Running Head: MANAGING TENSIONS IN UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICES

Managing Tensions in University Development Offices: A Competing Values Approach

Lisa C. Guzman and Peter A. Bacevice

University of Michigan

Send all correspondence to:

Lisa C. Guzman or Peter A. Bacevice
Center for the Study of Higher
and Postsecondary Education
University of Michigan
610 E. University Ave., 2117 SEB
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
lcguzman@umich.edu
bacevice@umich.edu

Managing Tensions in University Development Offices: A Competing Values Approach

Abstract

University development offices face many challenges – including the struggle to maintain collaborative relationships between external and internal stakeholders. As a collaborative and critical function for research universities, development offices offer university leaders new ways to think about aligning people, culture, and goals with institutional planning. Using the Competing Values Framework, university leaders will learn that no "one size fits all" approach works for development office planning. Positive tensions exist within all organizations that, when identified and managed, result in more effective and culturally aligned planning strategies. A private, research university in the Midwest is highlighted.

Managing Tensions in University Development Offices: A Competing Values Approach

University development offices face a number of problems that are often caused by tensions that if properly managed, can add to their likelihood of successful fundraising efforts. Administrative leaders have an immense amount of control over the strategy and daily operations of their university development offices, even those that consist of decentralized schools or colleges. Tensions will always exist in organizations caused by the diverse groups of people working in those organizations. Elimination of all sources of tension is not the goal. Instead it is best to effectively lead an organization by recognizing and utilizing its many strengths. When leaders fail to appreciate the differences within their organizations, tensions are more likely to lead to failure. This study's purpose is to learn about the various organizational cultures of university development offices and to identify the different elements of culture that emerge and must be managed in order for a development office to function with a high degree of success.

Philanthropy and its Role in American Higher Education

Philanthropy has played a role in American higher education since as far back as the founding of Harvard College. John Harvard bequeathed his library and half of his estate in 1638 to a new college just outside Boston. The college was named after this original benefactor and, thus, marked the beginning of the practice of private funding in American higher education.

The research university is a relatively new type of institution given the nearly 400-year history of American higher education. As an institutional type that was modeled after German institutions, the research university emerged in the post-Civil War years of the nineteenth century. Research universities differed from the traditional

liberal arts and religious colleges in that they focused on science and the scientific method of inquiry (Thelin, 2004).

The growth of the American research university was made possible through philanthropy. The growth of new private universities during this time is attributed to the relative ease of convincing a handful of wealthy people to fund new institutions rather than convincing public legislatures to embrace these new academic ideals for their public institutions. Wealthy individuals also wanted to show their ability to build entire institutions (Curti and Nash, 1965). The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries marked a period of significant philanthropic investment, as wealthy individuals made fortunes in a free enterprise system of cheap labor, low taxes, abundant resources, and little governmental control. Some of these industrialists like Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller saw greater societal needs that were beyond their own, or they at least saw a need to have their names positively associated with the public good (Woodring, 1970).

Philanthropy in Higher Education Today

With the decrease in public funds available for higher education, the private funds of philanthropists are still very important for the financial health of colleges and universities of all types. The philanthropists of today are different from those of a century ago. Elliott (2006) writes of the "new philanthropist" or the "venture philanthropist" in higher education who is increasingly concerned about this decrease in public funds for colleges and universities as well as concerned about the growing accountability demands and demand for efficiency in higher education. "The new philanthropist wants outcomes and evidence of progress when making gifts. They are

interested in staying involved with the administration of their gift and are more likely to support risky ventures than the traditional donor" (p. 38).

Although the wealthiest members of society are often the most visible donors to higher education, they are not the only source of private funds for higher education. There are as many different types and levels of donors as there are reasons why people give philanthropically. Elliott (2006) identifies seven such reasons. People give for any combination of religious, spiritual, or philosophical beliefs; guilt; recognition; self-preservation and fear; tax rewards; obligation; and pride and self-respect. Colleges and universities reach out to their alumni, community members, philanthropic foundations, and businesses for gifts of all levels to support their institutions. Asking for money requires building and maintaining relationships with these constituencies. "The most successful development programs result from establishing and cultivating long-term, mutually-rewarding relationships with donors and volunteers" (Osborne, 1993, p. 239). Drucker (1990) refers to this as "constituency building." Constituency building makes people want to give, not simply because someone is asking, but for self-fulfillment. "That (self-fulfillment) is the ultimate goal of fund development" (p. 58). This mutually beneficial relationship building function is the basis for university development offices.

The University Development Office

The university development office functions much like that of its counterparts in other nonprofit organizations. Like private universities, public universities also have development offices to raise money for their respective endowments. An endowment is a collective pool of gifts that, when invested like any other pool of money, earns interest on the principal. That interest income is then added to the operating budget of the

institution. Even a conservative 2% return on a $1 billion university endowment generates $20 million of operating support for the university.

