrier is a charismatic leader. These observations are particularly important because charisma is primarily validated by the perspectives of others, particularly peers and subordinates. Based upon an analysis of these findings, the conclusion can be made that Dr. Carrier is, indeed, a charismatic leader.

A cautionary word should be added here, however. It can be expected that administrators currently employed at JMU would be primarily complimentary in their appraisal of the institution and its president. While their comments are an integral part of this study, they nevertheless must be evaluated from the standpoint that these

individuals have a vested interest in the school. Therefore, unbiased comments made by Dr. Marvin W. Peterson and his research team in their report for the NCRIPAL Research Program on the "Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning" (1989), sponsored by The University of Michigan, are added herein to substantiate the administrators' remarks. Their conclusions were derived from answers received from questionnaires which were distributed to all administrators and all tenure track faculty members. "All returns were mailed directly to the research team headquarters and are confidential. The profile of results is designed to protect anonymity and is provided for general campus feedback and/or discussion" (p. 2).

In discussing their findings on the acceptance of JMU's culture by administrators and staff, the team states:

President Carrier is in his eighteenth year at JMU, and his strong personal philosophy of higher education is evident in the development of the institution. More than this, his philosophy has been adopted wholeheartedly by the vast majority of the faculty and staff who stay at JMU for more than a brief period. It was suggested that the culture of JMU reflected the President's approach, and that over time most of those who have disagreed radically with that approach have chosen to move on to other institutions. The net result of this has been the development of a high degree of cultural consistency within JMU. (p. 21)

The team also reports that there is some tension between the older faculty who have taught at Madison for a number of years and the new faculty who have not yet been assimilated into the culture and who are more interested in their disciplines than the institution. "However,

while these tensions exist, they are not as yet significant enough to give cause for serious concern. One more feature of the culture of JMU is the degree of acceptance people have for one another: where differences do exist, they do not tend to be large" (p. 22).

An important observation made by the research team underscores the autocratic characteristic attributed to charismatic leaders, yet their remarks, much like those made by JMU's own administrative team, are not overly critical:

Real faculty power seems limited, and it may be that the best description of the academic culture is one where "the student is king" under the watchful eye of a "benevolent dictatorship." The power of the presidency is not resented, but rather is seen as generally being used to good effect. This seems to be because, like the institution he leads, the President is seen as a caring person. (p. 23)

And it would seem that, in spite of the considerable power which is wielded by the president, the administrative tone of the institution is nevertheless considered to be consensual by the members of the different boards in the governance structure. The Board of Visitors is described as being "'non-intrusive'" (p. 4). Dr. Carrier is also advised by the University Council, comprised of the vice presidents, deans, six faculty members, three students, and himself, with five Commissions making recommendations to the Council as warranted. Additionally, the Faculty Senate considers policies which affect the academic climate of the university.

Real control [however] seems to be exercised through the university Council and its Commissions....The President is not

bound by any of their recommendations. In such a situation, it seems that it is the President who is the primary decision-maker in the institution, albeit acting with the approval of the Board and under the advice of the Commissions and University Council. This is not to suggest that the atmosphere for governance is non-participatory. Informants were unanimous in describing JMU as a very consensual institution....However, the final say in all matters, internally, clearly rests with the President. (pp. 5-6)

In summation, Dr. Peterson and his research team conclude:

The overall impression of James Madison University is one of a well managed institution with a very strong culture which is synonymous with the vision of the President. Whether or not one calls it a "monarchy," as some informants chose to, it is a fact that the President maintains close control of the institution. At the same time, "monarchy" need not mean "tyranny," and informants unanimously voiced their support, respect and admiration for Dr. Carrier, describing him as a man who cares very deeply about his institution, his faculty and staff, and his students. (p. 30)

With Dr. Carrier's charisma established as a premise, and with research supporting the fact that an institution that is "structurally open" is ripe for a charismatic leader to guide it on a new course, the next chapter will concentrate on those actions taken, at Dr. Carrier's instigation, to catapult Madison College into university status.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Transforming Madison College

#### Introduction

In 1970, Madison College was at a critical threshold: the institution should stay the same, or it should take a new direction. Either would be a conscious choice, and that choice would be made by the Board of Visitors in the selection of the new president to succeed Dr. Miller. By choosing Dr. Ronald Carrier, a charismatic academician, the board promulgated the concept to the institution's constituencies that the school would, indeed, be changing. The president assumed the position with a clear goal, the overall view of which was revealed through the study made by the Purpose Committee and his inaugural address. According to Alan Cervený (Personal communication, 1990, October 19), Dr. Carrier's lofty vision was to develop Madison College so that the school could compete against such institutions as the University of Virginia and William and Mary, becoming a distinctive college. While most people laughed at this concept, the president was undeterred. He had decided that the college's niche would come from offering a small college atmosphere while allowing the student population to grow, and developing student services to create solidly the "total collegiate environment" (Cervený, personal communication). These goals represented a departure for the institution and would require conscientious planning strategies to bring them to fruition. The purpose of this chapter, the second emphasis of this study, is to explore the planning and marketing strategies which the administrators used to transform

Madison College into James Madison University, using the planning model developed by Kotler and Fox in Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions (1985).

### The Importance of Planning

The concept of planning is not new to administrators of educational institutions. There are three general levels of planning according to Kotler and Fox (1985): budgeting and scheduling, in which all schools engage to some degree; short-range tactical planning, which includes recruitment, physical plant decisions, development, curriculum, and the like; and strategically oriented long-range planning, a level which many schools unfortunately do not reach. Most institutions are mired in the details of short-range planning and are "compounding their problems by relying on many short-range plans...when they should be proceeding to the third level" (Kotler & Fox, p. 72).

This third level, consisting of strategic and tactical planning, is a relatively new concept for most administrators.

Strategic planning is the process of developing and maintaining a strategic fit between the institution's goals and capabilities and its changing marketing opportunities. It relies on developing a clear institutional mission, supporting goals and objectives, a sound strategy, and appropriate implementation. (Kotler & Fox, p. 73)

This broad paradigm seeks to answer the question, "How can this institution best operate, given its goals and resources and its changing opportunities?" (p. 72). Tactical planning activities are



then developed as a result of the findings from strategic planning, and it is at this point that concerted marketing efforts are formulated.

#### Elements of the strategic marketing plan.

During the strategic planning phase, administrators on each level analyze the institution's present and future environment, review major resources, establish broad goals and objectives, select the most efficient fiscal avenues by which to achieve the goals and objectives, and finally, make the necessary changes in the school's structure to effect the plans. "When these components are aligned, they promise improved performance" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 72).

The Strategic Planning Process Model (Appendix A) as developed by Kotler and Fox includes five important steps, the first of which is the Environmental Analysis phase, also referred to as the Threat and Opportunity Analysis phase, in which administrators explore the various environments which have an effect upon the institution. These environments include the school's internal publics, the overall market potential, the institution's competitors, and the external publics, and the macroenvironment (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 74). In examining each of these discreet categories, the following three questions should be asked: What are the major trends affecting the environment? What are the implications of these trends? What are the most significant opportunities and threats? (p. 74).

Step Two of the model is the Resource Analysis component in which administrators seek to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses with regard to personnel, funding, facilities, the various delivery

systems, and an "extensive list of intangible as well as tangible" factors (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 76). "In particular, the school should look for its distinctive competencies, those resources and abilities in which it is particularly strong, and for those strengths that give it a differential advantage over its competition" (p. 76).

Once institutional threats and opportunities, strengths and weaknesses have been assessed, administrators can better formulate goals. This third important step is comprised of an evaluation of the institution's mission, the setting of short- and long-range goals, and the development of specific objectives to meet those goals. While a number of goals may be desirable, such as increasing enrollment, attracting top quality faculty members, developing the physical plant, and creating a national awareness of the institution, administrators usually must select lofty goals carefully and, in light of the aforementioned analyses, place some of these on simmer for probable emphasis in the future.

In Step Four, specific strategies are formulated to meet the objectives developed in Step Three.

According to an old adage, "If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there." Only when the environmental analysis, resource analysis, and goal-formulation steps have been carefully done can the institution's administrators and other planning participants feel confident that they have the necessary background for reviewing current programs and markets and considering changes. (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 78)

The strategies developed during Step Four may require altering the organizational design of the institution. Step Five takes into

consideration these possible modifications, particularly in light of the school's structure, people, and culture (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 78). For instance, to initiate a core curriculum, the administrators may decide to incorporate the humanities studies into one department, or key personnel members may be shifted into new positions to accommodate an administrative structural change. Likewise, "in adopting a new strategic posture, the school may also have to develop a plan for changing the 'culture' of the institution. Every institution has a culture; that is, its people share a way of looking at things" (p. 78). These "nested patterns of cultural behavior...have a pervasive, far-reaching influence on institutional life" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. iii), and, by their nature, are sometimes difficult to change. Yet, for the strategies to be successful, the school's culture must be compatible with the changes and modifications which the administration feels must be made to enhance the institution's competitive position.

Once the strategies have been formulated, tactical marketing planning is generally undertaken for each strategy, department, or program. This formal marketing plan "summarizes the information and analysis underlying a proposed strategy and spells out the details of how the strategy will be carried out" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 79).

#### Elements of an academic marketing plan.

The contents of an Academic Marketing Plan (Appendix B) include the Executive Summary, Table of Contents, Situation Analysis, Objectives and Goals, Marketing Strategy, Action Programs, Budgets, and Controls (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 79). The data gathered and

analyses completed during the strategic planning phase are critical elements to be considered in formulating the marketing plan.

"The purpose of the Executive Summary is to permit higher-level administrators to preview the major direction of the plan before reading the document for supporting data and analysis" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 80). Typically, a Table of Contents follows the Executive Summary for easy reference.

The Situation Analysis consists of four sections: background, normal forecast, opportunities and threats, and strengths and weaknesses. "The situation-analysis section describes where the institution stands and what its likely future will be if no changes are made" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 83). Background information and statistics, where applicable, are provided to establish patterns of activity for the department developing the marketing plan. Based on these findings, a normal forecast is then formulated to speculate where the department would be heading if no alterations were made. Opportunities and threats to the department are examined, including such factors as economic trends, population growth, serendipitous funding, and the like. Strengths and weaknesses of the department are then determined, particularly in light of the aforementioned findings.

Upon completion of the Situation Analysis, the department can better determine the goals and subsequent objectives to which it should aspire. An Admissions Office, for instance, may recommend that the institution's goal should be that enrollment should increase by one thousand students over a three year period. Once the goal has been set, specific objectives to meet that goal are then calculated,

some of which may include specific growth for each year and a dollar amount established to meet these objectives.

Armed with goals and objectives, the department then proceeds to the Marketing Strategy phase of the plan consisting of a "coordinated set of decisions on (1) target markets, (2) marketing mix, and (3) marketing expenditure level" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 83), the "who, how, and how much" portion of the marketing plan. For a fictitious college Admissions Office, for example, the target markets portion identifies potential markets in which to attract more students to the institution, the criteria for which might include "age, sex, income, [and] place of residence" (p. 83). Based on these criteria along with statistics on past admissions, the Admissions Office then determines which geographic areas should be targeted for potential students. A marketing mix—the various methods used to contact these students, including mailings, telephone contacts, "college nights" sponsored by high schools, and the like—is then developed for each of the target markets. And because most of these strategies require funds, budgets are formulated for these plans.

Section Five of the Academic Marketing Plan includes the development of the specific actions, and their time frames, to carry out the strategies which have been decided upon during the marketing mix section. If, for example, one of the strategies is to attract more area community college students to the institution, an action plan might include selecting an individual to act as liaison between the school and the community college (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 84).

"The objectives, strategies, and planned actions form the basis for preparing the budget....Once approved, the budget guides marketing

operations, financial planning, and personnel recruitment" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 84). For an Admissions Office, the Budget section takes into consideration projected revenues from increased enrollment along with expenditures necessary to implement the strategies designed to increase the enrollment.

Undergirding the whole, Controls are built in to monitor and evaluate the strategies developed so that any necessary modifications can be made.

#### The Initial Hypotheses Restated

My interest in the transformation of Madison College into James Madison University led to the formulation of two hypotheses as proposed in Chapter One of this study:

1. James Madison University has become a respected, nationally recognized university because of successful, well-planned marketing strategies which transformed its image from a provincial, Virginia women's college into a coeducational university with national prominence.

2. Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, president, played, and still plays, a prominent role in the school's evolution.

Chapter Four of this study establishes Dr. Carrier as the charismatic leader and, through the comments related by administrators and other individuals, the guiding force behind the transformation. This hypothesis was affirmed with relative ease.

Supporting the first hypothesis in which the idea is proposed that "well-planned marketing strategies" were used is another matter altogether. Had the administrators used a formal, written marketing

plan for the institution, this premise could have been affirmed quite neatly. According to key personnel members, however, no formal plan was ever developed. Fred Hilton, former Director of University Relations, stated that "to me, we had a marketing plan, but it was not written down" (Interview, 1989, June 21), and Glenda Rooney said that she knew of no specific marketing plan which was used to transform the institution (Interview, 1989, June 21). Likewise, Alan Cerveny affirmed that, to his knowledge, there was no overall concerted marketing effort to attract students because applications continued to increase from year to year without a marketing blitz (Interview, 1989, July 19). This information was gleaned from the first of many interviews which I conducted and was dismaying until, after conducting research, I discerned that the administrators did make and execute strategic plans, but just not within the confines of a prescribed marketing plan per se.

Because hypotheses in qualitative research efforts are active rather than static and can be reworked throughout the process (Merriman, 1988, p. 3), and in light of the fact that formal marketing plans were not universally used to transform Madison College into James Madison University, I now revise the first hypothesis to state:

James Madison University has become a respected, nationally recognized university because of strategic plans—rather than formal, tactical marketing plans—which transformed its image from a provincial, Virginia women's college into a coeducational university with national prominence.

Accordingly, the framework within which those actions which the administrators did take with regard to enrollment, sports, student

services, programs, and construction are evaluated using elements from the Strategic Planning Phase rather than from the Academic Marketing Plan to provide an appropriate, if artificial, guideline by which to draw disparate data together for analysis. I have modified the sequential steps of the model to accommodate the findings more accurately in terms of chronology.

#### Strategic Planning and Madison College

The early 1970s saw the budding emergence of discussion about marketing in academe, yet twenty years later, educational administrators generally are still reluctant to use marketing terms per se. For instance, in the October 12, 1990 edition of The Virginian-Pilot, Dr. Eugene Trani, new president of Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, states that "he doesn't particularly like the term 'marketing' but he considers spreading VCU's story across the commonwealth a key part of his job" (p. A18). Shakespeare writes in Romeo and Juliet, "What's in a name? That which we call a rose/By any other name would smell as sweet" (II, ii, 43), underscoring the fact that, whether or not administrators actually use marketing terminology to describe activities, the strategic plans and activities take place, just the same.

#### Goal formulation: Mission, goals, objectives.

As has been covered in Chapter Four in the section on Dr. Carrier's early vision for the institution, the greatest challenge with which he was faced was psychologically changing the campus and culture to be coeducational—in effect, changing the image of the



school. Therefore, the mission of Madison College had to be changed first so that the school's constituencies could become accustomed to a new mind-set about the institution, thereby creating an atmosphere conducive to change. Dr. Carrier had spent the first several months building a rapport with and gaining the trust of the school's internal publics so that they would support his vision for the college, realizing that "the dream or vision is the force that invents the future" (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, p. 9), and Madison's future was his consuming passion. After the study conducted by the Purpose Committee was completed in 1971, the Statement of Purpose for the college was substantially revised to reflect the mission of a regional, residential, comprehensive, coeducational institution, a rather radical departure from the original premise for the school.

Ensclosed within the revised mission were the new goals for Madison College, many of which were revealed in Dr. Carrier's inaugural address, the first Master Plan of his administration. Included in his speech were goals related to enrollment and the student body configuration, the institution's role in the community, program improvements and initiations, graduate study offerings, and research activities. Underpinning these goals was Dr. Carrier's persistent desire that the college not only become competitive with William and Mary and the University of Virginia, but that the school would eventually become one of the best undergraduate institutions in the country (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10); nearly every decision made during the early years and, indeed, throughout Dr. Carrier's presidency, was based upon this vision.

The objectives which were developed by Dr. Carrier and the administrative team to meet the goals are discussed in the "Marketing and Madison College" section of this chapter.

Environmental analysis: Threats and opportunities.

An examination of Madison College's various environments in 1971 is important in identifying elements affecting the institution, including the school's internal, market, competitive, public, and macroenvironments.

In the fall of 1971, 4,041 full-time and part-time students were enrolled, 1,016 (25 percent) of which were males. A composite of the freshman class reveals that it was 1,170 strong, with 341 males comprising approximately 29 percent of the new class (Table 2). 20.6 percent of the freshmen were out-of-state registrants (Table 2), generally adhering to the maximum percentage as mandated by the Board of Visitors (Journey, 1975, p. 9), with most of these entering Madison from Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Delaware (Table 4). The majority of the in-state freshmen came from Fairfax and Rockingham counties (Table 5) and the cities of Alexandria and Harrisonburg (Table 6). 49.57 percent of the entering freshmen, 580 students, were ranked in the first quartile of their respective high school graduating classes (Table 7), with a combined SAT score of 956 (Table 8). A total of 106 transfer students enrolled from two-year schools in Virginia, the majority of them transferring from nearby community colleges (Table 12). Data on the enrollees transferring from Virginia's other four-year institutions is not available for 1971 (Table 13). Approximately 66 percent of the 701

1971 graduates earned bachelors degrees in early childhood, elementary, and secondary teaching, with five percent earning degrees in business administration, excluding business education (Statistical Summary of the College, 1973).

Dr. Carrier spent a great deal of effort his first year becoming acquainted with the faculty which he had inherited. Specific data concerning the faculty of the four schools and twenty-one departments in existence in 1971 are delineated in Tables 14 and 15 concerning their credentials and years of teaching experience.

When asked to characterize the tone of the faculty members when he came to Madison College, Dr. Carrier replied:

After twenty-two years I think they were ready [for change].

There were three groups that were on campus: those that would support the system, whoever it was, and would do a good job and who were not challenging but supportive; those who were really unhappy with the Miller years because [his administration] had not changed or accomodated some of the changes in the academic program that were needed; and those that would not be part of the new campus we were building. (Interview, 1990, January 24)

For the most part, he felt that the faculty was cooperative and desirous of the changes which were slated to happen on the campus.

These changes which Dr. Carrier espoused were not well-received by at least two of the administrators, however. It is worth noting that the decisions to increase enrollment and to build more dormitories to house the influx and expand the residential life of the students resulted in the dismissals of both the Provost and the Dean of Students, neither of which supported these major moves. Most of the

administrators appeared to be in favor of the decisions, however. Likewise, Madison's first Board of Visitors, responsible for hiring Dr. Carrier, affirmed the new direction for the school as the members had sought and found "the dynamic leader" to propel the institution on a new course (First Decade, 1982, p. 1).

An examination of geographic trends shows that the majority of the in-state students which enrolled at Madison College in 1971 came from the northern Virginia market, with a substantial number attending from Rockingham county (Tables 5 and 6). New Jersey and Maryland supplied most of the out-of-state freshmen (Table 4).

Traditionally, Madison College was linked with her sister teachers' colleges in terms of competition for students. These schools, including Mary Washington, Longwood, and Radford, had become coeducational, in part because of a state mandate to do so, but each was still viewed as being a women's college with men. The four institutions had been established with essentially the same mission—to supply teachers for the state of Virginia. With the changes to Madison's Statement of Purpose, however, the college was consciously pulling away from this homogeneous group into heretofore relatively uncharted territory.

An important public environment with which the institution interacted which had influence on the college proper was the city of Harrisonburg. In 1908, the community greeted the news that the new Normal school would be established there, with great fanfare. Several publications recounting the history of the school state that "town and gown" relations were quite amiable, with only an occasional skirmish over parking and rowdy students living in residential areas. The

college was, and still is, welcomed as a viable part of the community's economic base.

The alumni of Madison College, while loyal to their alma mater, were not sufficiently organized in the early 1970s to play a significant role in the changes taking place during the early years of Dr. Carrier's presidency. According to Steve Smith (Interview, 1989, August 17), before the mid-1980s, very little was done with alumni except to solicit funds through five or six mailings a year. There were organized alumni chapters within the state, but these also did not gain strength until the mid-1980s. And, total giving to Madison College from all sources was around \$70,000 in 1970, with each gift duly noted in the college catalog.

Policies affecting Madison College on the state level were effected by both the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) and the state legislature of the Commonwealth. While Dr. Miller had been respected by the legislators and had been an able advocate for the teaching profession, Madison did not have a strong constituency among the representatives. Regionally, the institution was accredited by several agencies, including the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the requisite ten year self-study for which the school completed in 1971 during Dr. Carrier's first year.

Madison College did not operate in a vacuum. Several factors in the macroenvironment had an effect on the institution. The small school was not immune to student unrest and demonstrations characteristic of the late 1960s into the early 1970s on campuses throughout the nation. The decline in the traditional school age population once the "baby boomers" had completed their undergraduate

education, coupled with inflation and an economic downturn on the state and national levels, also affected the somewhat precarious fiscal condition of the campus. The militancy of the women's movement and the continuing call for civil rights resulted in national policies which affected decisions on programs, hiring and firing, and student admissions for virtually every college and university.

The administrators faced threats to the viability of Madison College in 1971. According to Dr. Carrier (Interview, 1990, January 24), the school was behind in its funding base from state resources and needed an increase in enrollment to close that gap, yet the student pool from which Madison drew its enrollees was shrinking, concomitantly creating a more competitive environment. Although the institution was coeducational, the public image of the school persisted in its being a women's college, and state teachers' college as well. And the institution did not have a strong constituency in the state legislature, either in terms of alumni holding office or from Rockingham County and the surrounding area.

On the flip side of the coin, however, there were opportunities on which Madison College could capitalize. The school had a new Statement of Purpose on which to build, and most of the faculty, administrators, and students were supportive of the changes therein. While Dr. Carrier had stated that he wanted the institution to be competitive eventually with the University of Virginia and William and Mary, the niche which he foresaw the school occupying was that of a regional, residential, comprehensive, coeducational institution with a "small college" atmosphere, a position in which he perceived a need in Virginia.

The nichers are those institutions and programs that aim to find and fill one or more niches that are not well served by other educational institutions....To be successful, nichers should look for niches that are of sufficient size and growth potential to be attractive, that are not well served by other institutions, and that the institution can serve effectively. (Kotler & Fox, 1985, pp. 144-145)

And the new president was more than eager to lead the institution on this different course.

Resource analysis: Strengths and weaknesses.

In addition to identifying those factors affecting the college's various environments, analyzing Madison's available resources in terms of personnel, funding, and facilities is germane in determining the formation of the initial plans for change.

According to the 1971 SACS Self-Study, the institution employed 284 faculty members, including teachers at the Campus School and part-time faculty. Of this total, 40.5 percent had earned doctorates and 54.6 percent had obtained their masters degrees. To their credit, many faculty members were actively pursuing the terminal degree in their various disciplines (Table 14). Fifty percent of the faculty were assistant professors, with 18.3 and 22.9 percents having achieved the ranks of associate professor and full professor, respectively. The college was divided into four schools—Education, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences (Table 19), and twenty-one departments, with the academic hierarchy being the president, the provost, deans of the schools, department heads, and faculty. The

organizational structure during 1970-71 included the Board of Visitors, the Office of the President, the Office of the Provost, the Office of Student Personnel Services, the Office of Business Management, Library Services, Social Directors, and Dormitory Hostesses (Table 20).

Income for Madison College was obtained from three sources: the General Fund consisting of appropriations from the state legislature and the source for capital expenditures, the Special Fund derived from student fees, and income received from the Campus School, cafeteria, federal grants, gifts, miscellaneous collections, and the like. According to the 1971 SACS Self-Study, "the income for the College is almost entirely from legislative appropriations and student fees" (p. 92). Institutional gifts were managed by the newly established Madison College Foundation, Inc., created "for the purpose of receiving, investing, and controlling endowment funds and other funds donated to the institution" (p. 92). In 1971, Governor Holton was informed that the college needed \$32.7 million in operating expenses for the 1972-74 biennium so that the institution could "continue its transition from a women's college to a coeducational, multi-purpose, regional institution" (Journey, 1975, p. 26). According to the November, 1973 Statistical Summary of the College developed by the college's Office of Institutional Research, the school received just over \$10.5 million in operating expenses and \$3.7 million for capital outlay expenses from the state for that period (pp. 37-38); miscellaneous gifts and grants totalled just over \$70,000.00.

