

Implementation of Marketing Strategies Across Department Parameters

Christine Evan Joy D. Semillano¹, Joyce C. Decendario, PhD^{2*}

La Carlota City College, La Carlota City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800609>

Received: 27 August 2026; Accepted: 01 September 2026; Published: 13 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceived implementation of marketing strategies across the Junior High School, Senior High School, and College departments of an educational institution. It focused on six areas: social media campaigns, SMS/inquiry responses, school tours and events, print materials, school campaigns, and referral systems. It also determined whether students' perceptions differed when grouped according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence. A quantitative descriptive-comparative research design was employed. The study included 366 students selected through proportionate stratified random sampling from a population of 4,231 students. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of 30 items covering the six marketing strategy dimensions. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the perceived level of implementation of the marketing strategies, while the Mann–Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis H tests were used to determine differences among groups. The overall mean of 2.47 (SD = 0.45) indicated that students perceived the marketing strategies as fully implemented. Social media campaigns received the highest mean ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.47$), whereas SMS/inquiry responses had the lowest ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 0.52$). Significant differences were found according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence. Post-hoc comparisons showed significant differences between the 13–16 and 17–20 age groups and between College and Senior High School students.

Keywords: Marketing Strategies, Educational Marketing, Social Media Campaigns, SMS/Inquiry Responses, School Tours and Events, School Campaigns, Referral System

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions need to communicate their programs and activities clearly to students, parents, and other stakeholders. Marketing in education is therefore not limited to advertisements. It also includes the ways an institution presents its programs, responds to inquiries, conducts school activities, communicates through digital and printed materials, and builds relationships with its community. These activities contribute to how students encounter and assess an institution.

The use of digital platforms has become an important part of school marketing. Social media allows schools to regularly share information about programs, activities, achievements, and announcements while providing opportunities for interaction with students and other stakeholders. At the same time, other forms of communication remain relevant. SMS and inquiry responses provide direct contact with students and prospective students. School tours and events allow individuals to experience the campus and interact with members of the institution. Print materials continue to provide information that can be distributed directly, while school campaigns extend institutional communication to communities outside the campus. Referral systems also contribute to marketing through recommendations from students, parents, alumni, faculty, staff, and other members of the school community.

Previous studies have recognized the importance of these different forms of communication in educational marketing. De Ramos and Briones (2024) reported that marketing practices in a Philippine higher education

institution included communication and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, Echavez et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of appropriate and consistent marketing strategies among higher education institutions in Mindanao. These studies show that educational marketing involves several activities that work together rather than a single promotional approach.

The study was guided by the view that students' perceptions of marketing implementation may differ according to the communication strategies they encounter and their individual and educational characteristics. In this study, the six marketing strategy dimensions represent the areas of marketing implementation being assessed, while age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence serve as grouping variables for examining differences in students' perceptions. This framework provides a basis for examining whether students with different characteristics report similar or different perceptions of marketing strategy implementation.

The present study was conducted in an institution with three major educational departments: Junior High School, Senior High School, and College. These departments provide a useful setting for comparison because students at different educational levels may encounter school marketing activities in different ways. Their age, educational level, previous school experiences, and involvement in institutional activities may be associated with how they receive or interact with school-related information. The study also considered sex, school origin, and place of residence to determine whether students with different characteristics reported different perceptions of marketing strategy implementation.

Six marketing strategy dimensions were examined based on students' perceptions: social media campaigns, SMS/inquiry responses, school tours and events, print materials, school campaigns, and referral systems. These areas were considered together because students may encounter the institution through several channels rather than through one marketing activity alone. Examining the strategies individually also makes it possible to identify which practices are more consistently experienced by students and which ones may need further attention.

Although educational marketing has been examined in previous studies, fewer studies have focused on comparing students from different educational levels within the same institution while considering several marketing strategies at the same time. This comparison is important because the experience of a Junior High School student may not be the same as that of a Senior High School or College student. Identifying these differences can help an institution determine whether its marketing activities are being experienced consistently across departments.

