Journal of ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Journal of Economic Development in Higher Education:
A publication of the University Economic Development Association **Volume 2, July 2019**

Research Article

Institutional Impressions through Economic Impact Studies

Amy French
Bayh College of Education, Indiana State University
Amy.French@indstate.edu

Abstract: This article explores how colleges and universities deploy impression management theory in economic impact studies. Ample resources are expended to produce the studies, but little attention has been paid to the overt, and covert, impressions portrayed within them. This study offers the first empirically-based work on economic impact studies by examining 24 studies from Ohio to pinpoint three impression management tactics: self-promotion, ingratiation, and supplication. A taxonomy was designed to elucidate the messages found within these studies to guide future practice.

Keywords: economic impact; impression management, institutional messaging

I. Introduction

Higher education institutions began crafting economic impact studies in the 1970s after Caffrey and Isaacs (1971) provided a standard for higher education. Economic impact studies gained popularity throughout the 1980s and 1990s through increased publication rates. Economic impact studies are an important resource that could arguably speak to the value of the institution within the local, state, and national economy. These studies are intended to articulate the value of college or university (McMahon, 2009; Siegfried, Sanderson, & McHenry, 2007) to compete for state funding (or resist cutbacks), maintain tax-exempt status, obtain a subvention, fend off criticism, or bolster fund-raising (Siegfried et al., 2007). Colleges and universities conduct the studies and distribute the findings to the public, but the studies differ in methodology, content, appearance, and focus, causing much scrutiny.

This study seeks to identify impression management tactics incorporated within economic impact studies. Impression management is a theory developed to understand the motivations behind human performance within a social setting, (Goffman, 1959) and the theory has been expanded to organizational settings (Bolino, Klotz, and Daniels, 2014; Brennan, Guillamon-Saorin, & Pierce, 2009; Clatworthy & Jones, 2003; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). Using state of Ohio institutions, this study explores economic impact studies to determine the extent to which colleges and universities deploy impression management tactics in economic impact studies and develops a taxonomy of economic impact studies informed by impression management theory.

II. Higher Education as Economic Driver

Colleges and universities contribute to the economic development of the region in which they are located. Franklin (2009) identified a need for deeper engagement with higher education institutions in the area of regional economic development. Universities transmit knowledge, conduct research, and play a key role in socio-economic development (Pastor, Perez, & Fernandez de Guevara, 2013). Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000) identified a "Triple Helix of university- industry- government relations" and Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz (1996) examined the manner wherein universities actively work as an important component working along with industry and the

government. Collegiate institutions have the ability to generate population movements, contribute to assets such as cultural property, and sustain regional reputation (Pastor et al., 2013).

Higher education institutions make diverse contributions to society. These institutions produce graduates, make the geographic area where they are located more dynamic, and generate other benefits through the supply and demand. Supply in terms of the increased productivity caused by increased human capital, and demand in terms of the expenditures and investments made by the universities in their daily activity and its multiplier effect on the economy (Pastor et al., 2013). Business incubators, retention of faculty, and incorporating business connections with higher education also increase the economic growth in regions (Baldwin & Borrelli, 2008; Benneworth & Hospers, 2007). Human capital, innovation, and investment in research and knowledge are vital to obtain stable, sustained growth based on productivity (Pastor et al., 2013).

III. Higher Education Economic Impact Studies

Caffrey and Isaacs (1971) produced the first guide that organized the measurement of economic impact studies by summing expenditures of faculty, staff, students, and visitors related to the institution and then applying multipliers to account for the interdependence of economic activity in a local economy. This guide answered the question of whether the cost of having a university in the community outweighs the revenue. This method identified the agents that generate economic impact of universities, estimated the spending in the local economy, and calculated the total economic impact on the economy. An economic impact study is intended to measure the region's economic activity due to the presence of a college or university (Elliott, Levine, & Meisel, 1988).

Critics began questioning economic impact studies because they fail to measure social benefits of higher education and dismiss spillover costs (McMahon, 2009). Leslie and Slaughter (1992) stated the studies "fall short in accounting for local and regional economic growth only in their incompleteness, not in their concept" (p. 229). Economic impact studies rarely attempt to include economic gain from earnings of college graduates or the spill over to others from the alumni presence (Leslie & Slaughter, 1992). With these critiques in mind, this study utilizes impression management theory in an effort to extrapolate themes that run throughout the studies.

IV. Impression Management

Goffman's (1959) theory of impression management held that an individual's understanding and comprehension of a phenomenon can be influenced by others and individual perceptions can be framed by these attempts. Goffman suggested that people use gestures, props, dress, and expressions to influence others. Further, Cialdini and Richardson (1980) explained that people present information about specific traits, abilities, and accomplishments for self-interest. These maneuvers can provide individuals with opportunities to promote favorable characteristics and minimize unfavorable characteristics.