The physical plant, sprawling over some 300 acres, consisted of sixty-six buildings when Dr. Carrier assumed the presidency of



Madison, with the Warren Campus Center, begun under Dr. Miller, completed his first year. The "Front Campus" was comprised of the bluestone buildings, and the "Back Campus," development of which was started by Dr. Miller, included the first red brick structures in the complex (First Decade, 1982, p. 4). While the campus setting and original structures were considered by most to be pleasing, several of the buildings required renovations and repairs, and the relatively neglected grounds were also in need of a facelift.

Madison College was strong in several areas, and the institution would need to capitalize on these strengths to implement the desired changes. Dr. Carrier represented an infusion of "young blood" into the school, a quality which the Board of Visitors had sought for the successor to Dr. Miller. According to Dr. Daniel (Interview, 1990, August 4), many of the new staff members were also young and eager to interact with the students. The Board of Visitors itself was new, having only been in existence for seven years. While this factor could be considered a weakness, the board's functional inexperience seemed to be overshadowed by its enthusiasm for the school's potential and its cooperation with the new president. Dr. Warren (Interview, 1990, April 10) also reveals several strengths, including "an amazingly pliable faculty" which was dedicated to teaching, the institution's location on Interstate 81, and the college's close proximity to the northern Virginia corridor with its economic development and high quality of high school graduates. He also cites the work ethic in the valley as contributing favorable to Madison's culture, affecting how "maids, food servers, mechanics, and groundspeople relate to students. They relate to them with a family

kind of warmth." And Dr. Carrier's Tennessee upbringing was compatible with the valley mind-set. Madison College had a reputation for fostering a nurturing environment for its students, and the new president also propagated the concept that the school was consumer-oriented, student-centered.

The institution also had weaknesses to overcome as well, most notably its image. Madison College was viewed as a women's teachers college, despite its coeducational status, having only 25 percent male students. The sports program for men was limited at best, while the women's program was considered competitive and strong. The school needed to attract males, but the academic programs traditionally linked with men during that period, principally business administration and pre-professional studies, were weak or ill-defined, with teacher education programs the strongest. Additionally, the women at the school were governed by a set of archaic rules.

Dr. Carrier relates:

When I came here, women still had to "sign out." They had to get cards signed by their mother and father that they could date....This was 1971. We were in Viet Nam. President Kennedy had been killed. His brother had been killed. Martin Luther King had been killed. The world had changed, and we were still signing out! (Interview, 1989, November 10).

Another problem which Madison faced was that it was not meeting enrollment projections, and the school needed five thousand students so that the funding base could be established (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24). And in the matter of facilities, deferred maintenance policies resulted in several buildings requiring repairs

or renovations, while others needed to be built to support increased enrollments and student services. The administrators had their work cut out for themselves.

#### Strategy formulation.

Once administrators determine the environmental threats and opportunities, and the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, they can more effectively ask themselves, where do we go from here, and how do we get there? According to the model developed by Kotler and Fox (Appendix A), a variety of formal strategies which attempt to answer these questions can be used by administrators in the Strategy Formulation phase to determine the effectiveness of institutional programs and the viability of markets for these offerings. These include the academic portfolio strategy, the product/market opportunity strategy, and strategies to determine the competitive edge, positioning, and target markets (see Glossary for definitions of terms). The development of each of these planning strategies can be an important component in the planning process, yet there is no evidence that the administrators at Madison College used such formal devices. In fact, the majority stated that no formal strategies were used per se, as has been previously stated in this study. This is not to assert, however, that the steps taken to begin the transformation were capricious. And it is important to remember that the time frame being discussed is the early 1970s, a period in which marketing in the nonprofit sector was in its infancy and the use of identifiable marketing strategies was virtually unknown in academe. Plans were developed by Madison's administrators to pursue the goals, and these

are discussed in the section "Marketing and Madison College" later in this chapter.

#### Organization design.

"The institution must have the structure, people, and culture to carry out its strategies" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 78). During the first few years of his presidency, Dr. Carrier substantially restructured the administrative divisions of the college to accommodate the changes which he espoused. In his first year, the organizational chart was divided into the Board, the Office of the President, the Office of the Provost, the Office of Student Personnel Services, the Office of Business Management, Library Services, Social Directors, and Dormitory Hostesses. There were separate deans for women and men, and there was no comprehensive health center; rather, the school employed part-time physicians for student health needs. In addition, there was no specific category for athletics. By the 1972-73 academic year, however, the governance structure had changed to begin to reflect a more comprehensive, modern institution. The President's Office temporarily added supervision of the new Directors of Budget/Planning and Computer Services, and the Academic Affairs division replaced the Office of the Provost, with added supervision over the Library and the Director of Admissions and Financial Aid. The Student Personnel Services division absorbed the Office of Student Personnel Services, with a Director of Health Services added and separate deans for men and women deleted. A new division, Public Services, was added to the organizational chart, supervising the Directors of Public Services,

Athletics, and Public Information; and the roles of Social Directors and Dormitory Hostesses were permanently expunged.

In 1973-74, the Public Services division added a Sports Information Director, Student Personnel Services added a Director of Student Life, and the Administrative Planning division was created with supervisory duties over the Directors of Budget/Planning, Computer Services, Systems Development, and Institutional Research, the latter two of which were newly created positions. The 1974-75 academic year saw further modifications, particularly in division titles, with the Public Affairs division replacing Public Services and adding Directors of Alumni Services and Continuing Education, and Student Affairs absorbing Student Personnel Services. Administrative Affairs replaced Administrative Planning, and a new Intercollegiate Athletics division was created. The admissions and financial aid functions were divided into two positions the following year, and a Director of Student Orientation was added in 1976-77. By the time that the institution was granted university status, administrative divisions were basically in place to accommodate an increasingly complex, student-centered organization.

For these changes to be implemented effectively, personnel members had to be flexible, as a number of the administrative staff members were shifted from one position or administrative division to another, depending upon their skills and the needs of the institution at that time. Most were desirous of and accommodated change, and those who could not support the goals either left or were fired, as has already been discussed, the Provost and the Public Relations Director in particular.

Most institutions have a culture which predisposes the constituencies to view their school through the lenses of history and, at times, embellishment, and then to act or react to situations based upon their perceptions of that history. The culture of Madison College was ingrained as a small, caring, women's institution when Dr. Carrier became president. To transform the image of the school into a comprehensive, regional, coeducational institution of distinction—the president's stated goals—would require not only an altering of the culture, but also the development of an organizational saga around which the school's publics could rally. Kuh and Whitt (1988) state that "individuals often loom larger than life in the making of an organizational saga" (p. 72), and the charismatic leader is one such individual (Richardson, 1971). And as Clark (1970) asserts that there have been few instances in which one person or one small group have had the opportunity to "devise a plan, test and reform it actively over a number of years, and have it reflected in the thought and style of the organization" (p. 234), Dr. Carrier was afforded that opportunity in a structurally open school, and capitalized upon it. A discussion of Madison's organizational saga is covered in the section on "the JMU Way" in Chapter Six.

#### System design.

This portion of the Strategic Planning Model concerns systems specifically designed to evaluate marketing activities, to include systems to monitor marketing information, marketing planning, and marketing control (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 79). As the administrators at Madison College did not use a formal marketing plan, it stands to

reason that they did not use formal monitoring systems as such, but information was gathered by the admissions and institutional research offices. They did develop and evaluate strategies to transform the institution, however, and these are discussed in this chapter's section on "Marketing and Madison College."

### A Marketing Orientation

Strategic planning is closely related to another concept: the marketing orientation (Williford, 1987, pp. 53-54), and a discussion about this orientation is important as it encompasses a total philosophy rather than merely activities.

There are those who mistakenly believe that because an institution undertakes marketing functions, such as fund-raising, advertising, public relations, and those conducted by the admissions office, that the school has a "marketing orientation." "This could not be further from the truth....They are using some marketing tools, but they are not necessarily marketing-oriented" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 10).

Kotler and Fox define a marketing orientation as one which

holds that the main task of the institution is to determine the needs and wants of target markets and to satisfy them through the design, communication, pricing, and delivery of appropriate and competitively viable programs and services. (p. 10)

The adoption of a marketing orientation presupposes responsiveness on the part of the institution's constituencies, and "educational institutions vary considerably in their level of responsiveness" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 28). The unresponsive school is bureaucratic in nature and usually serves people only when such action will not

create problems for the administration. The casually responsive institution attempts to solicit input as to consumer needs but often chooses not to act upon the concerns expressed.

The highly responsive institution, on the other hand, is one which operates within a marketing orientation framework. "It not only surveys current consumer satisfaction but also researches unmet consumer needs and preferences to improve its service. And it selects and trains its people to be consumer-minded" (Kotler & Fox, p. 29).

For the marketing orientation philosophy to work, the upper level administrators, and the president in particular, must demonstrate this mind-set. "By setting the tone that the institution must be service-minded and responsive, the president prepares the groundwork for introducing further changes later" (Kotler & Fox, p. 31).

Because a responsive school is concerned with service, it "has a strong interest in how its publics see the school and its programs and services, since people often respond to the institution's image, not necessarily its reality" (Kotler & Fox, 1985, p. 37). The way that people perceive the image of a school in the present is usually based upon its past. Madison College had been generally perceived as having a caring environment for its students, but this image was linked with its function as a single-sex teachers college. Therefore, the administrators in 1970-71 wanted to build on the public perception of caring for students, but within the new context of a comprehensive, regional, coeducational institution.

While Kotler and Fox recommend that a marketing director be hired to carry out institutional marketing research, arguing that the president cannot accomplish the tasks singlehandedly, this is not



necessarily required. If service-mindedness is promulgated throughout the institution from the top through administrative policy and subsequent action implementing those policies, then a marketing orientation can become a part of the cultural fabric of the school without a director hired to make it so. Additionally, selecting personnel, whether faculty, administrators, or support staff, that evidence a concern for students can also strengthen the orientation toward service. And various marketing tools are traditionally used by the admissions office, public relations director, and college statistician whether or not the functions are so labeled.

Dr. Carrier did not need to change the philosophy of caring at Madison College; this characteristic had already been established at the institution. Rather, he brought a student-centered viewpoint to his position—a marketing orientation, if you will—he indoctrinated his internal constituencies, and he built an administrative team that would implement policies to ensure the continuance of the nurturing atmosphere. Because of the force of his personality, his visibility on campus, and the early rapport he had created with his students and staff, he not only did not need to hire a marketing director, Dr. Carrier was the marketing director for all intents and purposes.

#### Marketing and Madison College

Specific tactics used by Dr. Carrier and his administrative team to meet objectives to increase enrollment, upgrade the sports programs, increase student services, restructure the schools, and build needed facilities are discussed below as each of these areas contributed significantly to the transformation of Madison College

into James Madison University. The information contained herein is not intended to be an exhaustive commentary on the recent history of the school. Rather, data and trends are supplied to show some of the specific actions taken to change the image of the institution.

#### Enrollment.

Dr. Carrier stated in his inaugural address that two long-term goals for the institution were that enrollment reach 7,000 by 1980, and forty percent of those students should be men. The short-term goal was to reach 5,000 enrollees as quickly as possible to secure a better funding base from the state, an increase of approximately 1,000 students.

We had a meeting of the staff. I had checked the enrollment projections, and we weren't reaching our enrollment projections. There was going to be a slight decline in high school graduates according to the State Council, and we needed to establish quickly that we had five thousand students so that we could get our [funding] base. We were then operating at about thirty-nine hundred students, and we needed to take five hundred more right away. I turned to the Director of Admissions and asked, "do we have five hundred [additional] qualified applicants?" He said, "oh yes. Good students." I said, "take them." (Carrier, interview, 1990, January 24)

In the 1970-71 academic year, there were 3,588 undergraduate students enrolled at Madison. The 1971-72 academic year saw an enrollment of 4,011 students, an increase of 423 students. Enrollment grew to 4,699 during 1972-73, and by the 1973-74 academic year, there were 5,325

undergraduate students attending Madison. To accomplish this, 80 percent of the applicants for first-time freshmen for 1971-72 were accepted out of 3,895 applications, 77 percent during 1972-73 from 4,650 applications, and 61 percent (6,038 applications) and 50 percent (6,720 applications) were accepted in 1973-74 and 1974-75 respectively (Table 9).

#### Admissions policies.

Admissions policies for this period, as detailed in annual admissions reports, show that qualifications for applicants were temporarily lowered so that more students could be accepted to meet the short-term goal. In 1970, students automatically admitted had to graduate in the upper third of their high school class, have a combined score of 850 on the SAT with neither score under 350, and receive a recommendation from their high school. Applicants were automatically rejected who graduated in the lower one fourth of their high school class, received less than 700 on the SAT, or received an unfavorable recommendation. Applications from students who fell between these guidelines were examined individually by the Admissions Committee. Madison used a rolling admissions policy, with the number of new admittances limited to dormitory and instructional space and budgetary considerations. Students applying for summer sessions had to meet the same criteria as students for the regular sessions. The Early Acceptance Plan stated that students meet the aforementioned qualifications but with a combined SAT score of 900 with neither score less than 400. All applications were evaluated as to the strength of the high school academic program and extra-curricular activities.

For the 1971-73 period, however, these policies were altered. Students were automatically admitted who graduated in the upper half of their high school class, had combined scores of 750 on the SAT with neither score under 300, and receive a recommendation from their school. Automatic rejections were extended on the same bases as delineated in the 1970-71 admissions policies. Combined SAT score requirements for Early Acceptance were lowered to 850, with neither score less than 350.

By 1974, admissions requirements became more strict in relation to SAT scores. For automatic admission to the regular session, students had to receive a combined SAT score of 800 with neither score under 350. For Early Acceptance, SAT score requirements were raised to 900 with neither score under 400.

1975-76 and 1976-77 marked a transition period for Madison with regard to admissions policies. The administration began to reconsider the rolling admissions policy. While this concept was retained, first consideration for regular acceptance was given to students who had higher SAT scores and class standing:

Immediately after Early Decision acceptances were mailed, applicants who ranked in the upper ten percent or upper one-fourth of their class with 1000+ SAT scores were considered. During the remaining part of November and during the month of December, applicants were considered if they ranked in the upper one-third of their class and had 900 and above on combined SAT scores. During January and February action was taken on those applicants who ranked in the upper one-half in their class and had 800 and above total SAT scores. (1975 Annual Admissions Report, p. 2)

Additionally, Early Acceptance was changed to Early Decision, and the requisite SAT scores for acceptance under these criteria were raised to 1000 with neither score below 450.

In 1977, the school's benchmark year in which the institution was granted university status and the name was changed to James Madison University, several new policies came into effect. The Early Decision policy was discontinued and the Honors Admission initiated. "Under this plan applicants could not request early consideration as with Early Decision, however, each applicant was reviewed upon receipt" (1977 Annual Admissions Report, p. 1), and students who had graduated in the top ten percent of their high school class and had achieved a combined SAT score of 1000 (1100 by 1980) were accepted on a continuing basis until February 1. For general acceptance to the university, students not accepted under Honors Admission were evaluated with other applicants from their high school or geographic area. The most important policy change was the discontinuance of the rolling admissions policy. The deadline for applications to be received by the university was set at February 1, a policy which is still in effect. To emphasize the school's desire to create a heterogeneous student body, the following was added to the institution's general admissions policy statement:

Consideration is given to those students who have potential to contribute to the diversity of the University community. Students are selected from a wide variety of interests, attitudes, and backgrounds. Applicants for admission and considered without regard to race, color, sex [new inclusion], age, or national origin of individuals. (1977 Annual Admissions Report, p. 1)

And in 1977, Dr. Carrier authorized an Admissions Review Committee to "screen applications of certain athletes, musicians, and other special talented applicants whose credentials did not clearly meet stated admissions requirements" (p. 2).

#### Recruitment.

Student recruitment efforts by the Admissions Office, as cited in annual admissions reports, were customary for the early to mid-1970s. Brochures were mailed to prospective students, high school counselors, principals, and alumni to the markets already identified as having a strong applicant base (Tables 4, 5, and 6); and admissions counselors participated in "college day" and "college night" programs at high schools. Most of the out-of-state visits were made to Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware, with a few excursions to West Virginia, North Carolina, and Washington, DC. In 1971, a young full-time male admissions counselor, an alumnus of the institution, was added to Madison's staff to help recruit males to the college. Visitation to the campus was also strongly encouraged and personal interviews for admission, while not required, were highly recommended.

#### Male students.

The percentages of males attending Madison also increased appreciably during this time frame. "Male enrollment increased slightly in the mid-60s but the percentage of male students stayed at around 10 percent until the fall of 1968 when Shorts Hall, the first male residence hall, was opened. That year male enrollment nearly doubled from the previous year to 635" (Journey, 1975, p. 11). Gary

Beatty cites the 1968 closing of Frederick College in the Tidewater area as the main reason for this dramatic increase:

When [Frederick College] was closed, there were eight hundred people there that were attending, and I was one of those. We found out at the end of that academic year that we had to find another school....Governor Godwin had issued a memorandum to the institutions [in the state] asking if they would be willing to accommodate applications after normal admissions deadlines.

Mr. DeLong [Madison's Admissions Director] decided that this was an opportunity to attract some males to Madison College. Madison was just building a new dorm at the time [Shorts Hall], and he knew that he had the responsibility to fill it with males.

(Interview, 1990, August 4)

Mr. DeLong and other Madison administrators visited Frederick College to recruit male students and mailed numerous follow-up brochures and information to the prospects. As a result of these marketing efforts, Madison received the bulk of the displaced students. "[Shorts Hall] was practically Frederick College" (Beatty, interview, 1990, August 4).

By the 1970-71 academic year, 24.52 percent of the freshman class was male. This increased to 29.14 percent the next year, and 31.87 percent during 1972-73. 1973-74 and 1974-75 saw the percentages increase to 37.16 and 41.01 respectively, and this figure never decreased (Table 10). This long-term goal which Dr. Carrier had set in his inaugural address was reached five years early.

### Consequences.

The decisions for rapid short-term growth and for increasing the male enrollment were not without sacrifice, however. The overall quality of the student body during this four year period declined somewhat, as evidenced by the number of students enrolled who were in the first quartile of their high school graduating class (Table 7) and by SAT scores (Table 8). In 1970, 58.77 percent of the entering freshmen had graduated from high school in the first quartile. But during the 1971-72, 1972-73, and 1973-74 academic years these percentages dropped to 49.57, 49.84, and 47.51 respectively. By the 1974-75 academic year, the percentage had increased to 72.01—the top three deciles—but the reporting procedures had changed from quartiles to deciles, so this figure is somewhat misleading.

Median combined SAT scores also dropped during this period. In 1970 the combined score was 987, but during the next four academic years, it dropped to 967, 958, 957, and 955. By 1976, however, the score increased to 1002, and it rose steadily in each subsequent year, except in 1983, reaching 1097 during the 1989-90 academic year. It would appear, then, that the admissions philosophy was to increase enrollment and the percentage of male students as quickly as possible and then, having achieved the short-term goal, tighten admissions requirements to become more selective and, therefore, more in line with the institutions with which Dr. Carrier wanted Madison to compete.



### Sports.

Athletics for women had been strong and varied for many years at the institution, to include the basketball program, initiated in the early 1920s (Dingledine, 1959, pp. 214-215), and field hockey, both of which could boast many winning seasons. Other sports were offered, as well, ensuring a varied program. But Dr. Carrier realized that, if Madison College was going to have the capability of attracting more male enrollees and thereby become a truly coeducational institution, one of the areas which had to be developed quickly was a more well-rounded sports program which also emphasized what laymen would consider to be "visible" sports for men, namely football and basketball.

We realized that an athletic program would do a great deal toward developing esprit de corps among students and faculty. The program would also have a certain public relations value, especially for an institution whose character was changing dramatically. (Carrier, "Sports Help Turn a College into a University," 1981, p. 40)

Several steps were taken to initiate the changes. Dean Ehlers, former colleague of Dr. Carrier at Memphis State and the first of the "Memphis Mafia" contingency to come to Madison, was recruited by the president to develop the program and become the school's Athletic Director. Mr. Ehlers relates:

I was in my office one day and got a phone call....There was a message on my desk to call Ron Carrier. I called him and said, "what are you doing in town?" He said, "I'm here to employ you as my athletic director." That was his opening comment....When I

first came here, I made the comment many times that I came for three reasons, the number one being Ron Carrier because I believed in him and in what he planned to do. I believed in the potential of this institution with him as the leader, and I thought it would be a great place to bring my family to live. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

The development of the football program was another critical turning point for the college. Dr. Carrier states:

The greatest task I had [when I came to Madison] was to change psychologically the campus to be coeducational. Football. That's why we have football....We had mass exodus on the weekends. We couldn't build programs. We couldn't convince people that we were a coeducational institution. The one way to do that was to have a football team, to have activities, and begin to change the philosophy. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

Challace McMillin, recruited by Ehlers and considered part of the original "Mafia," came to Madison to launch the school's first intercollegiate track and field program (Breeze, 1972, September pp. 5, 6) and was given the additional assignment to become the first coach of the Dukes football team. Their first season, in 1972, the Dukes played on the junior varsity level against five schools, two of which were private military college preparatory institutions, and the neophyte team did not score a single point the entire season. They won the first game of their second season, however, beating Anne Arundel 34-8, helped in part by freshman tailback, Bernard Slayton, who rushed for 1,041 yards and ten touchdowns during the season (Breeze, 1974, September 3, p. 19).

As football scholarships were not offered until the late 1970s, males were recruited on the bases of the facilities that were being built, the greater opportunity that they would have to play on the team, the challenge to be a part of building a new program, and the academic preparation which the college offered (Ehlers, personal communication, 1991, January 24).

Fall, 1974, marked the Dukes first varsity season, and they played Washington and Lee, Hampden-Sydney, Emory and Henry, Salisbury State, Bridgewater, and others. And instead of playing on the sometimes muddy field, they competed on the school's brand new astroturf, the first artificial surface at an educational institution in Virginia, built for intramurals and recreational sports as well as for the athletic program. Some jokingly it called "Ron's Rug," "Carrier's Carpet," the "Green Monster," and the "green helicopter pad," and some students did not approve at all, as evidenced by a letter to the editor of the Breeze, January 24, 1974 (p. 3) in which undergraduate Al Young calls the move to install the surface a "precocious decision" by the administration which, in his estimation, did not respond to student concerns over the perceived re-appropriation of funds away from renovations to Maury Hall and construction of the new building for the School of Education to free monies for the turf. The new surface was funded through a bond issue attached to the Godwin Hall construction, however.

Ehlers relates that "people said [the astroturf] was crazy, but it was one of the best investments ever made here from a standpoint of utilization by the student body" (Interview, 1990, April 10). As an aside, a later article in the Breeze (1974, April 9, p. 1) sheds light

on the renovations about which the student was concerned. Dr. Ray Sonner, then Director of Public Information, discusses the proposed renovation of Maury Hall, stating that funding had been requested for these improvements since 1952 but had not been approved by the legislature until 1974 and that administrators were happy to receive funding for the project "at a time when other major state schools suffered drastic budget cuts." Dr. Carrier informed me that this was the only capital project for higher education approved for 1974 (Personal communication, 1991, January 24). These improvements were viewed as a temporary measure until the college received approval from the state for the construction of the new School of Education, a request which had been denied in 1974 but which would be resubmitted in 1976.

Just four years after the football program was started, the first year of which the team did not score a point, the team was ranked number one nationally in Division III and was selected by the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) to play Hampden-Sydney College on national television in September of that year. Although the Dukes were defeated that day, ending their twelve-game winning streak, the fact that Madison College's team had received national exposure was a coup. In 1978, the program began preparations to move to Division I status and also started offering football scholarships, and by 1980, the Dukes football team was competing on the Division I-AA level.

Concomitant with the formation of the football program was the organization of the Madison Marching Band during the summer of 1972, ostensibly to offer entertainment at the games. That fall, the band received top honors at its first-ever parade competition (Breeze,

1972, September 29, p. 5). By 1978, the James Madison University Marching Royal Dukes moved to Division I, began performing at half-time festivities at professional football games, and in 1979 they hosted the Eastern Regional marching band competition. Their precision performances earned them accolades nearly every place they performed (Breeze, 1979, November 9, p. 3).

In the early 1970s, "Duke," the bulldog mascot, was first used at sporting events to help lend support and create a rallying point for the student body (Ehlers, personal communication, 1991, January 24). He, then his subsequent successor, Duke II, is a permanent fixture at the games.

