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ABSTRACT

Many adults today are realizing the need for more education. Recognizing this need, educators are designing programs to meet the needs and appeal to the interests of these adults. Because competition for the continuing adult student has reached a level never before attained, educators face the additional challenge of developing specific promotional strategies directed to this target audience.

Experts in the field of public relations report that the special event has become the most frequently used public relations tool in America. The open house is probably the best example of how an organization can use the special event to present a graphic demonstration of its people, programs, and activities. The nature of the publicity prior to an open house depends upon the size of the audience. In those cases where open houses are planned for smaller special interest groups, it has been recommended that direct mail invitations be used to contact guests.

This thesis, The Effect of Personalization on the Promotion of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware, is an attempt to determine the effect of personalization on the response to a "Neighborhood Open House"
sponsored by the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware. The study was designed to yield information in the following three areas of communication research: 1) the promotion of continuing education courses and programs, 2) the effect of invitations on the promotion of a special event, and 3) the impact of personalization on the effectiveness of direct mail invitations.

The "Neighborhood Open House" was held on March 21, 1979. The methods used in inviting people to the open house were written invitations (direct mail) and verbal invitations (telephone follow-up). The written invitations were randomly assigned to three invitational groups which varied in their degree of personalization. The degree of personalization of an invitation was determined on the basis of the following techniques: the method of inscribing the invitational message, the method of inscribing the address, the method of addressing the invitation, and the method of mailing the invitation. Follow-up telephone calls were made to a random sample of addresses in each of the invitational groups one week after the written invitations were mailed.

Data sources for this study were: 1) invitations presented at the open house, 2) a questionnaire distributed at the open house, 3) information derived from a telephone
invitational follow-up, and 4) a telephone survey of a random sample of people who did not attend the open house.

Information derived from these sources indicated that while receiving an invitation to attend the open house generated respondents, neither the degree of personalization of the direct mail invitation nor the telephone invitational follow-up significantly affected the response rate.

The results of this study can be used by continuing education personnel in the planning of future promotional events and may be helpful to other non-profit organizations in cases where generalizations are appropriate.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many adults are realizing the need for more education. These adults range from businessmen wishing to advance in their professions to housewives seeking to broaden their backgrounds or enter the business world. Recognizing this need, continuing educators (educators in the field of adult continuing education) are developing programs to appeal to these adults. It is not enough, however, that continuing educators develop programs desired by adults in the community. They must also develop ways to effectively promote these programs. Referring to this need, Stanley Kobre in his book, Successful Public Relations for Colleges and Universities (1974), says,

Universities must communicate their activities to many persons and groups in the community. They need to find ways to relay information about their contributions and to show how these benefit people. (p. 7)

The fall of 1978 was spent as a graduate intern in the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware. The focus of the internship was on career and academic counseling for women. The author observed that
many women were seeking new directions in their lives, but few of them knew about the counseling and testing services available at the ACCESS Center (Adult Center for Continuing Student Services). How could these people become aware of the opportunities available to them?

It was obvious that this was a problem in human communications. The facilities were there and so were the participants. What would it take to bring the two together? How could one communicate the existence of these facilities to someone who was unaware of them? What would be the most effective and efficient method of communicating this information to the public at large? What role would the personalized element in communicating with the subject play in the effectiveness of the communication process? These and other questions led to a number of proposals.

The original idea was to hold an ACCESS Center Open House for women in the Newark area. This idea was presented to Mr. John Murray, director of the Division of Continuing Education, and Dr. Edward Kepka, coordinator of the ACCESS Center. Mr. Murray and Dr. Kepka expressed interest in an ACCESS Center Open House, and suggested that it be discussed with other members of the continuing education staff. Barbara Peyton, information specialist for the Division of Continuing Education, suggested that such a project might
prove beneficial to all the programs and services offered by the Division of Continuing Education. She also recommended that the audience include both men and women from the community.

The concept grew from an ACCESS Center Open House to a Continuing Education Open House. Supervisors for the open house project were Dr. Jon Meggan, associate director of administrative and student services, and Dr. Edward Kepka, coordinator of the ACCESS Center. There was also an advisory committee whose members included: Mr. John Murray, director of the Division of Continuing Education; Dr. Richard Fischer, associate director of statewide programming; Ms. Barbara Peyton, information specialist; and Ms. Nancy Aldrich, associate program specialist.

The first advisory committee meeting was held on November 2, 1978. It was decided that the contact area for the open house would include only those residences located in the immediate vicinity of John M. Clayton Hall. Clayton Hall is the headquarters for the University of Delaware Division of Continuing Education. It is located on the University's North Campus in Newark, Delaware. Using Clayton Hall as the midpoint, the boundaries established for the contact area were: north to Newark city limits, south to Main Street, east to North College Avenue, and west to
West Main Street (Appendix A). Because the contact area for the open house was limited to the neighborhood of Clayton Hall, it was decided that the residents would be mailed invitations with a "Hi, Neighbor" approach. The promotional project was thus entitled, "Neighborhood Open House."

There were three purposes for the "Neighborhood Open House." The first was to acquaint those people residing in the immediate vicinity of John M. Clayton Hall with the courses, programs, and services available through the Division of Continuing Education. The second was to aid the Division of Continuing Education in determining the effectiveness of an open house as a means for promoting its courses, programs, and services. The third was to aid the Division of Continuing Education in determining the effect of invitations and telephone calls on the promotion of a special event.

The main concern of the author, however, was to determine how different modes of communication would affect the response generated by the invitational process. Thus, these three purposes fit well into a research program that would allow the author to develop the necessary procedures for planning and producing such an open house. These planning procedures included: (1) designing the program (Appendix B), (2) establishing a budget (Appendix C),
(3) producing a slide presentation, and (4) procuring and corresponding with program participants (Appendix D). They would also answer the following research questions:

**Research Questions**

(1) What effect does a direct mail invitation have on the response to an open house sponsored by the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware?

(2) What effect does a telephone invitational follow-up have on the response?

(3) What effect does the degree of personalization have on the response to a direct mail invitation?

The open house project would supply information in three areas of communication research: (1) the effect of invitations on the promotion of a special event, (2) the impact of personalization on the effectiveness of invitations, and (3) the promotion of continuing education courses and programs.

That information was lacking in these areas was discovered as a result of interviews with people in the fields of public relations and continuing education. These people were as follows: Helen Farlow, National University Extension Association, University of Illinois; Robert Comfort, associate dean of the School of General Studies, University of Pittsburgh; Richard L. Moore, chairman of N.U.E.A. Survey
Research Committee, University of Nebraska; Peter Tolos, executive director of Educational Cooperative, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Rhodes, vice president for Public Servicing of Continuing Education, Memphis State University; John Burns, director of the Division of Continuing Education, Purdue University; Phillip Nowlin, University of Chicago; Information Center of the Public Relations Society of America, New York, N.Y.; John Murray, director of the Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware; Richard Fischer, associate director of statewide programming, Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware; Jon Heggan, associate director of administrative and student services, Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware; Edward Kepka, coordinator of ACCESS Center, Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware; Barbara Peyton, information specialist, Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware; and Russell Powers, director of Communication Publications, University of Delaware.

Data sources for this thesis, The Effect of Personalization on the Promotion of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware, were: (1) invitations presented at the open house, (2) a questionnaire distributed at the open house, (3) information derived from a telephone invitational follow-up, and (4) information derived from a telephone survey of people who did not attend the open house.
The results of this study can be used by continuing education personnel in the planning of future promotional events and may be helpful to other non-profit organizations in cases where generalizations are appropriate.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Until recently, such terms as "public relations" and "marketing" spoken within an academic setting elicited negative responses from faculty, administration, and students. Continuing educators in an effort to maintain status in the academic community were especially sensitive to the Madison Avenue connotation suggested by these terms. To many educators "public relations" connoted "propaganda," and "marketing" and "selling" were one and the same. Both practices were strongly resisted as proper functions of colleges and universities (Elder, 1974; Lenz, 1976).

The Marketing of Continuing Education

According to Elinor Lenz (1976), director of the Western Humanities Center, University Extension, UCLA, "the idea of marketing continuing education has finally come out of the closet and achieved respectability" (p. 163). The reason for this change of attitude may be credited to various recent developments in the field of education. These developments have included: 1) decreased enrollment among under-graduates in traditional four-year programs,
2) increased enrollment among adults in continuing education courses, and 3) increasing competition for the continuing education audience.

There are many explanations for the decline in enrollment in higher education among today's college-age youth. Edward J. O'Brien (1973), chairman of the marketing program at Southwest Minnesota State College, suggests that educators can take their pick from the following: decline in the college-age population, economic inflation, drug usage on campuses, increased emphasis on vocational or job-oriented education, more (often tuition-free) vocational-technical schools, and more young people deciding to travel and gain experience before beginning college.

