ATHLETIC FUNDRAISING AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICES: A STRUCTURATIONAL RELATIONSHIP

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Keith Michael Dickhudt

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Major Department:
Communication

April 2010

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

ATHLETIC FUNDRAISING AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICES:

A STRUCTURATIONAL RELATIONSHIP

By

Keith M. Dickhudt

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

ABSTRACT

Dickhudt, Keith Michael; M.A.; Department of Communication; College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences; North Dakota State University; April 2010. Athletic Fundraising and University Development Offices: A Structurational Relationship. Major Professor: Dr. Paul Nelson.

This case study examines the working relationship between an athletic department and a central development office within a university. This study focuses primarily on the coordination of fundraising efforts between the two offices. A qualitative approach, using a structuration theoretical framework, presents the working relationship at Midwestern State University (MWSU) through in-depth interviews. Results suggest the two offices could improve the coordination of fundraising efforts. Recommendations, based on the results and theoretical framework, are given.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people deserve recognition and my personal gratitude for their work in the completion of this thesis. Great accomplishments are hardly ever carried out without the help of great people. I believe without the strength of the core people around me I would not have achieved my goal.

Dr. Paul Nelson, you and your wife were the deciding factor in choosing NDSU as an undergrad. My decision proved fruitful and I thank you for the six years of advising me. Your leadership, academic vision and engaging personality eased my graduate school process immensely.

Dr. Mark Meister, you sat on my committee. More importantly, you helped me to consider attending graduate school amongst other options. I'm grateful for your instruction and advice.

My immediate family, your love and support have been a rock throughout my life, and has not wavered. Mike Dickhudt, Connie Dickhudt, and Laura Burns; thank you for supporting me as I decided to seclude myself for two more years in Fargo, North Dakota. I greatly appreciate every visit, cooler of food, and you listening to me ramble about whatever roadblock my schooling or writing threw my way. I love each of you very much.

I would like to also recognize all of my instructors, individuals who participated in this study, and my close friends. The contributions and sacrifices you made, intentional or unintentional, were cornerstone in helping me build my future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

Very little research studies the importance of fundraising at a university and even less aiming at athletic fundraising (Kelly, 1991). Most studies highlight the importance of athletic success, media attention, the impact on enrollment, or the athletic department's contribution to a general university fund (Gaski & Etzel, 1987). Common knowledge and general observation show athletic fundraising is quite different than typical fundraising at a university. However, like other forms of university fundraising, athletic fundraising is critical for the success of the athletic department and the university itself.

An Athletic Director would directly benefit from understanding the relationship structure between athletic fundraising and university development offices. A great part of the Athletic Director's job is to oversee budgets and raise money (Robinson, Peterson, Tedrick, & Carpenter, 2009). A healthy relationship between the athletic department and the university development office allows the Athletic Director greater freedom to perform daily tasks. This study explores aspects of a specific relationship at a university. The understanding of which would manage the operations of an athletic department.

The athletic department needs to fit into the scope of the university, contribute to the university, and raise funds. Athletic departments are not intended to be small businesses for individual monetary gain (Sperber, 1990). Rather, athletic departments are intended to reflect the university as part of its greater system. Annual contributions to the university come in three ways: money, image, and recruitment. Athletic departments yield profits stemming from ticket sales revenue and donations. The institution's image is reflected, positively and negatively, though media exposure, face recognition, and competitive performance (Sperber, 1990). Recruitment of students benefits both the athletic department and the university as one receives an athlete to perform and the latter receives a student for the state to fund (Breneman, 1981). Recruiting students is a very small form of fundraising for the athletic department. Major donations and ticket sales, as mentioned before, are the primary fundraising efforts (Marciani, 1991; Stier, 1992).

The costs for an athletic department are much greater than other departments (Sperber, 1990). Coaches' salaries, travel budgets, advertising budgets, and scholarships are some of the major costs to run an athletic department (Jones,[1] Personal Communication, October 2, 2009.) More so, concerns over escalating costs and renewed concern over mandated Title IX programming has increased the need for outside resources.

Athletic departments raise funds to combat the growing expenses. Athletic Directors have become increasingly aware and talented in fundraising (Stier, 1992). Athletic directors create positions and hire based on the ability to raise funds. Fundraisers need to have a deep understanding of the political, economic, and social context in which they function (Slack, 1991). Fund raisers must develop an appreciation for the complex relationships, processes, and environmental forces that impact fundraising.

A link exists between successful athletic programs and internal fundraising programs (Stier, 1992). The greater the fundraising effort is, the greater the impact is on the athletic department through allocation of money, services, and goods for

---

[1] Interview names have been changed to ensure confidentiality. Jones has extensive knowledge and experience in administration for several athletic departments including at least one in the Midwest.

individual programs. Why athletic departments would raise funds with vigor is obvious. Yet despite the potential for monetary gain for the university, the greatest frustration for athletic fundraisers is the relationship between the athletic department and the university itself (Marciani, 1991; Walker, 1994). Athletic fundraisers reported this relationship is the biggest challenge and identified key issues including lack of communication (Walker, 1994). The relationship between the athletic department and the university is of critical significance to the athletic fundraising effort (Walker, 1994).

Midwestern State University (MWSU)[2] faces the same challenge. The working relationship at MWSU is defined between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department. The current situation has reported great improvement over the last couple years, but both offices admit imperfections. Research shows fundraising efforts are typically more ambitious in athletic departments and deploy more beneficial persuasive tactics for the donor (Stinson & Howell, 2004). Also, in MWSU's case, the Athletic Department and Development Foundation strive for different goals which explain competition for specific donors. Some self-reported instances list when the Athletic Department can talk to a potential donor (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009) and another details the donating strategy for the potential donation (Erickson,[3] 2009). All of the instances reported reflect the conclusions from current literature (Walker, 1994).

The researcher was in a unique situation during this study. The researcher

---

[2] MWSU masks the identity of a mid-sized, Midwestern university in this study.

[3] Erickson's (also a pseudonym) career has spent in an athletic department as either a basketball coach or, for more than the past ten years, as a fundraiser.

- had a unique opportunity to study the communication between MWSU athletic fundraising and the university's development office;
- worked in the athletic department for the men's basketball team at the time of the study, and had for five years prior to the study;
- maintained a working relationship with the Athletic Director and several members of MWSU's administration;
- has experienced how fundraising develops from concept to action;
- gained the trust and respect of many key people involved in fundraising for MWSU on the athletic and development sides of the university.

The basic understanding and professional relationships granted access to research and information many other individuals would not have been granted. The researcher's position is unique. The researcher used this opportunity, along with the study of communication theory, to understand the structure of communication between the Athletic Department and MWSU's Development Foundation.

Structuration Theory, created by Anthony Giddens (1984), has several elements that can help to identify the relationship between the Athletic Department and the Development Foundation. Structuration theory's elements of structure, systems, rules, resources, agency, production, reproduction, and transformation are present in the case previously described. This study will examine the current relationship between the Athletic Department and the Development Foundation at MWSU through application of Structuration Theory.