Men's basketball had been offered at Madison for a few years, but it was with the hiring of Lou Campanelli in 1972 as the basketball coach for the Dukes that the program began to develop and lend legitimacy to Madison's budding coeducational status. Athletic scholarships were first offered in 1972-73, and "the JMU basketball team took quick advantage of the opportunity" (First Decade, 1982, p. 14). The team posted several back-to-back winning seasons, led in the early to mid-1970s by forward Sherman Dillard, touted as one of the most effective players which Madison has produced (First Decade, p. 16). Coach Campanelli credits the recruitment of Dillard and the participation in the NCAA Division II Southern Regional Conference in 1974 as major factors in giving the basketball program "instant credibility" at that level (First Decade, p. 16).

A major move was undertaken in 1976 when the NCAA approved Madison's request to upgrade its athletic program from Division II to Division I status, except for the football program which would remain

in Division III. This goal had been set for 1980 but was initiated early because of the "mass exodus of Virginia schools from the Southern Conference" (Breeze, 1976, September 3, p. 23). The basketball team garnered four winning seasons in its first years at the Division I level, and by the 1980-81 season, the university's team won the Southern Division championship of the Eastern College Athletic Conference and participated in NCAA national playoffs.

While the football and basketball teams were in their developmental phases, it was Madison's soccer team in the early 1970s which was the school's most successful men's athletic squad and the first to move to Division I level, in 1973. "The team won state soccer championships during the 1972, 1973, and 1975 seasons and was state co-champion in 1974" (First Decade, 1982, p. 14). Goalkeeper Alan Mayer was the first Madison athlete to be drafted by a national franchise, playing professionally for over fifteen years, and "has been described by the Complete Handbook of Soccer as 'easily the most spectacular soccer player America has produced....he makes breathtaking saves and has the purest reflexes of any American Goalie'" (First Decade, p. 14). By 1977, James Madison University offered twenty-six intercollegiate athletic programs, thirteen each for men and women.

Intramural sports and recreational activities had been offered at the institution from its earliest days, and for many years these were the primary sports programs opened to the male student population. When coeducational status was granted, opportunities arose to develop the sports program more fully, but not at the expense of recreational activities which would continue to be available to the whole student

body. To underscore the importance of these sports activities, a new Intercollegiate Athletics division was added to Madison's organizational structure in 1974, with a Director of Recreation position created to oversee intramurals and other recreational events. By the time Madison College became James Madison University, the three-pronged programs of recreation, intramurals, and intercollegiate athletics were well entrenched.

Student services and student life.

The organizational structure for the Student Affairs division underwent several changes during Dr. Carrier's first few years, reflecting the importance which the president placed on this function. By 1974, for example, the division had been renamed Student Affairs with a vice president supervising the various functions, and Directors of Student Life and Health Services created. The positions for separate deans for women and men were abolished, and a Dean of Students position was added by 1976. By the mid-1970s, student survey instruments were developed by this office, under the auspices of the school's Counseling Center, and administered yearly to entering freshmen and randomly selected returning students to determine satisfaction levels with the institution and to identify areas within the school which needed improving or changing. According to Dr. Daniel, the instrument currently used is still essentially the same as it was several years ago so that data can be tracked over time.

A priority of the administration was the upgrading of student health services. In keeping with the presidential student-centered

orientation and to accommodate the planned for enrollment increases, staffing for student health needs was increased from three part-time physicians to the creation of the position Director of Health Services in 1972 to orchestrate more comprehensive services. By 1975, the infirmary staff, funded by student fees, included nine physicians among whose specialties were gynecology, surgery, orthopedics, and psychiatry, five full-time and two part-time registered nurses, and support staff.

When Dr. Carrier assumed the presidency, Madison College, like many other schools of its type, was essentially a "suitcase college" which students would vacate on weekends primarily because of strict rules and anemic social life. As has been previously stated, the regulations governing student residential life were greatly revised and relaxed within the first two years of Dr. Carrier's tenure to bring the school more in line with other coeducational institutions and to make residential life more appealing. In 1970 curfews for all female students were enforced and women had to obtain parental permission to go on dates or leave campus for the weekend. By 1971, the curfew was eliminated for all females over the age of twenty-one, or under the age of twenty-one with parental consent, and the next year curfew and signing out rules were abolished altogether. The Open House policy in the dormitories, strictly regulated in the early years, was revised by 1973 to include four options ranging from special occasions only to seven days per week visitation, with the latter option not available to freshmen. In loco parentis was replaced with self-regulation. The student hostess "Madison Dollies" and the traditional "May Pole" celebration, the last vestiges of a



women's institution, were phased out early on. And the dress code, appropriate for a conservative, all-female institution, was also substantially relaxed. Policies governing the use of alcohol fluctuated with state and federal regulations.

While the social life of students was enhanced by the relaxed dormitory visitation rules, other programs were also added or improved to create an environment which would lure students and entice them to stay on campus on weekends. The expansion of the men's athletic program to include football, particularly with its meteoric rise coupled with the pomp of the marching band, eventually gave the students a rallying point on fall Saturdays, and the success of the Dukes basketball team entertained them through the winter months. The opening of the Warren Campus Center, complete with special activities throughout the year, afforded the students a common meeting place, and the completion of the Grafton-Stovall Theatre several years later for productions as well as movies added to the student life experience.

Along with intramurals, campus organizations had been an integral part of the institution's fabric from the first, with the YWCA as one of the earliest groups. Organizations, clubs, and service groups were added or modified through the years as student interests broadened and changed, and this trend has continued unabated with the concept of offering something of interest for nearly everyone.

Greek life was finally welcomed to the campus in 1939 with the establishment of three sororities. Until that point, these groups were strongly opposed by the faculty, and the early students followed suit. "From the beginning of the first session, the faculty...took a firm stand against [sororities]....The School had none at present, had

had none in the past and would have none in the future" (Dingledine, 1959, p. 103). The students instead formed literary societies, but by the mid-1920s, these clubs became less literary and more social, and the sentiment among the student body was more in favor of sororities. The faculty still opposed the Greek system, however, and it was not until 1939 that the groups were permitted on campus. By 1943, the literary societies had died out. Local fraternities for men were established in the 1960s, and national fraternities were added just a few years later. Greek Row on Newman Lake was added to the physical plant in 1978 to house thirteen Greek organizations on campus.

Madison's Student Government Association had two branches, one of which governed the men, until the early 1970s when the two groups were merged, a move in keeping with a coeducational structure.

Less apparent, but equally important, was the fact that many administrative staff positions were filled over the years with individuals whose backgrounds had been in student affairs, an administrative decision in keeping with a marketing orientation.

Dr. Menard relates:

The Student Affairs perspective is valued highly. That's in part a reason why Dr. Carrier has surrounded himself with Student Affairs folks. The previous Vice President for Business Affairs...started in residence halls here. The previous Vice President for Administration...was previously Vice President for Student Affairs [here]....Dr. Carrier's Executive Assistant was also in Student Affairs, the current Vice President for Administration and Finance was in Student Affairs, and the acting

Vice President for Academic Affairs was moved to that position from Student Affairs. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

Dr. Carrier was young and many of the staff members hired, both administrative and faculty, were also young and desirous of creating an environment where students' needs could assume a level of importance in the institution, hence the emphasis on the student affairs orientation.

#### Programs.

Changes in program offerings came more slowly than other strategies engineered by the administration to make Madison College a truly coeducational institution "because we couldn't get the curriculum changed if we did not change emotionally and psychologically to a coeducational institution" (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10). But while the school was aggressively recruiting male students, increasing enrollment, and adding visible sports programs, some improvements were made in course offerings as well.

In the first years of his presidency, perhaps the most critical change in program offerings initiated by Dr. Carrier was the new importance placed in business administration studies, a move clearly designed to attract more men to the campus. In 1971, business administration and business education were departments in the School of Social Sciences. In comparison with other faculty members, the staff teaching in these programs was less experienced overall and only a relatively small percentage had earned doctorates in their fields (Tables 14 and 15). During the 1972-74 period, the schools were reorganized to combine natural and social sciences and the humanities

into the School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Business was created as a separate entity in the professional studies division.

Communications was another field which Dr. Carrier believed would be favorably received by prospective male students, and a major in this program was initiated in 1974, and a separate School of Fine Arts and Communications established in 1978. In 1977, males graduated from the university in non-teaching programs for the first time (Breeze, 1979, December 4, p. 4).

By 1980, more students, both male and female, majored in accounting, communication arts, and management than any other program offered at the university (Breeze, 1980, October 14, p. 4), clearly a move away from the emphasis on teacher education in which the vast majority of students had majored in the early 1970s.

While program changes and additions were clearly designed to bring the college in line with other coeducational institutions, Dr. Carrier is quick to point out that the women students at the school also benefitted from the changes.

We added programs that were geared toward coeducational institutions, but they certainly benefitted the women because now we have more accounting majors in women than we have in men. We have probably more women going to law school and medical school than men. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

#### Facilities.

There has not been one day during Dr. Carrier's administration that either construction cranes or renovation crews have not been visible on the campus. During the early years of his tenure the

president realized that desired growth in enrollment and programs would be impeded by lack of adequate facilities, but convincing the state legislature to allocate funding for new projects was a difficult task. "There was no real interest by the legislature in Madison College at that time because there was no alumni political base there to support Dr. Carrier's efforts....He had to sell them [on] the potential of the school and what it could do for the state" as a regional, comprehensive, coeducational institution (Merck in Inspiration to Excellence, 1986, p. 9). The much-needed Warren Campus Center and Godwin Hall for athletics, construction of which began under Dr. Miller's leadership, were opened in 1971 and 1972 respectively. And after numerous lobbying trips to Richmond, Dr. Carrier secured funding for several new buildings in the early 1970s, to include three dormitories and a new science building, and existing buildings were acquired and renovations started on others. The new football stadium, adding an additional 5,400 hundred seats to the 3,000 wooden bleachers, a concession stand, and two-story press box, opened in 1975 and was funded with a surplus from the bond issue which financed the building of Godwin Hall (Breeze, 1975, June 27, p. 1). With new or improved facilities, expanded programs, and growing interest in the school as evidenced by increased applications for enrollment, state legislators began to realize that "something significant was happening" at Madison and, therefore, became more supportive of requests for funding (Inspiration, p. 9).

Obtaining funding for one particular needed addition to the campus was a source of continual frustration for Dr. Carrier, however. Realizing that the institution required a library annex, he petitioned

the legislature for years, to no avail. He visited then Governor Dalton in 1978 to emphasize the importance of the new library wing, to which the governor responded that there were no funds available for the project.

I said, "well, you don't mind if I try to get the money myself, do you?" He laughed and said, "you won't get it." I said, "well, you don't mind, do you?" "No." So I raised two million dollars the first shot. Then I got another million, and then I finally raised six million dollars, I think. We built the library [addition] one damn floor at a time. I told them to keep designing and I'd keep getting the money. We finally finished it, but it's a hard, hard way to do it. (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10)

An interesting note is that Dr. Carrier broke with the long-standing tradition of naming buildings only for deceased individuals, a policy established by the school's first board as a response to a request made by the Class of 1913 which wanted to name Dormitory Number One for then President Burruss. It wasn't until 1953 that the first president was honored posthumously with having the new science building named in his honor (Dingledine, 1959, p. 70).

I had all these buildings and I didn't have any names on them. You had to have a number on them because you had to have something to put on the architectural plans. But you're a student here and you say, "I'm going over to M-2." That sounds like a prisoner-of-war camp. I just couldn't let the buildings sit around with numbers on them. So I started rewarding people who had worked hard and long for the institution, such as deans, vice presidents,

professors, board members, and the like. (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10)

And the university's Board of Visitors voted on January 6, 1984, to rename Madison Memorial Library to honor the contributions which Dr. and Mrs. Carrier had made to the institution when he decided in December, 1983, to accept the Chancellorship at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville. Even though the president announced to the university community on January 9 that he had decided to stay at Madison, the constituencies were still in favor of honoring the Carriers at Founders Day ceremonies that March.

I told them at the dedication that I felt like the fellow in Mark Twain's story when he had been ridden out of town tarred and feathered on a log. He said that if it wasn't for the honor, it'd be downright embarrassing! (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10)

In 1977, the physical plant had grown to 74 buildings on 365 acres (Office of Planning and Analysis, no date). By the time that Dr. Carrier celebrated his tenth year as president of the institution, major renovations to existing buildings had been completed and nearly twenty buildings had been either constructed or acquired, to include thirteen individual units on Greek Row around Newman Lake, Chandler Hall—a combination dormitory and conference center, Grafton-Stovall Theatre, three dormitories, Miller Hall, the School of Education and Human Services building, and a new baseball field and stadium. Construction on the library annex and the new Convocation Center across Interstate 81 was in process (First Decade, 1982, p. 4).

### Conclusions

When Dr. Carrier assumed the presidency of Madison College in 1971, his primary goals were to change the women's teachers college image of the school and to create a comprehensive, residential, regional, coeducational institution with a "small college" atmosphere, a niche in the Virginia higher education system in which he perceived a need. And eventually, he wanted Madison to be competitive with the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary, long the premiere and nationally recognized public institutions in Virginia. His vision would take the college in a new direction. The risks were apparent, the potential rewards worth the effort. He spent the first several months establishing rapport with the school's various constituencies, particularly the faculty, administration, and students, replacing uncooperative staff members, and promulgating his vision so that by the time of his inauguration eleven months after he assumed his position, they were ready to move quickly for change.

To achieve the goals of changing the image and moving the institution toward becoming a comprehensive, regional school, administrative decisions were promptly implemented regarding enrollment, the configuration of the student body population, intercollegiate sports, student services, programs, and construction to begin to accommodate these changes. The overall concept was to increase enrollment first and then to add programs (Breeze, 1976, October 22, p. 17).

No formal marketing plan was used. This tactic was unknown in academe at the time, and the president's style of leadership did not accommodate multitudinous planning processes. He did not, and still



does not, want to be "paralyzed by planning" (Doherty, interview, 1989, November 10). Specific actions and strategies were decided upon, however, and Dr. Carrier, through his then "hands on" administrative approach and by the force of his personality and enthusiasm, ensured their implementation.

And these concomitant actions were largely successful. To increase both enrollment and the percentage of males at the school, admissions requirements were lowered for a three-year span. When both of these objectives were achieved, the requirements were stiffened and the rolling admissions policy later abolished in favor of the February 1 application deadline, a decision which, according to Steve Smith, moved the college away from its sister schools and more toward its brother institutions such as the University of Virginia, William and Mary, and Virginia Tech (Interview, 1989, August 17).

The development of the men's athletic program, particularly the visible sports, also began to contribute to the public change in perception of the college. The fact that both the developing football and basketball programs had successful seasons was serendipitous, but fortunate nonetheless.

The elevation of the Student Affairs division, complete with a vice president, the visibility and accessibility of the president, and the increased importance placed on student services and extracurricular activities began to awaken the students to the fact that they were an important part of the institution. The marketing orientation—a student-centered philosophy—which Dr. Carrier espoused was also beginning to be incorporated within the culture of the

college, and the overtones of student unrest which were apparent on campus when the president arrived in 1971 were largely quelled.

The creation of a separate School of Business and the addition of communications arts to the existing programs attracted more male students to the school. And Dr. Carrier's eventual success with the General Assembly resulted in construction projects to accommodate the increased enrollment and the new emphasis on intercollegiate sports.

By the time that Madison College began to consider seriously changing its name and seeking university status, many at the school had already believed that the institution had been operating as a university. The name change would merely announce to the public what they felt was already an accomplished fact.

And as for Dr. Carrier's desire that Madison enter the ranks of the distinctive state institutions, statistics were beginning to reveal that the college was beginning to be competitive with the University of Virginia and William and Mary. The June 26, 1975 issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch reported that Madison only accepted 52 percent of its Virginia applicants, with William and Mary and UVA accepting 56 percent and 62 percent respectively. Madison accepted 43 percent out-of-state applicants, UVA accepted 32 percent, and William and Mary only 24 percent, resulting in overall acceptance rates of 47.5 percent, 44 percent, and 42 percent respectively. Whether or not this was a "fluke" or the beginning of a sustainable trend remained to be seen.

## CHAPTER SIX

### Enter James Madison University

#### Steps Toward University Status

1976 marked another critical year of potential change for Madison College: Through Dr. Carrier's leadership and the implementation of strategic plans as discussed in Chapter Five, the school had begun a decisive move away from its image as a women's teachers college in 1971 toward its new mission of becoming a regional, comprehensive, coeducational institution with a "small college" climate. And just five years later, rumblings were heard about the possibility of changing the school's name to reflect and solidify its budding new image among the college's constituencies.

Also during this period, Dr. Carrier was being heavily courted to accept the presidency of East Tennessee State University, his undergraduate alma mater, as well as the presidency of Florida State University, the position for which he was seen as a "dark horse" candidate among the thirty-five individuals who were being considered. He was flattered to be "in the running" for the position at FSU and wavered on whether or not to remain as a candidate:

In recent months, Carrier has given some people the impression that he feels he has accomplished most of the major tasks he outlined for himself when he came to Madison early in 1971.

(Breeze, 1976, September 3, p.1)

When he arrived, Carrier had said he would leave Madison in five years, hopefully using his accomplishments as a steppingstone

to the presidency of a large university. (Breeze, 1976, January 18, p. 1)

And his personal modus operandi was to function in discreet time periods, usually five year increments (Breeze, 1977, January 28, p. 5). By December, he had withdrawn his name from consideration for the post at ETSU and was among the final seven candidates personally interviewed for the position at Florida State, but his ties to Madison were strong. "A semester of suspense ended at the December faculty meeting when Dr. Carrier announced his decision to 'recommit' himself to the presidency of Madison College" (Breeze, 1977, January 18, p. 1). He believed that continuity in leadership would be essential for Madison's development over the next several years and, therefore, he postponed his personal goals for at least another four years, assuring the school's constituents that he would not entertain the idea of leaving during that time frame.

While Dr. Carrier was reevaluating his position at Madison and potential future moves which he might take that fall, the initiation for the possible name change came from students and faculty who approached him on the subject. An editorial in the Breeze greeted incoming students with "Madison University: we're already there" (1976, September 3, p. 2), and the September 18, 1976 issue of The Waynesboro News-Virginian asserted, "Yes, Let's Change the Name," stating, "in every respect—curriculum, enrollment, faculty, athletics and reputation—the college has reached big-time status and should be called by what it is, a university" (p. 2). Dr. Carrier directed the college's Public Affairs office to conduct a survey of faculty, students, staff, and alumni during the fall, 1976, to ascertain their

reactions to a name change and to help select the new name, the two most popular of which were James Madison University and Madison University. He stated that he was "'essentially neutral' on the name change," but added that he was "'receptive to change and may be leaning that way'" (Breeze, 1976, September 3, p. 1). But "'once Dr. Carrier realized the need for a new name, he worked like the devil for it,' contacting legislators, alumni, and friends" (Dr. Ray Sonner in First Decade, 1982, p. 6).

#### What's in a Name?

Inherent in the expressed desire for the name of the college to be changed was also the desire for the name to reflect university status. There were no definitive rules governing the criteria for a college seeking the "university" designation in Virginia, but generally, the "diversity of educational programs, the level of the athletic program, student enrollment" (Breeze, 1976, September 3, p. 1), and faculty and student opinions were factors which would be strongly considered by the General Assembly, responsible for the final decision.

When the results of the survey were compiled, they were given to the Board of Visitors which subsequently developed the resolution to be forwarded to the General Assembly. Survey results revealed that 88 percent of the randomly selected alumni, 87 percent of the student body, 86 percent of the staff members, and 83 percent of the faculty overwhelmingly supported the name change:

James Madison University was given as the preferred new name by 72 percent of those favoring a name change. The second choice,

Madison University, received 26 percent and a variety of other names received the other 2 percent. The heaviest support for James Madison University came from students, who preferred the name by better than a 4 to 1 margin over Madison University. A majority of each of the other constituent groups also listed James Madison University as their first choice for a new name. (Madison College Board of Visitors Resolution, 1976, October 22, p. VII)

The Resolution delineated several reasons, supported by documentation comparing the school with existing universities in the state, why the college should become James Madison University. While the name Madison College had been proposed by President Samuel Duke to honor James Madison, President Duke also had believed that the name would best reflect coeducational status, should the institution move in that direction, as well as school's growing commitment to liberal arts studies. The name "James Madison University" was decided upon because it would reflect the considerable changes which the institution had undergone in the last few years, it would more precisely honor the Virginia statesman, it "would help totally eliminate the belief, which is still held by many Virginians, that Madison remains a small, primarily-female institution offering basically only teacher education courses" (p. VI-2), and "would eliminate the long-standing confusion over the location of the institution....The name James Madison University would clearly be linked to an individual, not a community" (p. VI-2).

The arguments used to propose elevating the college to university status included the school's enrollment, the percentage of males attending the institution, the increase in number and breadth of

academic programs, degrees offered on the bachelor's and master's levels, and the quality of the faculty. While the State of Virginia did not use formal criteria for determining this status, the Board of Visitors chose to include requirements mandated by California and Maryland to help strengthen the case for Madison. Headcount enrollment at the school for the 1976-77 academic year was 7,659 (with the FTE at 7,492), the enrollment having "tripled in the last ten years, quadrupled in the past twelve, and quintupled in the last fifteen" (p. IV-1). The Resolution also stated that "Madison's FTE is 25 percent greater than that of Old Dominion and 187 percent greater than that of George Mason when those institutions received name changes" (p. IV-3) in 1968 and 1972, respectively. According to California's criteria, the headcount of an institution must be in the top half of the schools in the state college system. In 1976, Madison ranked sixth among Virginia's fifteen senior institutions and exceeded Maryland's requirement of 4,000 FTE students. The document also reported that the percentage of males attending the college had increased to 45 percent, up from less than 9 percent in 1966.

Additionally, the Board pointed out that the college offered 64 majors on the bachelor's level and 27 majors on the master's level in 29 separate academic departments housed in four schools. Six bachelor's degrees and eight master's degrees were available. These statistics more than met the requirements mandated by California and Maryland. The college was accredited by SACS, with only four public institutions in Virginia having been accredited longer, and all of its programs were accredited by the Virginia State Board of Education. NCATE accredited the School of Education in three areas, the entire

music program was accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music, and the institution expected "accreditation by various agencies in the near future for specific programs in business, social work, chemistry, library science and nursing" (p. V-3).

Faculty numbered 450, up from less than 300 in 1971, and 61 percent had earned the terminal degree in their particular field (43 percent of the faculty in 1971 had earned the doctorate degree), exceeding California's 50 percent requirement.

The Resolution also cited other reasons for becoming a university, including increased status and respect with the change in an institution's name becoming "almost akin to a reward for its excellence (or the opposite if a name change is proposed and not approved)" (p. VI-1); the ability to attract better faculty, a more diverse student body, federal grants, and other funding; better post-graduate opportunities for students in terms of job placement and graduate school acceptance; and the fact that the cost of the name change would be minimal.

The mission of the "new" university would remain essentially the same as had been developed during Dr. Carrier's first year at Madison. The administration assured the school's constituents that the institutional character would not change; the elevation in status was to affirm the positive direction which the school had already taken over the last five years.

The same issue of the Breeze which reported that Dr. Carrier was recommitting himself to Madison College also heralded the news that the Board of Visitors' proposal for the name change would be forwarded to the state legislature for action (1977, January 18, p. 1). The



bill was introduced to the House of Delegates by Delegate Bonnie Paul of Harrisonburg, and the Senate bill introduced by Senator Nathan Miller of Rockingham, and

on March 27, 1977, Virginia Governor Mills E. Godwin Jr. signed a General Assembly bill changing the name of Madison College to James Madison University. Governor Godwin's action came 69 years and six days after a predecessor as governor, Claude A. Swanson, had signed the bill creating the State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Harrisonburg. (Images, 1983, p. 83)

Mrs. Althea Johnston, a member of the original faculty of 1909 until her retirement in 1952 and for whose husband, Dr. James Johnston, Johnston Hall was named, was present at the occasion and received the first of two pens Governor Godwin used to sign the bill into law, the second of which was given to Delegate Paul (Breeze, 1977, March 25, p. 1). The formal change took effect on July 1, 1977, and James Madison University was born.