According to Goffman (1959), when one individual enters the presence of others, the individual discovers the facts associated with the particular situation. If these facts are previously known, the individual can present based on consistencies that align with the presenter's self-interest. Moreover, Goffman (1959) explained that individuals can create a desired impression and project that upon others. Given that institutions of higher education incorporate marketing into organizational duties and integrate multiple branding strategies, it is important to understand how impression management concepts relate to organizations.

V. Impression Management within Organizations

A plethora of marketing activities could be classified as impression management. Impression management can be observed in product positioning, corporate image advertising, and integrated marketing communications (Schultz, Tannebaum, & Lauterburn, 1993). Fisk and Grove (1996) suggested that impression management is "woven intimately into the fabric of marketing enterprise" (p. 8).

Much research on organizational image management has focused on how public relations officers use impression management to improve the external perceptions of the organization after the legitimacy of the organization has been questioned (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). Jones and Pittman (1982) developed a taxonomy to capture impression management behaviors that Bolino and Turnley (1999) used to measure impression management in organizations. While there are five theoretical tactics, self-promotion, ingratiation, and supplication are the three relevant tactics present in economic impact studies. These are defined below.

Self-promotion. Self-promotion, as defined by Bolino and Turnley (1999), manifests when individuals identify their own abilities or accomplishments so that observers perceive them as capable. Arkin and Shepperd (1989) identified self-promotion as attaining benefit. Self-interest will direct organizations or individuals to engage in behaviors intended to maximize self-interests, at the expense of others (Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989).

Ingratiation. Ingratiation describes behavior where individuals perform favors or flattery to elicit "likability from observers" (Bolino & Turnley, 1999, p. 190). In this context, ingratiation is described as "politically oriented and often evokes negative connotations" (Elsass & Ralston, 1989, p. 235). Ingratiation behaviors include "false modesty and self-enhancement" (Elsass & Ralston, 1989, p. 237) and requires sufficient skills to execute.

Supplication. Supplication occurs when individuals openly acknowledge weaknesses to elicit an attribution of being needy from observers (Jones & Pittman, 1982). Supplication has been defined as "a humble plea; an earnest request or entreaty, especially one made deferentially to a person in a position of power or authority" ("Supplication", 2012). One who assumes the behavior of supplication may desire a lighter workload, pardon for poor performance, or acquire a day off from work.

VI. Branding

Colleges and universities constantly communicate with external stakeholders such as prospective students, community partners, and government officials. Institutions also communicate with internal constituents including faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Institutions utilize branding to be effective with messaging. Aaker (1991) defined a brand as

> a distinguishing name and/or symbol (such as logo, trademark, or package design) intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers, and to differentiate those goods or services from competitors who would attempt to provide products that appear to be identical (p. 7).

Building a brand should be strategically driven (Davis & Dunn, 2002) and not responsive to outside pressures. Moving away from the short-term focus to a strategic orientation focused on assets and skills is necessary for effective branding techniques.

Branding is often thought of as signage, logos, mottos, mission statements, vision statements, school colors, etc. However, all materials that institutions dispense can be considered a form of branding, including economic impact studies. These studies are often created with a particular clientele to engage, thus inherently impressing a particular image or message to the reader. Bunzel (2007) added that motivation for branding is to "enhance reputation and to positively influence the university's rankings" (p. 153).

Applying impression management theory to economic impact studies could be useful to assist higher education administrators, legislators, and economic development partners. Below the method used for this study is described.

VII. Methods

The goal of this article is to determine the extent to which colleges and universities deploy impression management tactics in economic impact studies. Secondarily, this article will seek to develop a taxonomy as informed by impression management theory. In order to accomplish these objectives, a content analysis was selected as the methodology.

A comprehensive examination of economic impact studies must occur to successfully conduct a content analysis. One challenge for this study was the lack of a central repository for the economic studies. Given this consideration, Ohio was selected for the sample because it has an adequate representation regarding the variety of institution types. Ohio is a Midwestern, rust-belt state eager to reinvent its economy. Similar to current employment trends across the U.S., Ohio job growth is dependent on an educated workforce.

Using purposive sampling, 24 economic impact studies were acquired. The studies include institutional types of four-year public, four-year branch campuses, private institutions, community colleges, and for-profit schools. This breakdown provides a cross-section of institutional types, assesses contrasts between the various institutions and serves as a model for the country's institutions of higher education in terms of how the institutions effectively communicates economic impact to the broader community. Table 1 identifies the distribution of economic impact studies analyzed by type.

A copy of the most recent economic impact study conducted between 2004 and 2014 was requested from the institutions. This ten-year period was selected because it is not common practice for an institution to have an economic impact study completed annually. The studies varied in length, with the shortest being 1 page and the longest being 163 pages. In order to triangulate the data, regional and state-wide newspaper articles written about the impact studies were examined.

Table 1. Distribution of Economic Impact Studies Analyzed, by Type.

Carnegie Classification Type	Number of Institutions
Public Two-year Associates, Regional	10
Public Four-year Research	7
Private Four-year	4
Public Four-year Baccalaureate	2
For-Profit	1
Total	24

VIII. Coding Procedure and Reliability

Each economic impact study was examined for impression management elements. Because economic impact studies are voluntary disclosures released by universities, they are unregulated. This practice of self-disclosure makes it easier for institutions to identify specific aspects of their data over others, therein creating a potential avenue for impression management to arise.