Universities today are making a concerted effort to attract adults in the community to continue with their education. These adults enroll in credit courses and informal non-credit courses and workshops offered through the continuing education division of the university. Most colleges and universities have been offering degree programs at night for years. But now rising administrative costs, shrinking federal support, and decreasing undergraduate enrollment have forced colleges and universities to focus on the adult student. According to the National Center of Educational Statistics,
More than 17 million adults aged 25 and over were registered in continuing education courses in 1975. Some 3.6 million adults took part-time courses at colleges in 1975, up from 1.7 million in 1970. Adults over the age of 21 may account for 40% of total college enrollment by 1980. ("Colleges Learn The Hard Sell," 1977, p. 92)

Harold Hodgkinson, director of the National Institute of Education, has stated that there still exists a large untapped market of about 15 million adults who are potential educational consumers (Gorman & Waters, 1976).

Today, colleges, universities, public agencies, proprietary schools, high schools, labor unions, and private corporations are offering continuing education courses, seminars, and workshops. Competition among institutions has reached a level never before attained. This competition exerts even greater pressures on colleges and universities to attract adult continuing education students (Comfort, 1978; Lenz, 1976). Referring to this growing competition, Robert W. Comfort (1978), associate dean, School of General Studies, University of Pittsburgh, says, "We are in a buyer's market with growing, real pressures upon each seller to gain a greater share of that market" (p. 12).

Continuing educators are now expressing an interest in utilizing marketing tools in planning and promoting their programs. The number of conferences on marketing are
growing. The 1974 National University Extension Association (NUEA) annual meeting focused on the theme, "Marketing Continuing Education."

The marketing profession in recent years has been challenged to apply its analytical techniques and expertise to non-business organizations....Clearly marketing practitioners have an opportunity to play a key role in helping non-business organizations become more efficient and effective in the delivery of services offered to clients. (Suchanan & Barksdale, 1974, p. 34)

The first step in marketing planning is market research. An organization must be able to identify and understand its major publics and markets in order to successfully map out its marketing plan. Phillip Kotler, in his book, Marketing for Non-Profit Organizations (1975), states,

An organization's public is a distinct group of people that have an actual or potential interest or impact on the organization. When a public becomes valued by an organization, it becomes a target market for which the organization undertakes marketing planning and communications. (p. 34)

When continuing educators conduct market research they collect data about the needs, interests, and characteristics of the adult population within the community. This research not only aids the educator in planning programs, but also may serve as a form of advertising by informing adults in the community that the college or university is interested in meeting their needs and interests. Many continuing
educators conduct market research by surveying a general sample of adults in the community, present or former students, community leaders, or adult organizations (Hertling, 1973).

There are four basic areas in which organizations try to increase their share of the market by altering and improving the marketing variables under their control: 1) product or service, 2) pricing, 3) distribution channel, and 4) promotion (Buchanan & Barksdale, 1974; O'Brien, 1973).

In the field of adult education, the educational institution's product or service refers to its continuing education courses, programs, workshops, and seminars. In her article, "Continuing Education Goes to Market" (1976), Elinor Lenz cautions,

> If continuing education is to stay in step with the dynamism of American life, it must continue to opt for diversity, for pluralistic programs which reflect the needs and aspirations of people from all walks of life and varied cultural and economic backgrounds. (p. 164).

In a survey administered to member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULCC), Buchanan and Barksdale (1974) report that the majority of the schools surveyed are client-need oriented. That is, these universities and colleges endeavor to design programs to meet the needs and appeal to the interests of adults in the community.
In an educational setting, pricing refers to tuition and is generally based on a variety of economic variables. Distribution channel is the method of getting the programs or services to the potential adult consumer. Working during the day, many adults find it is necessary to attend early morning, late afternoon, evening, or Saturday classes. Colleges and universities must be willing and able to meet the adult student's desires and needs as to the place and time courses are offered. In an effort to expand their markets, most universities offer classes at both on- and off-campus locations in various parts of the community (Kobre, 1974, chap. 1; O'Brien, 1973).

The Promotion of Continuing Education

This thesis is mainly concerned with the fourth marketing variable, promotion. Universities and colleges have long practiced institutional promotion. The objective of this type of promotion has been to secure aid to serve the financial needs of the institution and the educational needs of its students. It has been directed toward alumni, legislators, and potential public benefactors (O'Brien, 1973).

If educational institutions must learn to change the direction of their promotional efforts in order to reach today's educational consumer, then specific promotional
strategies must now be created for and directed to the prospective adult student in the community.

We can no longer assume that all we have to do is provide the course, classroom and teacher, and somehow the students will find the way to our door. There are too many doors for them to find their way to. How do we bring them to ours?...the answer presents itself in the form of better, more effective ways of communication. (Lenz, 1976, p. 164)

In business organizations, selling is viewed as a form of communication. It is stressed that the customer is educated as to how the seller's product or service would fulfill his needs. Although most educators have a negative impression of selling, they will accept the concept of communications as necessary to the success of selling or educating (Miller, 1976). According to Phillip Kotler (1975), promotion's major role is persuasive communication and its primary task is "to present messages to the target audience which create interest or desire for the product" (p. 201).

People make decisions in a number of ways. Cal M. Logue (1977), associate professor of speech communication at the University of Georgia, says that persuasion is one of the most widely used forms of influencing decisions in a democratic society. Some of the factors involved in persuasive communication are: (1)\textit{The ethics of persuasion - Information must never be falsified or distorted in order}
to achieve the communicator's purpose. (2) **Understanding the listener** - The communicator must analyze how the listener will react to him and to what he says. The listener's interests, educational level, sex, age, economic status, attitudes, etc., must be considered. (3) **Analyzing the topic** - Before attempting to persuade others, the communicator must analyze the topic (product) intelligently. To analyze the topic is to better understand it. (4) **Personal persuasion** - The personal characteristics of the communicator can significantly influence the results of persuasive communication. Characteristics which can have a positive effect on listener response are authoritativeness (knowledge of the topic) and character (Logue, 1977).

The continuing educator who is attempting to promote his programs can only encourage adults in the community to inquire or apply to the university. His role is one of communicating educational opportunities to the residents of the community. The success of marketing or promoting continuing education programs is generally measured by attendance and begins with the dissemination of information about the college or university's division of continuing education, its programs and services (Fischer, 1978).

Comprehensive communication or "public relations" in the broad sense of the term is essential to institutions of higher education. The challenge to the leaders of higher education is to find
the means whereby it can be accomplished. (Elder, 1974, p. 32)

The university's public relations program should try to meet this challenge by developing appropriate messages and determining the most effective media for reaching its adult audience. Newspaper articles, radio, television, catalogs, direct mail, posters, and word of mouth are techniques often used to disseminate information to these adults (Kobre, 1974, chap. 1).

In many educational institutions, the catalog is the primary marketing tool... catalogs should be only a small part of an overall marketing strategy for colleges...Promotional planning includes far more than a few descriptive printed pieces of material. (Gorman & Waters, 1976, p. 14)

In the survey administered to member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), Buchanan and Barksdale (1974) found that all responding institutions used at least one communication method to inform the public of service offerings. The results of the survey indicated the following: (1) Direct Mail was used by 91.1% of the respondents, (2) Magazines by 45.6%, (3) Newspapers by 95.6%, (4) Personal Visitation by 75.6%, (5) Radio-T.V. by 88.9%, (6) Posters and "take one" materials by 73.3%, (7) Word-of-mouth by 80.0%, and (8) Other by 5.6%. Newspaper advertisements and direct mail were the most frequently used methods of
promotion (See Table 2 of Buchanan & Barksdale, 1974, for complete data).

In a study of six Illinois public community colleges, a survey was taken to determine what community colleges were doing to publicize adult and continuing education and the effectiveness of that publicity (Hardig, 1977). Those surveyed were asked to rank various dissemination methods in the order of their importance. Word of mouth was ranked highest by 24.7% of adult students, followed by course schedules (21.3%), college catalogs (21.0%), and flyers (12.8%), with newspaper advertisements and stories, and direct contact with the college comprising the remainder. It was concluded that new students were more likely to consider a flyer on a course and a friend or neighbor to be the most important source of information. Returning adult students relied more on college catalogs, course schedules, and teachers or counselors at the college. As a result of the study, Robert J. Hardig (1977) gives the following advice to adult and continuing education administrators,

Word-of-mouth publicity by satisfied students and others who recommend the college is capable of bringing more adult students to the college than any other publicizing method. (p. 8)

Word of mouth is perhaps the most difficult to control and subtle of publicity tools. One of the things that
contributes to word-of-mouth circulation is a spectacular and successful event like an open house (Baus and Coleman, 1967, chap. 34).

Open Houses as Special Events

The special event is a public relations tool which is designed to bring people who share a common interest together at a specific time and place. Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for the sponsoring group or organization to convey a positive image, communicate a message, or establish an idea in a hurry. Hal Golden and Kitty Hanson, in their book, Special Events (1960), report that the special event has become the most frequently used public relations tool in America. They go on to state that because special events attract people and focus attention on a particular purpose, "Organizations of all kinds have found the special event an excellent means of making friends and influencing people" (p. 11).

When the sponsoring organization is an educational institution, the special event gives the institution the opportunity to present a graphic demonstration of its people, programs, and activities. These events can often reach potential students who are not ordinarily contacted by the college or university (Kobre, 1974, chap. 13).
The open house is probably the best example of how an organization uses the special event to convey an image or communicate a message. Although open houses are often used by business or industrial organizations as a promotional tool, they are most frequently used by non-profit organizations. The main objective of an open house is to give the guests a positive impression of the organization which they will pass along to friends, neighbors, business associates, and the community at large (Golden & Hanson, 1960, chap. 2).

