Literature Review

Frances Huehls

is Assistant Librarian for the Joseph and Matthew Payton Philanthropic Studies Library at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. She holds master's degrees in philanthropic studies and library science, as well as a Ph.D. in Higher Education from Indiana University. Dr. Huehls is editor of *Philanthropic Studies Index*, an online periodical literature index and *PRO: Philanthropy Resources Online*, a full-text resource for the field of philanthropic studies.

The reviews for this issue cover a variety of topics: the changing roles of community colleges, university

institutional culture, integrated marketing communication, relationship marketing, and corporate strategic philanthropy.

Patricia J. Gumport (2003), "The demand-response scenario: Perspectives of community college presidents," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 586, pp. 38-61

Community colleges have responded to pressures from the higher education, government, and business sectors to move beyond the traditional functions of occupational training and helping students prepare to transfer to four-year institutions. New roles include student remediation, customized job training, and noncredit course opportunities for community members.

Flexibility has been a hallmark of the community college system and is a source of institutional pride but it has also raised questions about the mission of community colleges. Should they do whatever they are asked to do or is their effectiveness being eroded in all areas by trying to serve too many audiences? In particular, is diversity of function weakening the community college as a portal to higher education?

Research on community colleges has failed to silence many concerns. Gumport is particularly concerned with two issues:

"How do community college leaders perceive the pressures brought to bear on their colleges and the options that are available to them? What are the implications of these changing pressures and organizational responses for the identity of the community college as an educational institution?" (p. 40).

Gumport uses two constructs within institutional logic to analyze the propensity for change within public higher education. A sociological view would hypothesize that community colleges respond to external pressures in order to survive, since their mission tends to be defined within a wider sphere of academic institutions. She argues that an "industry logic," which prizes economic goals and opportunities and readily responds to market pressures, is becoming superimposed over and threatens to supersede traditional social goals. "Social institution logic" situates community colleges within education and goals that

include upward social and occupational mobility, intellectual and social education of citizens, and the transmission of national culture. The author's aim was to look at these two logics and how their somewhat divergent values play out in real life by examining the attitudes and reactions of community college presidents within the context of their institutional goals.

Community colleges in the United States evolved over the course of a century. The traditional roles of aiding student transfer and providing career training were established in the first half of the twentieth century. After World War II, they provided benefits legislated by the GI Bill and the Truman Commission on Higher Education. During the 1950s and 1960s, community colleges continued to serve the transfer function while facing increased enrollments and pressure to provide workforce training. The functions of technology training and remediation were added between 1975 and 2000.

This was all accomplished with a steadily declining share of higher education funds. Although community college accomplishments have been praised by industry and government, their presidents are constantly looking for cost savings and new nongovernmental revenue streams. Administrators are now questioning the real economic value of many initiatives, especially in view of the potentially negative impacts they may have on the academic functions of transfer and general education.

Presidents' perspectives were gathered during five, day-long focus group sessions. Thirty public college and university presidents reflected on their responses to demands for change during the 1980s and 1990s. The discussions were semistructured

to elicit the presidents' reactions to demands from external sources, how their organizations responded, and what the consequences of those decisions have been.

The expectations from outside result in "the demand-response scenario" (p. 44). Community colleges adapt to all external demands, providing workforce training, specific skills training, English as a second language, and remediation—all at affordable prices—in addition to transferable general education courses. The perception of demand is linked to the notion that community colleges are driven by money and the constant search for new sources of revenue.

The pressure to provide a wide array of services is accompanied by pressure to do everything well. All of this flexibility leads community colleges to be hybrid organizations—anchored in both K-12 and in the traditional college/university environment. The dichotomy is in both organizational form and in governance.

Some presidents resist these constant demands for change, saying that it may be necessary to say no to money in order to preserve institutional values. They say the goal should be to evaluate which demands to respond to and which to reject. Presidents described themselves as entrepreneurial, out of the box, and creative. They called upon themselves as "leaders to imagine goals and values not currently prescribed and to ignite discourse about them on their campuses" (p. 46).