The end result will provide scope to questions about the commonly cited faulty relationships.

CHAPTER TWO. LITERATURE REVIEW

The most reported challenge athletic director's face is the conflict between athletic fundraising and university development offices. No clear uniform structure has been identified for various reasons and obstacles. Clearly, each university has a unique allotment of resources and personnel, but the relationship between the athletic fundraising office and the university is an opportunity for increased clarity. The following literature looks at the current state of athletic departments, athletic director's responsibilities, and the reported status of the relationships between athletic department's fundraising efforts and university development offices.

An Athletic Director must be able to fundraise in today's university system (Walker, 1994). Many researchers have studied the financial effect of an athletic department on a university (Branch, 1990; Marciani, 1991; Stier, 1992; Robinson, Peterson, Tedrick, & Carpenter, 2003; Walker, 1994). Most researchers agree the most common complaint Athletic Directors have is the miscommunication between the athletic department and the central fundraising effort for the university. However, little research attempts to understand the communication between the athletic department and the central fundraising effort for the university. The following section will provide a review of the literature to situate the position of the athletic department and fundraising.

Murray Sperber (1990) published a fundamental book that changed the focus of the modern athletic department. Sperber was an associate professor at the University of Indiana and a former sports writer when he researched university athletic departments and student-athletes. *College Sports INC.: The Athletic Department VS. the University* investigated collegiate athletics and the monetary effects of a university. Sperber found five percent of American universities at the time operated on a profit. He argued athletic departments are forced to cover the loss by administering excessive student activity fees, accepting donations from local citizens, creating expensive ticket prices, and accepting state subsidies. Athletic departments, Sperber argues, operate more like small independent organizations rather than university departments. Although the main focus of the controversial book is to highlight the role of the student-athlete, Sperber outlines the role of the athletic department effectively.

The athletic director, a significant position for the athletic department, has not been studied closely in recent literature. Dallas Branch (1990) sought to find patterns of leadership behavior of athletic directors in terms of "consideration" and "initiating structure." He aimed to see if the position was more of administrative or as a leader. A mixed method approach of survey analysis and interpersonal interviews found the desire to initiate structure within an organization ranking as more importance than leadership. Robinson, Peterson, Tedrick, and Carpenter (2003) found through a survey of athletic directors that budget and finance troubles were the highest ranked negative aspect of the job. The desire for more financial resources was also a top complaint for many athletic directors showing the importance of fundraising to the job.

Athletic departments do not put the athletic director in charge of fundraising for the entire department for the task would be too demanding. Rather, the athletic department, in most cases, creates positions for fundraising within the department (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009). The recruiting coordinator can respond directly to the Athletic Director, the university, or a combination (Erickson, Personal Communication, October 13, 2009). Universities and athletic departments arrange fundraising offices to suit the personal, resources, and needs (Erickson, Personal Communication, October 13, 2009; Peterson,[4] Personal Communication, October 20, 2009).

A few studies in the early 1990s attempted to define athletic fundraising (Stier, 1992; Walker 1994, Marciani, 1992). These studies looked at athletics from a variety of angles. Stier (1992) described characteristics of athletic fundraising components and those of successful athletic fundraisers. Walker (1994) described a typical program of athletic fundraising at a Division I level. Marciani (1991) described the same efforts at a Division II university.

Stier (1992) discussed the need to increase efforts in athletic fundraising. More importantly, Stier defined the following the qualities of a successful fundraiser: basic skills, dedication, positive image, technical ability, interpersonal skills, and conceptual skills. Said skills were used in tasks such as: solicitation, sponsorship, sales, and special projects. Additional factors Stier defined were competency of personnel, utilization of fundraising activities, and efficient acquisition of actual resources including cash, goods, or services.

Walker (1994) looked at the management responsibilities of the athletic fundraiser. Walker found that the responsibility to fundraise for the athletic department is shared with a development office for the university such as a foundation. Almost half of the schools reported a shared responsibility. Thirty-five percent of schools reported the development office plays a role in managing the

---

[4] Peterson also has spent a majority of their career in the athletic department. Their majority was in coaching basketball before changing roles in 2008 to begin fundraising.

athletic department fundraising. Athletic fundraisers reported the development office impeded success, and this conflict is the biggest challenge faced on a daily basis. Marciani (1991) reported the same results at Division II universities. The research showed the "most serious concern (of athletic fundraisers), cited by 49 percent, was increased conflict with university or college development offices" (p. 52).

This review of existing literature of athletics and fundraising shows critical areas for research. Existing studies, although few aimed at theory building, show the need to understand the relationship between athletic fundraising and university development offices (Kelly, 1991). University athletics and development offices have a unique opportunity for connected development. A clear understanding of a universal applicable framework for communication is necessary to coordinate advanced athletic fundraising programs.

CHAPTER THREE. THEORY AND METHOD

The following section examines Structuration Theory in three ways. First, structuration is outlined holistically while specifically focusing on the aspects of Gidden's (1984) broad theory. Second, Structuration Theory is listed and defined according to the specific aspects related to greater understanding. Third, background information about athletic fundraising at MWSU is provided for later application. This section includes recent applications of Structuration Theory in research and a proposed method for research. The literature is discussed to provide examples of Giddens' (1984) theory in modern situations to validate the aspects chosen for this study. Last, a proposed method to study the communication between the Athletic Department and the Development Foundation at MWSU is detailed.

Structuration Theory

Giddens has published many works dedicated to organizational communication and social sciences (Giddens, 1976; 1979; 1984; 1987; 2005). He is especially known for his creation of Structuration Theory. Giddens' work would be heralded as a far more profound and defining communication theory except some critics find the theory too broad (Craib, 1992; Macintosh & Scapens, 1991). Giddens' 1984 book, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structure,* provided theoretical structure for many researchers to study the duality of structure and agency, or people, in organizations (Banks & Riley, 1993; Bates & Harvey, 1975; DeSanctis & Poole, 1994; Gynnild, 2002; Macintosh & Scapens, 1991; Norton, 2007; Poole, Siebold, & McPhee, 1985; Poole & McPhee, 1985; Pozzebon & Pinsonneault, 1985). Yates and Orlikowski describe Structuration

Theory as the use of rules to enact production, reproduction, and transformation of social institutions (1992). Macintosh and Scapens (1991) say Giddens' aim was to:

> Erect a conceptual apparatus that not only explained social institutions but also included a way of understanding the conditions for this transformation. (p. 135)

The rules shape the individual's actions (described later as *agency*) within the organization. The processes of repeating the rules or rejecting the rules reaffirm or modify the institution in an ongoing, recursive interaction. Poole and McPhee (2005) defined structuration theory as follows:

> Structuration theory encompasses both social structure and human action in common framework that could explain individual behavior and the development and effects of social institutions such as the economy, religion, and government. Structuration Theory combines social structure and human action while emphasizing the role of processes in the constitution of society. (p. 173)

The breadth of Giddens' work is demonstrated through its application in research. Many authors cite Giddens but choose only specific aspects of his theory for their work (Sewell, 1992; Wheeler-Brooks, 2009, Wittington, 1992; Yates & Orlkowski, 1992). Gidden's work, holistically or in sections, provides a theoretical basis for organizational communication.