In this context, the present study examined the perceived implementation of selected marketing strategies among students of the Junior High School, Senior High School, and College departments. It also determined whether perceptions differed according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence. The results are intended to provide the institution with a clearer basis for maintaining practices that students perceived as well implemented and addressing areas where students reported relatively lower levels of perceived implementation.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence?
2. What is the perceived level of implementation of marketing strategies as a whole and in terms of social media campaigns, SMS/inquiry responses, school tours and events, print materials, school campaigns, and referral systems?
3. Is there a significant difference in the perceived implementation of marketing strategies when respondents are grouped according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence?

Research Hypotheses

H₀: There is no significant difference in the perceived level of implementation of marketing strategies when respondents are grouped according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence.

RELATED LITERATURE

Marketing in educational institutions involves more than promoting programs and attracting prospective students. It includes the different ways an institution communicates its programs, services, activities, and identity to students and other stakeholders. Kotler, Kartajaya, and Setiawan (2021) noted that marketing has increasingly incorporated technology to understand customer needs and strengthen interactions. Applied to education, this perspective places greater importance on communication and engagement rather than on promotion alone.

Educational marketing is also influenced by the experiences and expectations of students and their families. Institutions compete not only through the programs they offer but also through their visibility, communication practices, and ability to establish trust. De Ramos and Briones (2024), in their study of a private higher education institution in the Philippines, identified communication and stakeholder engagement as components of institutional marketing practices. These aspects are relevant to the present study because students may form their perceptions of an institution through both formal promotional materials and their actual interactions with the school.

The literature reviewed for this study focuses on six marketing strategy areas: social media campaigns, SMS and inquiry responses, school tours and events, print materials, school campaigns, and referral systems. These strategies represent different ways through which students and prospective students may encounter an educational institution. Taken together, they provide the basis for examining students' perceptions of how these marketing strategies are implemented within an educational institution.

Social Media Campaigns

Social media has become an important channel for educational institutions because it allows schools to communicate information while maintaining interaction with their audiences. Capriotti and Zeler (2023) examined social media communication in higher education institutions and found that institutional communication through these platforms involves more than simply maintaining an online presence. The consistency of posting, quality of content, and interaction with stakeholders are important in shaping how institutions communicate online.

Al-Dmour et al. (2024) likewise reported that marketing strategies, including the use of social media, can be associated with how students evaluate universities and make educational decisions. In the Philippine context, Echavez et al. (2025) also examined marketing strategies used by higher education institutions in Mindanao, highlighting the role of strategic marketing in reaching prospective students.

Taken together, these studies indicate that social media can serve both an informational and interactive function in educational marketing. For the present study, this distinction is important because the social media dimension considers not only the promotion of programs and activities but also the use of visual content and opportunities for interaction with audiences. Students' perceptions of these practices provide an indication of how consistently they encounter the institution's social media activities.

SMS/Inquiry Responses

Direct communication is another important part of an institution's relationship with students and prospective students. Inquiry responses are often among the first points of contact between an individual and a school. How an institution responds may influence perceptions of its reliability and willingness to assist. Stankovska et al. (2024) identified responsiveness, reliability, assurance, and empathy as important aspects associated with student satisfaction in higher education.

SMS also provides institutions with a direct means of communicating reminders, announcements, and other information. Kim et al. (2022) examined a large-scale text-based advising intervention and found that student engagement was associated with communication that was timely, relevant, and structured around student needs. Although their study focused on advising rather than marketing, the findings are relevant to institutional communication because both activities depend on clear and timely messages.

The literature therefore points to the importance of both the content and timing of direct communication. In the present study, SMS and inquiry responses were examined separately from social media because direct communication requires a different form of institutional response. A school may maintain an active online presence while still experiencing challenges in responding consistently to individual inquiries. Examining students' perceptions of this dimension may therefore help identify areas where direct communication could be strengthened.

School Tours and Events

School tours and institutional events provide opportunities for prospective students to experience the institution directly. Unlike promotional messages viewed through digital or printed media, campus-based activities allow students and families to see facilities, observe the school environment, and interact with school personnel. Swanson et al. (2021) found that college campus visits can affect students' knowledge of the institution, postsecondary intentions, and engagement with school personnel.