Data analysis was applied to institutional logic to get a broader environmental view of demand versus what it is "possible, honorable, and necessary" to provide (p. 47). Industry logic dictates the need for wise choices but tolerates some economic risks. Social

institution logic predicates responsible action for educational goals and values. An increasingly diverse and unequal environment dictates the need to act both politically and ethically. The presidents' ability to move beyond the demand-response scenario suggests that there is more than one legitimate set of goals and responses available. Multiple logics may be playing concurrently: when industry logic gets out of hand, the mediating values of social institution logic step in as a buffer.

Gumport illustrates her theory using the functions of remedial education and workforce training. Community colleges respond to the environmental pressure to boost math and literacy skills of high-school graduates. Capping enrollments in remedial courses is a fairly common practice but seems asynchronous with the goal of providing service to all students who need it. Presidents rationalize this practice by saying that campuses should not be dominated by remedial students and that the cost of providing more sections may be too high. At the same time, access to higher education is cited as a core value and that institutions should do more marketing to make sure students know it is available. Most differentiated between access to education and access to enrollment, recognizing the need to improve retention or even say no to some students who have failed at remediation. Strategies for dealing with large numbers of remedial students—capping enrollments and limiting the number of times courses can be taken—are matched with statements about maintaining academic standards and goals while dealing with political and economic challenges.

Community colleges have also responded to environmental demands to

meet the training needs of specific companies. This practice provides enrollments for the colleges and saves money for the businesses involved. However, conflicts of interest may arise, including contractual restrictions on providing comparable training for competitor business or demands for preferential use of facilities that were provided through tax dollars. Social institution logic comes into play in these discussions through the use of language (e.g., lifelong learning) that suggests an educational purpose. Presidents encouraged employers to look at job training in terms of general education. The balance between industrial and social was also adjusted by attention to services that students need to remain enrolled, such as advising and child care. These may not be economical for the institution but are socially necessary to student success and retention. Institutions are making genuine attempts to bridge the tensions between the industry and the social.

Community colleges occupy an important space between K-12 and four-year colleges and universities. How they balance the competing demands of industry and society are important for three reasons. Who community colleges serve and what they provide will be dictated by outside forces. The definition of "public interest" may be unclear and may reflect the interests of policy makers, government agents, and business more than the "public" itself. Failure of community colleges to respond could result in losses of funding and public trust.

Accepted practices of community colleges can be explained by the existence and use of multiple logics. Community

colleges could justify a decision to rely on industry logic. Businesses, legislators, and students are generally satisfied with the job that community colleges are doing. Tenured faculty and alumni are not present to object. Still, community colleges persist in articulating an educational mission. Ultimately, they may provide universities and colleges with a

model for how to cope with competing demands.

There are high stakes for society in the direction community colleges decide to go. They are not only a significant national investment in terms of enrolled students and infrastructure but also are a venue where the American dream of equal opportunity is being played out.

Harold Silver (2003), “Does a university have a culture?”, *Studies in Higher Education*, 28, 2, pp. 157–69

Organizational culture was a topic of wide discussion during the 1980s. It was applied across all types of organizations, including universities. The dominant theme was the association of strong organizational cultures with a “shared way of thinking and a collective way of behaving” (p. 158).

Research on organizational culture primarily sought relationships between organizational structure, behavior, and marketing effectiveness. The “culture” aspect—with a few exceptions—bore no relationship to anthropology. The research on universities and colleges did reflect the use of ethnography but primarily looked at institutions as market entities. There was some attention to examining culture at the departmental and disciplinary levels.

Can the university be studied as a “unitary entity”? Silver’s purpose is to explore dimensions of this question, centering the discussion around the notion of shared values and beliefs. Universities, by virtue of their identity as social organizations, have multiple value systems, including symbolic culture, social structure, shared experiences, values

associated with higher education, and values associated with the professorate.

These multiple systems, Silver says, could easily lead to conflicts, particularly where disciplinary loyalty competes with loyalty to a specific institution. Do individuals who belong to disciplines look at themselves as belonging to a community represented by an individual institution? Which is more important—the discipline or the institution? The waters are further muddled by “culture” research on academicians that focuses on concepts such as professionalism, expertise, privilege, collegiality, and leadership. Studies of graduate school and student culture create additional dimensions. Conversely, institutional studies have often been based on theory or observation and have ignored the faculty.