Two noteworthy schemes were utilized to create a codebook for this study. Both Brennan et al. (2009) and Clatworthy and Jones (2003) explored accounting narratives through the lens of impression management. The codebook consisted of impression management tactics, definitions, examples, coding rules for data analysis, and an impression management scale for each tactic. Keywords and phrases for each impression management strategy were identified, with numbers placed to the side to indicate frequency. During the pilot test, a discussion surrounding coding emphasis and definitional meaning occurred.

Each study was read and coded individually. Researchers scored the three impressions management tactics of each study on a scale of 0 to 100%. Scores below 33% were considered low in that tactic, medium at 34-66%, and high between 67-100%. The approach allowed an opportunity to scale overall ratings of impression management tactics found in each economic impact study as well as a means to maintain and evaluate reliability throughout the study. The scores were entered into an impression management matrix which displayed whether the economic impact study under scrutiny was low, medium, or high in self-promotion, ingratiation, and supplication.

Table 2 displays an example of an impression management matrix for one institution. In this example, self-promotion was low for each of the researchers while ingratiation and supplication was identified in the high range. A difference of 5% was indicated between researcher 1 and researcher 2 in the ingratiation and supplication tactics.

Table 2. Impression Management Matrix Example

	Low 0-33%	Medium 34-66%	High 67-100%
Researcher 1			
Self-promotion	X (10%)		
Ingratiation			X (85%)
Supplication			X (85%)

	Low 0-33%	Medium 34-66%	High 67-100%
Researcher 2			
Self-promotion	X (10%)		
Ingratiation			X (90%)
Supplication			X (90%)

Following individually scoring each study, researchers compared code sheets, discussed discrepancies and refined the initial codebook to ensure clarity. Each coder worked independently, which serves to promote reliability (Krippendorf, 2013). The two content coders reconciled their agreement on scoring. To validate this study, press releases and newspaper articles from the institutions were reviewed using the impression management codebook to examine the degree to which the impression management techniques identified in the economic impact studies aligned with these public documents.

The prevalence of words and phrases is paramount in identification of impression management tactics. Definitions and an exhaustive list of codewords were provided in the codebook. Identifying phrases with self-promotion, ingratiation, and supplication elements within the economic impact studies were counted. Table 3 provides context for the tactic definitions.

.

Table 3. Impression Management Tactics

Tactic	Definition
Self-promotion	How the institution shows competence, impact, attempts to gain respect, and through performance claims. Abilities and accomplishments are identified so that observers perceive capability (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) and focuses on positioning the institution above other institutions (Arkin & Shepperd, 1989).
Ingratiation	How the study is self-characterized, particularly as it relates to state appropriations and/or funding. Ingratiation is utilized to appeal to outsiders. Likability (Bolino & Turnley, 1999) and appeal are main components of ingratiation and are politically oriented (Elsass & Ralston, 1989).
Supplication	How the study makes excuses for flaws within the study, for example, through disclosing unaudited data or data collection processes. Supplication is open disclosure of weaknesses (Jones & Pittman, 1982).

IX. Coding Procedure and Reliability

To understand how higher education institutions utilize impression management within economic impact studies, the number of times words and phrases ascribed to the impression management tactics of self-promotion, ingratiation, and supplication occur is important. In total, there were 1,615 self-promotion words and 257 phrases; 1,897 ingratiation words and 238 phrases; and 107 supplication words and 38 phrases. Self-promotion and ingratiation words appear more frequently in public four-year research institutions than in any other institution type. Overall, the public two-year regional institutions had shorter studies. Table 4 provides the complete distribution of impression management words based on institution type. Supplication terms are rarely utilized, particularly in the public four-year baccalaureate and for-profit categories.

Word count and phrase count provide an overview of how impression management is deployed in economic impact studies, however it is important to understand how these tactics are incorporated in the studies. Below, the impression management taxonomy will be introduced, with supporting evidence from the economic impact studies provided.

Table 4. Distribution of Impression Management Words Based on Institution Type

Institutional Type	Self-Promotion	Ingratiation	Supplication
Public Two-year Associates, Regional (10)	318	590	46
Public Four-year Research (7)	1,108	918	36
Private Four-year (4)	108	226	20
Public Four-year Baccalaureate (2)	53	140	2
For-Profit (1)	28	23	3
Total	1,615	1,897	107

Note. One institution accounted for 270 of the self-promotion terms, 516 of ingratiation, and 46 of the supplication words used within the public two-year associate's category.