Careful planning is essential to a successful open house. One of the first steps in planning an open house is the selection of a planning committee. Every phase of the event must be contemplated beforehand, and the entire project should be carefully analyzed with the head of the sponsoring organization (Kobre, 1974, chap. 13). Planning committee responsibilities generally include:

1. **Defining the objectives** - The committee's first responsibility may be to select a theme. The purpose of the open house must be determined and its objectives defined in order to successfully design and program it. The theme of the open house unifies the project and provides a central idea for conducting it (Chamber of Commerce; Kobre, 1974, chap. 13).
2. **Setting the date** - Four to six months should be allowed for planning the open house. A date should be selected which, if possible, does not conflict with another organizational or community activity (Chamber of Commerce).

3. **Choosing the guests** - Open houses should, in most cases, be planned for special interest groups or a predeterminded audience. By concentrating on smaller groups, the organization's facilities are not over-crowded and there is a greater possibility for close personal contact (Golden & Hanson, 1969, chap. 12).

4. **Establishing a budget** - The cost of holding an open house depends on many variables—the number of guests, the elaborateress of the program, etc. Necessary items as well as desirable ones should be included in the budget. All items of expense need to be considered and recorded (Chamber of Commerce; Kobre, 1974, chap. 13).

5. **Planning the program** - In planning the program, the objectives of the open house should be kept in mind. The program should be designed to provide the guests with a vivid demonstration of the organization's programs, activities, and services. Each step in the program must be planned in advance and a timetable set up which will insure that the program begins and ends on schedule (Golden & Hanson, 1960, chap. 12; Kobre, 1974, chap. 13).
6. **Planning the invitations and publicity** - The nature of the publicity prior to the open house depends upon the size of the audience. Invitations are generally used in those cases where open houses are planned for smaller special interest groups. Invitations should be mailed at least two weeks before the open house. They can be written on the organization's letterhead and signed by the director; or, they can be printed, formal invitations. In those cases where community-wide open houses are planned, publicity should be of a much broader scope (Chamber of Commerce; Golden & Hanson, 1969, chap. 12).

7. **Measuring the results** - After the open house has been held, the planners must objectively analyze the results of the project. The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the organization's objectives were fulfilled, and to aid the organization in the planning of future promotional events (Kobre, 1974, chap. 13).

**The Effect of Personalization on the Response to Direct Mail Invitations**

That research is lacking in the area of personalization and its effect on the response to direct mail invitations was evidenced by the absence of information on the subject. However, research has been conducted in the area of personalization and its effect on the response to direct mail questionnaires. Findings from this related area of
research were used in this study according to their alignment with the study objectives.

Various studies have been conducted which suggest that the critical factor in realizing a high frequency of direct mail questionnaire returns is the personalized element in communication with the subject. As a result of these studies, it has been reported that a high correlation exists between the rate of response and the subject's sense of receiving individual and personal attention (Roeher, 1963).

Jeanne E. and John T. Gullahorn (1963), Michigan State University, investigated the effects of three factors on questionnaire response frequencies: 1) the class of mailing (first or third class), 2) the color of the questionnaire (green or white), and 3) the type of postage on the return envelope (business reply or stamped). The results of their investigation demonstrated that the first-class mailing (51%) elicited a somewhat higher return than third class (49%); green questionnaires (51%) were slightly more effective than white (49%); and more questionnaires with stamped return envelopes (52%) were returned than with business reply envelopes (43%). The Gullahorns concluded, as a result of the study, that first-class mailing emphasizes the importance of the questionnaire and is therefore worth the added expense.
Donald S. Longworth (1953), Bowling Green State University, conducted a similar investigation on the response to direct mail questionnaires. Mr. Longworth also found that some procedures were more conducive to returns than others. He reported that small denomination stamps of various colors placed on the envelope increased returns by 2%, a personal note increased returns by 5%, and a follow-up phone call increased returns by 37%.

In the majority of studies which investigated the effect of personalization on response to direct mail questionnaires, it was generally assumed the effect of personalization on response could only be positive. However, Raymond Simon (1967), editor of *Perspectives in Public Relations*, conducted a study which demonstrated that in some cases a personally typed cover letter inhibited rather than increased the rate of returns.

Alan R. Andreasen (1970), State University of New York, followed Simon's lead and conducted a study to determine whether the additional costs involved in personalizing mail research correspondence were justified by the gains in response rate they produced. As a result of his investigation, Mr. Andreasen concluded,

The study supports Simon's findings that personalization is a variable with low potency for affecting response rate. Thus, we can conclude with Simon that the
costs of personalization usually are not justified by their benefits. (p. 277)

This thesis, The Effect of Personalization on the Promotion of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware, was designed to yield information in the areas of communication research outlined above: (1) the promotion of continuing education courses and programs, (2) the effect of invitations on the promotion of a special event, and (3) the impact of personalization on the effectiveness of direct mail invitations. Several concepts from other areas of communication research were combined in this study according to their alignment with the study objectives.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This study was concerned with those people who were invited to the Division of Continuing Education "Neighborhood Open House."

The day of the week and the time of day a special event is held may affect its attendance. It was felt that an open house held in the middle of the week during early evening hours would attract the most people. The "Neighborhood Open House" was held on Wednesday, March 21, 1979, from 7:00-9:00 p.m. in John M. Clayton Hall. Attendance may also be affected by the weather. The night of the open house was unseasonably mild which may have contributed to the attendance.

The Audience

The contact area for the "Neighborhood Open House" consisted of 700 residences located in the immediate vicinity of John M. Clayton Hall. This area extended north to the Newark city limits, south to Main Street, east to North College Avenue, and west to West Main Street (see Appendix
A). Addresses for the residences located in the contact area were obtained from the Newark City Directory (R. L. Polk & Co., 1978).

The demographic composition of the area included residential developments, non-development residences, apartment complexes, duplex apartments, and a shopping center. Businesses were not included in the addresses comprising the contact area.

The Methodology

The methods used in inviting people to the open house were written invitations (direct mail) and verbal invitations (telephone follow-up). The written invitations varied in their degree of personalization. The purposes of these methodologies were threefold: 1) to determine the effect of direct mail invitations on the response to a special event, 2) to determine the effect of personalization on the response to direct mail invitations, and 3) to determine the effect of telephone calls on the response to a special event.

The Written Invitations (Direct Mail)

The 700 addresses comprising the contact area were randomly assigned to three invitational groups which varied in their degree of personalization. The degree of personalization of an invitation was determined on the basis of
the following techniques: the method of inscribing the invitational message (printed or written), the method of inscribing the address (typed or written), the method of addressing the invitation ("Occupant" or resident's name), and the method of mailing the invitation (bulk mail or first-class). The message conveyed in the invitation was exactly the same for all three groups.

Certain assumptions were made regarding personalization. It was assumed that a written invitation was more personal than a printed invitation, a written address was more personal than a typed address, an invitation addressed to the resident's name was more personal than an invitation addressed to "Occupant," and an invitation mailed first-class was more personal than an invitation mailed second-class.

Group I invitations were considered the least personal. This group was labeled "Printed Occupant" and had the following characteristics: printed invitation, typed address, addressed to "Occupant," and bulk mail postage (Appendix E).

Group II was labeled "Printed Personal" and fell between Groups I and III in its degree of personalization. Invitations in this group had the following characteristics:
printed invitation, written address, addressed to the resident's name, and bulk mail postage (Appendix F).

Group III was considered the most personal of the invitational groups. It was labeled "Written Personal" and had the following characteristics: written invitation, written address, addressed to the resident's name, and first-class postage (Appendix G).

The last line of the invitation read, "Please Present Your Invitation at the Door." The purpose of this request was to provide an additional method of tabulating the number of people who attended from each group.

The invitations were mailed two weeks before the "Neighborhood Open House" (March 7, 1979).

The method of random assignment. The ace-10 of hearts and spades (20 cards) were removed from a standard deck of 52 cards. Beginning with the first address on the list of 700 addresses, cards were shuffled and drawn one at a time until each address was designated a number according to the card drawn. This procedure was followed exactly 35 times.

Each address was assigned to Group I, II, or III on the basis of its designated number. Addresses designated
ace, 2, 3, 4 were assigned to Group I. Addresses designated 5, 6, 7, 8 were assigned to Group II. Addresses designated 9, 10 were assigned to Group III.

The Verbal Invitations (Telephone Follow-up)

The telephone follow-up had two purposes. The first was to verbally extend the invitation to the "Neighborhood Open House." The second was to determine the effect telephone calls had on the response to the open house.

The people called were asked if they had received an invitation to the open house. They were not asked if they planned to attend. This information, however, was noted by the caller in those instances where it was volunteered.

A random sample of 1/5 of the addresses in Groups I, II, and III were designated to receive a telephone follow-up. There were two reasons for the size of the sample. First, it was felt that 1/5 of the addresses would provide adequate data necessary for the purpose of the study. Second, the number of calls had to be limited due to time considerations. It was felt that all of the calls should be made within a two to three day period.