This study used several components of Giddens' Structuration Theory. Definitions and working examples of each provide a general understanding of how the components harmonize theoretically. The components described are: *structure, systems, rules, resources, agency, production, reproduction and transformation.*

Giddens' original work (1984) is used as well as current applications of his theory as references for the theoretical framework.

Structure and System

The very root of Giddens' Structuration Theory is the term *structure*. *Structure* by definition is "(the) rules and resources recursively implicated in reproduction of social systems. Structure exists only as memory traces, the organic basis of human knowledgeability, and instituted in action" (Giddens, 1984, p. 6). Macintosh and Scapens (1991) refer to structure as the "codes, templates, blueprints, rules, or formulas that shape and program social behavior and provide for the binding of social practices across time and space" (p. 136). Essentially structure is the components and framework of an organization (Poole & McPhee 2005; Witmer, 1997). Structure, in Giddens' theory, does not indicate event times nor is it an itinerary for daily interaction. Rather, structure rationalizes social interaction and indicates and predicts observable patterns. The rules and resources for structure are in the agents' heads (Jones & Karsten, 2008).We have no handbook of hierarchy to guide in application of *structure*, but the repetition of human practices (patterns of activity meaningful for those engaged) define and determine a consensus structure (Poole & McPhee, 2005). A worker does not need to relearn responsibilities in relation to a boss everyday because a worker understands the role within the structure of the organization. Job descriptions are a precursor to the rules and resources needed to perform within a system, whereas the hierarchy within the organization is inherently understood.

The component of *system* in Giddens' theory refers to the relational component between those engaged. Rose (2005) defines *system* as "rational patterns consisting of concrete social practices (regularly occurring activities recognized by organizational members) such as an organizational status hierarchy or organizational chart" (p.22). Here the social and practical hierarchy is clearly stated and abided. Human interaction, such as the types of questions and topics discussed between parties, is predictably related to the organizational system. An employee would not typically approach an employer with discussions about everyday mundane tasks as they would a co-worker (Wittington, 1992). Hierarchical positions, vertically and horizontally related, give reason for social interaction. Observable human patterns outlay the basis of any organizational system.

Rules and Resources

Rules and resources are the tools for the characters in Giddens' theory to perform their tasks. Rules and resources outline the capabilities of the individual to perform specific tasks and give reason and rational for the organizational system.

Rules. *Rules* are defined by Giddens as "techniques or generalizable procedures that individuals access when they want to understand or sanction each other in concrete interaction situations" (1984, p. 175). Rules are a methodological system of events that are followed and enforced by either a positive or negative consequence. Poole and McPhee describe rules as principles that guide people's actions (2005). The level of adherence and enforcement varies among organizations demonstrated through repeated actions related to socially understood rules. Rules are often understood as an acceptable process for completing a task rather than a list of commandments. For instance, Yates and Orlikowski relate rules to *genres*, a term familiar to rhetorical analysis (1992). They argue organizations have genres embedded into daily communication such as memos, electronic mail, and business letters. Professional training produces an acceptable format for a business e-mail, or the genre of professional e-mail. The concept of rules within an organization follow the same pattern of genre just as everyone in an office would agree on how to write a professional e-mail.

Resources. The physical and non-physical tools for practice are considered the *resources* (Poole & McPhee, 2005, p. 174). The physical tools for someone within an organization are money, transportation, technology, and every other material object available for assistance. Some organizations may have more resources than others making similar positions at different at each organization. The non-physical resources are the amount of knowledge about a particular trait, degree of schooling an individual completed, amount of skill a person obtains, extent of an individual's vocabulary, and other aspects that can be used in action. Resources are constantly in flux because of availability renewal. Physical resources have a tendency to need to be monitored and constantly replaced while non-physical resources grow over time though experience and research (Poole & McPhee, 2005).

Agency and Ontological Security

Giddens' stance on human interaction and human's ability to think freely differs with other theorists in relation to the effect on daily performance and routine. Giddens labels the humanness of people's actions as *agency*. Macintosh and Scapens (1991) add "Agency is the ability of individuals to be purposive in social settings" (p. 136). Essentially, *agency* is the flow or pattern of people's actions (Pozzeboc & Pinsonneault, 2005). Agency is not intended to understand why an individual makes one decision but rather why a person repeats or acts a specific way over a period of time. Poole and McPhee (2005) argue that humans have three levels of consciousness in relation to agency: discursive consciences, practical knowledge, and unconscious.

First, discursive consciences are the things able to be put into words. Giddens (1984, p. 23) says the "discursive formation of a rule is already an interpretation of it." Such things are the rules and resources a worker can recite – *I have to be to work by 9:00 a.m.*

Second, practical knowledge includes the experiences and abilities not easily described by words – *ability to type 70 words per minute or understand the mood the boss is in by looking at his or her face.*

Third, the unconscious level represents prior experiences that shape actions unknowingly such as childhood experiences that shape current actions. The routinization of daily events mixed with prior knowledge encompass a person's ontological security (Norton, 2007). Here, a person's worldview enters into daily actions and effects agency.

Poole and McPhee (2005) also point out that agents are knowledgeable and reflexively monitor their conduct. Agents understand their surroundings and through repetition and use are able to discover quirks about their environment. A person may not know how to do a specific task, but through experience and several interactions will know who to ask to find the answer. Agents also are aware of their interactions as well as others through a process Giddens calls reflexively monitoring (2005). Poole and McPhee summarize Giddens' *reflexive monitoring* as "gathering information about operations and using information to change to become more efficient" (2005). Individuals can plan out a work week through the prior knowledge. They may remember past experience with a particular co-worker was a positive experience, so they will approach the same co-worker with similar problems in the future, or vice versa. Giddens does not believe groups are agents, only individuals. However, he admits organizations can participate in this behavior which he labels "institutional reflexivity" (1991, p. 243).

Sociologist Alfred Schutz contributed to the meaning of action in agency. Schutz describes two attributes for agency as motives, the general because-motive and in-order-to motive. The difference between the two motives lies in the intention. A general because-motive reacts on events out of past experiences. In-order-to motive reacts to accomplish a future task (Shutz, 1967). For example, a person is walking out the door, and they see it is raining. Before leaving, the person opens an umbrella. The friend observes the decision and asks, "why did you open the umbrella?" Unconsciously, the friend just asked the person's motives for opening the umbrella. If the person acted out of general because motives the response would be: "I opened my umbrella because it is raining." Meaning, the person remembered last time he or she walked in the rain without an umbrella and did not like the experience. However, if the person would have responded, "I'm opening my umbrella so my shirt doesn't get wet," he or she would have answered in an in-order-to motive. The second answer saw the rain, predicted the shirt would become wet, and acted accordingly (Aranzadi, Rodriguez, Turmo, & Vara, 2009). Two very different motives for the same action help to describe *agency*.