X. Taxonomy Archetypes

Following the data analysis, a taxonomy of economic impact studies was created using impression management theory. The taxonomy of archetypes was created based on the impression management tactics and their relative strength. A good classification forms "a hierarchy where subcategories are nested within larger categories" (Cappelli & Keller, 2013, p. 579). Archetypes were constructed as informed by the data and assigned a descriptive label. For example, it may be that a subset of institutions are high in supplication, perhaps in an effort to explain away underperformance while also high in ingratiation but low in self-promotion. This circumstance might be captured by the phraseology, "We have tried to do what you ask of us, but your expectations are not realistic for our size or position in the state." Another institution, perhaps an up-and-comer, may be high in both self-promotion and ingratiation, but low in supplication, in an effort to project a place on the move and worthy of greater support vis-à-vis competitors.

The five archetypes discussed below are labeled accomplished, benevolent, confident, dependable, and expecting. Every effort was taken to ensure that assumptions were not made about the institutions in the study, with the matrix relying solely on the results from the content analysis. Figure 1 provides a breakdown of the economic impact study taxonomy archetypes developed in this study informed by impression management.

Figure 1. Taxonomy of Economic Impact Studies

Accomplished
"We are the best, believe us."
High Self-Promotion
Medium Ingratiation
Low Supplication

Benevolent
"We support you, please support us."
Low Self-Promotion
High Ingratiation
High Supplication

Confident
"We are the leaders and the numbers show it."
High Self-Promotion
High Ingratiation
Low Supplication

Dependable
"We are reliable and trust that support will come."
Medium Self-Promotion
High Ingratiation
Low Supplication

Expecting
"We contribute but there is no reciprocity."
High Self-Promotion
Low Ingratiation
High Supplication

Accomplished: We are the Best, Believe Us

Institutions in the accomplished archetype express strong self-promotion aspects in both words and phrases. Proud of institutional heritage and boasting national recognition and an international footprint, institutions identified as accomplished exhibit the full definition of self-promotion. Ingratiation is present, but overshadowed by self-promotion. Institutional budgets are discussed with economic impact as the focal point, however institutional impact is explained as more grandiose than institutions exhibiting high ingratiation. Supplication is downplayed. The accomplished category indicates an organization's legitimacy has been achieved and maintained. Accomplished institutions could be summed up with the phrase "We are the best, believe us." Two institutions that fit into this category were Miami University and Franciscan University of Steubenville, discussed below.

Institutional examples. Miami University (MU) had a short but succinct economic impact study. MU begins the study with the following self-promotion statement: "With an unwavering commitment to undergraduate education, Miami's vision is to provide the best undergraduate experience in the nation, enhanced by superior and select graduate programs" (Miami University, 2013, p. 1). Further, the study stated that students receive "a return on [tuition] investment that is #1 in Ohio and among the top tier nationally according to SmartMoney.com, Payscale.com, and Forbes magazine" (Miami University, 2013, p. 1). MU's most frequent self-promotion word was ranked, as the study repeatedly compared the institution and specific academic programs to a variety of entities such as public national universities and public state universities. However, in the case of MU, the rankings and measurements were seemingly incorporated to validate the impact of the study without providing any in-depth research.

Franciscan University of Steubenville (FUS) used ample self-promotion words to describe the state and local impact. Moreover, growth was the most commonly used self-promotion word in the study, specifically in regard to the institution's national and global prominence. For example, the "growing importance of Franciscan University of Steubenville and the degree to which it has attracted, and continues to attract, funds from around the country and the world" (Welker & Zoric, 2010, p. 8) stands out as self-promotional. Another clear self-promotion example in FUS's study refers to the way the institution plans to "boost an economy in a dynamic way, in its long term potential for growth" (p. 12).

As stated in the description of the accomplished archetype, ingratiation is rated in the medium range. For the two institutions in this category, ingratiation was applied in relation to jobs and employment. For example, FUS uses the following statements, "generates jobs for nearly 8,100 people" (p. 1), "providing additional productive support," (p. 4) and "value added impact on the region" (p. 5). MU's study also referred to employment with the phrases, "Miami is the largest employer in Butler County" (Miami University, 2013, p. 1) and "benefiting Ohio people and programs" (p.1).

Confident: We are Leaders and the Numbers Show It

Ingratiation and self-promotion are highly prominent in this archetype. Additionally, supplication is scarce within the confident archetype. Confident institutions could be summed up with the phrase "We are the leaders and the numbers show it" because the presence of self-promotion and ingratiation in these studies emphasizes numerical data. Seven institutions are categorized as confident: Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland State University, John Carroll University, Kent State University, Ohio University, Ohio State University, and Shawnee State University.

Institutional examples. Ohio University's economic impact study had the most examples of self-promotion phrases in the whole sample. The statement, "Through its role as employer, education and workforce training provider, research institution, and regional steward for community and economic development, OHIO is a major engine of economic growth in its communities, the region, and state" (Ohio University, 2012, p. III) uses three different self-promotion words: development, major, and growth to emphasize prominence.