#### 1983: Another Critical Year for JMU

Similar to 1976-77, JMU found itself at yet another pivotal juncture in its institutional life in 1983. In January, 1977, Dr. Carrier had promised the university's constituents that he would not consider accepting a position elsewhere for four years, and he kept his word. By fall, 1983, he appeared ready to entertain offers. He was asked to consider becoming Chancellor of the University of Arkansas—Fayetteville. The president of the university, Dr. James Martin, was a personal friend. By December, Dr. Carrier announced that he would accept the chancellorship. "It was an agonizing

decision for me to choose to leave. The great opportunity for professional and personal growth available at the University of Arkansas...left me no other alternative than to accept the challenge'" (Breeze, 1984, January 10, p. 1). Three weeks later, however, he informed JMU spokesman Fred Hilton to announce that he had decided to decline the position:

The JMU Board of Visitors impressed upon me this past Friday that James Madison University is facing critical times which require continuity in leadership [to include funding cuts and frozen positions in the state's higher education system]. Also, after 13 years, I find it quite difficult to leave. In addition, I have been deeply moved by the great show of support and affection given to me by members of the JMU community. The leadership instability of the University of Arkansas system recently created by the announcement that Dr. James Martin, the current president, has resigned to accept the presidency of Auburn University releases me from any obligation to accept the position at the University of Arkansas. (Breeze, 1984, January 10, p. 1)

When Dr. Carrier announced his decision to leave JMU, the Board of Visitors voted to rename Madison Memorial Library in honor of the Carriers. The university's constituents were glad to keep the resolution intact when he decided to remain at the school.

#### National Recognition

Also in 1983, U.S. News and World Report published the rankings of colleges and universities in the nation considered to be the best by the 662 out of 1,308 presidents of institutions which responded to the

magazine's survey (November 28). "The educators were asked to base their judgments on the quality of academic courses, professors, student bodies and general atmosphere of learning provided" and to select their top five choices from a list of similar schools (Breeze, 1983, December 1, p. 2). The categories included national, comprehensive, and small comprehensive universities, national and regional liberal arts colleges, and were subdivided into regions where appropriate.

James Madison University was ranked seventh among 368 colleges east of the Mississippi in the comprehensive university category, the only public institution among the top seven which included Bucknell University, Wake Forest University, Furman University, DePauw University, Skidmore College, and the University of Richmond, and was the only public institution in Virginia to be included on any of the lists. According to the criteria established by the magazine, comprehensive universities offered liberal arts and professional programs, but few, if any Ph.D. programs.

This was the first national distinction of its type which JMU had received and was considered a real coup by the university's constituents, particularly since the school, just a few years before, was perceived as a women's teachers college. In 1985, JMU was ranked second in its category on the magazine's survey of college presidents in the category of comprehensive institutions located on the southern border, a region comprised of fifteen states with 160 private and public school represented. Perhaps the institution's appearance in the first survey was not a fluke, and Dr. Carrier's goal of creating a

comprehensive, regional coeducational institution was being realized and recognized by peer institutions.

A brief examination of enrollment, sports, student services and attitudes, programs, and facilities during the intervening years between attainment of university status and the 1983 U.S. News and World Report article is helpful in tracking the university's development toward its national exposure in the survey.

#### Enrollment.

By 1983, the institution's seventy-fifth anniversary year, enrollment had burgeoned to over 9,000, more than doubling its size from the beginning of Dr. Carrier's tenure, and the percentage of minority students increased to 3 percent (Images, 1983, p. 89). In 1977, 8,252 applications for admission were received at the university, more than twice the number received in 1971; by 1983, over 11,000 applications were received by the Admissions Office (Table 9). Numerous administrators attribute the "grapevine" as the most effective marketing tool they have in attracting more students to the school as "satisfied students beget more students." Also, "no one can say for sure that a beautiful campus attracts applicants or makes current students happier—but it certainly seems that way" (Inspiration, 1986, p. 4). The quality of the student body had continued to rise as increasing numbers of perspective students competed for the available slots. By the time the college had become a university, the acceptance rate had already become selective. In 1977, 39 percent of the applications were accepted, and in 1983, 36 percent of the applicants received the nod (Table 10). In only one

academic year since 1982 has the acceptance rate exceeded 39 percent or less (in 1985, this rate was at 41 percent). By 1974, the enrollment of males had reached 41 percent, and that trend has consistently continued, fluctuating between 41-45 percent. The median SAT scores rose appreciably as well through this period (Table 8), although in 1983, at 1028 the scores were lower for the first time in eight years, but they still exceeded the national median of 893 (Breeze, 1984, January 26, p. 3). Some administrators speculated that the large number of minority students accepted for the 1983-84 academic year, as a response to state mandates, may have contributed to the lower overall average (Breeze, 1984, January 26, p. 3). JMU exceeded its goals for black student enrollment by fifty-eight students, enrolling 187. Statistics indicate that this was a temporary aberration as median SAT scores have risen each subsequent year, and minority students enrolled in each of these years. Further study would need to be completed before a conclusion can be drawn concerning the effect of minority student enrollment on these scores.

It was brought to my attention that qualified students may attend James Madison University, but they would not remain there for the four-year duration as the school was not as academically challenging as these students would require. Statistics on retention rates are credible, however (Table 11), and Dr. Doherty contends that he has not noticed any trend indicating that the better students leave at a higher rate than the norm (personal communication, 1991, January 24). But to determine whether or not the aforementioned assumption is accurate, an analysis of the better qualified JMU students as differentiated by class standing and SAT scores, compared with their

particular retention rates, would be a more accurate indicator. It would also be important to determine why and to which institutions they transfer when they leave before graduating from the university. For the 1983-84 academic year, the survey of non-returning students, including all academic achievement levels, conducted by the Student Affairs Office indicates that "nearly 80 percent of JMU's non-returning students would attend JMU again 'if they had to do it over'" (Breeze, 1984, April 22, p. 3), with 75 percent "'completely satisfied'" or "'satisfied'" and 11 percent "'unsatisfied'" or "'completely unsatisfied'" (p. 3). Almost 50 percent of the students cited "personal reasons" for leaving JMU, including family responsibilities, marriage, and medical or psychological problems. "Eighteen percent said academic problems were primarily responsible and 16 percent cited institutional reasons such as class scheduling problems or the absence of a desired major" (p. 3) as their motivations to leave.

#### Sports.

The still growing intercollegiate athletic programs were funded principally through student fees, game revenues, and funding designated from auxiliary enterprises on campus (Breeze, 1984, September 20, p. 7). The challenge was to gain national recognition and hence, bigger funds for the programs.

Obviously, a recounting of all of the sports exploits and setbacks for this period is not the purpose of this study. What is rather remarkable, however, is that the neophyte visible athletic programs for football, basketball, and baseball did produce

professional athletes during this period. The merits or drawbacks of educational institutions producing professional athletes is not the issue being discussed herein. The inclusion of this barometer of success simply highlights that, in one arena, the programs at JMU were effective in producing some players capable enough in their respective sports to be given the opportunity to use these talents beyond graduation, in part due to the continuity of leadership in the athletic department.

By 1983, the Dukes' football team had competed in the NCAA's Division I-AA for three years. Two teammates on the 1981 squad, receiver Gary Clark and senior Scott Norwood, the Dukes' kicker, were destined for the "pros." Upon graduation, Clark made it to the Washington Redskins, through the USFL, where he is currently a member of the "Posse" and a frequent selection on the John Madden all-star team, and Scott Norwood is kicking for the Buffalo Bills. In 1984, JMU retired Clark's number 80 to honor his record-breaking accomplishments at the school. Both Clark and mid-80s JMU student Charles Haley of the San Francisco 49ers sport Super Bowl rings.

On November 19, 1984, football coach Challace McMillin, was fired, the main reason officially being the relatively poor record of the team on the Division I-AA level (Breeze, 1984, November 29, p. 1). When asked whether he wanted to resign or be fired, the only football coach which the school had known opted for the latter alternative. Dr. Carrier relates that McMillin was then offered, and accepted, a tenured faculty position in the athletic department, took a leave of absence to receive a Ph.D. at the University of Virginia, and is

presently teaching Sports Psychology at JMU (Personal communication, 1991, January 24).

The basketball program, under Coach Lou Campanelli, was successful to the point that the team appeared in the first round of the NCAA championship in 1981, earning the university some \$90,000 in revenues, and lasted through two rounds of the national NCAA championship in 1982, being beaten and subsequently eliminated by the Dean Smith coached University of North Carolina Tarheels. The Dukes also earned the right to play in the 1983 NCAA championship games. In 1982, Linton Townes was selected by the Portland Trailblazers in the second round of the NBA draft (Breeze, 1982, September 23, p. 13), and in 1983, Dan Ruland and Charles Fisher were selected by the Philadelphia 76ers as third and ninth round draft choices, respectively (Breeze, 1983, June 30, p. 1).

The baseball program, coached by Bradley Babcock from the early 1970s until the late 1980s, was equally as successful as far as producing professional ballplayers. By 1978, six JMU players had been drafted by professional teams, and in 1983, "four members of the JMU College World Series baseball team...were drafted by major league baseball teams" (Breeze, 1983, June 23, p. 3), two of whom decided to graduate from the university rather than leave. Dean Ehlers relates that one of the program's proudest moments was earning the right to compete in the College World Series in Omaha, Nebraska in 1983, an event to which only eight schools are invited to participate (Personal communication, 1991, January 24).



Student services and student life.

James Madison University had long shed its reputation as a "suitcase college" by this time and continued to offer a variety of on campus activities through sports, service and social organizations, and productions. The February 24, 1983 edition of the Breeze (pp. 9, 11-12) printed the results of a student-directed social survey to assess student views of different aspects of the university. The survey reveals that most students selected JMU for its location, academic reputation, or size of the institution; that JMU was their first choice with UVA cited as the first choice of others; that JMU is a friendly campus; that they did not consider JMU to be a "jock" school; and that ninety percent of the respondents participate in intramurals and basketball was the most important sport on campus. Other results indicate that academic pressures were considered "moderate" and teaching was the prime concern of the professors; that required classes were too large; and that Dr. Carrier was the administrator most admired, even being cited as a "cult figure." When asked to describe the type of student that should enroll at the university, most stated that "he or she should be an intelligent, well-rounded person who is looking for fun as well as knowledge" (p. 12).

In keeping with the administration's desire for input from a wide range of the university's constituents, the Board of Visitors passed a resolution in 1984 to permit a student to participate as a non-voting member of the board to serve as liaison between the campus and the governing members (Memorandum from Dr. Scott to Dr. Martha Caldwell, 1985, March 18).

Students generally felt that the food served in the dining hall was above-average with adequate variety. By the late 1980s, several menu selections were offered in the newly renovated cafeteria-style facilities, to include regular ethnic themes (Italian and Mexican), the yearly lobster feast, and salad bars in each of the dining areas. Student health services expanded as well as a result of a number of years of student lobbying efforts. By 1982, the university clinic began to offer a variety of birth control methods to students upon receiving counseling and, in some cases, a physical examination (Breeze, 1982, March 29, p. 1). These devices are paid for by the individual students.

#### Programs.

Undergraduate liberal arts studies have already been identified as a linkpin of the academic program at Madison College, and this emphasis did not diminish upon achieving university status. In July, 1978, the School of Arts and Sciences was divided into the School of Fine Arts and Communications, purported to be "the only one of its kind in the state" at that time (Breeze, 1978, July 6, p. 1), and the College of Letters and Sciences. The College became the "undergraduate focal point and academic base of the university, since its academic disciplines constitute[d] the heart of the General Studies Program" (Breeze, 1978, September 5, p. 11). When I asked Dr. Russell Warren what he felt his legacy would be to JMU after he left to assume the presidency of Northeast Missouri State University in June, 1990, he replied:

Probably, reclaiming general education. When I got here [in the mid-80s], I found that the majors had cannibalized the general education program. My own view is that an important part of education is general education....Almost everything I've done has been around that theme....We've done things like writing across the disciplines, put into place the freshman seminar with twenty or less students in the class. We're returning the institution to a broad education for the students in addition to the major. (Interview, 1990, April 10)

The faculty's overall dedication to teaching was cited by several administrators as an important component of the academic program at the university, in keeping with the mission of the institution and a marketing orientation which was, and still is, student-centered.

By 1983, the academic programs had been reorganized to include the College of Letters and Sciences, School of Fine Arts and Communications, School of Business, School of Education and Human Services, the new School of Nursing, the Graduate School, and divisions overseeing the summer school sessions and continuing education. Within these schools were 29 academic departments and some 100 academic programs taught by 530 faculty members. "Teacher training maintained an important role at JMU but the number of students majoring in education dropped to less than 20 percent with the majority of students majoring in business, the sciences, the liberal arts, communication arts and nursing" (Images, 1983, p. 89).

### Facilities.

In 1971, the physical plant was valued at approximately \$30 million, and by 1983, the facilities and acreage were worth \$143 million (Images, 1983, p. 91). When the athletic facilities at Godwin Hall were outgrown, the new Convocation Center opened in 1982 across I81 with a 7,600 seat capacity. The Mauck Stadium and Long Field baseball complex and the renovated Madison Stadium seating 15,000 spectators completed the athletic facilities for the expanding sports and intramural programs. Several new dormitories were built to accommodate the burgeoning student body, and Greek Row on Newman Lake was completed. Existing buildings were acquired for classroom space as well as the construction of the School of Education and Human Services Building and Miller Hall, and an addition to the library was completed, doubling its capacity.

And as the buildings were constructed and the physical plant expanded, there was also being built into the institution a certain "way of doing things," a philosophy which permeated decision-making processes and which determined how the university's constituencies perceived the school, and each other.

### "The JMU Way"

The "invisible tapestry" (Kuh & Whitt, 1988) which binds James Madison University's constituents together in a common frame of reference is "the JMU Way," a phrase often used by staff members and students alike to describe the institution's saga. The change in the mission of the school in the early 1970s had been accepted, and the institution had grown in a number of areas, leading to university

status. The nurturing environment—culture—of the school, considered to be a part of the institution from its inception, continued to develop in the 1970s and 1980s, but with a student-centered emphasis away from the protectiveness characteristic of all female schools toward a "whole person" philosophy. Clark (1970) states that an institutional saga

offers in the present a particular definition of the organization as a whole and suggests common characteristics of members. Its definitions are deeply institutionalized by many members, thereby becoming a part, even an unconscious part, of individual motive . . . .A saga is then a mission made total across a system in space and time. (pp. 234-235)

Clark further purports that in only a handful of institutions has one person or one small group had the "opportunity and the will to devise a plan, test and reform it actively over a number of years, and have it reflected in the thought and style of the organization"

(1970, p. 234). Dr. Carrier brought with him what can be considered to be an aggressive orientation toward serving students. He built upon the foundation which had been laid by his predecessors, instilled his own brand of a service orientation toward students—a marketing orientation—hired like-minded faculty and staff, became a visible and accessible fixture, particularly in the early years when the campus was smaller, and infused into the existing character of the college those elements of student-centeredness which would evolve into "the JMU Way."

Dr. Menard relates that he and Dr. Mark Warner, now Dr. Carrier's executive assistant, extracted information from Frederick Rudolph's

chapter on "The Collegiate Way" in The American College and University: A History (1962) to form a basis for defining "the JMU Way" (Interview, 1990, April 10). Rudolph defines this early American mind-set as

the notion that a curriculum, a library, a faculty, and students are not enough to make a college. It is an adherence to the residential scheme of things. It is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism. (p. 87)

Adherents of the collegiate way became ecstatic over the beneficial influence which classmates exerted on one another, over the superiority of the college community as an agency of education over mere studies. (p. 89)

Most of the early institutions reflecting Rudolph's "collegiate way" were traditionally located in rural settings, were residential with a viable dormitory life for students, and were paternalistic in nature—in loco parentis in its prime. "The agency that perhaps best served the purposes of the collegiate way was paternalism, whether in the conscious ordering of the college regimen or in the informal relationships that grew up between faculty and student in the smaller colleges" (p. 103).

Harrisonburg, Virginia is located in the Shenandoah Valley where a way of life exists that is more serene than the northern Virginia corridor or the Tidewater area, for example. Although industry has developed in the region, it is still considered to be a rural setting by many, in perception if not in reality. The school has been residential in nature and substance throughout its almost

ninety year history. And with only four presidents serving the institution in this same long time span, paternalism was also intrinsic in its character. These factors were among those which prompted Dr. Menard and Mark Warner to consider the organizational culture of JMU as "the JMU Way." Dr. Menard points out, however, that "Dr. Carrier is the one who developed 'the JMU Way'" (Interview, 1990, April 10), and others confirm this assumption, to include the NCRIPAL research team which reports that the culture of the university is "synonymous with the vision of the President" (1989, p. 30). And what Dr. Carrier developed was a student-centered orientation which is actively espoused by the university's constituencies. Dr. Daniel's definition of this "invisible tapestry" perhaps best encapsulates the overall tone of the institution and the way in which the school operates by describing "the JMU Way" as being

service-minded. We're very service-oriented, and, of course, our customers are the students and their families....We listen to students and respond to their needs, treat them as partners in the educational process, and that's the bottom line, really. That's "the JMU Way". (Interview, 1990, August 4)

Clark (1970) asserts that a "strong organizational saga or legend [is] the central ingredient of the distinctive college" (p. 234). That James Madison University has a strong, identifiable institutional saga has been established. But other factors which complete the total picture of the distinctive college need to be reevaluated as well to ascertain whether or not the university has achieved the distinctiveness desired by the school's administration.

The "Distinctive College" Redefined: Does JMU "Measure Up"?

As has been previously discussed, there are three avenues by which an institution can pursue a distinctive character: it can be a new school with no prior history, it can be an existing institution in crisis, or it can be an existing school that demonstrates openness to change. The 1970 Madison College fell into the third category.

For the change to occur successfully, a strong leader with a vision and willing followers dissatisfied with the status quo must be a part of the equation. These two important elements have already been established in this study, as shown in Chapters Four and Five.

Some of the factors which the president must consider in formulating the new mission for the institution include the geographic location, the size of the school, its "traditional clientele, entrenched personnel, and fixed reputation" (Clark, 1970, p. 236). Harrisonburg, although located in the Shenandoah Valley, is just two hours away from the state capitol to the east and less than two hours from the northern Virginia corridor. Both hubs are easily accessible by the interstate highway system, and JMU is situated directly on I81. The decision to enlarge enrollment from 4,000 to 8,000 students by 1980 was made to increase the funding base and to create a regional, comprehensive, coeducational institution with a "small college" flavor, a niche in which Dr. Carrier detected a void. Clark (1970) asserts that the smaller the school, the more easily the institution can attain a distinctive status. While "smallness" is generally thought of in terms of the size of the student body, this attribute can be attitudinal as well, although this is more difficult to achieve. Because of the student-centered orientation that pervades



the culture at JMU, students generally do not feel that they are just one of many numbers. For the most part, as evidenced by the annual surveys taken on student satisfaction, they perceive the school as having a "small college" atmosphere where their needs are met. The configuration of the student body was also greatly altered when the percentage of males accepted increased to over 40 percent in the early years of Dr. Carrier's presidency, thus effectively shifting the traditional clientele from virtually all-female to a student population more closely resembling a coeducational institution. How the president handled entrenched personnel and the fixed reputation of the school is covered in Chapters Four and Five of this study.

That a school has achieved this goal of distinctiveness can be partially validated through its "differentiated, protected position in the markets and organizational complexes that allocate money, personnel, and students" (Clark, 1970, p. 250). As has been shown, the president was eventually successful in convincing the state legislature that Madison College would become a noteworthy institution in the state, thereby securing funding for some of the necessary programs and requisite construction projects. The school was, over time, able to attract higher quality faculty members and students as the increasing numbers of applications for limited spaces ensured that better students would be admitted.

#### Public image.

"The idea of the distinctive college is also present in its public image, in the impressions held by outsiders" (Clark, 1970, p. 254), and this is a definitive measure as evaluations are made by unbiased

parties. As can be expected, most institutions, through self-aggrandizement in public relations and admissions materials, purport to be distinctive in one or more areas to attract students and funding. Therefore, the perception of outside groups or individuals, particularly in the education arena, is a more accurate yardstick by which to judge the school.

How some of these parties perceive the university is included below. The representative samplings cited are neither all-inclusive nor are they included as public relations pieces. James Madison, like most other institutions, distributes its own lion's share of promotional materials. Indeed, one article gives a rather scathing evaluation of the school. Rather, they are included because they were written by unbiased individuals or groups not associated with the university—Clark's "outsiders"—and, therefore, help to verify JMU's trek toward distinctiveness.

In a reprint of the Changing Times article, "Best of the Bargain Colleges," (1988, March) the author Nancy Henderson states that "colleges that cost less than average but offer better-than-average academic quality should fit anybody's definition of a bargain," and she and other researchers examined schools in relation to cost, academic quality of the student body as evidenced by SAT or ACT scores, and diversity of the students as shown by percentage of out-of-state students accepted. The schools had to be non-sectarian and residential in nature, as well. Both public and private institutions were screened, and when the list of some one hundred colleges was selected, a panel of thirteen education experts chose the top schools in their estimation. Among the fifty-eight schools

selected by the panel were the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, and James Madison University. Of interest is that Dr. Russell Warren, former Vice President For Academic Affairs at JMU, left that position in June, 1990 to assume the presidency of Northeast Missouri State University which also appeared on the list.

John Stickney, in "Ten Public Colleges with an Ivy Twist" for the May, 1986 issue of Money Magazine, cites ten "up-and-coming" public institutions (193) as selected by educators throughout the country, to include Drs. Marvin Peterson of Michigan, David Riesman of Harvard, and Wade Gilley of George Mason University. The schools chosen were selective: they emphasize undergraduate education, which means, among other things, that the heavyweight professors don't concentrate only on their research projects or graduate students; their campuses are residential rather than being mainly for commuting students; and they try to reach beyond the region, the state and even the U.S. for a portion of their student bodies.

(p. 194)

Stickney states, "in a state with two venerable, national-calibre publics—the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary [both of which are included in Richard Moll's The Public Ivys, 1985]—James Madison is the comer" (p. 194). Of the ten selected, only two were more selective, at 39 percent, than JMU, whose acceptance rate at that time was 41 percent. James Madison University is also included in Peterson's Competitive Colleges, along with UVA and William and Mary.

The November 5, 1986 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education cites Dr. Carrier as one of the 100 most effective college/university

presidents in the United States (p. 13), with JMU included in the Carnegie Comprehensive I designation. Dr. George Johnson of George Mason University is also listed in this category, and Dr. Robert O'Neil of the University of Virginia is cited in the Research II designation. The presidents were selected through a survey of 485 scholars, presidents, and educators in the higher education arena. According to the characteristics occurring most frequently on the list, the presidents cared about others at their institutions, and they were considered to be risk-takers, dreamers, visionaries, and loners.

And James Madison University has had several appearances through the 1980s in the U.S. News and World Report surveys of the top colleges and universities as determined by presidents of higher education institutions, as previously cited.

Not all the press that JMU has received has been favorable, however. One year before the university was listed on the first U.S. News and World Report survey, Rutgers University professor Dr. Paul Fussell, a regular contributor to The New Republic, wrote "Schools For Snobbery" which appeared in the October 4 issue, an article decrying the trend of colleges becoming universities with seemingly little effort, ostensibly to elevate the alumni's status. "In the absence of a system of hereditary ranks and titles...Americans have had to depend for their mechanism of snobbery far more than other peoples on their college and university hierarchy" (p. 25). Of JMU, he writes:

Many TV viewers of a recent national basketball championship must have been as puzzled as I was to see "James Madison University," which was playing the University of North Carolina. This

institution, located in Harrisonburg, Virginia, until recently was Madison College, a modest teacher-training outfit. It has been promoted now to a status bringing it into comparison with Bologna, Oxford, and the Sorbonne, but it still specializes in elementary education, and the average verbal score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test of its freshmen is a dismal 455 for the men, 463 for the women. (By contrast, the figure is in the high 600s for Harvard, Yale, and Stanford.) (p. 29)

His satire contains an analysis of his reasons why educational institutions seek to inflate their status, relating that the widening of educational opportunity which occurred in the 1960s led to verbal inflation about schools, the American status symbol. He particularly notes that the elevation of teachers colleges and trade, business, and secretarial schools to university status conferred on them "an identity they were by no means equipped to bear, or even understand" (p. 29). Dr. Fussell, however, apparently did not verify some of the facts related to JMU before his article appeared. The verbal SAT scores for men and women at the university in 1981 were 483 and 515 respectively—the figures which he reported were from the 1973 academic year—and the top three majors at the school for the 1980-81 academic year were communication arts, accounting, and management, not elementary education. The university's response to the criticism was to invite the professor to speak on campus as part of the Visiting Scholars series. He accepted the invitation at first, telling Dr. Catherine Boyd, the JMU professor who arranged the visit, "'you guys are really good sports'" (Breeze, 1983, January 31, p. 5). He

later declined the invitation, however, not wanting to be part of what could turn into a side show.