Recruitment practices also continue to include activities that bring prospective students into direct contact with institutions. Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2020) reported the use of campus open houses, campus visit days, and virtual visit days as recruitment activities in higher education. These activities combine the provision of information with personal interaction, giving prospective students an opportunity to develop a more direct understanding of the institution.

School tours and events therefore provide a more direct form of communication that complements the institution's digital and printed promotions. In the present study, students' perceptions of these activities were considered as one component of the broader implementation of marketing strategies.

Print Materials

Despite the growth of digital communication, printed materials remain one way for educational institutions to present information about their programs and activities. Flyers, brochures, posters, and other printed materials can be distributed directly to students, parents, and prospective students and may also be shared within communities.

Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2021) reported that print advertisements and materials such as viewbooks and brochures continued to be used by higher education institutions together with digital marketing channels. This indicates that traditional promotional materials have not necessarily been replaced by digital communication but may instead function alongside it.

Sharma and Al Sinawi (2021) emphasized the importance of resources and responsiveness as aspects of service quality in higher education. While their study did not specifically focus on printed promotional materials, the emphasis on accessible institutional resources is relevant to the presentation of school information. Clear and available information remains important regardless of whether it is delivered through digital or printed channels.

The continued use of print materials is therefore relevant to institutions that employ both traditional and digital approaches to marketing. In the present study, print materials were included to determine how consistently students perceive the institution's use and distribution of these materials.

School Campaigns

School campaigns include organized outreach activities intended to introduce an institution and its programs to prospective students and communities. These activities may involve school visits, career talks, information

drives, and other recruitment initiatives. Their purpose is to bring institutional information beyond the campus and make it accessible to prospective students in different communities.

Salazar et al. (2021) examined off-campus recruitment practices among public research universities and showed that recruitment activities may extend beyond the university campus. Such activities provide institutions with opportunities to communicate directly with prospective students. Howells (2021) also emphasized the importance of making admissions and recruitment experiences more personalized and relevant to prospective students. These findings support the inclusion of school campaigns as one of the marketing strategies in the present study.

Referral Systems

Referral systems represent a more interpersonal form of educational marketing. Recommendations may come from current students, parents, alumni, faculty, staff, or other members of the community. Unlike institutional advertisements, referrals are often connected to the personal experiences of people who have interacted with the institution.

Al-Dmour et al. (2024) reported that recommendations and communication-related factors can influence students' perceptions and educational choices. Sun et al. (2021) also found that useful and shareable information can contribute to positive word-of-mouth behavior. These findings provide a basis for considering referrals as part of the broader marketing process.

In educational settings, personal recommendations may be influenced by how stakeholders experience the institution. A student or parent who has had a positive experience may be more willing to recommend the school to others, while negative experiences may affect willingness to do so. Referral systems are therefore connected not only to promotional efforts but also to the institution's relationships with its stakeholders.

The reviewed studies show that educational marketing involves several forms of communication and engagement, including digital platforms, direct communication, campus activities, printed materials, community outreach, and personal recommendations. While previous studies have examined these strategies individually or in specific educational settings, there is less attention to how students from different educational levels within the same institution perceive their implementation. This gap provides the basis for the present study, which examines students' perceptions of the implementation of six marketing strategies among Junior High School, Senior High School, and College students and determines whether their perceptions differ according to selected demographic characteristics.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study used a conceptual framework in which age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence served as grouping variables. The main variable examined was students' perceived implementation of marketing strategies in terms of Social Media Campaigns, SMS/Inquiry Responses, School Tours and Events, Print Materials, School Campaigns, and Referral Systems.

The framework provides a basis for examining whether students from different demographic groups report different perceptions of marketing strategy implementation. It does not assume that demographic characteristics cause differences in perceptions.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive-comparative research design was used. The study examined students' perceptions of the implementation of selected marketing strategies and compared these perceptions across demographic groups. The study did not independently verify the actual implementation of the strategies; therefore, "implementation" refers specifically to the respondents' perceived implementation based on their observations and experiences.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents were enrolled students from the Junior High School, Senior High School, and College departments who participated in the study. Their responses were used to assess their perceptions of the implementation of the identified marketing strategies.