John Carroll University's (JCU) economic impact study used sentences such as "JCU is well on its way to success" (Austrian, Clouse, Piazza, Thompson, and Hrubey, 2012, p. 28) and "creates better citizens of its students while also aiding the residents of the community" (p. 28) to incorporate self-promotional phrases into the study. JCU discussed at length the financial impact the institution had on its region. Of the six ingratiation phrases in the study, one highlighted external stakeholders in the community. The "large base of contactable alumni" (p. 3) calls to attention the expectation the institution has for the alumni support and the resources that population provides the institution as well as the regional economy.

Shawnee State University exhibited self-promotion through statements such as "Shawnee State University embarked on the largest facilities investment of the institution's history" (Matthuews, 2010, p. 3) and "The VRCFA [Vern Riffle Center for the Arts] is a major attraction on campus" (p. 6). Similarly to JCU's study, there were many ingratiation words used, however ingratiation phrases were absent.

Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) was found to be high in self-promotion and the economic impact study focused on being the top institution. For example,

"The university employs more than 6,000 faculty and professional staff, making it among Northeast Ohio's top 20 largest employers" (Case Western Reserve University, 2011, p. 2). Another instance where top was used in a self-promotion phrase was when it reported being the "top-ranked global research university" (p. 1). One example of an ingratiation phrase that captured the overall ingratiation concept is summed up when CWRU articulates that it "benefits society through breakthroughs in teaching and research as well as direct engagement with our community" (p. 1).

Benevolent: We Support You, Please Support Us

Institutions in the benevolent archetype demonstrate minimal self-promotion characteristics in both words and phrases. Ingratiation is present but overshadowed somewhat by supplication. Contributions to the local tax base are highlighted and the generation of significant economic growth is emphasized. Supplication is prominent in this archetype. Benevolent institutions could be summed up with the phrase "We support you, please support us." Bowling Green State University (BGSU) and Wilmington College (WC) were the two institutions from the study matching this description.

Institutional examples. Key ingratiation phrases from BGSU are "significant economic engine" (Carroll, 2004, p. 3), "generates more tax revenues" (p. 4), and "generated an additional indirect impact" (p. 15). For WC, the phrase "Wilmington College also contributes to the local tax base through real estate taxes, worth $55,000 in FY 2010" (EconomicsCenter, 2010, p. 3).

Supplication language is high in this archetype. BGSU repeatedly makes statements regarding programs that are "prohibitively expensive" (Carroll, 2004, p. 16). BGSU claims that the institution "does not have a large number of events on campus that draws significant out of state visitors" (p. 16), thus creating doubt surrounding the economic reach of the institution.

WC's economic impact study addresses the regional economic decline and explained the effect of the recession upon jobs at WC. For example, WC's study stated "The subsequent loss of almost 10,000 jobs was likely due to the combination of the economic recession and the departure of DHL" (EconomicsCenter, 2010, p. 4), while the statement, "Employment at Wilmington College has been relatively resilient during the recession, decreasing at one-third the rate of the County overall from 2006-2010" (p. 1) continues the use of supplication techniques because the statement couched the layoffs at WC with a comparison of regional job layoffs and inevitably admits a decline in employment at WC. The study continues with more description of the effects of the economic recession on the local area and how certain jobs went unfilled at the college to minimize staff layoffs.

Dependable: We are Reliable and Trust that Support Will Continue

The dependable archetype describes institutions that are medium in self-promotion, high in ingratiation and low in supplication. This does not mean that self-promotion is discounted, but that ingratiation is emphasized. The importance of economic influence in relation to the overall benefits the institution provides the state is well documented. While self-promotion is employed throughout these studies, the main focus is to generate revenue, value the influence of the institution, and benefit society. Evidence of supplication is negligible. The phrase "We are reliable and trust that support will continue" could be used to refer to this archetype. 12 institutions are categories as "dependable." The 12 institutions are Ohio State University at Newark, COTC at Coshocton, COTC at Knox, COTC at Newark, COTC at Pataskala, Ohio University-Chillicothe Campus, Ohio University-Eastern Campus, Ohio University-Lancaster Campus, Ohio University-Southern Campus, Ohio University-Zanesville Campus, and Rhodes State College, and University of Toledo.

Institutional examples. Statements such as "$3.1 M generated in state tax revenue annually from activity associated with Chillicothe Campus" (Ohio University-Chillicothe, 2012, p. 1) and, "the Chillicothe Campus engages over 30 full-time and 120 part-time faculty" (p. 1), and "In addition, the Campus partners with the Ross County Education Services Center for teacher recertification, supporting the renewal of over 250 teachers' licenses" (p. 2) embody the definition of ingratiation.

Ohio University (OU) regional campuses shared high ingratiation language. OU-Eastern Campus stated "$1M generated in state tax revenue annually from activity associated with the Eastern Campus" (Ohio University, 2012, p. 14). The Southern Campus section stated, "$2.5M generated in state tax revenue annually from activity associated with the Southern Campus" (p. 18). OU-Zanesville stated "$2.3M generated in state tax revenue annually from activity associated with the Zanesville Campus" (p. 20).