Many development office staff members stumble into their careers, but many of them do so for many of the same reasons. They look to perform a service that benefits others in society and makes donors feel good. They are adept at practicing the art of matching the desires of donors to the needs of an organization. They also do so for personal satisfaction (Greenfield, 1991). Osborne (1993) identifies several characteristics of a good fundraiser. They have integrity, the ability to listen well, the ability to motivate, high energy, a concern for people, high expectations. They also love the work they do. They have perseverance and a presence and a quality of leadership. They themselves are philanthropic. They have innate intelligence as well as an ability to see the big picture. In any high performance nonprofit organization, motivated people will seek out careers in them. One way to keep and retain these staff members is to align HR strategies with the mission of the organization in order for that high energy to deliver on the organization's mission (Letts, Ryan, and Grossman, 1999).

Relationship building is the paramount function for development offices in colleges and universities. It is increasingly important as the gift level increases. As organizations progress from annual giving strategies for unrestricted operating support to major gift strategies and estate gifts for the purpose of endowment growth, the level of donor involvement and institutional involvement in that donor increases. The antithesis of fundraising through relationship building is what Greenfield (1991) calls "quick buck fundraising." This tactic is problematic, especially at major gift levels because it doesn't produce long-term donors who are committed to the institution. Greenfield notes:

Donors cannot be pushed or prodded into making gifts; they must be ready. Rushing them will result in smaller gifts as well as unhappy donors who might never give again. Similarly, it is important not to place too much emphasis on only money, which can be a danger signal to donors. No one likes to be 'had.' Besides, pressure tactics and arm-twisting are the wrong messages to send to donors. They will question the leadership of the organization and their confidence in making a gift decision will be shaken. (p. 16)

Nevertheless, it is easy for development offices to get caught up in the tactics of fundraising. A heavy focus on fundraising tactics might lead to "quick buck fundraising" in that it takes what is an ambiguous, long-term process and compresses it into rational, unambiguous steps. University development offices (as well as the nonprofit sector in general) increasingly function in a market-driven environment (Hammack and Young, 1993), which can reduce the development function to simply maximizing the dollar value of the relationship between the donor and the institution. Some of the fundraising literature (Edles, 1993) focuses solely on the tactics of fundraising while ignoring the greater purpose of the development function. Nahm and Zemsky (1993) suggest a framework that positions university development as a rational, planning process. Their tactical approach is divided into stages – developing the message, setting priorities, managing prospects, organizing the fundraising program, and carrying out the plan. Furthermore, fundraising has increasingly grown into a profession in its own right. Elliott (2006) notes this shift – "Fundraising, which was once the collaborative effort of college presidents and alumni volunteers, is now staffed by professionals educated in marketing, finance, and tax law" (p. 29).

There is justification for a rational, managerial approach to university development. Duronio and Loessin (1991) argue, "Administrators in academic institutions generally have been judged as failing as managers because of too strong a focus on process and not enough focus on results. Fundraising managers may have the opposite problem – too strong a focus on results and not enough focus on process" (p. 215). However the challenges of managing in higher education institutions are rooted in some of the organizational characteristics that are unique to colleges and universities. Universities have been described as "organized anarchies" (Cohen and March, 1974) and "loosely-coupled systems" (Weick, 1976; Clark, 1983). University departments are autonomous, and there is less organization among departments in universities then there is in other organizations. Individual work in universities has been described as "artisanal" (Jacob and Hellström, 2003).

In colleges and universities in which the development function is decentralized by school or college, fundraising operations fall into these same descriptive categories. In colleges and universities in which development is heavily centralized, development offices fall into the administrative hierarchy that Mintzberg (1979) describes as part of the higher education "professional bureaucracy." This model assumes that there are dual hierarchies of academic professionals and administrative professionals along with challenges managing between them. No matter which lens or framework through which one views a college or university, managing a higher education institution is challenging, thus justifying the desire for control, rational behavior, and tactics. Drucker (1990) argues that nonprofit organizations in general need management, but there have not been many management principles designed for them. Instead, many of the tools

available to nonprofits come from the business sector. These tools tend to be rational and tactical.

Development Office Leadership

The challenge of leading a higher education development office is to balance the philanthropic mission of the institution with the managerial tasks at hand. Drucker (1990) lists several qualities of a nonprofit organizational leader. Integrity and character are important as are people who take their roles seriously but who do not take *themselves* too seriously. Leaders must balance between being too cautious or too risky, and they must balance between opportunity and risk. Effective leaders need to take the time to make themselves understood, and they must not be afraid of the strengths in their own organization.

Two individuals stand out as the key leaders in a college or university development office – the president and the vice president for development/chief development officer (or equivalent titles).

Cook (1997) articulates the role of a college or university president in the context of the development process as one of a "quarterback/athletic director" dual role type. Fundraising becomes one of the president's most high-profile roles. It is an increasingly important criteria in the presidential selection process. Presidents play an important role in both the tactical and technical aspects of fundraising, and they also engage in the actual relationship building, cultivation, and, ultimately, the solicitation of donors.