Production, Reproduction, and Transformation

The prior components entail an organization and a holistic snapshot. The components, however, do not describe the ongoing process as an interactive model. Giddens acknowledges that to keep the system going we must *produce* and *reproduce* through accepting or rejecting the rules though episodes. Poole and McPhee describe the process of producing as positively affirming the rules through episodes and reproducing by repeating the process. Every action, every episode of interaction, produces actions which it is part and reproduce the system and its structure typically through small gradual changes (2005). A negative outcome, such as rejecting the action, causes a *transformation* of the system or structure.

Applied Structuration Theory

The elements described above are the aspects of structuration applied to this study. They are not all separate elements but work together to create a working body. An agent acts upon a structure within a system recalling resources to produce, reproduce, or transform rules. Hierarchy is explained though the agents who follow rules of communication with other agents whose individual structure is defined within the working system. Structuration theory, understood by these terms taken from Giddens (1984), applies to fundraising at the university level.

University Athletic Department Fundraising

Universities need fundraising to remain functional. Many studies show the different forms of campaigns universities deploy as a method to fund the costs of running a university (Marciani,1991; Sperber, 1990; Stier, 1992; Walker, 1994). Many universities call on the image of the athletic department as a fundraising strategy. Most universities even require the athletic department to have its own fundraising system. A study showed that 88 percent of Division I institutions required an internal athletic fundraising program (Walker, 1994).

The structure for fundraising at any given university is unique (Stinson & Howard, 2004; Peterson, Personal Communication, October 20, 2009; Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009). Some structures may be similar in theory, but are different in application. Universities typically do not know how other universities deploy fundraising strategies and systems. A system for each university is inherently unique because the system needs to fit the personnel involved (Peterson, Personal Communication, October 20, 2009). The potential for a university's monetary gain is earmarked within the university system and its long-term plan.

Midwestern State University's Structure

MWSU has a central governing body for fundraising titled the Development Foundation. The mission statement for the Development Foundation, summarized on its website, is "to raise, manage, and disburse contributions for the benefit of Midwestern State University" (MWSU, 2009). Further elaboration is as follows:

> We work in close collaboration with faculty, staff, students, and alumni, along with business, industry, and the community, to best understand and represent common interests. With the needs of the entire university in mind, we efficiently and effectively raise funds, manage assets, and administer other privately funded resources to stimulate continued development at MWSU. (MWSU, 2009)

The Development Foundation oversees all departments including the Athletic Department.

The Athletic Department responds, in fundraising terms, indirectly to the Development Foundation (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009; Peterson, Personal Communication, October 20, 2009). The Athletic Department is in charge of funding its own department just as any other department in the university. Also, the money raised by the Athletic Department is sent to the Development Foundation. However, the offices do not have to be in unison for fundraising projects, but it is in both offices' benefit to do so. The Athletic Department at MWSU produces intercollegiate athletics for 16 Division I athletics. The challenges are unique when compared to an academic department because competition rather than education is the primary focus (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009).

The challenges athletic departments face range from simple to complex. The athletic department needs to fit into the scope of the university, contribute to the university, and raise funds. Athletic departments, contrary to popular belief, are not intended to be small businesses for individual monetary gain (Sperber, 1990) Rather, athletic departments are intended to reflect the university as part of its greater system.

Annual contributions the athletic department come in three ways: money, image, and recruitment. Athletic departments yield profits stemming from ticket sales revenue and donations. The image is reflected, positively and negatively, though media exposure, face recognition, and competitive performance (Sperber, 1990). Recruitment of students benefits both the Athletic Department and the university as the athletic department receives an athlete to perform and the university receives a student for the state to fund (Breneman, 1981). Recruiting students does not make money nor does it factor in fundraising for the athletic department. Major donations and ticket sales, as mentioned before, are the primary fundraising efforts (Marciani, 1991; Stier, 1992).

The costs for an athletic department are very large compared to those of other departments (Sperber, 1990) Coaches' salaries, travel budgets, advertising budgets, and scholarships are some of the major costs in running an Athletic Department (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009). More so, concerns over escalating costs and renewed concern over mandated Title IX programming has increased the need for outside resources to effectively run an athletic department.

MWSU created a non-profit organization called TeamMakers to help fundraising efforts. Donors may join by agreeing to donate money to the university. Different amounts of donated money move a person higher in the program which designates greater personal benefits (MWSUA, 2009). Some benefits include season ticket guarantees, meetings with players and coaches, and lunch meetings with other members.

The two athletic department goals for fundraising at MWSU are to sustain and improve. The athletic department needs to have enough money to fund the yearly costs described above. Adequate money will allow the department to function as usual; insufficient funds would require changes including possible cut backs or even elimination of individual athletic programs. Another goal is to improve on the programs' current status. More incoming money would increase the annual budget and allow programs to recruit more notable coaches, recruit more athletes, travel with greater luxury, and build better facilities. All factors listed previously help improve the chances a program is successful in competition.

Development Foundation and Athletic Department Relationship

This study grows from previous literature that suggests an element of miscommunication between an Athletic Department and the university's governing body (Marciani, 1991; Walker, 1994). Fundraisers for the athletic departments cite this relationship as the most problematic element of their job. Several report a lack of communication (Walker, 1994) between the two offices. The lack of communication negatively impacts both offices, not just the athletic department. The severity of the discrepancies is growing (Marciani, 1991). Some even suggest improving the communication would greatly benefit the university fundraising potential (Walker, 1994).

Personal interviews at MWSU confirmed this discrepancy (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009; Erickson, Personal Communication, October 13, 2009). Two employees highly involved in fundraising for the Athletic Department felt there was room for improvement in the communication between their department and the university's fundraising body, the Development Foundation. Both cited issues in the process of identifying specific donors to address in a timely manner and the actual plan of donation for specific donors. Studies have shown athletic fundraising has involvement models different than regular university approaches (Stinson & Howard, 2004). The employees said frustration over the system of approaching donors was a problem for MWSU athletic fundraising. Their testimony echoes that of published literature.

Midwestern State University faces the same challenge. The miscommunication at MWSU stems from the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department not always having the same vision for fundraising. Fundraising efforts are typically greater in Athletic Departments, as proven through research, and deploy more beneficial persuasive tactics for the donor (Stinson & Howell, 2004). MWSU's Athletic Department and Development Foundation strive for different goals which explain the miscommunication over the donors. Some instances reported concern when the Athletic Department can talk to a potential donor (Jones, Personal Communication, October 2, 2009) and another details the donating strategy for the potential donation (Inniger, 2009). All of the instances reflect the studied literature (Walker, 1994).