JMU, UVA, and William and Mary.

That James Madison University has established a favorable reputation as an "up-and-coming" comprehensive university is apparent. Whether or not it is in the same league with nationally prominent University of Virginia and William and Mary is yet to be definitively determined. While JMU's peer group for faculty salaries as reported by SCHEV for 1990-92 is listed in Table 23, Dr. Carrier aligns JMU within the state higher education system with Radford and George Mason Universities, the three schools which he believes are the "growth institutions" (Personal communication, 1991, January 24). William and Mary and UVA are "public ivys," and many are surprised to learn that they are, indeed, public schools rather than private institutions. They are generally considered to be elite, and "elite" is one descriptive term which the administration does not want to be used with reference to JMU. Dr. Russell Warren believes that the elitist model will not work at JMU and that because premiere institutions are "drawing off the elitist kids," the type of student which JMU attracts is generally bright, but not elitist (Interview, 1990, April 28). And Dr. Carrier asserts, "we are not an elitist institution. If we became an elitist institution I think that it would change our mission and our service" (Breeze, 1977, February 1, p. 6) a statement he made thirteen years ago but the substance of which is still intact.

Recent findings obtained from SCHEV indicate that, in some areas, James Madison University is linked with the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary. According to Jean Keating, Research/Data Coordinator at SCHEV, the council uses a four-quadrant model to ascertain the least to most selective institutions, with the acceptance and subsequent enrollment rates of first-time freshmen as criteria (Personal communication, 1991, January 8). The fifty percent range is the deciding factor in delineating the data. Ms. Keating states that the most recent model shows that only three schools fit into the most selective quadrant with an acceptance rate of less than fifty percent and the subsequent enrollment rate of more than fifty percent: the University of Virginia, William and Mary, and James Madison University.

1973-86 acceptance and enrollment rates obtained from SCHEV for five of the fifteen senior institutions—JMU, William and Mary, UVA, George Mason, and Radford—are also included for comparisons (Table 22). Statistics for George Mason and Radford are cited as these institutions have been identified by Dr. Carrier as two of the "growth institutions" in the state, along with JMU (Interview, 1989, November 10). In 1983 and 1984, James Madison University was more selective than either William and Mary or UVA, though this was unusual. Since the institution attained university status in 1977, however, figures indicate that JMU has remained in the ballpark with these two schools with relation to selectivity.

College preps' changing perceptions.

One interesting and circuitous way to help determine prospective students' perception of James Madison University as compared with the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary is to track student interest in the institution from the viewpoint of an elite private school in the Tidewater area. Until the mid-1980s, students at Norfolk Academy in Norfolk, Virginia who selected in-state colleges preferred to attend the two aforementioned premiere institutions above all others in Virginia, with the Academy being considered to be a prime feeder school for these two schools. Little attention was given to JMU. When student interest did begin to surface, principally through word-of-mouth from Academy students' friends, applications for admission began to be received by the university. Not all of these students were accepted, however, as JMU was receiving applications from better qualified students, particularly from the strong northern Virginia corridor. Gary Beatty relates:

The most difficult problem we had in making this transition was not convincing students of the quality of James Madison University, it was in convincing parents so that it was socially acceptable to say that their children went to JMU. Whether we like it or not, this is an elitist state, and there is this image that one has because one's son or daughter goes to a particular institution. It is totally acceptable [now] in Richmond or Norfolk to say that one's children go to JMU. We didn't have this problem in northern Virginia. Northern Virginia was in such a growth area with so many people moving in from out-of-state. The students there accepted us as a quality institution, but in other



parts of the state we had to overcome an image that the parents had of JMU based on fifteen or twenty years ago. (Interview, 1990, August 4)

By 1989, Norfolk Academy ranked ninth out of all the schools in Tidewater, both public and private, to forward applications for admission to James Madison University (1989-90 Annual Admissions Report). And in 1990, JMU was second only to the University of Virginia, and ahead of the College of William and Mary, as the school of choice for the Academy's graduating class, a list of ten institutions which also included Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Horizons, 1990, p. 41). At this college preparatory school, it is becoming more acceptable to speak of JMU in the same sentence with UVa and William and Mary, although this is a recent phenomenon. Additionally, of the top honors graduates from the class of 1990 at Oakton High School in Fairfax County, Virginia, more of these students selected JMU than any other school, to include UNC-Chapel Hill, William and Mary, and UVa. Obviously, these are cursory findings and would require an in-depth analysis to determine to which schools these and the Norfolk Academy graduates applied, to which institutions these individuals were accepted or denied admittance, and what their top choices were, before a definitive statement can be made as to how they perceived JMU in the application process. That James Madison University was strongly considered is apparent, however.

Only time will tell whether or not James Madison University will be consistently linked with the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary by national polls, ranking educators, and the

public at large, and a study of this nature would be an interesting project for future consideration. It should be noted again, however, that Dr. Carrier's goal was that JMU be competitive with, but not a carbon-copy of, these fine institutions. Observations that are related in this chapter seem to indicate that JMU is becoming a competitive contender for academically qualified in-state students with these two schools, and is considered to be a regional university of distinction on its own merits.

#### Graduate school and JMU graduates.

One measure of an institution's distinctiveness is the quality of graduate school admissions for professional studies in medicine and law. Data obtained from JMU's Career Placement Office for 1986-89 indicate that most JMU graduates attended the University of Virginia, the Medical College of Virginia, and Eastern Virginia Medical Schools. Graduates attending law school primarily were accepted at William and Mary, the University of Virginia, T.C. Williams, Seton Hall, George Mason, and the Marshall-Wythe Law School, among others. These are credible institutions. It would be interesting, however, to contrast these statistics with those from the University of Virginia and William and Mary for the same time period to obtain a barometer of comparison.

#### Today

There are a number of interesting developments which have recently occurred, or are presently happening, on the James Madison University campus which should be cited in this study, including, but not limited

to, the hiring of a marketing oriented admissions director and reorienting of the Public Relations Department, the strides which JMU has made in affective student assessment, the revision of the university's mission, and the hiring of a nationally known controversial basketball coach.

A "marketing" admissions director.

In 1987, Alan Cerveny was hired as the Director of Admissions of the institution. With ten years of admissions experience, the previous two of which were as Acting Director of Admissions at the University of Nebraska, the youthful administrator brought with him a strong marketing orientation and aggressive viewpoint for the department. Through his instigation, the now bound annual admissions reports disseminated to the university's constituencies sport a new look and contain detailed information and graphs related to target market areas so that the administration can better determine the strong markets and those which needed to be explored. Mr. Cerveny states that no formal marketing plan is in place as the great number of applications for admissions ensures an academically qualified student body, evidenced in part by the median SAT scores (median scores for 1989 were 1096) (Interview, 1989, July 19). He also relates that favorable discussions by satisfied JMU students with their friends and family have been the most effective advertising tools to stimulate interest in the school for the last several years, and several other administrators corroborate this observation. This attitude is not to be taken as satisfaction with the status quo, however. One of his goals is to participate more actively in

traditional admissions activities in a wider range of states and to use the services of interested alumni more effectively in these endeavors. The Public Relations Department has also been recently reoriented toward pursuing a more national exposure for the institution, to include seeking positive exposure in publications such as The Wall Street Journal.

Student assessment.

In part as a response to the "Nation at Risk" report (1983) on the dismal state of the American education system and the ensuing public groundswell for accountability, JMU administrators, faculty, and students developed a five-year plan, funded by the state legislature, to assess student outcomes in cognitive and affective learning. The report, "Initiatives for Excellence and Accountability: A Five-Year Plan" (1985), laid the foundation for the eventual development of new assessment measurements in affective student learning which are being used as a model by other institutions. On the importance of this project, Dr. Carrier relates:

We [in higher education] are going to have to prove that we're doing the job that we say we're doing and that assessment is not going to be just a portfolio that we parade. We're going to have to prove that we did have an impact, that we changed the student, that we made him or her a different person....We [JMU] are good in assessment. We're developing some of our own tests. We were not happy with the national tests we were using for general studies. We gave those damn tests, and we couldn't figure out why our students didn't improve. We called in some experts, and they said

"they can't improve. The way this test is written, the students are already at the top when they come in, so they can't improve. Your students are at the top." So, we are now writing our own tests on affective learning. We believe that non-cognitive growth is very, very important. There's no school that puts as much professional emphasis on the student personality as we do here. We turned in the first report on this, and people said that it was the best report they'd ever read. (Interview, 1989, November 10)

A new mission statement.

In the early 1980s, as a result of the institutional self-study completed for SACS re-accreditation, a Master Plan for 1985-90 was developed for the university which also included elements derived from the 1983 "New Horizons for Excellence" report. "The University's ultimate intention is to become the nation's outstanding institution for undergraduate instruction" (James Madison University Master Plan 1985-1990). "By the late 1980s, however, it became apparent that a variety of changes in higher education and in society as a whole necessitated a major revision of the University's Master Plan to make it effective into the 1990s" (James Madison University Master Plan 1988-1990, p. I-1). As a result of these changes, the Master Plan was revised and a new Mission Statement for JMU developed in 1987-88, with input from a number of the university's constituents. The mission reaffirms the school's commitment to exemplary undergraduate education through ten objectives which include provisions for a broad liberal arts program, integrating liberal arts into specific majors through such measures as writing across the curriculum, affective development,

learning experiences which provide a global perspective, professional growth opportunities for faculty and staff members, research and service, assessment, a pleasing learning environment with modern technological advances, and a commitment to participatory governance.

The new basketball coach.

James Madison University's commitment to compete "in the big leagues" in intercollegiate sports was underscored with the hiring of nationally known Charles G. "Lefty" Driesell as the Dukes' varsity basketball coach in April, 1988. According to Dr. Carrier, JMU was "in a fringe of the media market" in the Washington, D.C. and Richmond areas and needed higher visibility for recruitment and scheduling purposes (Personal communication, 1991, January 24). The coach, controversial for his histrionics on the sidelines and his firing from the University of Maryland, brought with him a record of 524 wins accrued at Davidson (1960-69) and the University of Maryland (1969-86) and assumed leadership of one of the least experienced teams in his long coaching career. In a slick publication hailing his hire and highlighting different aspects of the program, Dick Vitale, a recognized basketball television commentator, is quoted:

It's show-biz at it's best when "Lefty" Driesell returns to the sidelines in Harrisonburg. Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey don't do it any better. The "Left-Hander" knows how to motivate. Teams around the CAA [Colonial Athletic Association] better enjoy taking their shots at JMU this season because in two years the Dukes will be a well-functioning, solid-gold machine. Watch out, America. Like Davidson, JMU will be in the top 20; you

can take that to the bank. (JMU Basketball: 1988-89, 1988,  
p. 10)

That bank withdrawal has yet to be made.

### Tomorrow

Two unrelated events, one internal and one external, occurring five years apart, had a part in shaping the academic plans for JMU into the twenty-first century. In remarks made to the JMU faculty on August 26, 1983, Dr. Carrier states, "plans were laid ten years ago which have resulted in the success of JMU today. Now, we must plan for the coming years" (Remarks to the Faculty, p. 3). One of the goals proposed was the creation of a Center for Science and Technology in part to "serve as a conduit for the exchange of ideas and expertise between the University and the community" (p. 7), an idea which had been brewing for some time. The center was established at the university in the mid-1980s.

And in 1988 the General Assembly formed a commission to make recommendations on the future needs of the Virginia higher education system, and during the fall, 1989, the report from the Commission on the University of the 21st Century was published in which the commissioners delineate the direction which the system should take to prepare for the changes which would be occurring in the state and to accommodate the prospective enrollment increase in the traditional age student population. Citing the move away from an agrarian and "smokestack manufacturing economy" toward "information technology and service industries" (p. 1), the new configuration of the working force which will include substantially higher numbers of minorities and

women, and the need for more aggressive research activities, among others, the commissioners make several recommendations for the institutions in the system to consider. These include the reorienting of the undergraduate curriculum "so that global perspectives are pervasive in all fields of study and technological competence is taught to all students" (p. 2), the use of advanced technologies within the classroom and institutional facilities such as libraries, and designing buildings appropriate for use well into the twenty-first century. The commissioners ask the colleges and universities in the state system to "develop a detailed plan in response to this report and about its own view of the future by June 30, 1991, and forward it to the Council of Higher Education" (p. 4).

#### The proposed new college.

James Madison University's response was to form the Greater University Commission in 1988 to study the external forces that would have an impact on JMU, evaluate curricular offerings, facilities, the student body configuration, the size of the school, and the impact of a possible increase in enrollment on the Harrisonburg community. The subsequent written report (December 15, 1988) also addresses the issues of accessibility, quality, accountability, and economic development, "four major goals set by the Commonwealth of Virginia for higher education" (p. 3), as they affect both the university's impact on the state and the school's reciprocal relationship with the community. The most far-reaching proposal made by the commission, and one which, if approved and implemented, would accommodate concomitant issues of increased enrollment and the need for increased learning



experiences and research demands in technology, science, and communications, was to expand the campus by some 110 acres for a new college (by 1990, the physical plant consisted of 90 buildings on 472 acres). Dr. Carrier had already begun negotiations to purchase the land, located directly across the interstate from the university. The president relates that he had been contacted by the gentleman who owned the acreage who said that he had been offered a substantial amount for the land but that he wanted the university to be able to purchase it (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10). Dr. Carrier was able to secure the option money to purchase the land and negotiate with the state legislature for funds to begin planning the new campus.

In August, 1989, Dr. Carrier appointed members to a "blue-ribbon panel" to review the school's proposal for the new College of Applied Science and Technology and to report on their findings. The final JMU report and addenda were developed in response to the recommendations made by the Virginia Commission on the University of the 21st Century (U21). Compatible with JMU's emphasis on liberal education, the mission of the new college would also encompass the areas of

quantitative skills required for scientific understanding and inquiry; experience in team investigations and problem-solving; sensitivity not only to science and technology issues, but also to the economic, environmental, social, and ethical contexts of public and private policy decisions; the capability of functioning effectively in a multi-cultural society and a global environment; [and] the tools for responsible citizenship in a technological age. (p. 2)

Other recommended components of the college curriculum would include a senior course for all JMU students to address the issues of science and technology within society as well as a "core curriculum in science and mathematics for all degree programs in the college" (p. 4) in addition to traditional liberal arts studies. The college would eventually admit a maximum of 3,000 students, employ 200 faculty members, be administered by a provost who would report to the president of JMU, and commonly share university facilities in addition to operating on its own campus. Administrators at JMU are excited about this new vision, despite austerity in the higher education coffers. Planning activities and are already underway, and a variety of creative funding possibilities are being discussed. The pricetag for the college is projected to be upwards of \$140 million.

What will happen when Dr. Carrier leaves?

Then, there is the inevitable question concerning JMU's future minus Dr. Carrier's pervasive leadership. Administrators are often asked what will happen to James Madison University when Dr. Carrier leaves or retires as, to many, he and JMU are synonymous. Dr. Scott muses:

Obviously you don't replace a person like Ron Carrier. He's a unique individual who brings certain things to this university and has for twenty years....My own feeling is that when the president retires or leaves it is going to be a period of a rather difficult transition because the institution is so identified with him and he is so identified with the institution. My feeling is that the institution has matured to the point, and the culture is so

ingrained, that the institution is going to continue, and it is going to continue probably to value the same things in the future.

(Interview, 1990, April 10)

Dr. Menard agrees with this assessment, asserting that the university can continue for "quite a period of time without reinforcement because...of the people who've been selected" (Interview, 1990, April 10), notwithstanding the hire of a new president whose views of leadership are diametrically opposed to those held by Dr. Carrier. Dr. Henry Willet, former presidential colleague, likewise believes that "what Ron has done will carry on...particularly if they get someone with the same general philosophy of life" (Interview, 1990, May 14).

As to the leadership style that a new president may exhibit, Dr. Daniel believes that

most of the time when you've had very strong central leadership, the person who then comes in is more of a consensus leader and more low-keyed, and more of an organization person that decentralizes a lot of things that were centralized. I think that is natural for organizations. So there will probably be somebody like that, and it could very well be somebody internally because there are people like that in the next level of leadership. (Interview, 1990, August 4)

And Gary Beatty thinks that Dr. Carrier will make his presence felt "on the sidelines even after leaving" (Interview, 1990, August 4).

The NCRIPAL Report raises legitimate concerns over this eventuality, however:

James Madison has apparently grown over the last 20 years in accord with the vision of one man. While his values are synonymous with those of the institution, there are no guarantees that his successor will share those values or that the Commonwealth of Virginia will continue to look upon JMU as a model for undergraduate education. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to predict how the culture of JMU might change, although several informants reported that they believed the culture of the institution to be so deeply imbedded that any efforts to change the direction of JMU would be strongly opposed. Even so, when an institution is so intimately associated with the will of one man, it is important to consider what might happen were he to leave. (1989, pp. 32-33)

It would not appear that James Madison University constituents will have to face this change in the near future, however. In recent informal talks, Dr. Carrier stated that he feels the urgency to be active in Virginia higher education into the twenty-first century to help ensure continuity of leadership both at his own institution and in the state as well, particularly with the possibility that the new campus will open before the 1990s are over. Additionally, he believes that the new leadership that will emerge in the state system can benefit from his experience.

#### Dr. Carrier on the State of Higher Education

Dr. Carrier has been both an active participant in and an observer of the Virginia higher education system for twenty years, surviving several gubernatorial administrations. Considered to be the dean of

college and university presidents among many of his peers, in part because of his longevity, his thoughts on academe both in the state and on the national front have been formulated out of his considerable experience in the field and are included in this study.

When I asked Dr. Carrier to give a brief analysis of the stands on higher education taken by Governors Robb and Baliles, he responded that Governor Robb's primary commitment was to improving secondary and elementary education and that higher education "paid the price for that because he wouldn't increase taxes, and during those years we didn't get any [significant increase in] positions....We were frozen. In fact, people lost positions" (Interview, 1989, November 10). Salary increases for faculty and staff finally did occur during the last year of the governor's term, funding for a few buildings was allocated, and the trust fund for equipment was initiated, but because the economy was in a recession, the bulk of available funding was concentrated on the public education system. He added that Governor Robb was not opposed to growth in higher education, but because of state fiscal constraints, funds were diverted from higher education into elementary and secondary schools.

It was Governor Baliles and a budget that was very favorable that allowed us to make progress. It was in the last years of Governor Robb's administration that we established the standards for salaries to be in the sixtieth percentile. They were all put into place with Senator Don Finley and Dr. Gordon Davies, but it was Governor Baliles that carried through. (Carrier, interview, 1989, November 10)

During the time of our first interview, Douglas Wilder and Marshall Coleman, incidentally a member of Madison College's Board of Visitors in the early 1970s, were campaigning for Virginia's governorship. As Mr. Wilder was ahead in the polls, I asked Dr. Carrier to project what he thought Wilder's stand would be for higher education in the state. His musings, prior to the announcement of the \$1.9 billion shortfall which the new governor would inherit, included that he believed Wilder would probably be "the most supportive person of higher education that we have had. He has that potential....He wants to leave a mark as the first black governor ....He's going to be a governor who looks to the twenty-first century, and he'll look at education to lead the way" (Interview, 1989, November 10). Dr. Carrier also stated that he believed that Mr. Wilder had the courage to increase the sales tax to five percent should that move be considered necessary.

Our subsequent visits took place after Douglas Wilder had been elected governor, with the state facing a sizeable shortfall, complete with undertones of recession coloring the economy. To recuperate, the governor mandated a ten percent budget cut for higher education institutions across the board and reallocated lottery monies, heretofore earmarked for construction projects in academe, to fund other state-supported necessities such as the penal system. Funding was also reduced for Virginia's public education system, as well. And at the time of the writing of this study, there is talk in Richmond of placing an enrollment cap on higher education institutions. Statewide institutional responses to this fiscal restraint have included leaving empty positions unfilled, firing selected faculty and staff members,

reducing hours of operation for institutional functions, such as the libraries, and putting some developmental programs and construction projects on hold.

According to Dr. Carrier, some of the issues which Virginia higher education needs to address into the twenty-first century include increasing the salary base to the eightieth percentile—Virginia is presently at the sixtieth; implementing major reforms in teacher education by building "great partnerships" in basic teaching between higher education institutions, government agencies, and the corporate arena; and allocating funds to support two major research institutions in the state which would be among the top twenty-five in the nation (Interview, 1989, November 10). Other concerns facing higher education are the increase in traditional age students in Virginia requiring access to postsecondary education; environmental issues; science, technology, and communications developments; and the need for more women and minorities to be actively involved in these fields (Interview, 1989, November 10). James Madison University's response to help meet these needs through the development of the new college has been discussed in the previous section of this chapter.

Dr. Carrier's assessment of higher education as a whole serves as an appropriate conclusion to this chapter. The president's opinion is that it is "the most dynamic social institution in America today, and if you have a chance to be a part of it, then try to do something positive" (Interview, 1989, November 10). He adds:

Education is a powerful social force that allows people to move from one social level to another in one generation.... Its the most powerful force for social mobility. The GI Bill, Pell

Grants—all these things made it possible for people to move into jobs and positions that they would have never been able to do before. And it's a great repository for knowledge. The libraries are full of the storage of knowledge. It's an institution that challenges society and questions its values and direction, looks at where it has been and where it is going. It's one that supports the arts and music. It's a place where people can make mistakes and still succeed. A youngster comes to school at eighteen or nineteen years old and can make some serious mistakes, but still succeed. The system protects them and makes sure that they have an opportunity. It is a place where people can be creative. And it's a good place to work. (Interview, 1990, April 10)



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### Conclusions

#### The Research Question Re-Stated

This qualitative research study concerns the transformation of Madison College, a small state teachers' college for women, into James Madison University, a fully coeducational, comprehensive, regional university which is nationally recognized as an "up and coming" institution.

The basic research question answered is:

How has James Madison University, formerly Madison College, attained a nationally respected reputation?

The underlying assumptions were that this was a rather unusual feat, considering that the metamorphosis took place in twelve years, a short period of time in the higher education arena where resistance to change is the norm (Walker, 1984), and that national recognition was not a temporary fluke but rather has been a sustained perception.

The two initial hypotheses which I developed to provide a starting point were:

1. James Madison University has become a respected, nationally recognized university because of successful, well-planned marketing strategies which transformed its image from a provincial, Virginia women's college into a coeducational university with national prominence.

2. Dr. Ronald E. Carrier, president, played, and still plays, a prominent role in the school's evolution.

Specific frameworks were required in which to examine these two rather open-ended statements and to manage the broad spectrum of information gathered. Two primary sources, Kotler and Fox's Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions (1985) and Clark's The Distinctive College (1970), were instrumental in this process as each provided a paradigm of sorts to explore both hypotheses respectively. The strategic planning model developed by Kotler and Fox was useful in providing a mechanism by which to assemble disparate information as to the actions which the administrators took to change the image of the institution, and Clark's analysis of the "charismatic leader" was the basis for examining Dr. Carrier's leadership style and his influence on the transformation. Among the numerous secondary works on leadership which I perused, Kerr's The Uses of the University (1982), was equally helpful in examining presidential characteristics. And The Distinctive College and Kuh and Whitt's The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities (1988) each provided an insightful guide into the phenomenon of institutional saga whereby to analyze what James Madison University constituents call "the JMU Way," a third emphasis which emerged during the research process.

I discovered very early in the data-gathering stage that the administrators at Madison College did not use a formal marketing plan per se to transform the college into a university. Therefore, because hypotheses in qualitative research can be revised during the process, I amended the first to state:

James Madison University has become a respected, nationally recognized university because of strategic plans—rather than formal, tactical marketing plants—which transformed its image from a

provincial, Virginia women's college into a coeducational university with national prominence.

### Subsidiary Questions Answered

The subsidiary questions posed in Chapter One have been answered and appropriately documented throughout this study. Brief synopses, however, are provided here as a method to summarize. Further findings, analyses, and conclusions are detailed in the next section of this chapter.

1. What prompted the desire to change the image of Madison College? When Dr. Carrier assumed his role as president of Madison College in 1971, he discerned a niche in the Virginia higher education system which he perceived had not yet been adequately filled—that of a comprehensive, residential, coeducational, regional institution with a "small college" atmosphere. The president also realized that enrollment needed to increase quickly to secure a more substantial funding base for the institution. The actions which were taken, and which are the substance of this study, were designed to bring about that end.