Moreover, the regional campuses emphasized the student enrollment at each campus. For example, OU-Lancaster Campus stated,

> With over 2,510 students enrolled at the Lancaster Campus during the academic year, OHIO's regional campus provides a permanent establishment where students can pursue and complete a post-secondary degree (p. 17).

Other examples include "the Lancaster Campus engages over 30 full-time and 105 part-time faculty" (Ohio University, 2012, p. 16), and "Southern Campus has saved over $128,000 as of 2013, as a result of sustainable operations decisions to reduce waste, electric services, and facility space" (p. 19).

University of Toledo (UT) repeatedly mentions its role in the generation of economic activity through statements such as "UT generates more than 1.1 billion dollars annually for the Ohio economy" (Carroll, 2006, p. 2), "UT generates $9.87 in local economic activity for each dollar it receives in state appropriations" (p. 2), and "UT generates more tax revenues (federal, state, local) than it receives in state appropriations ($125 million in tax revenues from $111.7 million in state appropriations)" (p. 2). The study closes with "the total economic impact on Ohio's economy was $1.1 billion. Therefore, every dollar received in state support generates more than $9 in economic activity" (p. 14). Statements such as these further the general theme of ingratiation which directly calls to attention Ohio's economy.

Expecting: We Contribute but There is No Reciprocity

The expecting archetype describes an institution high in self-promotion, low in ingratiation and high in supplication. Supplication is concentrated in this category, although self-promotion and ingratiation are present. The overall economic impact study hinges on financial problems and accreditation tribulations. Only Ohio's Career Colleges and Schools were placed in the expecting archetype. The phrase "We contribute but there is no reciprocity" could be used to describe the Expecting archetype. Words such as "loss", "problems" and "decreased" also appeared in the study.

Institutional examples. One distinguishing feature to this report is that student complaints were discussed at length. For example, "The number of student complaints remained fairly consistent during the period from FY 2000-2005, however, the number of student complaints has increased the past two years" (State Board of Career Colleges and Schools, 2007, p. 15). A chart also presented the reasons for student complains, which were listed as "poor quality of education," "failure to make a proper refund," "unfair school administrative policies," "financial aid problems," "involuntary dismissal issues," and "admissions problems" (p. 16). One ingratiation phrase was evident in this study, "graduates make a continuing contribution to the economy because of their improved productivity" (p. 13). While this study was inherently different from others in this study, it was imperative to include it to showcase the variation in economic impact studies, particularly to demonstrate how far these studies have moved away from the Caffrey and Isaacs model.

XI. Discussion

First, self-promotion, which focuses on positioning the institution above others, and ingratiation which relates to funding aspects, are present in each of the 24 studies. This could mean that the main premise of conducting the economic impact studies is to promote the institution and acquire or justify resources. Institutions use impression management statements to legitimate themselves. They are consequently conveying symbolic messages by deciding what to include or not include in the study. Decisions such as whether to include pictures of students, pictures of campus, quotations from students, administrators, faculty, or alumni, to cite national rankings, or to focus on statistics all factor into the meaning-making and the intentionality behind the economic impact study. Therefore, showcasing the self-promotion and ingratiation terms indicate the manner in which the institution is presenting the economic development information.

Second, supplication was the least prevalent impression management category utilized in the studies. Only 11 of the 24 used supplication terms. Compared to the word counts, there were just over 100 supplication words used compared to well over 1,500 for both self-promotion and ingratiation. Phrase count poses a similar phenomenon in terms of low supplication counts. There were 38 supplication phrases in the studies, whereas the other two impression management categories had well over 200 each. This is consistent with a lack of findings surrounding supplication in the literature regarding institutions of higher education (Brennan et al., 2009). Surmising from the previous section regarding self-promotion and ingratiation, it can be ascertained that institutions are focused on moving the institution forward and lack the desire to pass blame or dwell on failures. It is also important to note here, however, that the institutions withhold the right to decide what information is published and what information is not.

XII. Implications for Higher Education Administrators

Higher education administrators should examine the institution's mission and determine if the messaging of the economic impact study aligns with it. Strategizing how the institution's messaging aligns with the way the legislature perceives the contributory value of a particular institution could prove advantageous in regards to economic impact. If there is mixed messaging from the economic impact study and other institutional documents, legislators could question the validity of the information and steer funding toward a project wherein the purpose is clearly defined.

Economic impact studies are expensive to produce and intended to prompt action. Therefore, addressing difficult decisions regarding what should be included and what impressions matter must be decided upon by institutional administrators prior to conducting a study. The impression

management tactics used in economic impact studies were anticipated to be reflective of institution type. However, that turned out to not be universally true and hence, a taxonomy was designed. The taxonomy provides a foundation for administrators to identify where the institution is and how it presents to outside stakeholders. Recognizing the institution's projected archetype may allow for discussion prior to initiating an economic impact study to ensure that cost is minimized and the study is most effective.