The follow-up calls were made on March 12, 13, and 14, 1979.
The method of random assignment. Twenty-eight red cards and seven black cards (35 cards) were removed from two standard decks of cards. Beginning with the first address on the list, cards were shuffled and drawn one at a time until each address was assigned a color (red or black) according to the card drawn. Each address assigned a black card was designated to receive a telephone follow-up. This procedure was followed exactly eight times for Groups I and II, and exactly four times for Group III.

The Instrument

A survey was chosen as the best method for obtaining the necessary information from those invited to the "Neighborhood Open House." Two questionnaires were designed. The first was designed for those people who attended the open house (see Appendix H). The second was designed for those people who did not attend the open house (see Appendix I).

The Open House Survey

A questionnaire was distributed to the guests as they entered Clayton Hall (Appendix H). Guests were asked to complete and return the questionnaire before they left the open house. All measures were taken to make the questionnaire brief and easy to understand without sacrificing questions essential to the study. The majority of the
questions were formulated to be answered with a yes or no response.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information in two main areas pertinent to the study. The first area was concerned with the guest's reaction to the invitation and the open house. The second area was concerned with the guest's familiarity with John M. Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education.

Guests were asked to fill in their name and address at the top of the questionnaire. They were also asked if they had presented their invitation and if they had attended alone or with their spouse. This information was needed to tabulate the number that attended from each of the three invitational groups. Other specific questions which were needed to measure the results of the study included: a question concerning the telephone invitational follow-up and a question concerning the invitational source which had most influenced the guest to attend.

The remainder of the questions concerned the guest's familiarity with John M. Clayton Hall and continuing education courses, programs, and services. In those instances where guests gave an affirmative response, they were asked to elaborate. Guests were asked if they would like to
receive continuing education literature and were given a checklist of activities to mark.

At the end of the questionnaire, guests were asked to make comments or suggestions regarding the open house, invitations, telephone follow-up, and continuing education courses, programs, or services.

The Telephone Survey

A telephone survey was chosen as the best method for obtaining information from those people who did not attend the "Neighborhood Open House." A questionnaire was designed to elicit the necessary information from those people called (Appendix I). The first half of the questionnaire dealt with the respondent's knowledge of the invitations and the open house. The second half dealt with the respondent's familiarity with John M. Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education.

It was felt that the people called should be asked to devote a minimal amount of time and effort in responding to the questions. Questions were formulated to be answered with a yes or no response. It was explained to those people called that the Division of Continuing Education was trying to develop ways to encourage people to participate in its activities. They were asked if they would help by answering
a few questions and were given an opportunity to accept or decline.

Five percent of the people who did not attend were surveyed five days after the open house (March 26, 1979). They were randomly selected from Groups I, II, and III. Samples were drawn from each group in order to determine the impact personalization had on the respondent's ability to recall the invitation. It was felt that a 5% sample would provide adequate data necessary for the purpose of the study.

People who had received a telephone invitational follow-up were not included in the survey. The recall nature of the questionnaire precluded their participation.

The number that attended the open house and the number that received a telephone invitational follow-up were subtracted from the number invited. Five percent of the resulting difference was the number called in the telephone survey.

The method of random assignment. The number of addresses in each group was divided by the number of addresses to be surveyed. The resulting quotient determined the sequence in which the addresses on the list were designated to be called. In Groups I and II, every 19th address
was designated to be called. In Group III, every 21st address was designated to be called.

**The Sample**

Invitations to the "Neighborhood Open House" were mailed to 700 addresses. Group I invitations were mailed to 280 addresses, Group II invitations to 230 addresses, and Group III invitations to 140 addresses. Group III was assigned fewer addresses due to monetary considerations. Printing and mailing costs for Group III were significantly higher than for Groups I and II.

Invitational follow-up calls were made to 56 addresses in Group I, 56 addresses in Group II, and 28 addresses in Group III. Of the 140 telephone calls attempted, 129 were completed. Group I received 54 telephone calls, Group II received 50 telephone calls, and Group III received 25 telephone calls. Eleven calls were not completed for the following reasons: (1) the person called had moved to another address, or (2) the number called was no longer a working number.

Sixty-two people attended the "Neighborhood Open House." There were 20 people from Group I, 24 from Group II, and 8 from Group III. Thirty-six invitations were presented at the open house. There were 13 Group I invitations, 18 Group II invitations, and 5 Group III invitations.
Sixteen people attended with their spouses. Ten people attended who had not received invitations. These people included: two people who attended with an invited guest, three people who heard about the open house from friends (word of mouth), and five continuing education employees (not program participants).

Thirty-eight questionnaires were completed and returned by people who attended the open house. One questionnaire was to be completed for each invitation presented (spouses did not receive questionnaires). Thirty-five questionnaires were returned by invited guests. Group I guests returned 13 questionnaires, Group II guests 17 questionnaires, and Group III guests 5 questionnaires. One guest from Group II did not return a questionnaire.

Three questionnaires were returned by people who had not received invitations to the open house. Responses contained in these questionnaires pertaining to the invitations and telephone follow-up were not used in tabulating the results of the study. Responses to questions which pertained to John M. Clayton Hall and continuing education courses and programs were used in tabulating the results of the study.

Twenty-seven addresses were randomly selected to be called in the telephone survey of people who did not attend
the open house. Eleven addresses were selected from Group I, 11 addresses from Group II, and 5 addresses from Group III. Of the 27 calls attempted, 26 were completed. One number called in Group II was no longer a working number.

The Data Analysis

Data for this study were analyzed descriptively, using percentages. Chi-square was used to compute the relationship between the degree of personalization of the invitation and attendance at the open house. It was also used to compute the relationship between the telephone follow-up and attendance at the open house.

Two assumptions were made regarding the validity of the study: 1) People attended the open house in response to the invitations rather than for reasons not necessary to the study. 2) The survey questions were answered honestly rather than in an effort to please the author.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Invitations to the "Neighborhood Open House" were mailed to 700 addresses. Group I invitations were mailed to 280 addresses (40%), Group II invitations to 280 addresses (40%), and Group III invitations to 140 addresses (20%).

The Telephone Follow-up

Invitational follow-up calls were made to 140 addresses (20%). Group I was designated to receive 56 calls (20%), Group II 56 calls (20%), and Group III 28 calls (20%). Of the 140 calls attempted, 129 were completed. Group I received 54 calls (19%), Group II received 50 calls (18%), and Group III received 25 calls (18%).

Those called were asked if they had received an invitation to the "Neighborhood Open House." Of the 129 people called, 114 (88%) said they had received an invitation; 10 (8%) said they had not; and 5 (4%) were unsure. In Group I, 43 (80%) said they had received an invitation; 7 (13%) said they had not; and 4 (7%) were unsure. In Group II, 49 (98%) said they had received an invitation.
and 1 (2%) said they were unsure. In Group III, 22 (88%) said they had received an invitation and 3 (12%) said they had not.

**The Attendance**

Invitations to the "Neighborhood Open House" elicited 52 respondents (7%). Group I invitations elicited 20 respondents (7%), Group II invitations 24 respondents (9%), and Group III invitations 8 respondents (6%). Some invitations elicited more than one respondent.

Sixty-two people attended the open house. Of these people, 52 (84%) came in response to the invitations. There were 20 people (32%) from Group I, 24 people (46%) from Group II, and 8 people (15%) from Group III. Ten people who had not received invitations attended the open house (16%).

The number of invitations presented at the open house was 36. There were 13 invitations (5%) from Group I, 18 invitations (6%) from Group II, and 5 invitations (4%) from Group III.

Nine people (7%) who had received a telephone invitational follow-up attended the open house. There were 2 people (4%) from Group I, 6 people (12%) from Group II, and 1 person (4%) from Group III.
The Open House Survey

There were 38 questionnaires completed and returned by people who attended the open house. Invited guests returned 35 questionnaires (92%). Group I guests returned 13 questionnaires (37%), Group II guests returned 17 questionnaires (49%), and Group III guests returned 5 questionnaires (14%). People who had not received invitations returned 3 questionnaires (8%).

Eighteen guests (51%) attended the open house alone, 16 guests (46%) attended with their spouse, and 1 guest (3%) brought friends. In Group I, 6 guests (46%) attended alone and 7 guests (54%) attended with their spouse. In Group II, 10 guests (59%) attended alone; 6 guests (35%) attended with their spouse; and 1 guest (6%) brought friends. In Group III, 2 guests (40%) attended alone and 3 guests (60%) attended with their spouse.

Of the 38 respondents to the questionnaire, 37 (97%) were aware of the existence of John M. Clayton Hall prior to the open house. Thirty-one (82%) were aware that the Division of Continuing Education is housed in John M. Clayton Hall.

Twenty-nine guests (76%) were familiar with continuing education courses, programs, or services. Included in this number were 15 guests (39%) who had been enrolled
in a continuing education course, workshop, seminar, or studytrip; 19 guests (50%) who had attended a continuing education sponsored concert, lecture, art exhibition, or other cultural event; 1 guest (3%) who had used the services of the ACCESS Center; and 25 guests (66%) who had attended a business, organizational, or social function in John M. Clayton Hall.