Silver looks at how faculty and staff involved in teaching and learning view their institutions, rather than their departments or disciplines. The research was done in conjunction with a study of innovation in teaching that took place at 15 universities across the UK during 1997–9. The issue of organizational culture

emerged from the data of this research. Interviews were held with faculty and staff who represented a wide range of disciplines, seniority, and status levels. Five case studies of individual institutions comprised the second research phase. This included focus groups with faculty as well as interviews with vice-chancellors and senior and mid-level managers. The five case study institutions were Glasgow, Middlesex, Nottingham, Salford, and the Open University.

Respondents did not directly address the idea of institutional culture, although the notion of an institution having a “research culture” or orientation was verbalized by some. As innovators in teaching, the study participants were often met by hostility within their own departments. There was no discussion of a “culture of teaching.” Another theme that emerged was the constancy of change—particularly at the institutional level. Despite the conflicts and struggles for power that were prevalent in departments, they were also seen as a haven from institutional change. Stability was in disciplinary norms and values.

The discussions did not create a view of the university as an organization possessing “a culture that rested on a community of interest, shared norms, assumptions and even values that were clearly associated with the institution

itself” (p. 162). Silver does not connect the idea of institutional culture to academic values such as the commitment to pursue knowledge, and distinguishes between academic life and the institution—the university—that makes such a life possible. With the hesitant concession that some level of cohesion may exist among homogeneous institutions, such as the Ivies in the United States or Oxbridge in the UK, Silver systematically dismisses all studies that suggest the possibility of institutional community. Fragmentation and internal conflict, he suggests, are the norm rather than the exception.

Organizational culture can only be applied to institutions of higher education with extreme difficulty. Those researchers that have attempted it have not successfully included all players—students being the group most frequently omitted from the discussion. At best, the university can be seen as a collection of groups serving a wide variety of functions and interests.

In the end, disciplinary loyalty wins out as the source of shared beliefs and culture. Whether one views the university as anarchic or simply a place where people do not work closely and collaboratively, a unifying culture is not to be found even at the departmental level. The university as an institution, Silver concludes, does not have a culture.

Julie O’Neil (2003), “The challenge of promoting a cohesive institutional identity: An investigation of the impact of external audiences, task specialization, and the overall organization,” *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 11, 2, pp. 21–41

Integrated marketing communication (IMC) is based in the idea that organizational communication is most

effective when it is coordinated and cohesive. The conjunction of marketing, advertising, public relations, and sales

should result in a seamless focus of communication on the recipient. Achieving this end may not be simple. Organizational pressures and politics may result in communications that are more a reflection of the organization than of a focus on the recipient. This is true of nonprofit organizations—where the communicators may be volunteers—as well as commercial enterprises.

O'Neil's purpose is "to examine how communication practitioners working in dispersed departments at a large, decentralized public university—the University of Utah—construct their communication campaigns upon which the university's identity is built" (p. 21). Identity is constructed at multiple levels: external audiences, members of specific units or departments, and by organizational members as a whole. What happens when these audiences and particularly the employees of the institution have little or no contact with each other?

Identity is a social construction based in communications from the organization, including mailings, official documents, and websites, and the effect they have on organizational insiders and outsiders. Communications experts craft organizational identity, trying to create a unique but familiar image for their institution. A major goal is to personalize the institution in the face of constant organizational growth and the daily barrage of messages and communications. Consistency of the message is important. When there are specialists participating in multiple areas, it can be difficult to focus on the recipient and not the organization or even a specific department.

"Task orientation" (p. 24) may result in departmental communications that represent the department but not the

institution as a whole. This process begins when a person chooses a field of work. Some organizations actively control the socialization process of their staff. Through interacting with other people in an organization or part of an organization, a person develops a sense of the identity of that organization. Administrators may manage identity through the use of "strategic ambiguity" (p. 25)—a generalization about the institution that is widely accepted but subject to individual interpretation.

Research participants were chosen from the various communications units of University of Utah in Salt Lake City. The nine participants represented public affairs, health sciences, university publications, marketing, athletics communications, university communications, development, government and community relations, community relations, and communication and development for the Eccles Institute of Human Genetics. Although the sample of individuals was small, it was rich in individuals who were influential in their departments. The small group also made it possible to collect dense and descriptive data. During open-ended, semistructured interviews the participants rated the influence of external parties, their department, and the entire university on their communication. At the time of this study the communications units at the University of Utah were decentralized with little to no control or coordination of messages. Since completion of this study, an integrated marketing communication effort has been put in place.