Structuration Theory in Fundraising

The elements of Giddens' theory, discussed earlier, are logical for examining the communication between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department fundraising. The elements in relation to this study are: *systems, rules, structure, resources, agency, and production*. Each specifically relate to the study in a unique way. The *system,* by definition, encompasses the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department fundraising efforts including the non-profit organization Team Makers. The *rules*, by definition, represent the process of discovering and approaching donors as well as deciding how much to ask for in a donation. *Agency*, by definition, represents the individuals employed by MWSU who embark in fundraising efforts. The *structure,* by definition, represents the agents' job expectations including adherence to rules. *Resources,* by definition, are the budgets, knowledge, personal contacts, and other methods for gainful use toward fundraising. *Production, reproduction, and transformation* are the processes; agents use resources to adhere to the system.

Structuration is too broad of a theory to apply to this work. Many researchers, as stated before, only choose part of the theory to analyze. The following two examples illustrate how different researchers have used saturation theory in recent literature. The examples will analyze a) the Structuration Theory components used, b) the method for applying Structuration Theory, and c) the results of the study. These examples will justify the method for this study explained in the next chapter. The two examples are: Olufowote's 2009 article on informed consent to treatment and, Schewiger, Melcher, Ranganthhan, and Wen's 2004 article on electronic billing systems.

First, Olufowote examines the discursive and theoretical perspective of informed consent (IC) to medical patients. The Structuration Theory elements focused on were: reproduction, transformation, systems, agency, rules, and resources. Olufowote described the interaction of the components as:

> The reproduction and transformation of systems—societies, network formations, social movements, organizations, and groups through interacting agents' (re)productive and transformative appropriations of the rules and resources. Rules and resources are recipes for acting, which enable social action and actors' dominion over each other and the material world. (2009, p. 804)

The study's research questions were as follows:

1) In practitioners' interpretive schemes, what, if any, is the available evidence for the production and reproduction of IC's traditionalist structure?

2) In practitioners' interpretive schemes, what, if any, is the available evidence for the production and reproduction of IC's liability structure?

3) In practitioners' interpretive schemes, what, if any, is the available evidence for the production and reproduction of IC's decision-making structure?

The study recruited 15 patients for three focus group interviews. The researcher who moderated the group interviews used a semi-structured interview protocol with open-ended questions on their general experiences with IC, their thoughts and opinions about IC, and their vision for IC. Transcripts were written verbatim and interpreted with a popular social scientific qualitative method. The focus groups with radiologists found administers to be producing and reproducing structures in their interpretive schemes of patients' reactions to IC, IC as protective paperwork, and IC as a patient- and relationship-centered process.

In the second study, Schewiger, Melcher, Ranganthhan, and Wen (2004) used Structuration Theory to identify potential changes in information technology. The Structuration Theory elements used were primarily agency and reproduction. The article cited DeSanctis and Poole (1994) many times for the use of structure.

The method used case studies and chose a multi-office family practice in the Midwest. The study focused on a five-year growth in which the organization implemented a new billing system application. The study interviewed and observed many of the organization's offices to understand how the new system was accepted. Though participant-observation the researcher took part in the billing process at one of the clinics and used the software.

Application of the model through case study analysis verified the interconnected relationships between advanced information technology and the external sources of structure on the technology application process. In short, the system was easier to understand after the agents tried and reproduced the new system. The study discovered new rules, resources, and a new system (2004, p. 242).

Method

The following section will explain the rationale and procedure for the method of analysis in this study. First, I describe rational for the case study format. Second, I describe rational for in-depth interviews as method for data collection. Last, the design of the case study which includes a description of the participants, instruments, procedures, data collection, and data analysis. The method for this study was designed in accordance with several popular qualitative method reference materials (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2005; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002; van Manen, 1997).

Case Study

This study used a case study format to examine a specific relationship between a development foundation and an athletic department. MWSU was chosen because of the researcher's previous working relationship with the two departments at the university. The following section will explain why a case study is relevant and why this case is suited with academic rigor. Published examples of how case studies have been used provide suggestions for effectively writing a case study. The findings reflect the chosen case study. This rationale will justify the case study format.

Case studies are often used in qualitative research. Many scholars with an array of prestige have developed theory from a case example in many scenarios.

Often, case studies are considered to be some of the "most interesting" qualitative research (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). In Siggelkow's opinion, "it is much harder to make a paper interesting whose findings or conclusions only address theory. A paper should allow a reader to see the world, and not just the literature, in a new way" (2007, p. 23). A case study is often used when a particular phenomenon is present in an interesting way.

Authors have discussed how to use case studies properly. Siggelkow makes three charges about case studies to explain their effectiveness. First, the author must have a meaningful topic to derive excitement rather than simply describe an event based on a large sample. Secondly, authors too often try to defend the sample size and seek a "representative sample" to a fault. Siggelkow explains, "In fact, it is often desirable to choose a particular organization precisely because it is very special in the sense of allowing one to gain certain insights that other organizations would not be able to provide" (p. 21). Lastly, a case study requires conceptual insight; it cannot be only a descriptive analysis. Siggelkow (2007) offered general guidelines to effectively write a case example.

The chosen case fits the described criteria. MWSU and the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department is the chosen case. The geographic area surrounding MWSU has several other colleges and universities to chose and the study could have also conducted a cross examination of the colleges to compare relationships. However, a larger sample would not have reflected the interesting phenomenon. Rather, a focus only on MWSU exemplifies theoretical examples, mainly Structuration Theory, and an interesting dynamic which reflects literature. The four individuals selected for the case evenly reflect both sides of the working relationship of two small working units (how and why the four individuals were chosen are described later). Conceptual insight previously described in this chapter constructs the phenomenon. The event is not only described as it currently is, but the study will offer insight based on research and data. The chosen case fits the research-generated definition of a case study and the critiques for an effective case study.

In-depth Interviews

The in-depth interview method for a case study can help the researcher understand the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department. The description of the relationship by those immersed in the phenomenon provides an aide to the understanding of the working relationship based on the emergent data (Knapik, 2006). The interview, when done ethically, provides a unique opportunity for the researcher to discover personal testimonies. The results from the interviews provide data for the case study.

The in-depth interview offers several ethical challenges for the researcher. Brinkmann and Kvale state the challenges surpass respecting the subjects, but also includes respecting the context of the research (2005, p.162). Respecting the interviewee is a task often stressed, typically with strict IRB regulations and procedures. However, qualitative studies provide easy outlets to stretch the context of a study through data manipulation. Some power characteristics can interfere with the ethical standards for qualitative research. However, the interviewer must hold power control (meaning the interviewer must regulate the interview) in order to conduct an in-depth interview. Brinkmann and Kvale state the interviewer may manipulate the dialogue to follow the research design, remain the leader of the conversation, and hold a monopoly on the interpretation of the interviewee (2005). The researcher must understand the line between ethical and unethical power control over an interview. The in-depth interviews followed ethical standards though understanding the proper interviewing method.

The study consisted of four semistructured in-depth interviews and used eight open-ended questions per interview. The questions were designed to reveal different aspects of the structure of each individual office as well as the working relationship. The open-ended questions allowed the researcher to elicit narratives from the interviewee to use as examples for the data. Also, the semistructured design allowed the researcher to communicate with the interviewee for clarification or further probing to ensure data saturation (Tanggaard, 2008). The interview outline is included in Appendix A. The sample size was determined based on the scope of the research, accessibility of participants, and the number of potential participants (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The researcher examined the working relationship of the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU. The researcher spoke with four of the nine possible candidates that represent this relationship.