Population and Sampling Procedure

The population consisted of 4,231 students during the data-gathering period. Yamane's formula was used at a 5% margin of error to determine the required sample size:

$$n = N / [1 + N(e^2)]$$

$$n = 4,231 / [1 + 4,231(0.05^2)]$$

$$n = 4,231 / 11.5775 = 365.50 \approx 366$$

The population consisted of 4,231 students, distributed across Junior High School (656), Senior High School (980), and College (2,595). Proportionate stratified random sampling yielded 57, 85, and 224 respondents, respectively, for a total sample of 366.

Research Instrument

A researcher-made questionnaire was used to collect the data. Section I gathered demographic information, while Section II consisted of 30 items measuring students' perceived implementation of six marketing strategy dimensions: social media campaigns, SMS/inquiry responses, school tours and events, print materials, school campaigns, and referral systems. The items asked respondents to rate the extent to which they observed or experienced the identified marketing practices.

Responses were measured using a three-point scale: 3 for Fully Implemented, 2 for Moderately Implemented, and 1 for Not Implemented. The mean scores were interpreted using the following ranges: 2.34–3.00, Fully Implemented; 1.67–2.33, Moderately Implemented; and 1.00–1.66, Not Implemented.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Five experts with relevant experience in research, marketing, and educational management reviewed the questionnaire. The 30 items obtained a Content Validity Index of 1.00.

A pilot test was conducted with 30 respondents who were not included in the actual sample. The instrument obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.950, indicating strong internal consistency.

Data Gathering and Analysis

Institutional permission was secured before data collection. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. Only respondents who provided informed consent participated in the study.

The questionnaires were administered through printed or secure online forms. Completed responses were checked, encoded, organized, and prepared for statistical analysis. Pilot-test responses were excluded from the final dataset.

Statistical Treatment

Frequency and percentage were used to summarize the demographic profile of the respondents. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the perceived level of implementation of the six marketing strategy dimensions and the overall marketing strategies.

The Mann–Whitney U test was used to examine differences in perceived implementation between two-group variables, while the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used for variables with more than two groups. For the Mann–Whitney U test, the U statistic, p-value, group mean ranks, and effect size (r) were reported. For the Kruskal–Wallis H test, the H statistic, degrees of freedom, p-value, group mean ranks, and effect size (ϵ^2) were reported.

When a significant Kruskal–Wallis H result was obtained, pairwise comparisons were conducted to determine which groups differed significantly. The Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust the p-values for multiple comparisons. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

Ethical Considerations

The study followed basic ethical principles in the collection and handling of data. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from Silay Institute, where the data were collected. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, their voluntary participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. Appropriate consent procedures were followed before data collection. The information gathered was used solely for academic purposes and was handled with appropriate confidentiality.

Data Availability

The data generated and analyzed during the study are not publicly available due to confidentiality and privacy considerations but may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to applicable institutional policies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 366 respondents according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence.

Table 1. Frequency and Percent Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Respondents.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age	13–16 years	78	21.31
	17–20 years	181	49.45
	21–24 years	93	25.41
	25 years and above	14	3.83
Sex	Male	80	21.86
	Female	286	78.14
Department	Junior High School	57	15.57
	Senior High School	85	23.22
	College	224	61.20
School Origin	Private	142	38.80
	Public	224	61.20
Place of Residence	Within Silay City	246	67.21
	Outside Silay City	120	32.79

The largest proportion of respondents was aged 17–20 years (49.45%), followed by those aged 21–24 years (25.41%). Respondents aged 13–16 years accounted for 21.31%, while those aged 25 years and above comprised 3.83% of the sample. In terms of sex, female respondents represented 78.14% of the sample, while male respondents accounted for 21.86%.

College students comprised the largest proportion of respondents (61.20%), followed by Senior High School students (23.22%) and Junior High School students (15.57%). This distribution reflects the proportionate sampling procedure and the larger student population of the College department. In terms of school origin, 61.20% of the respondents came from public schools and 38.80% from private schools. Most respondents (67.21%) resided within Silay City, while 32.79% lived outside the city.

The demographic distribution provides the basis for examining whether students' perceptions of marketing strategy implementation differed across the identified groups. The variation in group sizes, particularly across departments and sex, was considered in the selection and interpretation of the nonparametric statistical tests.