The communication sources which most influenced guests to attend the open house were the invitations (76%), word of mouth (26%), and telephone follow-up (5%). Several guests indicated more than one source. Of the 29 guests who indicated that the invitation was the most influential communication source, 11 (29%) were in Group I; 14 (37%) were in Group II; and 4 (11%) were in Group III. Of the 10 guests who indicated word of mouth, 1 was in Group I (3%); 4 were in Group II (11%); 2 were in Group III (5%); and 3 had not received invitations (8%). Two guests in Group II (5%) indicated that the telephone follow-up had most influenced their attendance.

There were 25 guests (66%) who indicated that they would like to receive continuing education literature. Four guests (16%) checked under-graduate credit courses, 4 guests (16%) checked graduate courses, 17 guests (68%) checked non-credit courses, 13 guests (52%) checked
study trips, and 18 guests (72%) checked films, exhibits, and concerts. More than one activity could be checked.

The Telephone Survey

There were 27 addresses randomly selected to be called in the telephone survey of people who did not attend the open house. Eleven addresses (5%) were selected from Group I, 11 addresses (5%) from Group II, and 5 addresses (5%) from Group III. Of the 27 calls attempted, 26 (96%) were completed. Group II received only 10 telephone calls.

Of the 26 people surveyed, 19 (73%) knew about the open house and recalled receiving the invitation. This number included 6 people (55%) from Group I, 9 people (90%) from Group II, and 4 people (80%) from Group III.

There were 22 people (85%) who were familiar with John M. Clayton Hall, 16 people (62%) who were aware that the Division of Continuing Education is housed in Clayton Hall, and 17 people (65%) who were familiar with continuing education courses, programs, or services.

These people acquired their information from the following sources: 5 people (29%) had taken continuing education courses, 2 people (12%) were employed by the university, 2 people (12%) knew someone who had taken
continuing education courses, 4 people (24%) had attended functions in John M. Clayton Hall, 1 person (6%) had seen newspaper ads, and 1 person (6%) had made inquiries regarding continuing education courses.

The Data Analysis

For those who received a telephone follow-up, Table 1 displays response rates for each of the three invitation treatments. Chi-square analysis yielded a non-significant value ($X^2 = 3.15, df = 2, p > .05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Did Not Attend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those who did not receive a telephone follow-up, Table 2 displays response rates for each of the three invitation treatments. Chi-square analysis yielded a non-significant value ($X^2 = .51, df = 2, p > .05$).
TABLE 2
Groups I, II, and III Response Rates
(No Telephone Follow-up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Did Not Attend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 combines those who did and did not receive a telephone follow-up for each invitation type. As expected, a non-significant Chi-square was found ($\chi^2=1.81$, df=2, p>.05).

TABLE 3
Groups I, II, and III Response Rates
(Telephone Follow-up/No Telephone Follow-up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Did Not Attend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 displays response rates for those who did and did not receive a telephone follow-up for all of the
invitation types. Chi-square analysis yielded a non-significant value ($x^2=1.10$, df=1, $p>.05$).

**TABLE 4**

Response Rates  
(Telephone Follow-up/No Telephone Follow-up)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Did Not Attend</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Telephone</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

A review of the literature indicated that universities today are making a strong bid for adults to continue with their education. It further pointed out that continuing educators are now interested in utilizing marketing tools in planning and promoting programs for these adults. Because competition has reached a level never before attained, continuing educators face the challenge of developing specific promotional strategies directed to these adults. An essential step in the planning of any successful promotional strategy is the determination of the most effective media for reaching the target audience.

Experts in the field of public relations have reported that the special event can be effectively used by non-profit organizations to convey a positive image or communicate a message. Taking this a step further, the open house is probably the best example of how an educational institution may use the special event to present a graphic demonstration of its people, programs, and activities to potential adult students in the community.
In those cases where open houses are planned for smaller special interest groups, it has been recommended that direct mail invitations be used to contact guests. Some insights into the effect of personalization on the response to direct mail invitations were provided by research in the area of personalization and its effect on the response to direct mail questionnaires. Early research conducted in this area concluded that the effect of personalization on response could only be positive. However, later research suggested that personalization had a minimal effect on response and was, therefore, not worth the added expense.

The purposes of this study were two-fold. It was designed to determine: (1) the effect of direct mail invitations and telephone calls on the response to an open house sponsored by the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware, and (2) the effect of personalization on the response to direct mail invitations.

Invitations to the University of Delaware Division of Continuing Education "Neighborhood Open House" were mailed to 700 residences located in the immediate vicinity of John M. Clayton Hall. Addresses comprising the contact area were randomly assigned to three invitational groups which varied in their degree of personalization. Group I invitations, which were considered the least personal, were
mailed to 280 addresses. Group II invitations, which fell between Groups I and III in their degree of personalization, were mailed to 280 addresses. Group III invitations, which were considered the most personal, were mailed to 140 addresses. The purposes of this methodology were to determine: (1) the effect of direct mail invitations on the response to a special event, and (2) the effect of personalization on the response to direct mail invitations. Invitations were mailed two weeks prior to the open house.

A sample of 1/5 of the addresses in Groups I, II, and III was randomly selected to receive a telephone invitational follow-up. Of the 140 calls attempted, 129 were completed. Group I received 54 telephone calls, Group II 50 telephone calls, and Group III 25 telephone calls. The purpose of the telephone invitational follow-up was to determine the effect of telephone calls on the response to a special event. The follow-up calls were made in a threeday period one week prior to the open house.

A survey was chosen as the best method for obtaining the necessary information from those invited to the "Neighborhood Open House." A questionnaire was distributed to those people who attended the open house. It was designed to determine: (1) the guest's reaction to the invitation and the open house, and (2) the guest's familiarity with
John M. Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education. Thirty-eight questionnaires were completed and returned by people who attended the open house.

Five percent of the people who did not attend were surveyed five days after the open house. Twenty-seven addresses were randomly selected to be called. Of the 27 calls attempted, 26 were completed. Eleven addresses were surveyed from Group I, 10 addresses from Group II, and 5 addresses from Group III. The purpose of the follow-up survey was to determine the effect personalization had on the respondents' ability to recall the invitation. The survey questionnaire was designed to determine: (1) the respondent's knowledge of the invitation and the open house, and (2) the respondent's familiarity with John M. Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education.

The study shows that the majority of those called in the telephone invitational follow-up (68%) had received an invitation to the "Neighborhood Open House." Group II invitations appear to have made the greatest impression on those called. Only one person in this group was unsure of receiving an invitation. In Group I, 20% of those called stated they had not received an invitation or were unsure if they had received one. Twelve percent of those called in Group III said they had not received an invitation.
Only six invitations were returned by the Post Office. None of these was addressed to people called in the telephone invitational follow-up. It was assumed, therefore, that the invitations had been delivered.

Seven percent of those invited to the "Neighborhood Open House" attended. Group II invitations elicited the largest response (9%), Group I ranked second with 7% response, and Group III was lowest with 6% response.

The majority of those who attended the open house (84%) came in response to the invitations. Almost half of the invited guests (46%) were from Group II. Group I guests accounted for 38% of the attendance and Group III guests for 15%.

Ten people who had not received invitations attended the open house (16%). Two of these people came with an invited guest, three learned of the open house from friends, and five were continuing education employees who did not participate in the program.

Guests at the open house were equally divided in their decision to attend alone or with another person. Half of the invited guests (51%) attended alone. The remainder attended with their spouses (46%) or brought friends (3%).
Of those people who received a follow-up telephone call, 7% attended the open house. Group II guests accounted for the largest response (12%) followed by Groups I and III with a 4% response each.

Most of the guests were familiar with Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education prior to the open house. Only one guest was unaware of the existence of John M. Clayton Hall. The majority of the guests (82%) knew that the Division of Continuing Education is housed in Clayton Hall.

Many of the guests (76%) knew about or had participated in continuing education courses, workshops, seminars, or studytrips. Half of the guests (50%) had attended a continuing education sponsored concert, lecture, art exhibition, or other cultural event. Almost 2/3 (66%) had attended a business, organizational, or social function in John M. Clayton Hall. Only one guest (3%) had used the counseling and testing services offered by the ACCESS Center.

The majority of the guests (76%) attended the open house in response to the invitations. Invitations were cited as the most influential communication source by more guests in Group II (37%) than in Groups I (29%) or III (11%). Over 1/4 of the guests (26%) indicated that friends, neighbors, and spouses (word of mouth) had most influenced
their decision to attend. Only 5% of the guests said they attended in response to the telephone invitational follow-up. Several guests indicated a combination of communication sources.

Almost 2/3 of the guests (66%) expressed an interest in receiving continuing education literature. Most of these people were primarily interested in cultural affairs activities and non-credit courses. The largest number of requests was for information regarding films, exhibits, and concerts (72%); non-credit courses (68%); and studytrips (52%). Requests for credit course information was equally divided between undergraduate courses (16%) and graduate credit courses (16%).

Many of the guests made comments or suggestions at the end of the open house survey. Over 1/4 of the guests (29%) commented positively on the open house, 13% on the invitations, 11% on continuing education courses and activities, and 3% on the telephone invitational follow-up. Some typical survey responses were:

A great idea for "neighbors" getting to know you and what can be available.