Design

The research design for this case study involves in-depth interviews. This section will describe the participants, instruments, data collection, and data analysis used for the case study. The research design was also inspired by recent and commonly used qualitative resources (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Knapik, 2006; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002; & van Manen, 1997).

Participants

This study used a theoretical construct sample (N=4) to represent the relationship. The theoretical construct sample was chosen based on this study's theoretical interest, structuration theory (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The participants in this study were all Midwestern State University (MWSU) employees, which is a Division I institution. Two participants were from the Development Foundation and two were from the Athletic Department. Each side of the relationship was represented by a coordinator and a solicitor. A coordinator, described later in detail, oversees the office and fundraising efforts. A solicitor, later termed an "asker" will do most of the fundraising. A solicitor responds directly to the corresponding coordinator. Each of the participants has worked with each other for more than five years. The participants were selected through the researcher's longstanding personal connections to the offices. Each participant was granted anonymity as per IRB requirements. All participants are given pseudonyms and their quotations are disguised. The following are pseudonyms: Alex Jones, Kelly Smith, Casey Johnson, and Jamie Erickson.

Instruments

This study used three instruments for data collection. First, background information about the current working relationship was gathered from members of both sides. Information sought in these meetings helped construct a theoretical background. Participants in these meetings were not all used for later interviews. Second, the researcher conducted another informal meeting with each participant who would be used for the formal in-depth interviews. These interviews were used to help establish, or reestablish, a connection between the interviewer and the interviewee as well as design an interview guide.

The third instrument was the interview guide for each participant. An interview guide is a "grouping of topics and questions that the interviewer can ask in different ways for different participants" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p.195). An interview guide highlights the importance of topics and level of responses. Each participant was asked about the same topics in similar ways as suggested by Lindlof & Taylor (2002). All questions were open-ended but were specific to guide the conversation such as, "Can you tell me about a specific time when you and (the other office) were interested in the same donor?"

Procedures

The study consisted of four in-depth interviews with four different participants (one coordinator and one solicitor for each office) to describe the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU. The interviews were conducted to understand the structure of the working relationship of the particular case. Keyton (2006) stated each situation is dynamic and gives no number for a sample for qualitative interviews. The availability of the participants and the amount of data to reach saturation were the criteria to select participants. Saturation point is reached when "no new information or themes are observed in the data" (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The interviewer used an interview guide and tape recorded each in-depth interview. Only the formal in-depth interviews with the interview guide were tape recorded. Proper Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines were achieved and followed during this study.

The researcher met with both offices, including people outside of the four primary participants, to understand background information about the working relationship between the two offices. The researcher then met informally with each primary participant to familiarize with each party and gather background information needed to form the interview guide. The researcher met once again with each participant in a formal setting and tape recorded the in-depth interview. Each participant was interviewed in his or her own, personal office with no other person present. Each interview lasted between 40-45 minutes. The time span between the first and last formal in-depth interview was three days.

Data Collection

The interviewer made audio recordings of each interview with a digital recorder. The recorder, with the recordings on it, was locked in a desk at all times when not being utilized in accordance with IRB regulations. Only the researcher and the faculty advisor had access to the recorder. The recordings were later used as the original transcript for transcribing data onto a word processor. The transcripts and the recorder were always safely locked when not used.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

All four interviews were transcribed verbatim from audio to text onto a computer for analysis. The document resulted in 1,063 lines of text. The primary researcher transcribed each interview. The primary researcher read each transcript several times to ensure accuracy. Each transcript was sent to the corresponding interviewee to double check accuracy of facts and completeness; a second interview was offered, if desired (Knapik, 1997). No participant thought a second meeting was necessary, but one participant offered factual corrections and another expressed appreciation for the interview. Upon agreement of accuracy, the primary researcher began to read each transcript carefully to familiarize with the text (Knapik, 2006; van Manen, 1997). The researcher began to form reoccurring themes as represented by the data through thematic analysis. As per Knapik (1997), the researcher: "Read the transcripts repeatedly, articulated my overall sense of each account, identified themes, evaluated the relationship of specific utterances to the various themes, and examined the relationship of the themes with each other" (p. 3). Themes were defined as conversational topics that happened repeatedly and represented an element with theoretical emphasis (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Each theme was assigned a specific color for data color-coding. The researcher read the transcript again and highlighted direct quotes in association with the corresponding theme in an open categorical coding process. Themes were then sorted by theoretical definition and clustered to remain organized (Boyatzis, 1998). The researcher made new documents for each theme with a list of direct quotes for analysis and created theoretically clustered sub-themes for clarification (Boyatzis, 1998).

In conclusion, this chapter identified Structuration Theory and the method used for analysis. Gidden's Structuration Theory provides a backbone for the working relationships between development foundations and the athletic departments. This study chose to analyze a specific case at MWSU through in-depth interviews. The interviews were open-coded for emergent themes related to theory.

CHAPTER FOUR. RESULTS

This case study about fundraising uses Anthony Gidden's structuration theory (1984) as a guide to explore the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU. Members from both offices were asked to share about daily activities, how fundraising works, and their relationship with the other office. The analysis resulted in eight emergent themes. The following sections will provide explanation of the analysis as well as anonymous excerpts from the in-depth interviews for greater detail. The following are themes: *structure; agents; system; rules; resources; agency; and production, reproduction and transformation.*

Structure

The theme of *structure* defines the framework of the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU. Four sub-themes emerged from the data: *Development Foundation, Athletic Department, Independence, and Coordination.*

Development Foundation

The Development Foundation's structure has two coordinators and four solicitors who seek major gifts for the university (the section on *agents* will detail their role further). Each coordinator and each solicitor operate differently due to individual personalities; however, they act their roles in union to replicate this working structure. The greatest impact on the structure is seen through their role, approving projects, and denying projects. Most of the decisions are made from the coordinator's position. The solicitor's impact on structure is seen at a greater magnitude in other themes.

The role of the Development Foundation is to take the major fundraising projects as assigned by the president's office and determine feasibility. For instance, the president's office may present six major campaigns for fundraising efforts and the Development Foundation must decide which, if any, are appropriate for the university to engage. One member stated this situation clearly:

> When it is a capitol project like a building or a scholarship initiative or something rather large, the foundation does not identify which projects we're going to raise dollars for. That's an institutional process, so for example with the (arena project), anything of a capitol nature ends up at the president's cabinet. And then we engage with the rest of the fundraising staff, identifying prospects, coordinating volunteers, moving forward. (Johnson)

A reason an institution would want to assess feasibility through a development foundation is to avoid having to balance the many potential requests for an institutional campaign. One coordinator said, in a tongue-in-cheek manner, "Every dean on this campus has a blueprint in their right-hand desk drawer. They all need a building. The institution has to decide which building is of most importance (Johnson)."