Although the respondents claimed that their communications were driven by outside audiences, a deeper look showed that departmental socialization was

probably the determining factor in external communications. The university lacked a cohesive identity. Some images such as “bigness” and the status of being a “flagship” institution contained contradictions that went beyond strategic ambiguity. Bigness can bring diversity of opportunity but also may imply a sense of loneliness for students. Flagships can be prestigious but also elitist and expensive. Participants also expressed concern about contradictions in identity for the institution, further verifying that a problem existed.

It may appear to those in charge of communications that they are receiver-centered because the number of receiving audiences is so diverse. O’Neil thinks it is more likely that specialization and departmental socialization are sources of the problem. What makes the university unique in the eyes of communications staff—namely bigness and flagship status—may be negatives in the eyes of the external audiences.

The findings of this study are too

limited to generalize to other universities or even other university employees at University of Utah. Limiting factors include the possibility that participants may also have hesitated to be frank with the interviewer and the absence of viewpoints from external audiences.

There are, however, implications for other organizations. First, an integrated communication effort or “communications czar” is a strategy for getting cohesive messages to the outside. Second, for organizations that rely on public support, communications staff need to consider whether the best strategy is to educate the public about the organization’s identity or if it might be advantageous to adjust the organization to public perceptions. And finally, organizations need to know themselves before they can project a cohesive identity outward. They need to know what employees at various levels think about the organization. This can happen through communications audits and by interviewing employees.

Dennis B. Arnett, Steve D. German, and Shelby D. Hunt (2003), “The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing,” *Journal of Marketing*, 67, pp. 89–105

Today’s business environment demands that marketers develop long-term relationships with their clients that go beyond the economic exchange. Social benefits also accrue from exchanges, such as the prestige of owning a certain product or the warm glow of donating to a charitable cause. “Relationship marketing” recognizes the long-term partnerships that develop between

organizations and stakeholders. By creating value that goes beyond the economic exchange, a business may become more competitive. Research on relationship marketing focuses primarily on economic relationships that are between businesses in the profit sector.

The authors believe that relationship marketing also applies in situations where there are high levels of social exchange,

such as business marketing to consumers and marketing by nonprofit providers. However, as the context changes, the characteristics of relationship marketing may also differ from what has appeared in the research literature. Arnett, German, and Hunt propose an “identity salience model of relationship marketing success” (p. 89) which they assert is useful in understanding these social exchange venues.

Identity salience emerges from identity theory, which says that individuals have multiple ways of identifying themselves—for example, as son, parent, physician, and trustee. There is a hierarchy within this set of identities. The more important the identity is to the individual, the more likely it is to affect behavior. The authors theorize that identity salience may be particularly important in relationships that involve at least one individual and where one partner receives a significant social benefit from the transaction. For example, the purchase of a luxury automobile may provide status as well as transportation to the purchaser. Donors to nonprofit organizations may experience emotional and spiritual rewards as well as tax breaks and gift premiums.

The research model is developed for marketing higher education. The premises are that an identity is affected by the quantity and quality of interactions that affect that identity, that a specific identity is reinforced by relationships that support it, and that there may be additional extraneous factors not related to identity that also affect the success of relationship marketing. The success of relationship marketing in this context is defined as the university’s ability to successfully persuade alumnae to support and promote the institution. Six hypotheses are tested:

- university identity salience is positively related to donations,
- university identity salience is positively related to promotion of the institution,
- participation in university activities is positively related to university identity salience,
- perceived reciprocity (the extent to which the institution gives back to the donor) is positively related to university identity salience,
- perceived prestige is positively related to university identity salience,
- satisfaction with university experience is positively related to university identity salience (pp. 93–4).

Two extraneous factors considered are donor income and perceived need of the institution. Both were expected to correlate positively with alumnae giving. The results were also compared to a rival model that put more emphasis on the importance of satisfaction.

The sample was drawn from the alumnae of a large southwestern state university. A mail questionnaire was sent to representatives from the 1954, 1974, and 1994 classes. The 963 respondents represented 21.3 percent of the mailing. The questionnaire utilized a single indicator for donations and income; multi-item scales were used to measure promoting, identity salience, perceived need, reciprocity, prestige, satisfaction, and participation.