Perceived Level of Implementation of Marketing Strategies

Table 2 presents the perceived level of implementation of the six marketing strategy dimensions and the overall result.

Table 2. Perceived Level of Implementation of Marketing Strategies

Marketing Strategy	M	SD	Interpretation
Social Media Campaigns	2.56	0.47	Fully Implemented
SMS/Inquiry Responses	2.37	0.52	Fully Implemented
School Tours and Events	2.51	0.51	Fully Implemented
Print Materials	2.40	0.51	Fully Implemented
School Campaigns	2.51	0.53	Fully Implemented
Referral System	2.44	0.50	Fully Implemented
Marketing Strategies as a Whole	2.47	0.45	Fully Implemented

Note: Interpretation: 2.34–3.00 = Fully Implemented; 1.67–2.33 = Moderately Implemented; 1.00–1.66 = Not Implemented.

The overall mean of 2.47 (SD = 0.45) indicates that the strategies were perceived as fully implemented. Among the six dimensions, Social Media Campaigns received the highest mean (M = 2.56, SD = 0.47), followed by School Tours and Events and School Campaigns (both M = 2.51). Referral Systems obtained a mean of 2.44, Print Materials 2.40, and SMS/Inquiry Responses had the lowest mean at 2.37.

School Tours and Events and School Campaigns both obtained a mean of 2.51. For School Tours and Events, the highest-rated indicator was that these activities help prospective students become familiar with the institution (M = 2.56). This suggests that students perceive school-based activities as a visible part of the institution's promotional efforts. For School Campaigns, communication of information about programs, services, and activities received the highest rating (M = 2.54), while coordination among departments received a mean of 2.50. These results suggest that school campaigns serve both an informational and coordinating function in promoting institutional programs and activities.

Referral Systems obtained a mean of 2.44, with strengthening the institution's relationship with the community receiving the highest rating (M = 2.47). This suggests that recommendations and word-of-mouth continue to complement the institution's formal promotional activities. Sun et al. (2021) similarly found that useful and shareable information can encourage positive word-of-mouth behavior.

Print Materials received a mean of 2.40. Although the dimension was generally perceived as fully implemented, the regular distribution of print materials received a lower mean of 2.32, interpreted as moderately implemented. This may indicate that printed materials are still used but are not distributed as consistently as other promotional channels. Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2021) likewise noted that print materials continue to be used alongside digital marketing in higher education.

SMS/Inquiry Responses recorded the lowest dimension mean ($M = 2.37$). The lower ratings were particularly evident in the consistent use of SMS notifications and inquiry responses ($M = 2.26$) and responding within an appropriate period ($M = 2.29$). In contrast, providing accurate information ($M = 2.42$) and handling inquiries professionally and courteously ($M = 2.46$) were rated as fully implemented. This pattern suggests that the main concern is consistency and timeliness rather than the quality of communication itself. Timely and reliable communication is also emphasized in studies on student engagement and satisfaction (Kim et al., 2022; Stankovska et al., 2024).

Overall, students perceived the institution's marketing strategies as fully implemented across the six dimensions. Social media and school-based activities were the most highly rated, while SMS/inquiry responses and the regular distribution of print materials were relatively weaker. These areas may therefore benefit from more consistent and timely communication, particularly in responding to student and prospective-student inquiries.

Differences in Perceived Marketing Strategy Implementation by Demographic Characteristics

Table 3 presents the results of the tests for differences in perceived marketing strategy implementation according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence.

Table 3. Differences in Perceived Marketing Strategy Implementation by Demographic Characteristics

Grouping variable	Group Mean Ranks	Test	Test statistic	p	Effect Size	Interpretation
Age	13–16: 210.56; 17–20: 168.34; 21–24: 193.63; 25+: 161.43	Kruskal–Wallis H	10.316	0.016	0.020	Significant
Sex	Male: 205.03; Female: 177.48	Mann–Whitney U	9,718.00	0.039	0.108	Significant
Department	JHS: 202.20; SHS: 220.34; College: 164.76	Kruskal–Wallis H	19.172	< .001	0.047	Significant
School origin	Private: 169.88; Public: 192.14	Mann–Whitney U	13,969.50	0.049	0.103	Significant
Place of residence	Within Silay: 193.66; Outside Silay: 162.67	Mann–Whitney U	12,260.50	0.008	0.138	Significant

Note: Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

The results showed statistically significant differences across all five grouping variables. However, all effect sizes were small, which means that the differences were limited. Thus, although students differed statistically in their perceptions, the demographic characteristics examined were associated with only small differences in perceived implementation.