2. What definable marketing strategies were used to change the image of the school? During the five year period in which the college underwent its metamorphosis, the use of a formal marketing plan was virtually unheard of by academicians, administrators at Madison College included. Traditional marketing activities did take place, however, particularly in student recruitment, although perhaps not using the nomenclature associated with the business sector. Goals were stated in Dr. Carrier's inaugural address, and strategic planning

was undertaken on the various administrative levels to initiate actions to meet these and other objectives. Kotler and Fox's Strategic Planning Process Model has provided a frame of reference within which to analyze the activities in which administrators did engage, to include environmental and resource analyses, examination and subsequent alteration of the college's mission, adopting strategies to increase enrollment overall and the male student population in particular, and reorganizing the administrative structure of the institution. These have been discussed at length in Chapter Five of this study, and further analysis follows in the next section of this chapter.

3. What was the "marketing mix" used? Were some components planned and others serendipitous? A marketing mix includes the elements of price, position, product, and promotion which are factored into the strategic planning formula in proportions appropriate to the desired end. While each of these four components played a part in the overall plan, clearly, administrators at Madison College were most concerned with the position of the school in relation to other Virginia institutions. The price of attending the state-supported college was affordable, and need-based financial aid through state and federal sources was available. The principle strategies were directed primarily toward repositioning the institution by transforming the image of school from a small women's teachers college into a regional, coeducational, comprehensive institution by increasing and altering the configuration of the student body, modernizing social regulations, and stressing student services and on-campus activities. The product or program offerings were restructured to give greater emphasis to

studies in business administration and communications, courses which had greater appeal to prospective male students, and to develop the men's intercollegiate sports programs. The institution promoted itself through traditional admissions activities and with the addition of a young male admissions counselor to recruit more men to the campus. Litton (Donnelly & George, 1981) proposes that two additional "P's" be added to the marketing mix for the educational arena: philosophy and pedagogy to help marketing officers understand the unique nature of academe. The educational philosophy which Dr. Carrier brought with him to the college was a student-centered orientation, and the primary mission of the faculty to teach was built upon and substantiated. The strategies developed to achieve these ends were well-planned, as described at length in Chapter Five. Serendipitous results were achieved from the visible intercollegiate athletic programs, however, which were surprisingly competitive almost from their beginnings.

4. What kinds of data were gathered to plan the strategies necessary for the transformation? During the first year of his presidency, Dr. Carrier solicited advice and ideas from the institution's constituencies, particularly the faculty, students, and staff members, as to the direction they wanted the institution to take and the programs they wanted developed or improved. The Purpose Committee was formed to evaluate the school and to make recommendations; Dr. Carrier's inaugural address was the first Master Plan for the institution. It should be emphasized that the president knew, almost from the beginning, the niche which he wanted the college to fill in the state, and he knew what needed to be done to accomplish that end.

While the solicitations he made were important in the effort, it is my estimation that they served more to provide consensus for plans which he had already predetermined would be implemented.

5. What has the role of athletics played in the transformation of the institution? The development of a full-fledged intercollegiate athletic program, particularly for male athletes, was a primary goal in changing the image of Madison College to a coeducational institution. The initiation of the football program in 1972 gave the students a reason to stay on campus on weekends and began to create an esprit de corps within the student body, and the growth of the basketball program afforded another rallying point for the students, as well. By 1980, the intercollegiate athletic programs competed in the NCAA Division I category.

6. How did enrollment configurations change during the transformation? During the 1970-71 academic year, enrollment was just over 4,000, with with a less than 25 percent male population. By the 1974-75 term, the percentage of males accepted to the institution had risen to 41 percent, and this figure has fluctuated between 41-46 percent in each succeeding year to the present. The goal of a 7,000 enrollment by 1980 which Dr. Carrier cited in his inaugural address was reached by 1975. Additionally, after a three-year period during the transformation in which admission requirements were lowered to increase the student population and admit a substantially higher number of males, the quality of the student body rose appreciably as evidenced by SAT scores and the percentage of enrollees who graduated in the upper third of their high school classes. Applications also rose impressively, ensuring a large applicant pool from which to

select qualified students in terms of academic ranking, SAT scores, extracurricular activities, and the ability to benefit from and contribute to the institution.

7. How was funding secured for the institution? Funding for Madison College was generated through three primary sources: the state's General Fund, student fees, and monies obtained from auxiliary enterprises at the college. Donations from private sources were not substantial. Dr. Carrier's principal objective with state legislators was to convince them that the college could become a viable comprehensive institution in the state. This was ostensibly a singular campaign as the political constituency for the geographic region and the school was weak, at best. Through the president's persistence, and with his political acumen accompanied by hard data on the increase in applications and enrollment and the updating of programs, Dr. Carrier succeeded in bringing favorable attention to the college in Richmond. As a result, more funding became available to the institution for construction projects. Additionally, private giving to the school also increased appreciably.

8. What factors precipitated the change from college to university status? By 1976, the consensus among the school's constituencies was that Madison College was already acting like a university and should be so designated. The growing student enrollment was fully coeducational, the budding athletic programs for men had had successful seasons, the School of Business had been developed, along with improvements in other programs, the quality of the faculty had risen, degree programs had been expanded, and the facilities had grown to accommodate many of the changes.

9. Who were the key players in effecting the change? The desire for university status was voiced to Dr. Carrier by both students and staff members. The Public Relations Office conducted a survey among the school's constituents to determine their viewpoints about this issue and to propose an appropriate name. When the results were tabulated, and an overwhelming majority supported a status and name change, Dr. Carrier lobbied actively among the Virginia legislators to have the General Assembly grant university status to the college and to be renamed James Madison University. Governor Mills Godwin signed the bill into law in March, 1977, with July 1, 1977, the effective date.

10. What effect did the name change have upon the school? The name change represented a definitive break from Madison College's past image of a small, single-sex teachers college into a fully coeducational university. Pride in the school increased, as evidenced by the upsurge in applications mainly due to students and families telling friends about the institution. As a university, the school broke away from its heretofore sister institutions and entered the arena of the brother schools as a new player. Perceptions among some Virginians die hard, however, and it will take a longer period for the university's previous history as a small teachers college to be laid to rest.

11. How were the changes accepted by the university's constituencies? In a word, enthusiastically. In 1971, Madison College was poised for change, and when Dr. Carrier led the school in a new direction, most of the troops followed.



12. What effect did/does the "institutional saga" of Madison College/James Madison University have on the steps which the school has taken to increase its stature on the national level? Clark (1970) asserts that a definitive component of the "distinctive college" is evidence of a strong institutional culture or saga. This perspective pervades the whole environment of the school, to include decision-making processes and the perceptions of students, staff members, alumni, and friends of the institution. What began as a nurturing atmosphere for female students in the school's early years eventually coalesced in the 1980s into "the JMU Way," a strong student-centered philosophy espoused by administrators, staff, and students alike. This mind-set has served as a cohesive thread and provides continuity, the force of which cannot actually be quantitatively measured but the effect of which is discernible nonetheless. This phenomenon is discussed more fully later in this chapter.

13. How important was/is the role of Dr. Ronald Carrier, president of Madison College/James Madison University? That Dr. Carrier's influence in the school's transformation was crucial is unquestioned. That his pervasive charismatic leadership is still an important component in the fabric of the institution is apparent. Chapter Four analyzes his presidency in terms of the "charismatic leader," and further findings are discussed in the next section.

### Findings

During our interview, Dr. Russell Warren mused:

I think a study like this is fascinating, and I just think that there is an incredible discovery here that's not yet been

discovered, that somehow behind the words we at JMU are all using when we talk to folks like you, that somehow it's behind those words. (1990, April 10)

And in The First Decade of the Carrier Presidency (1982), then Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Thomas Stanton states, "'no one knows why we are popular...but [in his opinion] Madison is the "in" place in Virginia—almost like designer jeans'" (p. 2). "Stanton said he would like to know why JMU is popular and how this popularity can be sustained so the University can continue its winning campaign" (p. 2). To these gentlemen and to the others who expressed similar sentiments, I submit that, after having conducted several data-gathering trips and analyzing a variety of resources, it would be presumptuous of me to state that a new "incredible discovery" was, indeed, made. Yet there were discernible factors contributing to the effective transformation nevertheless, as evidenced by the national recognition which the university has received. These findings are categorized in three groups: the charismatic leadership of Dr. Ronald Carrier, the specific strategic plans used, and the ethos of "the JMU Way," with conclusions offered in the next section as to why these jigsaw puzzle pieces have coalesced successfully.

#### The charismatic leader.

A premise of this study was to examine Dr. Carrier's leadership of Madison College/James Madison University in light of Clark's "charismatic leader," and the findings as based on Clark's and other scholars' characteristics of this leadership style are conclusive that Dr. Carrier is a charismatic leader. Among the qualities described by

these academicians, the charismatic leader is a change agent, dissatisfied with the status quo, opportunistic, visionary, an entrepreneur, an advocate of the big picture, less interested in day-to-day details, a persuasive communicator, sensitive to the needs of his or her constituents, a confidence builder, personally magnetic, strongly enthusiastic and passionate, intolerant, impatient, and autocratic. More importantly, charisma is acknowledged only insofar as followers confirm this attribute. Therefore, one of the emphases of the research effort was to interview many key administrators and others to determine their perceptions of the president's leadership style. I purposefully did not ask these individuals whether or not they believe that Dr. Carrier is charismatic so that preemptive comments could be avoided. The responses elicited confirm that the president is perceived to be charismatic by the university's constituents and that, as a result of his leadership, the transformation of the school and the development of an institutional saga were initiated and proceeded at an accelerated pace.

#### Marketing.

Using a sophisticated formal marketing plan was virtually unheard of in academic circles in the early 1970s, although traditional, but generally uncoordinated, marketing efforts through admissions and public relations offices had been a part of most institutions' activities for many years, to include "college day" and "college night" visits, the forwarding of promotional information to prospective students and high school guidance counselors, and press releases to newspapers. Despite the lack of a marketing plan per se,

Madison College administrators and faculty, with input from the institution's constituencies as appropriate, did develop and implement strategic plans to achieve their objectives. The Strategic Planning Model as described by Kotler and Fox has provided a framework within which to colate and evaluate the effectiveness of Madison's strategic plans.

Components of the Strategic Planning Model include environmental and resource analyses to determine threats/ opportunities and strengths/weaknesses, goal formulation, strategy formulation, and organization design. While it does not appear that the administrators used these specific designations to identify their plans, the actions which they did take sufficiently align with Kotler and Fox's model to render it a viable construct.

1971 marked a year for reflection, assessment, and team building for Madison College. The president expended a great deal of energy and time becoming acquainted with the faculty, staff, and students and in building a relationship based on trust. He also brought with him several administrators from Memphis State University as part of his team, and fired a few staff members whose views were opposed to his vision for the institution. Dr. Carrier knew from the outset the direction which he wanted the college to take, and his efforts in seeking consensus and realigning his administrative organization were designed to achieve that end. Through countless sessions with administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and analyzing data from the Admissions Office and other sources, institutional strengths and weaknesses and environmental threats and opportunities were evaluated so that appropriate strategies could be formulated.

The overall goal of the administrators was to change the image of Madison College from a small women's teachers college into a comprehensive, residential, fully coeducational, regional institution with a "small college" flavor, a niche in which Dr. Carrier observed a void in the Virginia higher education system. To that end, the mission of the school was altered during the first year of Dr. Carrier's presidency to reflect the changes and was promulgated through the Purpose Committee report and his inaugural address.

#### Changing the image.

Principal strategies developed to change the image of the school included increasing enrollment and the male student population, developing the men's intercollegiate athletic program, adopting social regulations more compatible with a coeducational institution, improving academic programs, particularly in business and communications, and building facilities to accommodate the changes. The premise was to increase the enrollment first while concomitantly developing the other programs. From 1971 to 1976, enrollment increased to over 7,600 students with an over 40 percent male student population, applications for admission had almost doubled mainly due to favorable publicity from satisfied students, the quality of the student body was beginning to rise from the previous three-year decline in which the short-term goal was for enrollment to increase to 5,000 quickly, the men's football and basketball programs were enjoying successful seasons, and the academic departments had been reorganized into the Schools of Business, Education, and Arts and Sciences, with a major in communications studies offered. Among

organizational changes made, the Student Affairs Office evolved from the Student Personnel Services Office, complete with new areas of responsibility and a vice president to oversee the operation, and the Intercollegiate Athletics Department and Public Affairs Office were created. By mid-1976, the structure was in place to support the rising groundswell of opinion that the college was a university in fact and should be so designated. July 1, 1977, marked the birthday of James Madison University, and by 1983, the institution received the first of its favorable national press as a comprehensive university by being cited in the U.S. News and World Report survey of top colleges and universities in the United States.

#### A marketing orientation.

The concept of the marketing orientation proposed by Kotler and Fox is an important consideration for this study. This orientation presupposes a desire on the part of administrators to discern and meet students' needs, thereby placing students, as consumers, first in the educational process. Dr. Carrier brought an aggressive student-centered philosophy with him when he assumed the presidency of Madison College, and he fine-tuned this concept in a system already accustomed to nurturing its students, through his own enthusiasm for this philosophy and by building a supportive administrative team, faculty, and staff. This "way of doing things" eventually evolved into what became known as "the JMU Way."

### Institutional saga.

An essential ingredient in Clark's "distinctive college" is the presence of a strong institutional culture or saga which provides a pervasive environment in which decisions are made and constituents consolidate their perceptions of the school into a distinct theme. This saga or ethos even becomes a focal point, creating an impassioned esprit de corps among the institution's various members, much like, for example, the term "Brother Rat" evokes deep emotions among the cadets, staff members, alumni, and friends of The Virginia Military Institute. The discernible influence of the student-centered orientation at James Madison University gained enough strength to be designated "the JMU Way" in the 1980s, a phrase that became a simple, concise maxim for describing the culture of the institution. And woven into this fabric are symbols and legends about the university, including the old, large rock which guards the front campus grounds, the emergence of Dr. Carrier as a cult figure, and underground tunnels, now unused and purported to be haunted, which joined three of the original bluestone buildings (Swaim, 1990, Summer, p. 63). While the strong presence of an institutional saga does not presume that consensus on all issues is automatic or that there are no areas of friction which arise, "the JMU Way" does serve, nevertheless, to draw the various constituents together.

### Conclusions

Analyses of the strategic plans undertaken and the contributions made by Dr. Carrier to the overall process through his charismatic leadership style have identified discreet elements which played a role

in the transformation of Madison College into James Madison University, but these findings do not reveal the whole story. I submit that the most effective term to use to describe the success of this transformation is "synergism: the mutually cooperating action of separate substances which together produce an effect greater than that of any component taken alone" (Funk & Wagnalls' Standard Dictionary: International Edition, 1969, Volume Two), with the operative phrase being "mutually cooperating action of separate substances." In addition to the specific plans and objectives and Dr. Carrier's leadership, other factors, some of which are intangible, contributed to the success of the metamorphosis.

The force of Dr. Carrier's personality and bearing cannot be discounted in the equation, nor can his political acumen be minimized in his dealings with the state legislators and governor's office where respect for his leadership of the university, his influence within the higher education arena as a whole, and his economic expertise have grown appreciably throughout his twenty-year tenure.

Madison College itself was poised and ready for change in 1971 when Dr. Carrier assumed the presidency. Whereas "like an organism invaded by a foreign substance, institutions can spend incredible amounts of energy resisting and reworking decisions that are viewed as alien" (Walker, 1984, p. 96), most of the school's constituents welcomed and helped to accommodate the president's vision of creating a comprehensive, coeducational, regional institution. The non-intrusive Board of Visitors gave the president what amounted to *carte blanche* in guiding the school. And the cooperation and flexibility of the faculty and staff, which numerous scholars have cited as critical to



any sustained success, were important elements which cannot be overemphasized.

Adherence to the undergraduate teaching mission of the college/university has remained undiluted, and it is this quality of the institution of which Dr. Carrier is most proud (Interview, 1989, November 10).

The campus is easily accessible, located strategically in the Shenandoah Valley on Interstate 81 and just two hours away from both northern Virginia and Richmond. The university is considered to be close enough to these two highly populated areas to afford diversions, but far enough away to ensure a serene setting with a slower pace of living where the work ethic and the propensity for caring, characteristics of the Valley, play a valuable role in the culture of the institution. These characteristics are also compatible with the type of upbringing which Dr. Carrier had in the hills of Tennessee. He understands this way of thinking, and this has been most helpful in his interactions with the Harrisonburg community. Additionally, large pieces of land close to the campus proper became available for purchase for the Convocation Center and the proposed new college. Had the school been located in a densely populated urban area, acquisitions of this size might have been considerably more difficult. Likewise, one cannot underplay the importance of the look of the campus itself. Believing that a pleasant setting is a viable component in the total educational experience, Dr. Carrier initiated comprehensive landscaping plans for the campus and, by example, has instilled a pride in the facility evidenced by the fact that he

himself picks up extraneous pieces of trash when he walks through the campus.

An additional factor worth noting is that a 1989 report generated by the FBI cites JMU as having one of the ten safest campuses in the United States for four-year institutions with an enrollment of at least 7,200 students (Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, 1989, October 3).

According to Richardson (1971), the development of a strong institutional saga is aided by "a strong and preferably charismatic leader, a receptive faculty, a viable and compelling ideology that lends a sense of purpose, limited size, relative isolation, and a period of grace or freedom from the impingement of strong external influence" (pp. 516-517). Remarkably, each one of these elements was present and, therefore, contributed to the rapid evolution of "the JMU Way." And this in itself has provided a valuable marketing tool as, according to Clark (1970), "the richly embellished institutional definition that we call a saga can...be invaluable in maintaining viability in a competitive market" (p. 262).

The rising popularity of James Madison University can be principally attributed to informal advertising by satisfied students themselves who speak favorably about the institution with their friends and family. As one administrator told me, "successful students beget more students," and the increased applications for admission attest to the fact that many prospective students are applying to the university.

Underpinning the whole is the unusual continuity of leadership which the school has enjoyed throughout its almost ninety year history. Amazingly, there have been only four presidents at the helm

of the institution, the shortest tenure of which was ten years. The presidents at least had the time available to develop supportive administrative teams, programs, and facilities, whether or not the wherewithall was forthcoming when funding was desired.

Each of these factors worked favorably toward the synergistic transformation of the institution and the eventual national recognition which the James Madison University has received. What makes this unusual in higher education is that these disparate elements converged cooperatively in an almost simultaneous time frame, a phenomenon which could not have been planned for or foreseen, even by the most astute administrator. Perhaps the simple assessment put forth by a number of administrators encapsulates this synergy adequately: Dr. Carrier was the right man in the right place at the right school at the right time. And perhaps this synergy is the "incredible discovery" to which Dr. Warren alludes.

#### Implications for Further Study

The peculiarity of a qualitative research study is that the process itself is usually terminated arbitrarily by the researcher due to time and/or funding constraints, generally before all the ramifications of the issue can be explored. Often, because of the circuitous nature of the investigative procedure, interesting and sometimes unrelated information is uncovered which, if given time, would be interesting to study further.

For James Madison University administrators, I submit some areas which they might consider studying. First, as part of student assessment and student satisfaction surveys which are already

conducted on campus, those students whose academic credentials place them as Honors students who terminate enrollment at JMU prior to graduation need to be specifically polled as to why they left the institution. This information would be helpful in determining what, if any, program adjustments would need to be implemented to challenge these individuals. This type of specific study is compatible with the stated institutional goal of becoming the best undergraduate institution in the United States.

To that end, the Board of Visitors should have one or two more members who reside outside of Harrisonburg proper, to include non-Virginians. This would help ensure a broader perspective about the institution and widen its range of influence. Concomitantly, a small percentage increase in out-of-state students would enhance the diversity of the student body and add to the funding available to the university without appreciably diminishing the school's reputation in the state.

The Admissions Office should continue to increase activities on a national level by enlisting alumni to help in a wide range of geographic areas. Surprisingly, data reveal that the applicant pool in the southern and southwestern contiguous states is comparatively small. Therefore, recruitment efforts in these states should be intensified.

Cooperative actions should be coordinated between the Admissions and Public Affairs Offices as the university seeks to widen its base. For example, visits from school officers or alumni could be scheduled shortly after a national or regional public relations article is

released about the school in that area to take advantage of the positive exposure.

Additionally, the university has relied heavily on informal word-of-mouth advertising by satisfied students to attract prospective enrollees to the campus, in addition to traditional recruitment activities. This type of advertising should be tracked more formally to assess what impact it has had on student enrollment so that the efficacy of using additional formal marketing efforts can be evaluated.

The archives of James Madison University need to be organized properly so that administrators, faculty, staff, students, and future scholars can have easy access to necessary information. It is my understanding that this task has been recently undertaken, and I emphasize the importance of this endeavor. Additionally, I submit that the papers, notes, and speeches of the presidents of the institution should be colated adequately to track the evolution of the school from the presidential perspective.

Finally, an informal goal for the university has been to be competitive with the two premiere Virginia institutions, the College of William and Mary and the University of Virginia. While some findings indicate that JMU is becoming a contender for the top students along with these two schools, further, more formal studies need to be completed to determine whether or not this is a lasting trend and to evaluate what actions should be taken to ensure continuing competitiveness.

There are other studies worth exploring in the larger higher education arena. The four women's state teachers colleges in Virginia

have each become coeducational institutions within the same, approximate time frame. It would be interesting to conduct a "where are they now?" study to compare their missions, enrollment trends, selectivity, the impact of coeducation on the individual schools, their plans for future development, and other pertinent topics. This would be intriguing to pursue concerning former teachers colleges in other states, also.

Similarly, studies of previously all-male colleges which became coeducational would be provocative, particularly in determining strategies developed to change the image of the school, add programs, and alter or build facilities. It would likewise be important to determine if athletics played any significant role in the change and compare this to women's schools who introduced intercollegiate athletics for men to attract more males to the campus.

Little to date has been written about the president's role in marketing efforts on behalf of an institution. This would be an interesting component to add to ongoing research about presidencies in higher education.

James Madison University's response to the report generated by the Commission on the University of the 21st Century is to build a new College of Applied Science and Technology with an eventual enrollment of 3,000 students and 200 faculty members to help accommodate the increase in student enrollment in Virginia in the 1990s and to help meet the growing need for technical training in the workforce (Schneider, 1989, November 15, p. C-5). Other Virginia schools have similar plans, to include a joint effort between the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech to create the Woodrow Wilson College in

northern Virginia and George Mason's planned Prince William County institute of technology (Boyer, 1989, November 15, p. A-1), each of which would be competition for JMU's planned new campus. Radford University is seeking planning funds for a "global studies" college (Boyer, p. A-1), and the Board of Visitors at Mary Washington College has approved plans for a satellite campus ("Board approves plans," 1990, February 18). Gordon Davies, director of SCHEV, has called for "'a new university in Northern Virginia, probably along the major highway to the west'" ("Vying for a College," 1989, August 28, p. A-6). In light of this statement, it would be beneficial to study what the various Virginia institutions propose in response to this report, how they justify the need for a new college or institution in their area to accommodate the Commission's recommendations, and how they would fund the projects in light of the mandated budget cuts for higher education.

And finally, even though countless institutional histories have been written, most of these have been either vapid or self-aggrandizing. Therefore, additional qualitative case studies need to be completed by schools to document and analyze significant internal changes and trends and to place them contextually in the larger arena. By conducting the requisite exercises and assembling in one place the disparate information needed to complete such a task, the institution's constituencies can better affirm where they have been, who they are now, and what they propose to be in the future.

## Glossary

academic portfolio strategy: A tool which can be used to analyze institutional programs based on centrality to the school's mission, quality, and market viability (Kotler & Fox, 1985, pp. 133-134). The programs are evaluated low, medium, or high in relation to quality and centrality to the mission to help administrators determine which to continue funding and which should be deleted or assimilated. A nine-block (3 x 3) matrix is used to graph the data.

BCG matrix: An analytical tool developed by the Boston Consulting Group to evaluate a product's market growth rate and the product's market share in relation to its largest competition. This matrix can be adapted for educational institutions to evaluate academic programs on the bases of the "growth of FTE students in that field over the past five years" (Kotler & Fox, pp. 135) and "the ratio of FTE students of the largest competing university to FTE students" (pp. 135) of the evaluating institution in that particular field. The matrix is divided into four quadrants, with (1) "stars" being the high growth programs, with a high percentage of students, which require initial heavy investments of finances and resources; (2) "cash cows" being revenue-producing programs supported by a high percentage of students; (3) "question marks" being high-growth programs with a low student population; and (4) "dogs" being low-growth fields with few students.

distribution system: The means by which an institution's offerings are delivered to the consumer (principally, the student). As many schools offer a variety of on- and off-campus programs, viable methods



to make these available to the appropriate individuals are essential.

exchange: An institutional offering of a program or service deemed of sufficient value to cause an individual to participate in and/or pay for that product or service. "The concept of exchange is central to marketing....Since both parties agree to the exchange, both see themselves as better off after the exchange" (Kotler & Fox, p. 7).