Once the institution decides it would like to pursue fundraising for a project, the development foundation either approves the request or denies the request. The two paths are further detailed.

> First, there are several projects the Development Foundation finds to be attainable for the institution. Some of the factors for approval are marketability

and priority. The level of marketability is found through a feasibility study, where the Development Foundation will look at potential donors, potential interest, and other measures. Then, based off the level of marketability, the project's priority is ranked. The level of priority will help solicitors determine the vigor to pursue funding the project. (Johnson)

Secondly, the Development Foundation may deny a project. Sometimes a project is not found to be marketable and is placed very low on the priority list or not included at all. One coordinator explains:

> The institution may come and say a library. Right now there is a (multi-million dollar) blueprint for a library. Everybody loves a library, but at the same time no one is a constituent of the library. So the likelihood of raising (the amount of money) on our campus of private dollars is slim. The only way we could do it is, on this campus, is if every single entity on campus stood up and said we need a library. (Johnson)

The Development Foundation did not find the library to be marketable and ranked the project very low. The decision can result in mixed emotions. Several interviewees stated their understanding that hardly anyone on campus would like to be denied permission to seek funding for a project.

Athletic Department

Just as the Development Foundation has a structure, the Athletic Department also has a structure for major gift fundraising. The Athletic Department needs its own fundraising arm because of the extenuating circumstances. As previously pointed out, the overall budget, facility concerns, and the role of constituents are much different than the rest of the university. The goal of the Athletic Department is to grow its endowments to pay for scholarships, one of the greater financial burdens of a Division I department, so annual giving could cover operational expenses. The major gift fundraising effort could fund external improvement rather than maintenance. However, one member stated, "Well, we're a bit a ways from that (Jones)." The university, because of the department's sufficient ability to fundraise, does not raise funds directly for the Athletic Department unless funds are for a major campaign.

The Athletic Department has two major gift fundraisers (askers). The askers report directly to the coordinator within the department and have little to no communication with the Development Foundation coordinator (the *agents* section will detail the relationship). The askers are assigned donors to solicit for major gifts. An asker's main goal is to raise money for endowments and major capital projects. However one asker explained "Any project that (the Athletic Director) has in mind is what I'm going to be working on (Erickson)." This comment means wherever a program needs money, the asker will work to raise funds. Two other fundraising options exist in the department -- marketing and a non-profit in charge of planned annual giving -- but their impact does not match the goal of this study which is major gift fundraising.

Independence

The combination of the two working structures of the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department captures the basis for this paper's research. As one person stated, "[at institutions nationwide] there is probably more expressed frustration between centralized foundations and Athletic Departments than any other college or academic unit out there that does their own fundraising

(Johnson)." Part of the issue, Johnson says, "is primarily due to the rabid nature of the (university's) fan base, the direct access that they have, and the visibility of those programs." This can create a feeling of independence for the Athletic Department described as being a "lone wolf" among other colleges.

More expressed "frustrations" have been over how the two offices interact, or do not interact. One common sub-theme within the structure from MWSU shows the coordinators work separately within the structure. Both coordinators expressed this opinion, Johnson said, "It is more of an ancillary relationship where if I have concerns or questions or issues, I'll pick up the phone and call (the other) directly and say we have this issue." The relationship within this structure between the two coordinators is that of "business as-is" where communication occurs if necessary. The two offices bear no apparent hard feeling or animosities, rather ironing out conflicts is simply the nature of the structure. Jones said, "Everything we're doing, (he) knows." Johnson reiterated, "although there is not a reporting line here, it is important we are all kind of working, rowing the boat in the same direction so to speak."

Coordination

The Development Foundation and the Athletic Department battle the independence by coordinating efforts. Communication for coordination is not easily done with employees who travel as much as fundraisers are required to do. Two common sub-sub-themes emerged from the data which are *meetings* and *working together*. The sub-themes explain the structure for coordination between the two offices.

The first of the two sub-sub-themes is the meetings between the two offices. Each month, on a set day, the coordinator for the Development Foundation will meet with both fundraising staffs but not the Athletic Department's coordinator. Here, each person can report on important topics of others should be aware. One solicitor commented:

> [in these meetings one might] report on, yeah we have this event coming up in Arizona. Do any of you have some donors you would like to tell about it? It is really a let's share. All of us share information on things going on. [A worker] might talk about the annual fund we are getting ready for our faculty staff campaign. It kind of keeps them in the loop of the whole fundraising picture. It keeps us in tune to [their] fundraising. It becomes a two-way street. (Smith)

Some of the better coordination comes after the meeting. "So after the meeting we might stick around, 'I might need to see you about something.' So we don't always try to bring up everything during the meeting ... [it is only the] whole big picture as far as what we are working on and our latest goals (Smith)." One problem with the monthly meetings is "one of them is not there that month, which happens, and then suddenly it is two months (Smith)." Coordination can be difficult with long gaps in communication. "All [of the askers] at once is probably pretty rare that they'd all be there (Smith).

Another sub-sub-theme for coordination is the aspect of working together. One area of working together is seen within the interdepartmental coordination of prospects. Each person has a computer program (explained in greater detail in *resources)* which lists to whom each donor is assigned. However, the assignment does not eliminate other people within the department from contacting the donor.

In fact, we encourage it because their relationship is only with one person, on the transient nature of this business, if the relationship is just with me, and I pick up and leave, I haven't done the institution any good. But we try to have one individual who coordinates their relationship there and has an understanding of what all the university is doing in terms of their case. (Johnson)

In the case of the Athletic Department, its askers will sometimes continue the relationship with the donor to raise money outside of the Athletic Department. The coordinator for the Development Foundation stated although this scenario is rare: "they will raise funds for those projects as well (Johnson)." An asker for the Athletic Department elaborated saying:

I mean I just had some people give to the business 50,000 dollars. They didn't know it was coming. They wanted to give so much to the business department; well, they didn't know about it. So I do that too. ... I got [another] half million dollar gift to the business building [as well]. I'm working on one right now this week down here that is for the business building ... for several million dollars. (Erickson)

A second area of working together is seen where the Development Foundation helps the Athletic Department. The Athletic Department currently has a campaign for a new arena. The Development Foundation recognizes the campaign and will send its askers out to raise money for the campaign.

You really have to work with the foundation just to manage it appropriately. That is kind of what the university wants too. Anytime you do a major capital campaign, the foundation has to sign off on it. So now their gift offices can help raise that money too. Like (askers) would suddenly say okay the (arena) is a priority, when you go out and talk to people; you have someone who is unsure who they want to give too, show them the (arena) project and say here is this. (Jones)

One instance of coordination showed the two offices working together with donors for unrelated interests. Often times the Athletic Department will work with the Alumni Association to plan major events across the country. However, recently the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department teamed up to plan a golf outing where both offices could talk to the same group of donors for each department's own fundraising needs.