For age, the Kruskal–Wallis test showed a significant difference, $H(3) = 10.316$, $p = .016$, $\varepsilon^2 = .020$. Post-hoc analysis showed a significant difference between the 13–16 and 17–20 age groups (adjusted $p = .019$). The other pairwise comparisons were not significant. This means that the main difference in perceptions was between these two age groups, although the small effect size suggests that the difference was limited.

A significant difference was also found according to sex, $U = 9,718.00$, $p = .039$, $r = .108$. The mean rank was higher for male respondents (205.03) than for female respondents (177.48), indicating that male respondents reported higher perceived implementation. However, the small effect size shows that the difference was modest.

Department showed the largest difference among the grouping variables, $H(2) = 19.172$, $p < .001$, with a small effect size ($\varepsilon^2 = .047$). Post-hoc comparisons showed a significant difference between College and Senior High

School respondents ($p < .001$), while the differences between College and Junior High School ($p = .051$) and between Junior High School and Senior High School ($p = .948$) were not statistically significant after Bonferroni adjustment. Thus, the most noticeable difference in perceived implementation was between College and Senior High School respondents. This difference may be related to variations in students' exposure to institutional activities and communication channels, although these factors were not directly measured in the study.

School origin also showed a significant difference, $U = 13,969.50$, $p = .049$, $r = .103$. The small effect size suggests that the difference between respondents from public and private school backgrounds was limited. Similarly, place of residence showed a significant difference, $U = 12,260.50$, $p = .008$, $r = .138$, although the effect was also small. These findings show some differences in students' perceptions based on school origin and residence, but they do not establish these characteristics as causes of the differences.

Overall, perceived marketing strategy implementation differed across the demographic groups examined, with department showing the clearest statistical difference. Although significant differences were found for age, sex, school origin, and residence, the effect sizes were small. This suggests that students generally had similar perceptions of the institution's marketing practices despite some differences across groups.

In practical terms, the institution may not need completely different marketing strategies for each demographic group. Instead, attention could be given to areas where perceived implementation was weaker, particularly the consistency and timeliness of SMS and inquiry responses. The institution may also consider the communication needs of students across different departments. However, these suggestions are practical considerations rather than causal conclusions because the study focused on perceived implementation and did not examine the specific factors that may explain the differences between groups.

Table 4. Significant Pairwise Comparisons

Grouping Variable	Pairwise Comparison	Adjusted p	Interpretation
Age	13–16 vs. 17–20 years	0.019	Significant
Department	College vs. Senior High School	$< .001$	Significant

LIMITATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

Several limitations should be considered in interpreting the findings. First, the study measured students' perceived implementation of marketing strategies rather than objectively verified implementation. The results therefore reflect respondents' experiences and observations and should not be interpreted as a direct assessment of actual institutional implementation.

Second, the study was conducted in a single educational institution, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Third, the data were self-reported and collected at one point in time, making the results subject to respondents' individual experiences and interpretations. The study also examined only selected demographic characteristics and did not include other factors that may influence students' perceptions, such as frequency of social media use, exposure to school activities, or interaction with admissions personnel.

Finally, statistical significance should not be interpreted as evidence of causation. Although significant differences were found across the demographic groups, the effect sizes were small. Future studies may include multiple institutions, additional explanatory variables, longitudinal data, and objective measures of marketing implementation to provide a broader understanding of these differences.

CONCLUSION

The study found that the institution's selected marketing strategies were generally perceived as fully implemented, with an overall mean of 2.47 ($SD = 0.45$). Social Media Campaigns received the highest rating, while SMS/Inquiry Responses had the lowest dimension mean. Although SMS/Inquiry Responses remained

within the Fully Implemented level, the results point to the need for more consistent SMS communication and more timely responses to inquiries.