With two exceptions, the results supported the authors’ hypotheses. Perceived reciprocity was not a factor in how strongly alumnae identify with the institution. Satisfaction also does not result in higher levels of donation or of promoting the university. The role of satisfaction was particularly difficult to

interpret in this model. To increase donations, marketers should work on the ties to the institution that the alumnae identify strongly with. Additional contacts with the institution and opportunities for ongoing participation may accomplish this goal. Students should also be encouraged to create long-term ties by participation in campus activities. Prestige of the institution also increases identity salience, which results in higher levels of donations and promotion. Working to improve academic programs and support for faculty research may result in enhanced institutional prestige. The depth of identity with the institution that had developed was also a factor.

A number of limitations in the study were noted. The model would benefit from longitudinal data. The context of higher education may not apply to other nonprofit organizations. The model also does not test the effect of experiences alumnae had with the institution in the years after graduation. There are other constructs in the literature, such as commitment, trust, and communication that should be tested against the model. Finally, the model did not address or test other viable theories such as the contention that marketing concepts may be transferable from the profit to the nonprofit sector if the environments being compared are similar.

**David H. Saiia, Archie B. Carroll, and Ann K. Buchholtz (2003),
“Philanthropy as strategy: When corporate charity ‘begins at home,’”
Business & Society, 42, 2, 169–201**

Strategic philanthropy that benefits both the recipient and the corporate bottom line is a noted trend in corporate philanthropy. Saiia, Carroll, and Buchholtz view this as viable compromise between the seeming conflicts of social and fiduciary responsibilities. Pressure for higher profits and the workforce reductions that result from these pressures make it difficult for companies to justify philanthropy unless a clear connection can be made to the added value of a giving program.

Corporate giving managers lend credibility and a professional presence to the company giving program. Legitimacy comes from the careful selection of causes and issues that benefit both company and community. Giving managers who are

intent on advancing their careers are more likely to be strong advocates of strategic philanthropy.

Corporate giving is also likely to be affected by “business exposure” (p. 176) or stress factors that open a company up to criticism. These might include a wide customer base, a broad geographic market, or a product that might have use-associated risks. Higher exposure should lead to greater emphasis on strategic philanthropy.

Saiia, Carrol, and Buchholtz present the findings of their survey of corporate giving managers of US companies. Each entity had an established giving program that was at least five years old and was currently giving at least \$200,000 each year. The sample of 806 publicly traded

companies was drawn from the *Taft Corporate Giving Directory*. A survey sent to the corporate giving officer was “designed to measure his or her perceptions of the firm’s giving practices, the perceived influence of top management on giving, the perceived influence of identified components of business exposure, the degree of firm strategic orientation, and the degree of the giving manager’s career focus” (p. 176). Additional information was drawn from corporate 10K forms and the Forbes 500 database for 1997. The survey used a combination of forced choice and Likert-style six-point scale questions for main and supporting queries, respectively. Participants were assured of confidentiality. The usable responses constituted 15.6 percent or 126 firms. Many responded that their companies had a policy of not participating in surveys. Business exposure was tested by examining product, customer, and geographic mix.

In addition to specific hypotheses, the survey polled the participants on their definition of “strategic philanthropy.” The components cited by 75.6 percent of the respondents were the existence of a giving manager to coordinate the company’s philanthropy, the identification of community causes that matched the mission of the company, the utilization of other company resources in carrying out corporate philanthropy, and the

development of participation at all levels of the company. Strategic philanthropy is also driven by corporate mission, and is evaluated like other corporate units or departments.

Survey results indicate that corporate giving managers believe that their companies are following the trend toward strategic philanthropy. Top management is also requiring corporate philanthropy to account for its activities and is looking for high levels of professionalism from corporate giving managers. The extent to which a manager is focused on career advancement also positively influences the level of strategic philanthropy employed. A moderately significant relationship between business exposure and strategic philanthropy was demonstrated. Managers are more inclined toward strategic philanthropy when business exposure is high.

This research supports the idea that the nature of corporate philanthropy is adjusting to fit into an increasingly competitive marketplace. Although some researchers would contend that the idea of “strategic philanthropy” presents fiscal and social contradictions that render it invalid, the authors maintain that the paradox it presents may provide the food for thought necessary for corporate managers and executives to sort out the role of their companies in the communities where they do business.