Excellent opportunity to meet our neighbors and learn more about the benefits of Continuing Education.

Similar efforts in the future to keep us informed would be appreciated—plus, it was fun meeting our neighbors!
Most of the respondents indicated they especially liked the open house concept and the "Neighborhood" approach.

The telephone survey of people who did not attend the open house shows that the majority of those called (73%) knew about the open house and recalled receiving the invitation. Once again, Group II invitations appear to have made the greatest impression. Of those called, 90% from Group II, 80% from Group III, and 55% from Group I knew about the open house and recalled the invitation.

The majority of respondents were familiar with John M. Clayton Hall (85%) and the Division of Continuing Education (62%). Almost 2/3 of those surveyed (65%) were familiar with continuing education courses, programs, or services. Most of the respondents who indicated an awareness of continuing education programs had acquired their knowledge through personal contact with the university. Twenty-nine percent had been enrolled in a continuing education course, workshop, or seminar; 24% had attended functions in John M. Clayton Hall; 12% knew others who had taken continuing education courses; 12% were university employees; 6% had made inquiries regarding continuing education courses; and 6% had seen newspaper ads.

Chi-square analysis of response rates for those who did and did not receive a telephone follow-up for each
invitation type yielded a non-significant value ($X^2=1.81$). It also yielded non-significant values for those who did and did not receive a telephone follow-up for all of the invitation types ($X^2=1.10$), for those who received a telephone follow-up for each of the invitation types ($X^2=3.15$), and for those who did not receive a telephone follow-up for each of the invitation types ($X^2=.51$).

**Discussion**

The above analysis provides information to answer the following three research questions:

1. What effect does a direct mail invitation have on the response to an open house sponsored by the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware?

2. What effect does a telephone invitational follow-up have on the response?

3. What effect does the degree of personalization have on the response to a direct mail invitation?

While receiving an invitation to attend the open house generated respondents, it appears that neither the degree of personalization of the direct mail invitation nor the telephone invitational follow-up significantly affected the response rate.
Although the degree of personalization did not significantly affect response, it was felt that the use of direct mail invitations had a positive effect on attendance at the open house. This deduction was based on two important factors. First, the direct mail invitations to the "Neighborhood Open House" elicited a 7% response. According to Barbara Peyton (1979), information specialist, Division of Continuing Education, University of Delaware, the average rate of response for direct mail is 2%. This increase in response rate could prove to be highly significant in cases where the target audience is greater in scope. Second, many guests at the open house indicated that the invitation had a positive effect on their decision to attend. One guest wrote at the end of the open house questionnaire, "Thanks for the invitation." This expression of appreciation was stated verbally many times during the course of the open house. It would appear that personalization in the form of a direct mail invitation did have an effect on response. It was the degree of personalization which proved to be non-significant.

Only 5% of the guests indicated that the telephone invitational follow-up most influenced their decision to attend the open house. Considering the costs in time and personnel invested in this type of telephone campaign, the resulting benefits did not seem worth the expense.
It appears that Group II invitations made the greatest impression on those invited to the "Neighborhood Open House." This deduction is based on the following findings:

(1) Of those called in the telephone invitational follow-up, more people in Group II said they had received an invitation to the open house. (2) Of those people who attended the open house, Group II invitations elicited the largest response. (3) Of the guests at the open house who had received a telephone invitational follow-up, Group II invitations elicited the largest response. (4) In the follow-up telephone survey of people who did not attend the open house, more Group II respondents recalled the invitation and knew about the open house.

In each of the findings cited above, Group I invitations (least personal) ranked second in the rate of response and Group III invitations (most personal) ranked third. The only exception occurred in the follow-up telephone survey when Group III respondents recalled the invitations more often than Group I respondents.

This pattern of responses suggests that invitations of a medium degree of personalization were consistently the most effective of the three invitational types. It may further suggest that the most personal of the invitations had the least effect on response. Although these findings
are not statistically significant, they may be interpreted that the degree of personalization could actually have an inverse effect on the response rate.

Although the invitations appear to have had the greatest influence on attendance at the open house, the effect of word-of-mouth publicity should not be minimized. The results of the study indicate that word-of-mouth publicity, although difficult to control, had a definite impact on response.

The study shows that the typical guest at the "Neighborhood Open House" was familiar with John M. Clayton Hall and the Division of Continuing Education prior to the open house. The guest had been enrolled in a continuing education course, workshop, or seminar; had attended a continuing education sponsored cultural event; or had attended a business, organizational, or social function in John M. Clayton Hall.

It appears that the person most likely to attend a continuing education open house is someone who has an existing knowledge of and interest in continuing education. If this deduction is valid, it suggests that the open house may be most effectively used to disseminate information about program offerings to present or former adult students in the community. Word-of-mouth publicity resulting from
a successful open house could prove to be significantly effective in reaching the potential adult student who has not been reached by the more traditional communication methods.

The results of the study suggest the following recommendations for further research:

1. The author feels that an important factor which affected the results of this study was the size of the sample. In order to minimize non-significant results and erroneous conclusions concerning research findings, it may be essential that a larger number of subjects respond. More valid results might ensue by increasing the target audience to a point where an adequate sample could be obtained.

2. A follow-up study of respondents, conducted three to six months after an open house, could aid in statistically determining the effectiveness of the open house as a promotional tool. Effectiveness might be measured by determining the number of respondents who have participated in the sponsoring organization's programs as a result of information disseminated at the open house.

3. A study comparing the response to different communication methods could aid educational institutions and other non-profit organizations in determining the most
effective media for reaching their target audiences. Results obtained from word-of-mouth publicity might be compared to direct mail publicity, telephone publicity to bulletin or catalog publicity, electronic media publicity (radio, television) to newspaper publicity, etc.

Although the findings in this study were inconclusive, the author feels that the potential effectiveness of open houses and direct mail invitations in the promotion of continuing education should not be minimized. The interpersonal character of these communication methods could prove equally beneficial to both the continuing educator and the continuing adult student.
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APPENDIX A

MAP OF CONTACT AREA

The map on the following page shows the city limits of Newark, Delaware. It is from a modified reproduction of a map of New Castle County, Delaware. The outlined area in the upper left section of the map indicates the contact area for the "Neighborhood Open House." The asterisk indicates the location of John M. Clayton Hall.
APPENDIX B

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE" PROGRAM
"Neighborhood Open House"
March 21, 1979 - 7:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall

5 min. Description of Program Schedule
and Introduction of John Murray------ 7:15-7:20
(R. Fischer)
Welcome (John Murray)

15 min. Slide Presentation (1st run)-------- 7:20-7:35

5 min. Introduction of Program, Conference
& Access Specialists; Delos String--- 7:35-7:40
Quartet Members, Suzanne Moore,
and Stuart Sharkey

20 min. Refreshments/Social Period--------- 7:40-8:00

15 min. Delos String Quartet Concert--------- 8:00-8:15

15 min. Introduction of Suzanne Drury
(N. Aldrich) -------- 8:15-8:30
Suzanne Drury "Unwinding"

2 min. Closing Remarks (J. Murray)--------- 8:30-8:32

15 min. Slide Presentation (2nd run)-------- 8:35-8:50

Total Time: Approx. 1½ hrs.
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE - DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE"

March 21, 1979 - 7:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
John M. Clayton Hall

******************************************

Room 120

7:15 p.m. OPENING REMARKS Richard Fischer
Associate Director
Statewide Programming

WELCOME John Murray, Director
Division of Continuing Education

7:20 p.m. SLIDE PRESENTATION "Continuing Education:
A Lifelong Process"

7:35 p.m. INTRODUCTIONS Richard Fischer

Lobby

7:40 p.m. REFRESHMENTS Art Exhibit: Cultural Affairs Traveling
Exhibits

Room 120

8:00 p.m. CONCERT Delos String Quartet

8:15 p.m. "UNWINDING" Suzanne Drury, Lecturer
Dept. of Psychology
University of Delaware

8:30 p.m. CLOSING REMARKS John Murray

8:35 p.m. SLIDE PRESENTATION "Continuing Education:
(2nd run) A Lifelong Process"

******************************************

ACCESS, Program and Conference personnel will be present in
the Lobby from 7-9 p.m. to provide information or answer
questions concerning continuing education courses, programs,
and services.
APPENDIX C

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE" BUDGET
NONCREDIT PROGRAM BUDGET AND FEE REQUEST

University of Delaware
Continuing Education

Instructions: Prepare in duplicate!!
1 copy for program file
1 copy for Administrator

Name of Program
"Neighborhood Open House"

Program Dates: March 21, 1979, Location: John M. Clayton Hall
Course No.