Significant differences in perceived marketing strategy implementation were found when respondents were grouped according to age, sex, department, school origin, and place of residence. Post-hoc comparisons further showed significant differences between the 13–16 and 17–20 age groups and between College and Senior High School students. These findings indicate that although students generally perceived the marketing strategies as fully implemented, perceptions varied across some demographic groups.

Overall, the results show that students generally perceived the institution's selected marketing practices as well implemented. At the same time, the differences across respondent groups indicate that students may experience these activities differently. Giving greater attention to direct communication, particularly the consistency and timeliness of SMS and inquiry responses, while continuing the strategies that students rated highly, may help strengthen the institution's overall marketing efforts. The findings reflect students' perceptions and should not be interpreted as an objective measurement of actual institutional implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The institution can enhance its social media campaigns by creating engaging, relevant, and timely content suited to different digital platforms.
2. The institution may improve its SMS and inquiry response system to ensure timely, accurate, and consistent communication with prospective students, parents, and other stakeholders.
3. School administrators may continue supporting marketing activities by providing adequate resources for both digital and traditional promotional activities.
4. The marketing staff can organize and expand school tours, educational fairs, campus visits, and school campaigns to increase public awareness and student participation.
5. Faculty members, students, alumni, and other stakeholders may participate in referral programs and promotional activities to strengthen the visibility and reputation of the institution.
6. Marketing strategies may be adjusted according to the needs and characteristics of different student groups to improve their effectiveness and reach.
7. The institution may periodically evaluate its marketing strategies to identify strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for further development.
8. Future researchers may conduct similar studies using additional variables, different research settings, or larger groups of respondents to further validate and expand the findings of the study.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Dmour, R., Al-Dmour, H., & Al-Dmour, A. (2024). The role of marketing mix and social media strategies in influencing international students' university choices in Jordan. *Journal of International Students*, 14(4), 642–663. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v14i4.6407>
2. Capriotti, P., & Zeler, I. (2023). Analysing effective social media communication in higher education institutions. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10, Article 656.
3. De Ramos, J. R., & Briones, J. P. (2024). Marketing practices of a private higher education institution in the Philippines. *International Journal of Marketing and Digital Creative*, 2(2), 16–32. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijmadic.v2i2.2381>
4. Echavez, L. F. J., Prado, N. I., & Vedra, S. A. (2025). Effectiveness of the marketing strategies for higher education institutions in Mindanao. *Seybold Report Journal*, 20(2), 19–32.
5. Howells, K. (2021, May 24). Changes ahead: Personalizing the admissions and recruitment experience in higher ed. *EDUCAUSE Review*.
6. Kim, B. H., Meyer, K., & Choe, A. (2022). Gauging engagement: Measuring student response to a large-scale college advising field experiment (EdWorkingPaper No. 22-567). Annenberg Institute at Brown University. <https://doi.org/10.26300/dcrq-rv92>
7. Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., & Setiawan, I. (2021). *Marketing 5.0: Technology for humanity*. John Wiley & Sons.

8. Ruffalo Noel Levitz. (2020). 2020 marketing and recruitment practices for undergraduate students: Effective practices for undergraduate recruitment at four-year colleges and universities, as rated by campus officials from 151 institutions.
9. Salazar, K. G., Jaquette, O., & Han, C. (2021). Coming soon to a neighborhood near you? Off-campus recruiting by public research universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 58(6), 1270–1314.
10. Sharma, S., & Al Sinawi, S. (2021). Organizational performance influenced by academic service quality: An investigation in public universities in Malaysia. *Education Research International*, 2021, Article 8408174. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8408174>
11. Stankovska, G., Ziberi, F., & Dimitrovski, D. (2024). Service quality and student satisfaction in higher education. In *Education in developing, emerging, and developed countries: Different worlds, common challenges* (BCES Conference Books, Vol. 22, pp. 153–160). Bulgarian Comparative Education Society.
12. Sun, X., Foscht, T., & Eisingerich, A. B. (2021). Does educating customers create positive word of mouth? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 62, Article 102638.
13. Swanson, E., Kopotic, K., Zamarro, G., Mills, J. N., Greene, J. P., & Ritter, G. W. (2021). An evaluation of the educational impact of college campus visits: A randomized experiment. *AERA Open*, 7, 1–18.