Dr. Carrier views the students as individuals in a partnership with JMU rather than merely as customers or consumers.

familiarity-favorability analysis: One method by which an institution can measure its image with a variety of its publics. A pre-determined public is queried as to how familiar it is with the school on a five-point scale ranging from "never heard of" to "know very well," and how favorable the public feels about the institution on a similar scale ranging from "very unfavorable" to "very favorable." The responses can then be graphed to evaluate the school's standing with that particular public.

image: "The sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of an object....An image is a whole set of beliefs about an object" (Kotler & Fox, p. 38).

market: "The set of all people who have an actual or potential interest in [the institution] and the ability to pay for it" (Kotler & Fox, p. 149).

marketing: "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" (Kotler & Fox, p. 7). See the definition for "exchange."

marketing mix: "The particular blend of controllable marketing variables that the institution uses to achieve its objectives in the target market" (Kotler & Fox, p. 153). The mix traditionally contains the four elements of product, price, place, and promotion. Each of these elements is defined in this Glossary.

marketing orientation: The philosophy which "holds that the main task of the institution is to determine the needs and wants [author's emphasis] of target markets and to satisfy them through the design, communication, pricing, and delivery of appropriate and competitively viable programs and services" (Kotler & Fox, p. 10).

marketing plan: A planning document which details the steps by which a specific marketing strategy should be implemented. This plan is detailed in Chapter Five.

marketing research: "The systematic design, collection, analysis, and reporting of data and findings relevant to a specific marketing situation or problem facing an institution" (Kotler & Fox, p. 55).

organizational saga: Also referred to as "organizational culture," it is a "collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group. Based on past exploits, the formal group develops a unitary sense of highly valuable performance and place. The group's definition of the situation, intrinsically historical, links stages of organizational development....An organizational saga...contains a sense of romance and mystery that turns a formal place into a deeply beloved institution" (Clark, 1971, pp. 500-501).

perceptual map: An analytical four-quadrant graph whereby similar institutions, programs, or services are grouped based upon the results of surveys taken of specific target markets, the questions of which use parameters similar to the familiarity-favorability analyses. This is a visual tool for administrators to use to see at a glance their institution's standing among its primary competitors.

place/position: The perceived situation or image of a school by an individual or institutional public in relation to other schools.

price: The cost of participating in a school's programs, the elements of which can include the "list" or stated price and the actual price which is calculated in relation to student financial aid packages. The "effective price to a student and his or her family is the net amount they must pay after financial assistance is subtracted" (Kotler & Fox, p. 243).

product development: The comprehensive formulation of strategies for new institutional programs or services, the components of which include the identification of opportunities for a new program, the design of the program, and its subsequent testing, formal implementation, and evaluation.

program/market opportunity matrix: An analytical tool by which programs and markets are evaluated in a nine-block (3 x 3) matrix in terms of programs (existing, modified, and new) and markets (existing, geographical, and new).

promotion: The public relations efforts and advertising of a school's offerings to specific target markets.

public: "A distinct group of people and/or organizations that has an actual or potential interest in and/or effect on an institution" (Kotler & Fox, p. 24). There are numerous groups, to include internal publics such as administration and staff, trustees, faculty, and volunteers. External publics include the students, parents and friends of the school, alumni, prospective students, donors, foundations, the community, government agencies, accreditation organizations, the public at large, the media, prospective students, competitors, and suppliers.

segmentation: The division of a market into discrete categories for the purpose of determining specific targets for particular programs or services. Classifications include, but are not limited to, delineation by age, sex, lifestyle, geography, and income.

semantic differential: An analytical scale by which an institution can measure its image with a variety of its publics. The scale contains a select number of bipolar adjectives which can be used to describe the institution in question along with two or three of its major competitors including, for example, bipolar adjectives dealing with teachers, institutional size, facilities, environment, and emphasis placed upon student wants and needs.

target market: Those specific individuals or groups, already identified or potential, which an institution pursues which could be interested enough to invest time and/or money in the school.

## Appendix A

### Strategic Planning Process Model

#### STEP I: ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS/THREAT AND OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS

1. Internal environment
2. Market environment
3. Competitive environment
4. Public environment
5. Macroenvironment

#### STEP II: RESOURCE ANALYSIS/STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES ANALYSIS

1. Personnel
2. Funds
3. Facilities
4. Systems

#### STEP III: GOAL FORMULATION

1. Mission
2. Goals
3. Objectives

#### STEP IV: STRATEGY FORMULATION

1. Academic portfolio strategy
2. Product/Market opportunity strategy
3. Competitive strategy
4. Positioning strategy
5. Target market strategy

(continued on next page)

**STEP V: ORGANIZATION DESIGN**

1. Structure
2. People
3. Culture

**STEP VI: SYSTEM DESIGN**

1. Information
2. Planning
3. Control

Note. From Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions by  
P. Kotler and K. Fox, 1985.

Appendix B  
Academic Marketing Plan

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(Table of Contents)

II. SITUATION ANALYSIS

1. Background
2. Normal Forecast
3. Opportunities and Threats
4. Strengths and Weaknesses

III. OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

IV. MARKETING STRATEGY

V. ACTION PROGRAMS

VI. BUDGETS

VII. CONTROLS

Note. From Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions by  
P. Kotler and K. Fox, 1985.

Table 1

Breakdown of Students Registered:  
Freshmen, Transfers, and Re-Entries

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	<u>Re-Entries</u>	<u>Total</u>
1969:	(*)	(*)	(*)	1352 (*)
1970:	(*)	(*)	(*)	1338 (*)
1971:	(*)	(*)	(*)	1564 (*)
1972:	1575 (502)	396 (198)	73 (38)	2044 (738)
1973:	1585 (589)	435 (222)	143 (67)	2163 (878)
1974:	1619 (664)	454 (243)	141 (81)	2214 (988)
1975:	1465 (601)	494 (224)	145 (80)	2104 (905)
1976:	1493 (723)	440 (223)	140 (78)	2073 (1024)
1977:	1403 (637)	500 (216)	109 (53)	2012 (906)
1978:	1648 (751)	542 (235)	86 (44)	2276 (1030)
1979:	1508 (691)	644 (297)	134 (77)	2286 (1065)
1980:	1503 (668)	751 (320)	170 (107)	2424 (1095)
1981:	1611 (718)	621 (273)	158 (85)	2390 (1076)
1982:	1637 (740)	619 (273)	172 (98)	2428 (1111)
1983:	1682 (710)	666 (282)	167 (96)	2515 (1088)
1984:	1626 (707)	566 (219)	196 (105)	2388 (1031)
1985:	1769 (731)	606 (259)	165 (92)	2540 (1082)
1986:	1897 (789)	621 (267)	158 (78)	2676 (1134)
1987:	1957 (886)	562 (*)	156 (*)	2675 (*)

Note. \* statistics not provided. ( ) denotes males.



Table 2  
Breakdown of First-Time Freshmen  
by Sex and Residency Status

	<u>Male: IS / OOS</u>		<u>Female: IS / OOS</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>% OOS</u>	<u>% Male</u>
1969:	181	32	728	154	1095	18	19.45
1970:	217	43	644	156	1060	19	24.52
1971:	290	51	646	183	1170	20.6	29.14
1972:	386	116	816	257	1575	23.9	31.87
1973:	466	123	781	215	1585	19.4	37.16
1974:	520	144	780	175	1619	17.7	41.01
1975:	461	140	703	161	1465	18.4	41.02
1976:	537	186	616	154	1493	22.7	48.42
1977:	501	136	636	130	1403	18.9	45.40
1978:	514	237	718	179	1648	25.2	45.57
1979:	484	207	693	124	1508	21.9	45.82
1980:	464	204	654	181	1503	25.5	44.44
1981:	511	207	680	213	1611	26	44.56
1982:	556	184	677	220	1637	24.6	45.20
1983:	519	191	762	210	1682	23.8	42.21
1984:	510	197	723	196	1626	24.2	43.48
1985:	521	210	763	275	1769	27.25	41.32
	<u>Male/Female IS</u>		<u>Male/Female OOS</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>% OOS</u>	
1986:	1368		529		1897	27.8	
1987:	1438		519		1957	26.5	
1988:	1557		477		2034	23.5	
1989:	1477		466		1943	23.9	

Table 3

Total Enrollment at Madison College/James Madison UniversityMadison College

1970	4041
1971	4562
1972	5492
1973	6288
1974	6841
1975	7343
1976	7659

James Madison University

1977	7926
1978	8073
1979	8387
1980	8817
1981	8970
1982	9048
1983	9242
1984	9320
1985	9580
1986	9757
1987	10126
1988	10525
1989	10709
1990	11011

Table 4

Top-Ranking States for First-Time Freshmen(excluding Virginia)

1969:	New Jersey, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware
1970:	Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware
1971:	Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware
1972:	New Jersey, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1973:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1974:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1975:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1976:	Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware
1977:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1978:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1979:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1980:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1981:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1982:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1983:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1984:	Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware
1985:	Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware
1986:	Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware

Note. It is interesting that West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, or states immediately to the south do not figure significantly in these statistics.

Table 5  
Top-Ranking Virginia Counties  
for First-Time Freshmen

1969: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Augusta, Page  
1970: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Augusta  
1971: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Augusta, Prince William  
1972: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Augusta, Prince William  
1973: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Augusta, Shenandoah  
1974: Fairfax, Rockingham, Arlington, Henrico, Augusta  
1975: Fairfax, Rockingham, Augusta, Henrico  
1976: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico, Arlington, Augusta  
1977: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico, Arlington, Chesterfield  
1978: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico, Arlington, Chesterfield  
1979: Fairfax, Rockingham, Chesterfield, Arlington, Augusta  
1980: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico, Augusta, Chesterfield  
1981: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico, Chesterfield  
1982: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico  
1983: Fairfax, Rockingham, Henrico  
1984: Fairfax, Rockingham, Chesterfield  
1985: Fairfax, Chesterfield, Rockingham

Table 6  
Top-Ranking Virginia Cities  
for First-Time Freshmen

1969:	Harrisonburg, Alexandria, Staunton, Hampton
1970:	Alexandria, Harrisonburg, Virginia Beach, Newport News, Hampton
1971:	Alexandria, Harrisonburg, Roanoke, Staunton, Waynesboro
1972:	Harrisonburg, Alexandria, Virginia Beach, Richmond, Hampton
1973:	Alexandria, Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Roanoke, Staunton
1974:	Harrisonburg, Virginia Beach, Alexandria, Roanoke, Richmond
1975:	Harrisonburg, Virginia Beach, Richmond, Alexandria
1976:	Harrisonburg, Staunton, Virginia Beach, Richmond, Roanoke
1977:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Newport News, Alexandria, Roanoke
1978:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Hampton, Alexandria, Newport News, Richmond
1979:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Alexandria, Newport News, Charlottesville
1980:	Harrisonburg, Virginia Beach, Lynchburg, Staunton, Richmond
1981:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Newport News, Richmond
1982:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Richmond
1983:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Richmond
1984:	Virginia Beach, Harrisonburg, Newport News
1985:	Harrisonburg, Virginia Beach, Richmond

Table 7: Percentage of First-Time Freshmen  
in the First Quartile of Their High School Classes

	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>First quartile</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1969:	1095	758	69.28
1970:	1060	623	58.77
1971:	1170	580	49.57
1972:	1575	785	49.84
1973:	1585	753	47.51

Percentage of First-Time Freshmen  
in the Top Three Deciles of Their High School Classes

	<u>Enrollment (M/F)</u>	<u>Top third (M/F)</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1974:	664/955 (1619)	343/823	72.01
1975:	601/864 (1465)	300/833	77.34
1976:	723/770 (1493)	442/747	79.63
1977:	637/766 (1403)	449/729	83.96
1978:	751/897 (1648)	534/836	83.13
1979:	691/817 (1508)	459/729	78.78
1980:	668/835 (1503)	445/768	80.71
1981:	718/893 (1611)	477/790	78.65
1982:	740/897 (1637)	517/821	81.73
1983:	710/972 (1682)	569/859	84.90
1984:	707/919 (1626)	576/859	88.25
1985:	731/1038(1769)	579/957	86.83
1986:	790/1107(1897)	609/981	83.82
1987:	886/1071(1957)	625/934	79.66
1988:	887/1147(2034)	660/1001	81.66
1989:	868/1055(1943)	666/941	82.71

Table 8: Median SAT Scores for First-Time Freshmen

	<u>Verbal</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Total</u>
1969:	478	507	985
1970:	485	502	987
1971:	472	495	967 *
1972:	464	494	958 *
1973:	460	497	957 *
1974:	457	498	955 *
1975:	473	515	988
1976:	478	524	1002
1977:	481	529	1010
1978:	486	532	1018
1979:	492	539	1031
1980:	493	539	1032
1981:	500	547	1047
1982:	503	548	1051
1983:	491	537	1028 *
1984:	500	553	1053
1985:	507	559	1066
1986:	510	560	1070
1987:	514	573	1087
1988:	519	577	1096
1989:	519	578	1097

Note. \* denotes scores lower than previous year(s).

Statistics compiled from annual Admissions Reports and from the 1973 Statistical Summary developed by Office of Institutional Research.

Table 9

Breakdown of Applications From Degree-Seeking Students

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	<u>Re-Entries</u>	<u>Total</u>
1971:	3091 (899)	707 (378)	97 (43)	3895 (1320)
1972:	3685 (1179)	857 (452)	108 (54)	4650 (1685)
1973:	4764 (1797)	1078 (585)	196 (89)	6038 (2471)
1974:	5357 (2230)	1141 (604)	222 (118)	6720 (2952)
1975:	5841 (2311)	1045 (530)	197 (100)	7083 (2941)
1976:	6037 (2312)	1145 (562)	182 (96)	7364 (2970)
1977:	6828 (2746)	1278 (572)	146 (71)	8252 (3389)
1978:	6834 (2947)	1404 (632)	158 (82)	8396 (3661)
1979:	7084 (2885)	1495 (688)	209 (120)	8788 (3693)
1980:	7399 (2933)	1777 (794)	247 (139)	9423 (3866)
1981:	8036 (3198)	1649 (746)	219 (125)	9904 (4069)
1982:	8842 (3512)	1683 (740)	251 (150)	10776 (4402)
1983:	9817 (3973)	1896 (899)	247 (137)	11960 (5009)
1984:	10213 (4096)	1768 (771)	277 (152)	12258 (5019)
1985:	9821 (4008)	1771 (808)	262 (141)	11854 (4957)
1986:	11154 (4472)	1561 (731)	249 (122)	12964 (5325)
1987:	11663 (4756)	1601 (678)	272 (163)	13536 (5597)

Note. ( ) denotes males.



Table 10

Acceptance Rates for First-Time Freshmen

	<u>Acceptances</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>% Apps accepted</u>	<u>% Enrolled</u>	<u>% Males</u>
1969:	1980	1095	71	55	19.45
1970:	2008	1060	68	89	24.52
1971:	2373	1170	80	49	29.14
1972:	2758	1575	77	57	31.87
1973:	2733	1585	61	58	37.16
1974:	2626	1619	50	62	41.01
1975:	2537	1465	44	58	41.02
1976:	2615	1493	44	57	48.42
1977:	2621	1403	39	54	45.40
1978:	3288	1648	49	50	45.57
1979:	3153	1508	45	48	45.82
1980:	3123	1493	43	48	44.44
1981:	3263	1611	41	49	44.56
1982:	3417	1637	39	48	45.20
1983:	3545	1682	36	47	42.21
1984:	3656	1626	36	44	43.48
1985:	4006	1769	41	44	41.32
1986:	4018	1897	36	47	41.59
1987:	4128	1957	35	47	45.27
1988:	4202	2034	31	48	43.60
1989:	4332	1923	35	44	*

Note. \* statistic not available.

Table 11

Retention Rates for First-Time Freshmen

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Graduated by 8/90</u>	<u>Returned fall 1990</u>	<u>%Graduated</u>	<u>%Grad. or returned</u>	<u>%Student athletes grad.*</u>
1983	1,686	1,290	14	76.5	77.3	
1984	1,626	1,281	18	78.8	79.9	
1985	1,768	1,380	58	78.1	81.3	84.5
1986	1,896	1,142	433	60.2	83.1	75.6
1987	1,959	4	1,657	0.2	84.8	76.1
1988	2,034	0	1,790	0.0	88.0	71.6
1989	1,924	0	1,798	0.0	93.5	71.6

Note. Statistics were obtained from the Office of Planning and Analysis, JMU.

\* Statistics on athlete graduation rates (based on five years of undergraduate study) were obtained from the Athletic Department, JMU.

Table 12

Transfers From Community Colleges and Two-Year Colleges in Virginia

(Total applications [males]/acceptances/enrollees in parentheses)

1969:	Blue Ridge CC, Ferrum, Northern Virginia CC, Shenandoah, Bluefield (236 [141] / 138 / 106)*
1970:	Blue Ridge CC, Shenandoah, Northern Virginia CC, Ferrum, Dabney Lancaster kCC (208 [104] / 151 / 100)*
1971:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Shenandoah, Virginia Western CC, Ferrum (278 [163] / 228 [131] / 160 [96])
1972:	Blue Ridge CC, Ferrum, No. Virginia CC, Dabney Lancaster CC, Southern Seminary (343 [187] / 297 [155] / 213 [107])
1973:	Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Ferrum, Lord Fairfax CC, Tidewater CC (386 [236] / 279 [167] / 202 [126])
1974:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Ferrum, Lord Fairfax CC, Virginia Western CC (455 [284] / 336 [199] / 208 [133])
1975:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Ferrum, Lord Fairfax CC, Virginia Western CC (367 [217] / 302 [169] / 212 [118])
1976:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Ferrum, Lord Fairfax CC, Virginia Western CC (441 [271] / 346 / 225)*
1977:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Ferrum, Piedmont CC (412 [217] / 352 [179] / 223 [113])
1978:	Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Ferrum, Piedmont CC, Lord Fairfax CC (451 [238] / 344 / 221)*
1979:	Blue Ridge CC, Ferrum, Northern Virginia CC, Piedmont CC, Lord Fairfax CC (433 [230] / 350 / 234)*

(continued on following page)

- 1980: Blue Ridge CC, Ferrum, Northern Virginia CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Piedmont CC (522 [266] / 444 / 285)\*
- 1981: Ferrum\*\*, Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Piedmont jCC, Lord Fairfax CC (474 [244] / 334 / 215)\*
- 1982: Blue Ridge CC, No. Virginia CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Piedmont CC, J. Sargeant Reynolds CC (420 [181] / 303 / 202)\*
- 1983: Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Piedmont CC, Richard Bland (565 [289] / 321 / 212)\*
- 1984: Blue Ridge CC, Northern Virginia CC, Piedmont CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Richard Bland (458 [219] / 237 / 167)\*
- 1985: Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Piedmont CC (457 [230] / 268 / 172)\*
- 1986: Northern Virginia CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Blue Ridge CC, Piedmont CC (401 [227] / 253 / 179)\*
- 1987: Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Piedmont CC, Central Virginia CC (413 [197] / 234 / 165)\*
- 1988: Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Piedmont CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Central Virginia CC (442 [201] / 277 / 189)\*
- 1989: Northern Virginia CC, Blue Ridge CC, Piedmont CC, Lord Fairfax CC, Dabney Lancaster CC (516 [268] / 250 / 179)\*

Note. \* all statistics for males not available.

\*\* Ferrum College became a four-year institution in 1982.

Table 13

Transfers From Four-Year Institutions in Virginia

(Total applications [males]/acceptances/enrollees in parentheses  
where information is made available)

1974:	George Mason, Radford, VCU, VPI, Bridgewater
1975:	Longwood, VCU, George Mason, VPI, ODU, UVA
1976:	Christopher Newport, George Mason, Radford, Longwood, VPI
1977:	George Mason, Radford, VCU, VPI, ODU, Mary Washington
1978:	Radford, ODU, Mary Washington, George Mason, VCU
1979:	Radford, ODU, George Mason, Mary Washington, VPI
1980:	George Mason, Radford, VPI, ODU, Mary Washington
1981:	Radford, George Mason, ODU, Mary Washington, VCU, VPI
1982:	Ferrum, George Mason, Radford, ODU, VPI, VCU
1983:	Ferrum, Radford, George Mason, ODU, Bridgewater (671 [299] / 400 / 257)
1984:	Radford, Ferrum, George Mason, Mary Washington, Longwood, VCU (600 [209] / 334 / 195)
1985:	Radford, George Mason, Mary Washington, ODU, VPI, Longwood, VCU (560 [224] / 319 / 187)
1986:	Radford, George Mason, Mary Washington, VPI, ODU, VCU, Ferrum (472 [206] / 306 / 214)
1987:	Radford, George Mason, VPI, Mary Washington, ODU, VCU (499 [192] / 314 / 200)
1988:	Radford, George Mason, ODU, VCU, Longwood, VPI (491 [200] / 322 / 195)
1989:	Radford, George Mason, ODU, VCU, VPI, Longwood, Mary Washington (561 [204] / 307 / 193)

Table 14

Data on Faculty Members From the 1971 SACS Self-Study

<u>School</u>	<u>No.faculty</u>	<u>%Drs</u>	<u>%Masters</u>	<u>%Bachelors</u>	<u>%Pursuing doctorate</u>	<u>%Published</u>
Education	40	53	45	3	23	53
Department:						
EDU.	18	55	45	0	22	60
LIB. SCI.	4	0	75	25	25	50
PSYC.	11	64	36	0	18	45
SP. EDU.	7	57	43	0	28	43
Humanities	69	32	65	3	35	42
Department:						
ART	10	20	70	10	40	80
ENG.	24	45	55	0	25	42
FR. LANG.	11	45	55	0	28	45
MUSIC	16	19	81	0	50	25
SPCH/DRAMA	8	12.5	75	12.5	50	25

(data on the Schools of Natural Science and Social Science continued  
on following page)

<u>School</u>	<u>No.faculty</u>	<u>%Drs</u>	<u>%Masters</u>	<u>%Bachelors</u>	<u>%Pursuing</u>	
					<u>Doctorate</u>	<u>%Published</u>
Nat. Science	70	44	52	3	16	54
Department:						
BIO.	14	64	36	0	14	71
CHEM.	6	100	0	0	0	100
GEOL.	3	33	66	0	0	100
MATH	17	29	71	0	24	29
PHYS. ED.	23	26	65	9	17	43
PHYSICS	7	57	43	0	14	57
Social Sci.	60	42	52	6	36	55
Department:						
BUS. ADMIN.	14	21	64	14	21	36
BUS. ED.	6	33	50	17	0	50
HISTORY	13	77	23	0	23	54
HOME EC.	8	25	75	0	0	63
SOCIOLOGY	8	37	50	13	13	75
POL. SCI./						
GEOG.	11	45	55	0	27	64

Table 15

Data on the Teaching Experience of the 1971 FacultyFrom the 1971 SACS Self-Study

<u>% Teaching experience</u>	<u>5-9 yrs</u>	<u>10-20 yrs</u>	<u>20-30 yrs</u>
EDUCATION	22	39	15
HUMANITIES	19	30	11
NATURAL SCIENCE	17	38	9
SOCIAL SCIENCE	29	22	9

Because the administration recognized the need to expand the Business Administration programs, statistics on the faculty in place in 1971 are provided below:

<u>% Teaching exp.</u>	<u>1 yr</u>	<u>2 yrs</u>	<u>3 yrs</u>	<u>4 yrs</u>	<u>5-9 yrs</u>	<u>10-20 yrs</u>	<u>20-30 yrs</u>
BUSINESS ADMIN.	0	7	21	14	35	21	0
BUSINESS ED.	17	0	0	0	17	0	34

Note. As shown in Table 14 in the section on the School of Social Sciences, most faculty members in the Departments of Business Administration and Business Education had only completed their masters/bachelors degrees, with only a small percentage actively pursuing their doctorate degrees.

With the exception of the Department of Business Education which had 34 percent of the faculty members with 20-30 years teaching experience, both departments were relatively young as evidence by the teaching experience factors.