According to Patton (1993), the roles of the chief development officer consist of creating fundraising strategies and action plans, creating an atmosphere of integrity and performance, and facilitating president and trustee participation in the fundraising process. A VP/chief development officer, in many ways, is a manager of tensions in that

the competing priorities of the various functions require an effective mediator. Duronio and Loessin (1991) argue, "A chief development officer may fill as many as five different roles in leading the fundraising process: college or university officer, fundraiser, manager, mentor, and entrepreneur" (p. 206). They further note similarities among VP/chief development officers. They demonstrated that they understand and value higher education. They are articulate representatives of their institutions and the fundraising field. They have respect for donors. Finally, they have high professional standards for themselves and their staff members. The authors further suggest:

> Each of them talked of the importance of fundraising programs that are designed to provide long-term benefits for the institution…(Each of them) all had a strong belief in the need for fundraising decisions and plans to be made within the context of each specific institutional environment. No one was interested in 'canned' or 'off-the-shelf' programs, and all emphasized how fundraising decisions reflected overall institutional values and directions. (p. 206)

Towards a Theoretical Construct of University Development Office Leadership

Leading a development office in a higher education context is challenging. The context itself is one that contains both uncertainty (a lack of information) and ambiguity (incomplete or conflicting information). This ambiguity and uncertainty is a function of both the outside environment (shaped by external constituents) and the inside environment (shaped by internal constituents) – together which comprise the higher education context. Ambiguity and uncertainty – collectively known as equivocality – are present in all organizational settings. Organization and management are attempts to control equivocality by trying to make things as unequivocal as possible. However, the higher education and fundraising context is anything but unequivocal.

In colleges and universities, students and faculty teach, learn, and conduct research. The very nature of academic work embraces equivocality through information gathering and knowledge creation. If everything in the academic world were unequivocal, there would be no need for further scholarly inquiry. Even the most rational scientific theories are applied to equivocal situations in order to further expand the corpus of knowledge. Colleges and universities are organized around academic disciplines. Thus, they are organized around equivocality. Development offices serve the needs of the academic organization in its quest for resources to battle the equivocal aspects of the world.

In another aspect of the equivocality of fundraising, development offices are continuously engaging people and building relationships. Relationship building itself is a battle of equivocality. The donor's interests are not always apparent to the development office, and the institution's needs are not always apparent to the donor.

The first place to start when thinking about how to lead in an equivocal environment is to recognize it and embrace it. Variety in an environment must be met with a variety of organizational responses (Weick, 1979). Weick writes, "It's because of requisite variety that organizations have to be preoccupied with keeping sufficient diversity inside the organization to sense accurately the variety present in ecological changes outside it" (p. 188). In this logic, leaders should see that a "one size fits all approach" to leadership is ineffective. However in the "one size doesn't fit all" logic, the question for leaders to consider is, "Just how many variations of *all* are there?"

Bergquist (1992) offers four cultural types of colleges and universities – collegial, managerial, developmental, and negotiating. Similarly, Birnbaum (1988) offers four higher education organizational models – the collegial institution, the bureaucratic

institution, the political institution, and the anarchical institution. He writes, "All four system models are invented social constructs that 'make sense' of organizational processes. They reflect our need to impose order and meaning on equivocal events and thereby help us believe that we truly understand the internal operations of colleges and universities" (p. 175). Though he warns that stronger management in colleges and universities is unlikely to be of much help because of the unique nature of colleges and universities. Understanding that colleges and universities are equivocal in nature helps explain why strong management (which is meant to make this unequivocal) is likely to fail.

Colleges and universities and their development offices are not the only organizations to be defined by multiple organizational types, cultures, or by their equivocal nature. All organizations have these traits. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) developed a four-quadrant model through their research on the various ways that organizational effectiveness is defined. Their model, known as the Competing Values Framework (CVF), illustrates tensions between flexibility and control as well as the tensions between the internal development of people and the external development of the organization.

The research behind this model demonstrates how positive tensions emerge within organizations when leaders recognize differences, or tensions, and lead the organization in a way that makes these tensions have positive outcomes (DeGraff and Quinn, forthcoming). The weighted importance of each quadrant in the model is based on the organization's goals as well as external constraints that affect those goals (Buenger, et. al., 1996). DeGraff and Quinn label the four quadrants as *Compete*, *Create*, *Collaborate*, and *Control*.

Figure 1. The Competing Values Framework (DeGraff and Quinn, forthcoming)

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

The CVF can be used to understand and map the equivocality in college and university development offices. The quadrants illustrate various development office priorities and the approaches that leaders might take in response to them. As with Birnbaum's higher education organizational model, there is no one right way to lead a university development office. The interpretive manager (Lester, Piore, and Malek, 1999) is one that is less focused on any one process and more focused on interpreting and listening to all those in the contextual environment. The CVF is one way to understand the contextual environment. The following is a description of each quadrant and how each may be applied to a university development office context.

The *Compete* quadrant drives universities to use gift attainment as a competitive tool. They look to development as a way to increase revenue through active solicitation of donors with an emphasis on the speed at which solicitations occur and gifts are received. Underlying the push for revenue dollars and speed is the drive for institutional prestige, especially in aligning institutional gift attainment with that of peer institutions and pushing the boundaries of what is considered a "peer institution."