Target Audience
Estimated Attendance

Academic Department/Contact

Program is: (x) New ( ) Offered Before
No. Sessions Total Hrs. Total Days

ESTIMATED/ACTUAL EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion Brochures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage $36.80</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other INVITATIONS $166.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $166.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personnel (Other than SWF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(details on back)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Faculty Speaker $50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Travel (details on back)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contd. Ed. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructional Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies Projector/tape $20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Aids 15 minute slide show-</td>
<td>$876.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebrewery, Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nametag, Signs, Programs $27.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other technician fees, equipment $92.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $976.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of Space $60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (Kind)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other QUESTIONNAIRES $5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $65.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food &amp; Lodging (if included in fee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If not included, details on back)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfasts (No.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunches (No.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinners (No.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary Meals (No.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments $35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Administrative Expenses (35% of Direct Cost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Program Cost (line 9 plus line 10) $1,293.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED/ACTUAL INCOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recommended fee per individual Even No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Recommended group fees/discounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Income from registrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other income (List)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Income-Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTION TO MARGIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 3-21-79
Signature: Barbara J. Young
(Program Specialist)

Date: Signature
(Administrator)
APPENDIX D

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE" CORRESPONDENCE
Correspondence concerning the "Neighborhood Open House" project are reproduced on pages 70 to 84. The following is a chronological list of letters and memoranda dated November 21, 1978 to April 4, 1979:


75. February 1, 1979. Letter to Dr. Daniel Rouslin, Delos String Quartet representative.

76. March 7, 1979. Memorandum to Continuing Education Professionals and Staff.

77 & 78. March 9, 1979. Memorandum to Statewide Programming Staff and Directors.

79. March 9, 1979. Letter to Mr. Stuart Sharkey, director of Housing and Residence Life, University of Delaware.


November 21, 1978

University of Delaware
Conferences
John M. Clayton Hall
Newark, Delaware 19711

Attention: Dolly Raker

Dear Ms. Raker:

This letter is to confirm that I have reserved Room 120 in Clayton Hall from 7:00 P.M. until 9:00 P.M., for March 21, 1979.

Sincerely,

Barbara Young

BY: hl
November 29, 1978

Ms. Barbara Young
116 Country Club Drive
Newark, DE 19711

Dear Ms. Young:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your request to hold the Neighborhood Continuing Education Open House at John M. Clayton Hall on March 21, 1979.

Your request for facilities has been approved, and a University of Delaware Reservation of Facilities form is enclosed to serve as an official confirmation. Would you please review your copy to be sure we have included the appropriate facilities and services that will be required for your program.

I have been assigned as your Conference Specialist to coordinate your total program requirements at the University of Delaware. In the event any additional facilities or services are required or should you have any questions, please contact me at (302) 738-2214. If you find it necessary to cancel your program, please notify me as soon as possible. Cancellation of facilities with less than 30 days notice will be subject to a service charge unless the facilities are rescheduled by another group.

Sincerely,

Janice B. Holton
Assistant Conference Specialist

JBJ:cms
Enclosure
TO: Continuing Education Professional Staff

FROM: Barbara Young and Edward Kepka

We are preparing a ten minute slide presentation depicting the story of continuing education at the University of Delaware. We need your input and would appreciate any ideas or recommendations you might have on this subject. Please mark the following checklist and add any additional comments or suggestions at the bottom of the page. Please return checklists to Ed Kepka on or before the December 20 staff meeting at Goodstay Center. If time permits there will be a brief discussion of this topic at the meeting. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

---------------------------------------------------------------------

Continuing Education Slide Presentation (Checklist)

NAME ____________________________

1. What do you feel the major focus of our message should be?

[ ] Affective (telling a general story which will produce positive feelings from the audience)

[ ] Factual (relating specific information regarding programs, courses, and services)

2. What aspect or aspects of your programs would you like to see represented in this presentation?

[ ] The subject matter presented (i.e. Assertiveness Training, Scuba Diving, etc.)

[ ] The program's format (i.e. Workshops, Seminar, etc.)

[ ] The time the program is offered (i.e. Weekends)

[ ] Other (please describe)

3. What specific (winter and/or spring semester) programs would you like to see represented? Please list on back.

4. Do you have any slides on file which might contribute to this presentation and which we may borrow or copy?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

5. Comments or suggestions: (please use back)

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU
DATE: December 20, 1978

TO: Continuing Education Professional Staff

FROM: Barbara Young and Edward Kepka

The Division of Continuing Education is planning a Neighborhood Open House for Wednesday, March 21, 1979, from 7:00 - 9:00 p.m. The Open House will be held in room 120, John M. Clayton Hall. The purpose is to acquaint residents of the area immediately surrounding Clayton Hall with the programs and services available through continuing education.

We would like to have specialists from the various continuing education areas and representatives from ACCESS Center present to provide information and answer questions. Contact stations will be set up for ACCESS Center and each participating program and conference specialist.

Please respond to the statements at the bottom of the page and return to ACCESS Center at your earliest convenience. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Name ________________________________

1. [ ] I can attend
   [ ] I cannot attend

2. I am involved with the following continuing education programs or services. Please list and describe on back.

3. I can bring the following written information concerning these programs (i.e., brochures, bulletins, etc.) to the Open House. Please list on back.

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU
Ms. Suzanne Drury  
c/o Tressler Center for Human Growth  
Two Centerville Road  
Wilmington, Delaware 19808

Dear Ms. Drury:

Thank you very much for accepting my invitation to speak at the "Neighborhood Continuing Education Open House". The open house has been scheduled from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., March 21, 1979, in Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall. Your segment of the program is scheduled for approximately 8:15 p.m. to 8:30 p.m..

As we discussed in our telephone conversation, the topic of your presentation will be "Unwinding".

I look forward to seeing you on March 21st. If you have any questions, please call me at 731-5258.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Barbara B. Young

BBY:hl
Dr. Daniel Rouslin  
Nine Prospect Avenue  
Newark, Delaware 19711

February 1, 1979

Dear Dr. Rouslin:

Thank you very much for accepting my invitation to perform at the "Neighborhood Continuing Education Open House". The open house has been scheduled from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., March 21, 1979, in Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall. Your concert is scheduled for approximately 7:55 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.

I look forward to seeing you on March 21st. If you have any questions, please call me at 731-5258.

Very truly yours,

Barbara B. Young

Barbara B. Young

BBY:hl
Memorandum

DATE: March 7, 1979

TO: Continuing Education Professionals and Staff
FROM: Ed Kepka, Coordinator of Student Services
       Barbara Young, Coordinator of Open House Project
SUBJECT: "Neighborhood Open House"

The Division of Continuing Education is planning a "Neighborhood Open House" for Wednesday, March 21, 1979, from 7-9 p.m. It will be held in Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall.

The program for the open house includes:

- A ten-minute slide presentation depicting the story of continuing education at the University of Delaware.
- A mini-concert by the Delos String Quartet.
- A short talk by Dr. Suzanne Drury, a part-time faculty member at Wilcastle Center, on the topic "Unwinding".
- A social/refreshment period.

All personnel within the Division are cordially invited to attend.
Memorandum

DATE: March 9, 1979

TO: Statewide Programming Staff and Directors
    John Murray          Gay Enterline
    Don Bard             Jake Haber
    Rich Rischer         Pat Kent
    Ed Crispin           Jerry Miller
    Jon Heggan           Barbara Peyton
    Nancy Aldrich        Matt Shipp
    Nick Biasotto        Vickie Tittomb
    Sylvia Brocka

FROM: Edward Kopka and Barbara Young

Subject: Continuing Education Neighborhood Open House

You have received earlier communications concerning the Open House scheduled for March 21 at Clayton Hall. This memo will confirm previous arrangements made with the programming staff.

Purpose. The purpose of the Open House is to welcome our neighbors from communities surrounding Clayton Hall. Through direct person-to-person communications, our hope is that our guests will learn more about our resources and services and that we will learn more about their interests and continuing education concerns. Our message will be conveyed through your participation as an active listener and responsive educator. In addition, a formal program has been planned to serve as a further introduction to the Division of Continuing Education.

Room arrangements. As shown in the attached diagram, in the open area near the fireplace, there will be a refreshment table and four literature display tables. Program specialists will meet with our guests in this area before the formal program, during the break, and after the program.

The formal program will be in Room 120.

Materials to bring. For the literature display tables, please bring pamphlets, brochures, and handouts for your programs that you would like to see disseminated to this audience. You may also wish to bring other items for exhibition purposes such as texts, manuals, photos, equipment.

Tables will be set up in the afternoon. Your program area will be designated by a sign. Please arrange to display materials at your table before guests arrive.

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU
SCHEDULE

Display your handout materials on table (preferably before 5 p.m.)

5:00 Statewide Programming and Administrative & Student Services dinner meeting
       Receive Open House name tags

6:45 Move to literature display area. Locate near your literature and meet with early arriving guests.

7:10 Steer guests to Room 120.

7:15 Formal program begins -- Room 120

7:15 Description of Schedule -- Rich Fischer
       Introduction of John Murray -- Rich Fischer
       Welcome -- John Murray

7:20 Slide presentation (1st run)

7:35 Introduction of Program, Conference and ACCESS personnel -- Rich Fischer
       Invitation to refreshments

7:40 Refreshments/Social period -- lounge

8:00 Formal program resumes -- Room 120
       Deios String Quartet

8:15 Introduction of Sue Drury -- Nancy Aldrich
       Sue Drury -- "Unwinding"

8:30 Closing remarks -- John Murray

8:32 Refreshments/Conversation

8:45 Slide presentation (2nd run)
116 Country Club Drive
Newark, Delaware 19711

March 9, 1979

Mr. Stuart Sharkey
Director of Housing and Residence Life
Five Courtney Street
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dear Mr. Sharkey:

Enclosed please find the schedule for the March 21st Continuing Education "Neighborhood Open House".