Table 16  
Data on Faculty Members in 1977

<u>School</u>	<u>No. faculty</u>	<u>%Doctorates</u>	<u>%Tenured</u>
ARTS AND SCIENCES	216	63	52
BUSINESS	61	54	21
EDUCATION	114	67	42
TOTAL	391	63	44

Note. Statistics from the Office of Planning and Analysis, 1977.

Table 17  
Data on Faculty Members in 1983

<u>School</u>	<u>No. faculty</u>	<u>%Doctorates</u>	<u>%Tenured</u>
COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCES	166	79	74
BUSINESS	77	66	34
EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES	111	77	68
FINE ARTS AND COMMUNICATION	74	41	68
NURSING	7	14	14
TOTAL	435	69	63

Note. Statistics from the Office of Planning and Analysis, 1983.

Table 18  
Data on Faculty Members in 1990

<u>College</u>	<u>No. faculty</u>	<u>%Doctorates</u>	<u>%Tenured</u>
LETTERS AND SCIENCES	183	86	76
BUSINESS	88	78	57
EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY	68	90	81
FINE ARTS AND COMMUNICATION	87	45	74
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	46	57	63
TOTAL	472	71.2	70.2

Note. Statistics from the Office of Planning and Analysis, 1990.

Table 19

Academic Departments for Madison College/James Madison University

1970-71:	School of Education
	School of Humanities
	School of Natural Sciences
	School of Social Sciences
	Graduate Studies
1972-74:	School of Arts and Sciences
	School of Business
	School of Education
	Graduate School
	Continuing Studies
1974-78:	School of Arts and Sciences
	School of Business
	School of Education
	Graduate School
	Summer School (with an assigned dean)
	Continuing Education

(continued on following page)

1978-79: College of Letters and Sciences

School of Business

School of Education

Graduate School

Summer School

Continuing Education

1981-86: College of Letters and Sciences

School of Business

School of Education and Human Services

School of Fine Arts and Communication

School of Nursing

Graduate School

Summer School

Continuing Education

1986-88: College of Letters and Sciences

College of Business

College of Education and Human Services

College of Fine Arts and Communication

College of Health and Human Development

Graduate School

Continuing Education

Table 20: Notes on the Organizational Structure of Madison College

1970-71: BOARD; OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT (includes the Director of Public Relations); OFFICE OF THE PROVOST; OFFICE OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES (includes Director of Admissions and Financial Aid, Dean of Women/Director of Student Affairs, Dean of Men, part-time physicians, Director of the Counseling Center, Director of Student Activities/Student Center, Field Services and Placement); OFFICE OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT; LIBRARY SERVICES; SOCIAL DIRECTORS; DORMITORY HOSTESSES

1972-73: PRESIDENT (delete Director of Public Relations, add Director of Budget and Planning and Director of Computer Services); ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (replaces Office of the Provost, adds a Vice President for Academic Affairs, Librarian, Director of Admissions and Financial Aid from Office of Student Personnel Services); PUBLIC SERVICES (a new division with a Director of Public Services, Director of Athletics, and Director of Public Information); STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES (add Director of Health Services, delete Deans of Women and Men); BUSINESS MANAGEMENT; delete Social Directors and Dormitory Hostesses

1973-74: PRESIDENT (delete positions as mentioned above); PUBLIC SERVICES (add Sports Information Director); STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES (add Director of Student Life); BUSINESS AFFAIRS (add Purchasing Supervisor); ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING (Director of Budget and Planning, Director of Computer Services, Director of Systems Development, Director of Institutional Research)

(continued on following page)

1974-75: PUBLIC AFFAIRS (replaces Public Services and adds Director of Alumni Services; Director of Continuing Ed and Field Services, Assistant Director of Placement, retains Director of Public Information and Sports Information Director); STUDENT AFFAIRS (replaces Student Personnel Services and adds Vice President for Student Affairs); BUSINESS AFFAIRS (adds Vice President for Business Affairs); ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS (replaces Administrative Planning); INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (Director of Athletics, Associate Director for Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, Director of Athletic Facilities, Director of Recreation)

1975-76: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (Director of Admissions and Director of Financial Aid divided into two positions); PUBLIC AFFAIRS (adds Vice President for Public Affairs); STUDENT AFFAIRS (adds Dean of Students)

1976-77: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (adds Director of Student Orientation and Academic Advising to Dean of Summer School's responsibilities); PUBLIC AFFAIRS (deletes Sports Information Director); INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (Managers replace Directors of Athletic Facilities and Recreation)

Note. These are general notes to reflect significant changes to the Organizational Structure of Madison College. When no changes occurred, then that particular Administrative Division is not listed. Obviously, the Board of Visitors and the Office of the President are permanent parts of the organizational structure and are not cited repetitively except where changes occurred.

Table 21

Notes on the Organizational Structure of James Madison University

1977-79: BOARD; PRESIDENT; ACADEMIC AFFAIRS; PUBLIC AFFAIRS (adds Director and Assistant Director of Career Planning and Placement and Placement Officers deleted); STUDENT AFFAIRS; BUSINESS AFFAIRS; ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS; INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

1981-82: UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (replaces Public Affairs, Vice President and Assistant to the Vice President for University Relations, etc); STUDENT AFFAIRS (adds Director of Counseling and Student Development Center); ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS (adds Director of Institutional Research and Budget)

1983-84: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (adds Administrator for Valley of VA Consortium for Higher Ed/Assistant Dean of Graduate School); STUDENT AFFAIRS (Director of Financial Aid moved from Academic Affairs); ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS (adds Director of Internal Audit and Management Analysis)

1984-85: BUSINESS AFFAIRS (adds Director of Budget)

(continued on following page)



1985-86: PRESIDENT (adds Senior Vice President and Vice President for University Relations, Assistant to the President for Development); ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS (adds Affirmative Action Officer/Coordinator for Services for the Handicapped); INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (Associate Director of Athletics is not specifically delineated for women); INTERNAL AUDIT AND MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS

1986-87: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (adds Marketing Coordinator/Assistant Director of Admissions position for this year only); BUSINESS AFFAIRS (adds Director of Telecommunications); UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT (Vice President for University Advancement, Assistant Director for Development, Director of JMU Annual Fund, Director JMU Alumni); UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (top position changed to Director of University Relations, adds Manager for Printing Services); INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (adds Manager for the Convocation Center); INTERNAL AUDIT AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW SERVICES (replaces Internal Audit and Management Analysis)

1987-88: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (adds Director of Academic Program Support); ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS (adds Director of Data Communications, Director of Academic Computing Services, Director of Microcomputing Services, Director of Administrative Computing Services/formerly Director of Computer Services)

Note. These are general notes to reflect significant changes to the Organizational Structure of James Madison University. When no changes occurred, then that particular Administrative Division is not listed.

Table 22  
Acceptance/Enrollment Rates for  
Five of the Fifteen Senior Institutions in Virginia  
 (in percentages)

	<u>JMU</u>	<u>W &amp; M</u>	<u>UVA</u>	<u>Geo. Mason</u>	<u>Radford</u>
1973	61/58	36/56	48/61	74/66	100/59
1974	50/62	38/56	45/59	90/64	99/57
1975	44/58	41/52	45/57	96/64	88/58
1976	44/57	41/53	46/57	85/66	87/53
1977	39/54	35/54	41/57	82/56	84/50
1978	49/50	33/57	42/55	84/68	76/49
1979	45/48	31/57	43/58	83/68	74/52
1980	43/48	36/54	40/59	79/66	71/49
1981	41/49	36/54	39/59	80/62	71/52
1982	39/48	37/52	37/60	67/65	69/43
1983	36/47	42/50	37/55	80/55	77/49
1984	36/44	46/48	43/54	85/53	78/43
1985	41/44	41/46	37/56	85/53	79/45
1986	36/47	40/51	29/55	72/47	77/42

Note. These statistics from SCHEV include first-time Virginia and out-of-state freshmen only.

1987-1990 statistics were not available from SCHEV at the time of the writing of this study.

Table 23: SCHEV 90-92 Faculty Salary Benchmark Institutions for JMU

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

California State University - Chico

California State University - Fresno

California State University - Sacramento

Illinois State University

Western Illinois University

Western Michigan University

Saint Cloud State University

University of Southern Mississippi

SUNY College - Brockport

SUNY College - Oswego

SUNY College - Plattsburgh

Appalachian State University

University of North Carolina - Charlotte

Bowling Green State University - Main Campus

Middle Tennessee State University

University of Tennessee - Chattanooga

Eastern Washington University

Western Washington University

University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse

Baylor University

Miami University - Oxford Campus

Indiana State University

University of Wisconsin - Sookosh

## Bibliography

Periodicals and Newspapers

- Associated Press. (1989, October 3). 2 Virginia schools among safest campuses in U.S. Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, p. A-7.
- Bartels, R. (1974). The identity crisis in marketing. Journal of Marketing, 38, 73-76.
- Barton, D. (Ed.). (1978). New directions for higher education: Marketing higher education, 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Best of the bargain colleges. (1988). Changing Times, reprint.
- Bickford, R. (1978). The president as marketer. Community and Junior College Journal, 48, 14-16.
- Board approves plans for satellite campus. (1990, February 2). Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, p. A-9.
- Boyer, T. (1989, November 11). Va. college retooling advised. Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, p. A-1.
- Brooker, G., & Noble, M. (1985). The marketing of higher education. College and University, 60, 191-200.
- Callahan, F. (1990, October 12). Academic competition: Virginia presidents on the stump. Virginian-Pilot, p. A-18.
- Carrier, R. (1981, February). Sports help turn a college into a university. American School & University, 53, 40-43.
- Clark, B. (June, 1971). Belief and loyalty in college organization. Journal of Higher Education, XLII, 6, 499-515.
- Dr. Ronald E. Carrier inaugurated fourth president of Madison College. (1972, Winter). Alumni Quarterly, East Tennessee State University, p. 20.

Evangelhauf, J. (1986, May 24). Professors in high-demand fields are getting higher than average salaries, 2 studies find. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 11, pp. 25, 28.

Exclusive national survey: Rating the colleges. (1983, November 28). U.S. News & World Report, pp. 44-48.

Fussell, P. (1982, October 4). Schools for snobbery. The New Republic, pp. 25-31.

Gaither, H. (1979). Some tools and techniques of market research for students. In J. Lucas (Ed.), New directions for institutional research: Developing a total marketing plan, 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Guide to America's best colleges. (1987). U.S. News & World Report, pp. 17, 27, 111.

Hilpert, J., & Alfred, R. (1987, Summer). Improving enrollment success: Presidents hold the key. Educational Record, 68, 30-35.

Hughes, G. (1980, Fall). This little college goes to market. College and University, 56, 92-94.

Johnson, D. (1979). The researcher and nonprofit marketing: Is anyone listening? In J. Lucas (Ed.), New directions for institutional research: Developing a total marketing plan, 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for introducing marketing into nonprofit organizations. Journal of Marketing, 43, 37-44.

Kotler, P., & Levy, S. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing. Journal of Marketing, 33, 10-15.

- Kotler, P., & Levy, S. (1969, July). A new form of marketing myopia: Rejoinder to professor Luck. Journal of Marketing, 33, 55-57.
- Krachenberg, A. (1972). Bringing the concept of marketing to higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 43, 369-380.
- Lay, R., & Endo, J. (Eds.). (1987). New directions for institutional research: Designing and using market research, 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Litton, L. (1980). Marketing higher education: Benefits and risks for the American academic system. Journal of Higher Education, 51, 40-59.
- Lucas, J. (Ed.). (1979). New directions for institutional research: Developing a total marketing plan, 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Luck, D. (1969). Broadening the concept of marketing—Too far. Journal of Marketing, 33, 53-55.
- Maccoby, M. (1979). Leadership needs of the 1980s. [Monograph]. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1, 17-23.
- Most effective college presidents are "risk takers" who rely on respect, not popularity, study finds. (1986, November 5). The Chronicle of Higher Education, XXXIII, 10, pp. 11, 13.
- Murphy, P., & McGarrity, R. (1978, Spring). Marketing universities: A survey of student recruitment activities. College and University, 53, 249-261.
- Nickels, W. (1974, Winter). Conceptual conflicts in marketing. Journal of Economics and Business, 27, 140-143.

- Richardson, R. Comment by Richard C. Richardson, Jr. Journal of Higher Education, XLII, 6, 516-524.
- Schneider, G. (1989, November 15). Job seekers won't qualify, study says. Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, p. C-1.
- Stickney, J. (1986, May). Ten public colleges with an ivy twist. Money Magazine, pp. 192-195.
- Swaim, S. (1990, Summer). Unknown underground: Memories of tunnels reveal stories of JMU's past. Curio: The Valley Magazine, pp. 63-64.
- The 100 most effective college leaders, named in a survey of their peers. (1986, November 5). The Chronicle of Higher Education, XXXIII, 10, p. 13.
- Vanpelt, W. (1968). Marketing approach to college relations. Journal of College Placement, 29, 48-50.
- Vermilye, D. (Ed.). (1973). Current issues in higher education: The future in the making. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Vying for a college. (1989, August 28). Virginian Pilot-Ledger Star, p. A-5.
- Williford, A. (1987, Fall). A critical analysis of marketing higher education. College and University, 63, 49-56.

### Books

- Astin, A. , & Lee, C. (1972). The invisible colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bartlett, J. (1980). Bartlett's familiar quotations. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

- Berry, L. (1984). Services marketing is different. In C. Lovelock (Ed.), Services marketing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). Priorities for action: Final report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Centra, J. (1978). Maintaining faculty vitality through faculty development. In A. Liberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, B. (1970). The distinctive college. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Conger, J. (1989). The charismatic leader. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Dodds, H. (1962). The academic president: Educator or caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Donnelly, J., & George, W. (Eds.). (1981). Marketing of services. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Education Index. (1968 - 1988). New York: The H. W. Wilson Company.
- Fram, E. (1973). Marketing higher education. In D. Vermilye (Ed.), Current issues in higher education: The Future in the making. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Funk & Wagnalls. (1969). Standard dictionary: International edition, Vol. Two. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.



- Gaff, J. (1976). Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hegener, K., Suber, E., & Goldstein, A. (Eds.). (1984). Peterson's competitive colleges. Princeton: Peterson's Guides.
- Hodgkinson, H. (1971). Institutions in transition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hodgkinson, H. (1981). Impact of national issues. In P. Jedamus, M. Peterson, & associates (Eds.), Improving academic management: A handbook of planning and institutional research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Hofstadter, R., & Smith, W. (Eds.). (1961). American higher education: A documentary history. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Husen, T., & Postlethwaite, T. (eds.). (1985). The International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 3. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Jedamus, P., Peterson, M., & associates. (1981). Improving academic management: A handbook of planning and institutional research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Keeton, M. (1971). Models and mavericks. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Kotler, P. (1973). A generic concept of marketing. In W. Lazer and E. Kelley (Eds.), Social marketing: Perspectives and viewpoints. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Kotler, P. (1975, 1982). Marketing for nonprofit organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P. (1980). Marketing management: Analysis, planning, and control (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P., & Andreasen. (1987). Strategic marketing for nonprofit organizations (3rd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P., Ferrell, O., & Lamb, C. (Eds.). (1983). Cases and readings in marketing for nonprofit organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kotler, P., & Fox, K. (1985). Strategic marketing for educational institutions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Kuh, G. & Whitt, E. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lauffer, A. (1984). Strategic marketing for not-for-profit organizations. New York: The Free Press.
- Lazer, W., & Kelley, E. (1973). Social marketing: Perspectives and viewpoints. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

- Litton, L. (1981). Educational essentials and the marketing of higher education. In J. Donnelley & W. George (Eds.), Marketing of services. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Lovelock, C. (1984). Services marketing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lovelock, C., & Weinberg, C. (1977). Cases in public and nonprofit marketing. Palo Alto, CA: The Scientific Press.
- Lovelock, C., & Weinberg, C. (1978). Readings in public and nonprofit marketing. Palo Alto, CA: Scientific Press.
- Lovelock, C., & Weinberg, C. (1984). Marketing for public and nonprofit managers. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lucas, J. (1981). Identifying regional and community markets. In P. Jedamus, M. Peterson, & associates (Eds.), Improving academic management: A handbook of planning and institutional research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Lynton, E., & Elman, S. (1987). New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Mayhew, L. (1983). Surviving the eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Miller, G. (1989). Rockingham: An annotated bibliography of a Virginia county. Harrisonburg, VA: Harrisonburg-Rockingham Historical Society.

- Moll, R. (1985). The public ivys: A guide to America's best public undergraduate colleges and universities. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rados, D. (1981). Marketing for non-profit organizations. Boston: Auburn House Publishing Company.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university. New York: Vintage Books of Random House.
- Schein, E. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.
- Stanton, W. (1978). Fundamentals of marketing. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. (1967-1987). The Virginia plan for higher education. Richmond, VA: Author.
- State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. (1979-1990). Fact book: Higher education in Virginia. Richmond, VA: Author.
- Stoke, H. (1959). The American college president. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Thelin, J. (1976). The cultivation of ivy: A saga of the college in America. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company Inc.
- Thelin, J. (1982). Higher education and its useful past: Applied history in research and planning. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company Inc.
- Traynor, K. (1981). A benefit analysis of higher education using multiple discriminant analysis. In J. Donnelly & W. George (Eds.), Marketing of services. Chicago: American Marketing Association.

- Walker, D. (1984). The effective administrator: A practical approach to problem solving, decision making, and campus leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.
- Wilson, L. (1972). Shaping American higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations. Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

#### Other Sources

- Diamond, N. (1969). Brother Love's traveling salvation show. Stonebridge Music. New York: UNI Records.
- Diamond, N. & Becaud, G. (1978). September morn. Stonebridge Music. In The Best Songs Ever. Winona, MN: Hal Leonard Publishing Corporation.
- Hartle, T. (1987, February 24-25). Then Resident Fellow and Director, Social Policy Studies, the American Enterprise Institute. From a speech delivered at the Annual Graduate and Professional Financial Aid Council Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Horizons. (1990). Norfolk, VA: Norfolk Academy.
- State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. (1987). Admissions summaries for 1973-86. Richmond, VA: Author.
- State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. (1989). Faculty salary benchmark institutions for JMU. Richmond, VA: Author.
- Yankovich, J. (1990, September 13). Marginal notes on drafts of dissertation chapters submitted for review and comments.

Resources Obtained From James Madison University

Annual Admissions Reports for Madison College/James Madison University. (1969-1989).

Bluestone. (1970-1989). Student Yearbook.

Board of Visitors Minutes, James Madison University.

Breeze. (1970-1985). Student newspaper.

Carrier, R. (1971, December 4). Inaugural address, Madison College.

Carrier, R. (1989). Vita.

Commission on the University of the 21st Century. (1989). A letter to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the people of Virginia from the Commission on the University of the 21st Century.

Richmond, VA: Authors.

Development plan for Madison College. (1961).

Dingledine, R. Jr. (1959). Madison college: The first fifty years 1908-1958, Madison College.

The first decade of the Carrier presidency. (1982). Division of University Relations.

Greater University Commission. (1988, December 15). Final report.

Images of James Madison University 1908-1983: Blue Stone Hill to JMU. (1983).

Initiatives for excellence and accountability: A five-year plan.

(1985). Prepared by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and cited in the Board of Visitors Minutes, Vol. XXI, No. 4, April 5.

James Madison University bulletins. (1977-1989).

James Madison University master plan: 1985-1990. (no date).

James Madison University master plan: 1988-1990. (no date).

- James Madison University student handbook. (1977-1989).
- Madison College bulletins. (1972-1976).
- Madison College 1964-1974: A journey into eminence. (1975).
- Madison College institutional self-study prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1971).
- Madison College student handbook. (1969-1976).
- Manual of the Board of Visitors of James Madison University. (1981).
- NCRIPTAL. (1989). Organizational climate for teaching and learning: A survey for the NCRIPTAL Research Program on the organizational context for teaching and learning, executive summary and survey profile for James Madison University. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- New horizons for excellence report. (1983).
- Office of Career Planning. Graduate statistics 1986-89.
- Office of Institutional Research. (1973, November). Statistical summary of the college.
- Office of Planning and Analysis. (1977, 1983, 1990). Statistical summary of James Madison University.
- President's annual report to the Board of Visitors. (1972).
- President's annual report to the Board of Visitors of Madison College. (1973).
- Report of the Blue-Ribbon Panel for the proposed College of Applied Science and Technology. (1990, January 31).
- Report of the self-study committees for the institutional self-study prepared for the Commission on Colleges and Universities, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1981).

Report on the periodic visitation and institutional self-study of

Madison College. (1972, March 12-15).

Sonner, R. (1974). Madison College: The Miller years 1949-1970.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA. (University Microfilms No. 870).

Student development news. (1979-1990). Office of Student Affairs.

Student surveys.

Summary report of the Madison College institutional self-study

prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. (1961). Harrisonburg, VA: Madison College.

Survey results on job satisfaction at JMU and other Virginia universities and colleges. (1990). Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Resources Obtained From Special Collections, Carrier Library, James Madison University

Carrier, R. (1971, September 9). President Carrier's report to the faculty.

Carrier, R. (1983, August 26). Remarks to the faculty.

Carrier, R. (1987, April 11). Presentation to the Secretary of Education and James Madison University Board of Visitors.

The case for James Madison University: A resolution of the Visitors of Madison College. (1976, October 22).

Demos woo Carrier for senate race. (1984, February 10).

Harrisonburg, VA: Daily News-Record.

Dickerson, Z., Jr. (1984, December 3). Memorandum to faculty regarding the faculty meeting, August 24, 1984.



- Gyllenhall, A. (1975, May 12). Carrier on the road: "Getting all the facts." Daily News-Record.
- JMU names library for Carriers. (1984, January 7). Daily News-Record.
- James Madison University 1980-1981 report.
- James Madison University: Inspiration to excellence in 15 years. (1986). Division of University Relations.
- Kinley, D. (1983, December 30). Carrier sees "large mission" ahead at Arkansas. Daily News-Record.
- Kinley, D. (1984, January 10). Carrier staying as JMU president. Daily News-Record.
- Madison College 1975-76. (1975).
- Madison is most selective: "Open admissions" characterize Virginia colleges. (1975, June 4). Daily News-Record.
- Madison University: We're already there. (1976, September 3). Breeze, 2.
- Most applicants won state college entry. (1975, June 26). Richmond Times-Dispatch.
- Murphy, P. (no date, but probably late 1970). Broken hoe grew college president. Daily News-Record.
- Murphy, P. (1971, December 4). Carrier inaugurated at Madison College. Daily News-Record.
- Quality: JMU group seeks to diagnose needs for next century. (1986, January 5). Richmond Times-Dispatch.
- Scott, R. (1985, March 18). Memorandum to Dr. Martha Caldwell regarding student member to the Board of Visitors.

- Simmons, C. (1984, May 11). Finishing first: JMU ranked far more selective than state's elite institutions. Daily News-Record.
- Yes, let's change the name. (1976, September 18). The Waynesboro News-Virginian.

#### Interviews With the Author

- Beatty, G. (1990, August 4). Associate Director of Admission, James Madison University.
- Carrier, R. (1989, November 10; 1990, January 24; 1990, April 10). President, James Madison University.
- Cervený, A. (1990, July 19). Director of Admissions, James Madison University.
- Daniel, L. (1990, August 4). Former Dean of Students, James Madison University.
- Doherty, F. (1989, November 10). Assistant Director of Planning and Analysis, James Madison University.
- Ehlers, D. (1990, April 10). Director of Athletics, James Madison University.
- Hilton, F. (1989, June 21). Director of Public Relations, James Madison University.
- Menard, A. (1990, April 10). Acting Vice President for Student Affairs, James Madison University.
- Rooney, G. (1989, June 21). Director of Advancement Information, James Madison University.
- Rose, L. (1990, April 10). Vice President for Administration and Finance, James Madison University.

- Scott, R. (1990, April 10). Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, James Madison University.
- Smith, S. (1989, August 17). Alumni Director, James Madison University.
- Spong, W. (1990, May 17). President, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.
- Warren, R. (1990, April 10). Vice President for Academic Affairs, James Madison University.
- Willett, H. (1990, May 14). Former President, Longwood College, Farmville, VA.

## Vita

## Emily Gillespie Robertson

Birthdate: April 14, 1947

Birthplace: Bluefield, West Virginia

Education:

1984 - 1991 The College of William and Mary

Williamsburg, Virginia

Education Specialist

Doctor of Education

1982 - 1984 CBN University

Virginia Beach, Virginia

Master of Education

1965 - 1969 Longwood College

Farmville, Virginia

Bachelor of Arts