Planning strategies in the Compete quadrant will reflect heavy investment in direct fundraising staff, especially those who have the ability to close gift solicitations.

The *Create* quadrant drives universities to use development to push macro-level institution building. Gift attainment is important if it leads to creative new programs at the university. The focus is less on making the university look good relative to peers and more on making the university a great institution. Speed is less important than the breadth of initiatives that emerge from fundraising and collaboration. Prestige, future gift attainment, and future collaboration will flow naturally when the institution becomes great (i.e. "the university will sell itself"). Planning strategies in the Create quadrant will reflect investment in entrepreneurial-minded fundraising staff but will also reflect a greater recruitment of existing university staff (especially faculty) with visionary capabilities to participate in development activities.

The *Collaborate* quadrant drives development offices to push relationship building as its primary objective. Gift attainment is important but only to the extent that it emerges from a collaborative relationship among stakeholders. Alumni are seen as vital to the future of the institution, regardless of their ability to give financially. They may be able to support the institution in other ways. Planning strategies in the Collaborate quadrant will reflect a major investment in alumni relation's staff and other constituency relationship staff. Direct fundraising staff will be present, but they will be more collaborative with each other and with stakeholders with whom they interact. The role between fundraising and relations is blurred, and staff responsibilities will reflect that. Retention of donors and volunteers and cultivating their long-term relationship with the institution is key.

The *Control* quadrant drives development offices to emphasize development function as a rational process that can be evaluated through metrics. Gift attainment is critical because it is a measurable goal and can be controlled through processes. Relationships are codified and maintained in a systematic way. There is a clear distinction in the roles of staff members. Fundraising is limited to fundraising staff; alumni relations are limited to alumni relation's staff; faculty focuses on their academic work. Planning strategies in the Control quadrant will reflect a relatively heavy investment in support staff that control gift processing and other back office functions. Fundraising and constituency relationship staff will be hired and assigned to specific departments within the university.

The purpose of our study is to marry what we know about development office leadership with what we have learned about the potential sources of tension that emerge within college and university development offices. The study uses the CVF as a map for understanding the tensions and equivocality in the development process. The development process in higher education is a synthesis of constituent relationship building and corresponding managerial processes for the purpose of raising money for the growth of colleges and universities and the knowledge and innovations that they produce. Tensions can arise when one or few pieces of this synthesis are emphasized at the expense or neglect of others. Our study shows how research can identify these tensions in a practical way so that college and university leaders can address them and manage them in an attempt to create a sense of organizational equilibrium. The existence of college and university development offices is a result of a long tradition of philanthropy in higher education whose format has evolved and will continue to be necessary in fulfilling the mission of higher education.

Methodology

Data Collection

Two types of data were collected during the course of the project. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all participants. An assessment survey was also administered to all participants.

Participants

The university highlighted in this research study is a private research university in the Midwest. Since 1999 this university has seen a tremendous amount of turnover in its senior administrative leadership. Specifically, there have been four presidents (later referred to as President A, President B, President C, and President D) and three vice presidents for development (later referred to as Vice President A, Vice President B, and Vice President C). There has also been a significant turnover in fundraising staff. In addition, the local press has cited insufficient fundraising as a major contributor to the university's current budget problems. The effects of this on development officers are explored. Using the snowball method described by Merriam (1998), early participants of the study advised us of additional potential participants. In total, fourteen development officers working in one of the eight colleges at the university were sought to participate in this study.

An initial e-mail was sent out to inform the selected development officers of this research study and to identify their willingness to participate. Seven current and seven former development officers were contacted. Two current and three former development officers never responded to any contact in regard to this study. A total of nine participants agreed to participate in this research study – five current development officers and four former development officers. Each was sent a consent form and the

assessment survey, and all were interviewed. It was essential to have the perspective of both current and former development officers in this study due to the recent rapid rate of turnover in senior administrative leadership at the university. This dual perspective was also useful in that it provided a balance between responses that may have been guarded because of the nature of current employment with the institution and responses that may have been too opinionated because of the nature of why people were no longer with the university.

The development officers interviewed represented four of the eight colleges at the university, and their collective experience represented a time span of each presidential and vice presidential tenure. Five of the development officers interviewed had previous experience working for the campus central development office, which was an office that typically dealt with university-level fundraising initiatives. Assessment surveys were collected from all but one development officer. An additional assessment survey was returned incomplete and the data returned was unusable.

Semi-Structured Interviews

An interview protocol consisting of fourteen questions was generated for the semi-structured interviews. An interview protocol was composed for both the current development officers and the former development officers. The interviews were intended to elicit responses pertaining to the development officers' roles, responsibilities, and experiences working in their respective development office at the university. In addition the interviews aimed to uncover the perceived influence of senior administrative leadership on the functioning, focus, and culture of development practices at the university and to identify tensions that exist(ed). The topics were

chosen and supported by the literature reviewed. They have been identified as important influences of successful development functioning and management.