We look forward to introducing you at approximately 7:35 p.m. If you have any questions, please contact me at 731-5258.

Very truly yours,

Barbara B. Young
Barbara B. Young
Project Coordinator

BBY:hl
Enclosure
March 9, 1979

Dr. Daniel Rouslin
9 Prospect Avenue
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dear Dr. Rouslin:

Enclosed you will find the schedule for the March 21st "Continuing Education Neighborhood Open House". Please note that the Quartet's portion of the program is scheduled for 15 minutes from 8:00-8:15 p.m..

As you can see on the enclosed format, we have scheduled a speaker immediately following your performance at 8:15 p.m.. If this poses a time problem with regards to the removal of your musical equipment, please contact me at 731-5258. We would appreciate the Quartet's help in following this schedule as closely as possible.

Very truly yours,

Barbara E. Young
Project Coordinator

BBY:hl

Enclosure
116 Country Club Drive
Newark, Delaware 19711

March 9, 1979

Ms. Suzanne Drury
c/o Tressler Center for Human Growth
2 Centerville Road
Wilmington, Delaware 19808

Dear Ms. Drury:

Enclosed please find the schedule for the March 21st, "Continuing Education Neighborhood Open House". Please note that your portion of the program is scheduled for 15 minutes from 8:15-8:30 p.m..

I look forward to seeing you on March 21st. If you have any questions please contact me at 731-5258.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Barbara B. Young
Project Coordinator

BBY: hl
Enclosure
116 Country Club Drive
Newark, Delaware 19711

March 9, 1979

Ms. Suzanne Moore
Director of University Relations
University of Delaware Community Relations
109 Hullihen Hall
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dear Ms. Moore:

Enclosed please find the schedule for the "Continuing Education Neighborhood Open House". The open house will be held in Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall, on March 21st, from 7:00-9:00 p.m..

We look forward to introducing you at approximately 7:35 p.m. If you have any questions regarding the open house, please contact me at 731-5258.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Barbara B. Young
Project Coordinator

BBY:hl
Enclosure
DATE: March 29, 1979

TO: Statewide Programming Staff and Directors

John Murray Nick Blasotto Matt Shipp
Don Bard Sylvia Brocka Vickie Titcomb
Rich Fischer Gay Enterline Esther Smith
Ed Crispin Jake Hafer Leo Boyles
Jon Heggan Jerry Miller Lois Bankes
Nancy Aldrich Barbara Peyton Nancy Fraser
Nancy McKenzie

FROM: Edward Kepka and Barbara Young

SUBJECT: Continuing Education Neighborhood Open House

Thank you for your participation in the "Neighborhood Open House". Your cooperation helped make this affair a real success. Not only did this activity provide us with the opportunity to get together, but also the "Neighborhood Open House" realized its major objective of welcoming community members from the surrounding area.

Another asset resulting from the open house is the slide presentation, "Continuing Education: A Lifelong Process". You are invited to borrow this audio-visual resource to help you in your work with community groups. To borrow the materials please contact Ed Kepka.

You may be interested in knowing we sent out 700 invitations and approximately 65% of our neighbors attended. Preliminary examination of the evaluation sheets indicates the response was enthusiastically positive. Typical evaluation sheet responses include:

- A great idea for "neighbors" getting to know you and what can be available.
- Excellent opportunity to meet our neighbors and learn more about the benefits of Continuing Education.
- Similar efforts in the future to keep us informed would be appreciated — plus, it was fun meeting our neighbors!

Further indication of the success of the open house is that 65% of the people returning evaluations requested their names be added to our mailing list.

The potential benefits from arranging similar affairs are suggested by the positive feeling engendered by this first "Neighborhood Open House". Similar affairs may be adapted to Wilcaster, other neighborhoods in Newark, and possibly Dover. Your observations on the "Neighborhood Open House" and suggestions for improvements for possible future efforts are welcomed. Thank you once again for your help.

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU
TO: EDWARD KEPKA
FROM: ED CRISPIN
SUBJECT: CONTINUING EDUCATION NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE

First, I would like to extend my congratulations to you and Barbara on an extremely worthwhile event held at Clayton Hall on March 21.

Secondly, I would like to ask if we could initiate plans for holding a similar event at the Wilcastle Center? I would see such an event being held in much the same fashion as the one in Clayton Hall, but highlighting the degree and nondegree courses/programs available at Wilcastle plus the groups which we serve through our workshops and seminars. We might also give some thought to the fact that in addition to having residential neighbors, we also have many industrial neighbors.

I would like to thank you for your attention to this memorandum. If you would please give me a call after you have had some time to think over having this event I would be most appreciative.

cc: Richard B. Fischer

CONSERVE ENERGY SO ENERGY CAN SERVE YOU
APPENDIX E

REPRODUCTION OF GROUP I INVITATION
University of Delaware - Division of Continuing Education
Cordially Invites You and Your Neighbors
To Attend A

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE"

Date: Wednesday, March 21
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Place: Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall
University of Delaware North Campus
(off New London Road, Rt. 896)
Ample Free Parking

Refreshments and a mini concert by the Delos String Quartet are
only part of the informative, enjoyable evening we have planned
for you.

Please Present Invitation At Door

Division of Continuing Education
John M. Clayton Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Newark, Delaware
Permit No. 28

Occupant
211 Hanover Place
Newark, DE 19711
APPENDIX F

REPRODUCTION OF GROUP II INVITATION
University of Delaware - Division of Continuing Education
Cordially Invites You and Your Neighbors
To Attend A

"NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN HOUSE"

Date: Wednesday, March 21
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Place: Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall
University of Delaware North Campus
(off New London Road, Rt. 896)
Ample Free Parking

Refreshments and a mini concert by the Delos String Quartet are only part of the informative, enjoyable evening we have planned for you.

Please Present Invitation At Door

Division of Continuing Education
John M. Clayton Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

Mr. and Mrs. H. K. Young
116 Country Club Drive
Newark, Delaware 19711
APPENDIX G

REPRODUCTION OF GROUP III INVITATION
University of Delaware - Division of Continuing Education
Cardially invites you and your neighbors
To Attend a
"Neighborhood Open House"

Date: Wednesday, March 21, 1979
7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Place: Room 120, John M. Clayton Hall
University of Delaware North Campus
(off New London Road, Rte. 896)
Ample free parking

Refreshments and a mini-concert by the Delta String Quartet are only part of the informative, enjoyable evening we have planned for you.

Please present your invitation at the door

Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Szyto
119 Meriden Drive
Newark, Delaware
19711
APPENDIX H

OPEN HOUSE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Please answer and return the following questionnaire. The information you provide is needed for a graduate research project within the Division of Continuing Education. Thank you for your co-operation.

1. Name __________________________
2. Address _________________________

3. Did you present your invitation? [ ] Yes [ ] No

4. Are you attending alone? [ ] With your spouse? [ ]

5. Did you receive a telephone call regarding the open house? [ ] Yes [ ] No

6. Were you aware of the existence of John M. Clayton Hall prior to the open house? [ ] Yes [ ] No

7. Were you aware that the Division of Continuing Education is housed in John M. Clayton Hall? [ ] Yes [ ] No

8. Were you familiar with any of the programs, courses or services offered through the Division of Continuing Education? [ ] Yes [ ] No If Yes, please specify.

9. Have you ever enrolled in a continuing education course, workshop, seminar or study trip? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, please specify.

10. Have you ever attended a continuing education sponsored concert, lecture, art exhibition or other cultural event? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, please specify.

11. Have you ever used the services of ACCESS Center (Adult Center for Continuing Student Services)? [ ] Yes [ ] No

12. Have you ever attended a business, organizational, or social function in John M. Clayton Hall? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, please specify.
13. Would you like to receive continuing education literature in the future? [ ] Yes [ ] No
If yes, which activities most interest you?
[ ] Undergraduate credit courses
[ ] Graduate credit courses
[ ] Non-credit courses, workshops or seminars
[ ] Studytrips
[ ] Films, exhibits, concerts

14. What communication source most influenced you to attend the open house?
[ ] Invitation
[ ] Telephone call
[ ] Word of Mouth (neighbor, spouse, etc.)

15. Please make any additional comments or suggestions you may have regarding:

a) The open house

b) Invitations

c) Telephone follow-up

d) Continuing education courses, programs or services

e) Other
APPENDIX I

TELEPHONE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
I'm calling from the Division of Continuing Education at the University of Delaware. We are trying to develop ways to encourage people to participate in our activities and would appreciate it if you could help us by answering a few questions.

On March 21st we held a "Neighborhood Open House" at John M. Clayton Hall,

1. Did you know about the "Neighborhood Open House"?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

2. Do you recall receiving an invitation to the Open House?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

3. Are you familiar with John M. Clayton Hall?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

4. If yes, are you aware that the Division of Continuing Education is housed in John M. Clayton Hall?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

5. Are you familiar with any of the courses, services, or programs offered through the Division of Continuing Education?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

6. If yes, how did you become aware of these courses, services, or programs?

Thank you for your time and cooperation in answering our questions.