XII. Taxonomy Application

Given the unique nature of this study, there is an opportunity to apply the taxonomy to other contexts. An impression management codebook based on Brennan et al.'s (2009) research was revised to apply to documentation from higher education institutions. This codebook can be applied to any organization or institution's public documentation such as annual reports, view books, presidential speeches, and strategic plans to name a few. The codebook focuses on the thematic analysis in terms of impression management words and phrases as well as the repetition of statements utilizing impression management. Impression management has been historically studied through a business lens in a public relations context. Therefore, the taxonomy can be applied to higher education, but can also go far beyond that scope to reach the private sector as well as the nonprofit sector.

In a higher education context, the taxonomy could be used to help an institution craft appropriate messaging for new initiatives. Particularly if an institution is struggling with its branding, a heightened awareness may be necessary to ensure that stakeholders understand the vision of the institution for the next five to ten years. Recognizing that an institution falls into one of the archetypes may help administrators customize the message to reach the desired audience. For example, if an institution is in the dependable category, it may be more focused on identifying strengths focused on tending to the needs of all students (via open enrollment) rather than expending resources trying to dig out from behind the prestigious shadow of a flagship campus. This taxonomy could provide a venue for institutions to own who they are rather than try to fit into an archetype that they are not.

Further, this taxonomy is intended to serve as a gauging mechanism. For example, if an institution considers itself to be in the accomplished archetype, an analysis could be conducted to ascertain whether the materials being produced evoke high self-promotion and medium ingratiation. If the institution is not using higher self-promotion language to emit the accomplished definition, it may be appropriate to examine the cultural, historical, and political context occurring at the institution to determine if the institution has shifted into a different archetype, and what that means for the institution.

XIII. Study Limitations

As with any research study, this one is not without limitations. First, while definitions were described and informed by the literature, there is an element of interpretation that enters into a content analysis. Second, economic impact studies do not have a standardized layout and vary in length and format. While a rubric was crafted to alleviate this limitation, and additional measures were taken, it remains a limitation due to the various inconsistencies within each study. Third, the value this study brings elucidates meaningful implications for economic impact studies that could be useful for colleges and universities across the nation, but this study only speaks to those implications within Ohio. Finally, there was consistency in coding between the researcher and content coder, but it is possible that different researchers could yield alternative interpretation. However, this methodological framework is well established and evidences confidence for the findings through triangulation of data.

XIV. Future Directions

It is problematic to measure the impact of colleges and universities in only economic terms, however legislators and other stakeholders often rely on economic data to make decisions. Broadening the scope of the study to include economic impact studies across the United States may prove valuable in order to potentially identify clusters that fit within the parameters of the taxonomy. Identifying any differences in the economic impact studies between regions could be valuable information for federal policymakers and stakeholders. Understanding more regarding the application of the taxonomy and how legislators make decisions could provide valuable insights into the caveats associated with this approach and further address the definitional subtleties.

Lastly, the value of a mixed method approach in this context could allow for a deeper exploration of the economic impact study given that the institutional context, when paired with numerical data, budgetary information, and interviews with higher education administrators could yield a more holistic picture of the economic development landscape as well as the institutional context. This approach could determine if the impression management tactics employed in the economic impact studies are appropriate for the actual financial information. A mixed method approach could achieve a richness that this study left unmet. Recognizing the institutional history and campus climate are important to appropriately analyze campuses of

higher education, targeted site visits may provide a depth and richness to the analysis. It is pertinent to understand why an economic impact study was conducted. What factors prompted the decision to have a study conducted? Who were the campus leaders involved in the process, and why? Why did an institution choose to have the study conducted in-house versus hiring a consultant? Was there a specific focus of the economic impact study, such as emphasis on an academic program or the highlighting of a new campus renovation? These questions only begin to address some of the information that could be collected using such an approach.

References

Aaker, D. (1991). Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Arkin, R. M., & Shepperd, J. A. (1989). Self-presentation styles in organizations. In R.A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), Impression management in the organization (pp. 125-139). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Austrian, Z., Clouse, C., Piazza, M.C., Thompson, T., & Hrubey, M. (2012). Economic impact of John Carroll University: FY 2011. Center for Economic Development, Cleveland State University Center. Retrieved from http://webmedia.jcu.edu/ economicimpact/ files/2012/11/JCU-Impact-2011-Final-Report.pdf

Baldwin, N., & Borrelli, S. A. (2008). Education and economic growth in the United States: Cross-national applications for an intra-national path analysis. Policy Science, 41, 183-204. doi:10.1007/s11077-008-9062-2

Benneworth, P. & Hospers, G. (2007). Urban competitiveness in the knowledge economy: Universities as new planning animateurs. Progress in Planning, 67, 105-197.

Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., & Daniels, D. (2014). The impact of impression management over time. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29, 266-284. doi:10.1108/JMP-10-2012-0290

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. Organizational Research Methods, 2, 187-206. doi:10.1177/109442819922005

Brennan, N. M., Guillamon-Saorin, E., & Pierce, A. (2009). Impression management: Developing and illustrating a scheme of analysis for narrative disclosures—a methodological note. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 22, 789-832. doi:10.11089/09513570910966379

Bunzel, D. (2007). Universities sell their brands. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 16, 152-153. doi:10.1108/10610420710740034

Caffrey, J., & Isaacs, H. H. (1971). Estimating the impact of a college or university on the local economy. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Cappelli, P., & Keller, J. (2013). Classifying work in the new economy. Academy of Management Review, 38, 575-594. doi:10.5465/amr.2011.0302

Carroll, M. C. (2004). Measuring Bowling Green State University's impact on Ohio's economy. Retrieved from http://www2.bgsu.edu/offices/ir/BGSUportfolio/ finance/BGSU_Impact_Report_11-1-04_.pdf

Carroll, M. C. (2006). The impact of the "new" University of Toledo on Ohio's economy. Urban Affairs Center. Retrieved from http://uac.utoledo.edu

Case Western Reserve University. (2011). Imagination, innovation, impact: Case Western Reserve in the region. Retrieved from https://www.case.edu/corporate/1665_EconomicImpact_FINAL.pdf

Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 406-415. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.39.3.406

Clatworthy, M., & Jones, M. J. (2003). Financial reporting of good news and bad news: Evidence from accounting narratives. Accounting and Business Research, 33, 171-185.

Davis, S. M., & Dunn, M. (2002). Building the brand-driven business: Operationalize your brand to drive profitable growth. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

EconomicsCenter, (2010). The economic impact of Wilmington College in Clinton County. Retrieved from http://www.wccchamber.com/wpcontent/uploads/2011/07/WIlmingtonCollege-EconomicImpact.pdf

Elliott, D. S., Levine, S. L., & Meisel, J. B. (1988). Measuring the economic impact of institutions of higher education. Research in Higher Education, 28(1), 17-33. doi:10.1007/BF00976857

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the business week rankings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 442-476. doi:10.2307/2393938

Elsass, P. M., & Ralston, D. A. (1989). Individual responses to the stress of career plateauing. Journal of Management, 15(1), 33-47. doi:10.1177/014920638901500104

Etzkowitz, H. & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From national systems and "mode 2" to a triple helix of university-industry-government relations. Research policy, 29(2), 109-123.

Ferris, G. R., Russ, G. S., & Fandt, P. M. (1989). Politics in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), Impression management in the organization (pp. 143-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fisk, R. P., & Grove, S. J. (1996). Applications of impression management and the drama metaphor in marketing:

An introduction. European Journal of Marketing, 30, 6-12. doi:10.1108/03090569610130061

Franklin, N. E. (2009). The need is now: University engagement in regional economic development. Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 13(4), 51-73.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic selfpresentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self (pp. 231-262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Leslie, L. L., & Slaughter, S. A. (1992). Higher education and regional development. In W. E. Becker & D. R. Lewis (Eds.), The economics of American higher education. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Leydesdorff, L. & Etzkowitz, H. (1996) Emergence of a triple helix of university-industry-government relations. Science and public policy, 23(5), 279-286.

McMahon, W. W. (2009). The private and social benefits of higher education: Higher learning, greater good. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Matthuews, K. B. (2010). A study of the economic impact of Shawnee State University: Fiscal year 2008-2009. Retrieved from http://www.shawnee.edu/offices/president/media/docs/EconomicStudy-2008-2009.pdf

Miami University. (2013). Measures of quality 2012-2013: A report card for parents, taxpayers, governor, and legislators. Retrieved from http://miamioh.edu/_files/documents/about-miami/Report_Card_2013.pdf

Ohio University. (2012). Ohio University economic impact assessment: Educating students, impacting communities. Retrieved from https://www.ohio.edu/ucm/upload/Economic-Impact_full_report-2.pdf

Ohio University-Chillicothe. (2012). RHE economic impact report: Ohio University-Chillicothe. Retrieved from https://www.ohio.edu/chillicothe/about/rheeconomicimpactreport.cfm

Pastor, J. M., Perez, F., & Fernandez de Guevara, J. (2013). Measuring the local economic impact of universities: An approach that considers uncertainty. Higher Education, 65, 539-564. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9562-z

Schultz, D. E., Tannebaum, S. I., & Lauterburn, R. F. (1993). Integrated marketing communications: Putting it together and making it work. Chicago, IL: McGraw-Hill.

Siegfried, J. J., Sanderson, A. R., & McHenry, P. (2007). The economic impact of colleges and universities. Economics of Education Review, 26, 546-558. doi:10.1013/j.econedurev.2006.07.010

State Board of Career Colleges and Schools. (2007). [Annual Report]. Retrieved from http://scr.ohio.gov/Portals/0/PDFs/FY07-AnnualReport.pdf

Supplication. (2012). In Oxford English Dictionary's online dictionary (OED Third Edition). Retrieved from http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.indstate.edu/view/Entry/194653?rskey=wEKG2X&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

Welker, M., & Zoric, J. (2010). Franciscan University of Steubenville: Economic impact 2009-2010. Retrieved from http://www.franciscan.edu/uploadedFiles/Top_Level/About/Our_Mission/Economic%20Impact%202009-10.pdf