     Use of semi-structured interviews allowed for flexibility in order to probe and to address material not originally anticipated during the interview process. Each interview was conducted using the same interview protocol, although differences in probing techniques were used as determined to be necessary. Eight of the semi-structured interviews were conducted face-to-face. The one remaining interview was conducted over the telephone. All of the interviews were audio-recorded and notes were also taken during each of the interviews.

Survey

The assessment survey used in this study consists of a 21-question survey instrument. The questions were adapted from the *Change and Innovation Assessment* instrument in DeGraff and Quinn's forthcoming work because it provided a useful and practical survey for evaluation using the Competing Values Framework. An adaptation was made for both the current development officers and for the former development officers. The assessment survey is divided into three categories (*Purposes*, *Practices*, and *People*) with seven questions in each. Each question has four responses that must be force-ranked with a number 1 to 4. The current development officers were asked to assess how the development office currently is and how it is desired to be, while the former development officers were asked to assess how the development office was at the time of employment and how it was desired to be.

The questions found in each of the three categories are intended to elicit responses that would further identify the development officers' experiences and beliefs about their respective development office. The Purposes set of questions center on the

outcomes, values, and strategies that the development office intends to create. The

questions focus on how the development office defines success and how success is

measured by it. The Practices set of questions center on the culture, competencies, and

processes of the development office. The questions focus on the development office

mission, planning, decision-making, and the investment and cultivation of its officers.

The People set of questions focuses on the individual development officer. The

questions in the Practices section are similar to the ones found in the People section but

only focus on the individual development officer. For this reason, the questions focus

on the development officers' personal views about the mission, planning, decision-

making, and skill cultivation in their own work in their respective development office.

Delimitations and Limitations

The reliance on the snowball sampling method to identify potential participants

may have limited the representation of development officers in this study. In addition,

the limited number of development officers interviewed may have resulted in a less than

comprehensive sample. Other university development officers and those working in

other development offices not represented in the sample may have different

perspectives in regard to working at the university. Because of these restrictions to the

project design, the internal validity of the project is tempered. Additionally, because a

case study approach was undertaken to complete this project, the results are specific to

this university and are not generalizable.

In contrast, the project's validity is upheld by the voluntary nature of the project.

Each development officer had an opportunity to refrain from answering any question(s)

they were uncomfortable with answering, although no one did. They did not receive

compensation for participation in the project or have any undue influence imparted on

them to participate. In these ways, the trustworthiness and credibility of responses from the interviews can be better assured. Member checking was done for the interviews – participants were given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of their interview. Finally, to bolster internal validity, the use of the assessment survey was used to triangulate the data.

Limitations must also be considered when interpreting the results of the analysis. The limited number of semi-structured interviews and assessment surveys may be a limit to the project and the use of additional methods – observations or an ethnographic experience – may have been helpful to further triangulate the data. In addition, the assessment survey used for this study was adapted from an existing survey and has not been tested in its current form. Finally, the coding and interpretation of the data may be unduly influenced by researcher biases not apparent during the analysis phase of the project.

Analysis

Both interviews and the assessment surveys guide the course of this study – legitimizing them as appropriate measures to analyze. The interviews were reviewed in order to gather a general sense for the data. After completion of the interviews, interview notes were reread to generate an initial list of potential themes to be used during the data analysis phase. The coding scheme was subsequently developed. A check for consistency of themes and codes across interviews found the data to be reliable.

In addition to the interviews, the assessment surveys were also reviewed and tabulated. After the tabulations were completed for each individual assessment, the assessment surveys were combined and retabulated to produce an aggregate

assessment. The retabulation technique to produce an aggregate assessment was done for both the former and current development officer assessments. The retabulation was calculated by adding the individual assessments to produce an aggregate result. Aggregate results were also tabulated for each group of development officers and their beliefs about their experiences with the vice presidents of development that they had served under while at the university.

<div align="center">Results</div>

The first task that we undertook was to determine if current and former development officers had differing experiences and beliefs from each other as reported by the aggregate assessment surveys. To do this, we compared the aggregate assessment surveys and compared the current and former development officer responses to the Purposes, Practices, and People portions of the survey. We focused on the differences reported in each of the four quadrants of the CVF – Compete, Create, Collaborate, and Control. This task was easily organized by using the Change and Innovation Assessment instrument, which specifically asks questions around each of the four sections of the model by requiring assessment takers to force-rank responses into each quadrant.

"Purposes" Comparison

Both the current and former development officer assessments indicated that the Control quadrant had the strongest pull. Current development officers see the university development priorities as being very metric-driven, and former development officers saw the same priorities when they were employed at the university. These findings are consistent with the interview data. Many of the comments to that effect reflected participants' reactions to the leadership under Vice President B. They strategically identified Vice President B's focus on taking complete control of all

university prospects and establishing rigid metrics for all development staff to follow. Participants spoke of Vice President B's strategy of getting out and seeing as many potential donors as possible but often complained that the strategy focused heavily on the number of prospects without regard to their giving potential or their sense of affiliation to the university. This vice president also placed a heavy emphasis on submitting as many gift proposals as possible in follow up to these visits.

Some of the development officers who currently work under Vice President C and who also worked under Vice President B also note Vice President C's orientation toward the Control quadrant. One participant noted C's focus on getting gift proposals out. Another participant described Vice President C as a "command and control" leader. All five of the current development officers in this study worked under both Vice President B and Vice President C, but most of the Control quadrant attributes coincide with Vice President B.

All of the former development officers in this study worked under Vice President A and Vice President B.   Each left during the tenure of Vice President B and indicated B's strong strategic pull toward the Control quadrant while saying very little about Vice President A's pull toward the Control quadrant. Thus, their assessment data likely refers to their experiences working with Vice President B more so than with Vice President A.

Vice President B's Control quadrant strategies were reflected in participants' comments about this person's leadership. One participant described B's leadership attitude as "[knowing] this institution better than anyone else; this is the way it's going to be done, period, end of story, there's no discussion." Another participant described B's leadership style as, "Don't talk to anyone above your level."

Both the current and former development officer assessments indicated the same weights placed on the remaining three quadrants for the Purposes section of the assessment. The Create quadrant had the second highest pull; the Compete quadrant had the third; and the Collaborate quadrant had the fourth (or lowest) pull. The interview data confirmed that the Collaborate quadrant characteristics of relationship building were a low strategic priority under both Vice President B and Vice President C, given that participants spoke heavily about the emphasis on *quantity* rather than the *quality* of prospect visits.

One of the assessment findings that seemed to conflict with the interview data was related to the emphasis on Create quadrant characteristics. Some of the former development officers spoke of a highly entrepreneurial environment under Vice President A, which is consistent with the Create quadrant. However, many of the current and former development officers spoke of a very risk averse and innovation-less environment under Vice President B, which seems to have carried over into the environment under Vice President C.

During the interviews, participants generally expressed a strong pull toward the characteristics of the Compete quadrant to varying degrees under all three vice presidents. Some of the most telling statements seemed to reflect an emphasis on competitive strategies in this university's development operation:

"At the end of the day you still have to be able to put your numbers on the board."

"It was like a sales meeting in a used car lot."

Goodwill is fine, but in the end, bringing in the money is what matters (paraphrase).

"The job is to meet with the big folks, the major players, and see if you can get the money."

Vice President B wanted a "high end shop" relative to peer universities.

"Just ask them for the money – they [already] have an affiliation."

According to the assessment data, current development officers differed from former development officers in how they would like to see *Purposes* emphasized or how they would have like to have seen them emphasized. Both current and former development officers want to see Collaborate quadrant strategies and priorities emphasized more than they are or when they worked there, but current development officers want to see a higher emphasis placed on Create quadrant strategies. Current development officers would like to see less competitive (Compete quadrant) strategies, while former development officers would liked to have seen more.

Table 1

Summary of "Purposes" assessment data

Current development officers seeing the organization now	Former development officers as they saw the organization
1. Control Quadrant	1. Control Quadrant
2. Create Quadrant	2. Create Quadrant
3. Compete Quadrant	3. Compete Quadrant
4. Collaborate Quadrant	4. Collaborate Quadrant
Current development officers how they would prefer to see the organization in the future	Former development officers how they would have preferred to see the organization when they were there
1. Create Quadrant	1. Collaborate Quadrant
2. Collaborate Quadrant	2. Compete Quadrant
3. Control Quadrant	3. Control Quadrant
4. Compete Quadrant	4. Create Quadrant

"Practices" Comparison

The assessment data shows that both the current and former development officers felt that Practices were least oriented towards the Collaborate quadrant.

Interestingly, the interview data suggested otherwise, but in a different way. In speaking about collaboration and the human side of practice, most participants spoke of a collaborative working environment among development officers within their own school or unit level, and some spoke of collaboration among schools.

Thus, collaboration was a working condition practice expressed by many, but it was not a professional practice in the context of raising money. One current development officer indicated that there was a complete lack of donors' interests being practiced. This participant said, "Everyone's just looking at the numbers and seeing people as very expendable resources" and that in some cases, there was a practice of trying to change the donor's philanthropic interest in order to put the school's needs above the donor's needs. This is consistent with the findings in the Purposes assessment data in that Collaborate quadrant characteristics showed the least pull, while Control quadrant characteristics showed the greatest pull. Thus, the competencies and day-to-day tasks of raising money were consistent with the strategies and priorities of raising money.

According to their assessment data, both current and former development officers felt that Practices should be or should have been most strongly oriented towards the Collaborate quadrant with the second strongest orientation towards the Compete quadrant. The overall desired level of pull from the Compete quadrant is higher than it currently is or was. Interview data from both current and former development officers suggested a very strong orientation towards the Compete quadrant. One former development officer described a certain competition among schools for fundraising dollars in that "each tub rested on its own bottom." From an individual development officer perspective, there was a "veiled threat" of termination if someone did not raise

enough money. One current development officer spoke of "poaching" prospects by some development officers from others as a practice while noting that other development officers were "corporate minded" and "aggressive" goal setters. Others spoke of a generally competitive atmosphere among development officers. According to interview data, however, this competitiveness appeared more often between school development officers and central development officers than it did among school development officers.

An interesting finding from the assessment data is the relatively high pull from the Create quadrant. Interview data seemed to suggest otherwise. Some former development officers spoke of an entrepreneurial environment under Vice President A that supported doing what was necessary to bring in the money. One former development officer said that the dean for whom this person worked took a similar approach. But most other development officers who worked under Vice President B or Vice President C said nothing about creativity, innovation, or entrepreneurship in day-to-day activities related to Practices. One former development officer spoke of having to engage in "hide behind the bushes innovation" while working under Vice President B. When asked about being able to be creative or innovative at work, one current development officer stated, "that's an area where we're lacking." Another current development officer stated, "It's hard to find time to be creative."

Table 2

Summary of "Practices" assessment data

Current development officers seeing the organization now	Former development officers as they saw the organization
1. Control Quadrant	1. Create Quadrant
2. Create Quadrant	2. Control Quadrant
3. Compete Quadrant	3. Compete Quadrant
4. Collaborate Quadrant	4. Collaborate Quadrant
Current development officers how they would prefer to see the organization in the future	Former development officers how they would have preferred to see the organization when they were there
1. Collaborate Quadrant	1. Collaborate Quadrant
2. Compete Quadrant	2. Compete Quadrant
3. Create Quadrant	3. Control Quadrant
4. Control Quadrant	4. Create Quadrant

"People" Comparison

The final comparison is the comparison of development officers' individual self-assessments. The current development officers showed no variation in how they see themselves now and how they see themselves in the future. Current development officers see themselves as being most strongly oriented toward the Collaborate quadrant. The interview data further supports this finding. Every current development officer described themselves to some extent as collaborative, people-focused individuals. One person was self-described as being service-oriented towards donors. Another person was a self-described bearer of "good news" about the university. One person expressed the importance of being very ethical. Current development officers were least oriented towards the Create quadrant, which was consistent with the overall lack of expression toward this quadrant during the interviews.

Former development officers were also the same in their orientation towards the Create quadrant. They differed from current development officers in that their assessment data indicated that they generally wanted to be slightly more collaborative

and slightly less competitive. Again, interview data suggested that these individuals had a strong orientation towards the Collaborate quadrant.

Table 3

Summary of "People" assessment data

Current development officers seeing themselves now	Former development officers as they saw themselves
1. Collaborate Quadrant	1. Compete Quadrant
2. Control Quadrant	2. Collaborate Quadrant
3. Compete Quadrant	3. Control Quadrant
4. Create Quadrant	4. Create Quadrant
Current development officers how they would prefer to see themselves in the future	Former development officers how they would have preferred to see themselves
1. Collaborate Quadrant	1. Collaborate Quadrant
2. Control Quadrant	2. Compete Quadrant
3. Compete Quadrant	3. Control Quadrant
4. Create Quadrant	4. Create Quadrant

Other Findings

During the interviews, participants were asked to comment on their interactions with the various presidents who were at the university. Most development officers had little, if any, contact with any of the presidents. Most of the personal contact between any of the presidents and the development officers was for the purpose of securing a major gift with an important donor.

Many comments about the presidents were likely the result of impression than actual interaction. President A and President B were not described in any meaningful detail for purposes of this research. President C was an interim leader between President B and President D and was described as such. President D was described as a "visionary" and a "dreamer" who tried to increase the university's visibility. Someone described President D's goals as unrealistic. One person described President D as "hope and hype." Another participant described President D as an individual with good people skills. Most of the qualities used to describe President D fall into the Create quadrant.

In general, this study did not indicate that presidential leadership had much of an effect on the day-to-day activities of development officers. Many day-to-day priorities were shown to have come from the various vice presidents and the deans of the schools to which participants were assigned.

Discussion and Implications

The university in this study faced a number of tensions within its development office structure that likely contributed to the problems that it now faces. Vice presidential leadership has a powerful effect on the strategy and daily activities in a development organization, even in a university that consists of decentralized schools or colleges. That effect can be so powerful that it overshadows the president's role in setting an agenda for development. Most of the data from this study came from current and former development officers who worked under Vice President B and President D. President D was oriented toward the Create quadrant of the CVF and had a subordinate vice president who was oriented toward the Control quadrant. President D's orientation appeared to have resonated less with development officers than that of Vice President B, thus creating a source of tension within the university. In other words, the president may be speaking about things one way while the vice president is interpreting things and handing down orders another way. Coupled with that tension, the individual development officers as a group appear to have a generally strong orientation toward the Collaborate quadrant. This is consistent with Greenfield's (1991) findings of why development officers end up in their careers as well Osborne's (1993) identified characteristics of a good fundraiser. As front line individuals who meet with donors, this orientation is expected. Thus, the president is oriented toward one quadrant, the

vice president is oriented toward a second quadrant, and the development officers are oriented toward a third.

The theory behind the CVF is that there will always be tensions in organizations caused by differences among people, the practices that go on every day, and the strategies that define the greater purpose. The goal is not to eliminate tensions so that everyone is oriented the same way, but rather the goal is to recognize and lead an organization that recognizes the strengths of everybody. In the university development context, the "no one size fits all approach" is consistent with Elliott's (2006) list of the various reasons why people give philanthropically. Development leaders should recognize those differences among donors as well as the differences that can emerge within the development office organization in order to effectively lead around these tensions. The interview data from this research demonstrate that such a form of leadership was absent. Instead, the university faced a series of leadership transitions in which new leaders failed to fully consider these differences and instead added to the tensions rather than leading through them.

Institutional research methods provide tools for determining the sources of tensions. This study showed how a survey assessment and interviews could be used for that purpose. Leaders have the ability to employ surveys, but they have the added advantage of being able to listen to staff and enact change, which is more than what researchers can do.

This research shows an example of a university development office that, contrary to what some of the literature suggests, focused less on the relationship aspects of fundraising and the day-to-day management of an organization and more on the metrics of the process of raising money. Ironically, the demand for metrics that Elliott (2006)

discusses helps to meet the increasing accountability standards in higher education, but too much emphasis on metrics can be a distraction from the true purpose of relationship building and fundraising. The focus on metrics at the expense of relationship building was a source of tension for the institution in this study and one that other institutions should try to manage.

This university also witnessed several shifts in leaders and leadership styles and priorities. Change is inevitable in any organization, but the concern for university development offices is that it affects the development officers who have front line contact with donors, and those donors are likely to sense when the university is struggling. A practice of going from relationship building to cold calling in order to raise money is likely to be visible to major donors, especially in a time when donors expect to be more involved with the organizations that they support. Greenfield (1991) warned of the consequences of "quick buck fundraising," which was a practice that appeared to have negative consequences for the institution in this study.

Other universities and their leaders that face similar challenges of leadership transitions, increasing demands for money, and day-to-day tensions because of differences, may want to consider using tools like the ones presented here to get a firmer grasp on their organizations. Doing so will likely put the institution on better footing with donors because the institution will have a better handle of its needs and will be better equipped to handle the variety of donors who can come to support those needs.

References

Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Buenger, V., Daft, R. L., Conlon, E. J., and Austin, J. (1996). Competing values in organizations: Contextual influences and structural consequences. *Organization Science, 7* (5), 557-576.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective.* Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Cook, W. B. (1997). Fund raising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty: 1975 to the present. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68* (1), 53-86.

Curti, M. and Nash, R. (1965). *Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

DeGraff, J. and Quinn, S. (forthcoming). *Leading innovation: How to jumpstart your organization's growth engine.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the nonprofit organization: Practices and principles.* New York: Harper Collins.

Duronio, M. A. and Loessin, B. A. (1991). *Effective fund raising in higher education: Ten success stories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Edles, L. P. (1993). *Fundraising: Hands-on tactics for nonprofit groups.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Elliott, D. (2006). *The kindness of strangers: Philanthropy and higher education.*
New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Greenfield, J. M. (1991). *Fundraising: Evaluating and managing the fund
development process.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hammack, D. C. and Young, D. R. (Eds.) (1993). *Nonprofit organizations in a market
economy: Understanding new roles, issues, and trends.* San Francisco: Jossey-
Bass.

Jacob, M. and Hellström, T. (2003). Organising the academy: New organisational
forms and the future of the university. *Higher Education Quarterly, 57* (1), 48-
66.

Lester, R. K., Piore, M. J., and Malek, K. M. (1999). Interpretive management: What
general managers can learn from design. In *Harvard Business Review on
Breakthrough Thinking.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Letts, C. W., Ryan, W. P., and Grossman, A. (1999). *High performance nonprofit
organizations: Managing upstream for greater impact.* New York: John Wiley
and Sons.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in
Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The professional bureaucracy. In M. C. Brown, II (Ed.) (2000),
Organization and governance in higher education (5th ed.) (pp. 50-70). Boston:
Pearson.

Nahm, R. and Zemsky, R. M. (1993). The role of institutional planning in fund raising.
In Worth, M. (Ed.). *Educational fund raising: Principles and practice* (pp. 57-
66). Phoenix: Oryx/American Council on Education.

Osborne, K. E. (1993). Hiring, training, and retaining development staff. In Worth, M.

(Ed.). *Educational fund raising: Principles and practice* (pp. 239-250)*.*

Phoenix: Oryx/American Council on Education.

Patton, S. L. (1993). The roles of key individuals. In Worth, M. (Ed.). *Educational fund*

raising: Principles and practice (pp. 51-56). Phoenix: Oryx/American Council

on Education.

Quinn, R. E. and Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria:

Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management*

Science, 29 (3), 363-377.

Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education.* Baltimore: Johns

Hopkins University Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In M. C.

Brown, II (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education (5th ed.)* (pp.

36-49). Boston: Pearson.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing (2nd ed.).* New York:

McGraw-Hill.

Woodring, P. (1970). *Investment in innovation: An historical appraisal of the Fund*

for the advancement of education. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.