I'd say a lot of their events they work with the Alumni Association downstairs. Like the whole Arizona event and the golf events I bet they work closely with them. Not development; this thing in New Jersey is pretty unique as far as development helping with an event out there. It helps us both. It is kind of like that mutual: you help me I'll help you; let's get these people together for the evening. It has turned out really good. (Jones)

The last coordination within structure is the decision for prospect coordination. The Foundation Department has the final judgment on who may talk to a donor and who may not.

We'll weigh the individual prospect and say, can we maximize the gift? If we have the (two projects), well both groups want that. We'll look at Bob and say well, "where is the maximum benefit we can get?" If we were to present one or the other. If we don't know, we'll present both and say do you have a preference? What road can we take you down? We may look and say ya know here are a lot of people who can support the greenhouse, but there is only a handful of folks who can support this particular effort so that's the road we're gonna take them. Those are all parts of the discussion that come into play when you're making the decision. (Jones)

The importance of prospect coordination is documented. "So what that allows us to do is not have everybody under the sun talking to people about their specific set of blueprints about what they want to coordinate (Jones)." Also, some departments have advantages over others, "the fact of the matter is when we talk about the fine arts program; they don't get 9,000 people to show up every Saturday for a home game." (Jones) The last comment refers to attendances for athletic programs.

Agents

The relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department has another emergent theme, the Agents. As stated earlier, each office has at least one coordinator who is assigned askers.

Coordinators

The Development Foundation has two coordinators and four askers for major gift donations. The coordinators assigned each asker a different geographical area to help coordinate donor communication. "I divide the prospects by geographic area. So I have a fundraiser for example that works primarily the Washington, DC, to Boston area (Johnson)." The coordinator not only maintains the structure of the office, but delegates project priorities, oversees the askers' fundraising, and coordinates prospect assignment.

The Athletic Department has only one coordinator and two askers but the responsibility is handled similarly. The coordinator for the Athletic Department says, for major gifts, one asker works for gifts from 0-10,000 dollars as well as the endowment program; and the other asker is works for 10,000 dollars and greater gifts.

Askers

The asker's role is mainly to fundraise. The last section discussed the coordination between askers, both with their own office and the other office. This coordination is done though visitation reports, interpersonal communication, and monthly small group meetings. The information they need to coordinate is what new prospects an asker cultivated, potential proposals to a donor, and any noteworthy communication with a donor.

An asker needs to continually find new prospects for donations. This process is called cultivation. An asker may find a donor though lists of alumni, personal connections, or many other ways. One coordinator listed the three qualities of a potential major gift donor, "we talk about three things people need for a major gift. There is linkage and interest in the institution are one and two, the third one is ability. That is the thing we have absolutely no control over." (Jonson) Johnson continued,

> So while the Alumni Association spends all their time loving all alums equally, on the fundraising side of things, we have a tendency to spend part of our time focusing on those individuals who have the financial capability to make an institution changing gift. So we spend a lot of our time identifying who those individuals might be.

When a potential donor is identified, an asker will create a relationship with the potential donor, determine the correct project and amount to request, and then make an "ask." The last section stated how the Athletic Department askers sometimes raise funds for the rest of the university. The Development Foundation askers must also raise funds for several departments. "So one visit in the morning might put on a pharmacy hat on then they may be going to talk to an engineer, they may talk to a former athlete. So each individual wears many different hats," said the Development Foundation Coordinator. The asker does not cut communication after the ask. The askers remain in contact with the donors even after a donation. The theme of relationship maintenance is fruitful for one asker.

> A guy has given over 300,000 dollars. I have been talking to him for last couple of years. So now I have this project I'm working on and I ask him again. He said, 'well, geeze, you want more?' I said, 'yeah, I do.' So that is why you really never give up on a person. You need to stay in touch with them. (Erickson)

The main difference between the askers, in terms of offices, is the Athletic Department askers are under greater annual pressure. "For us, right now, we have to act fast. So we have to do things that are a little different than what they do (Erickson)." This pressure also leads to greater freedom.

> (The Athletic Director) lets me go, which is a really nice feeling. (The Athletic Director) doesn't care what my schedule is, which is a great trust factor. But I've earned that probably a little too. I don't mean to be cocky or conceited, but I've brought a lot of money into the Athletic Department. And a lot of money is going to come in way after I leave. (Erickson)

System

The theme system found observable patterns in the social hierarchy for the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department. Two sub-themes emerged for system: *coordination* and *cultivating*.

Coordination

Coordination focuses on the patterns between the askers in both offices. Repeatedly, askers made references to not interfering with another asker's progress.

> But working with athletics then has been a little different just because they do have their own fundraisers. The other colleges do not. So athletics is the only division that I'm aware of that does their own fundraising. We do have to work together and not, like I say, step on any toes. (Smith)

Many expressed the ease of communicating within their own office in comparison because, "when you see one another, you probably have an opportunity to communicate more (Jones)."

Cultivating

The information askers coordinate the cultivation of donors. A direct pattern of assigning each donor a spokesperson is present as discussed earlier. This is to avoid a situation such as:

> You have got a guy who gives to pharmacy who likes athletics, an engineer who likes athletics. All of the sudden (an asker) is knocking on the door of someone who gives significantly to pharmacy and they doesn't know that and they go and asks for athletics. We really have to manage that, and that's why any report they do goes over to the Development Foundation so they can list that. (Jones)

The coordinator for the office assigns an asker to a donor based of the previously described criteria. The asker, depending on the office, will ask for the most sensible department on campus. "We need to know who is working that individual and what they are working on. So use your major, let's say your major was business. So the business department might have you (Erickson)." Sometimes other askers in other offices may disagree with the department the asker is seeking because of the many roles an individual had during their time at college. In that case one asker would object, "I'd say look, he worked with basketball for all these years (Erickson)." But the asker would not act until there was discussion because, "the purpose would be so you don't get hounded on by three, four different people. You know what I mean. Otherwise you'd say we don't have our act together at all (Erickson)."

The pattern of discussing donor assignments has brought problems. That can be frustrating. Also, sometimes the assignment disagreement will lead to individuals asking for forgiveness rather than permission. It is always easier after the fact. That is one of the challenges in terms of prospect coordination. Just making sure everybody has honest and open dialog ongoing.

Rules

The theme *rules* shapes the agent's action and creates situations for production, reproduction, and transformation. Different rules for the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department exist. The Development Foundation protects the donor relationship. The Athletic Department relies on the Development Foundation and cultivates over a shorter time period.

The Development Foundation creates and protects donor relationships in two ways. The first way is the protection from other departments asking for donations from a donor who belongs to another department. This process was described in detail in the *agent* section. The second way is through a longer cultivating period. Askers in the Development Foundation maintain considerably longer cultivating periods before asking for donations. One reason to support a longer cultivating period is to match a major campaign with a donor's interest. For example, an engineering graduate may have the three qualities to donate but his or her interest may not match the current projects. One asker in that situation said, "I might tell them (the project) is part of our overall fundraising, but if they're an HD&E graduate, I would know that is not their interest (Smith)." The Development Foundation protects donor relationships by shielding other departmental requests and by sustaining a cultivation period.

The Athletic Department rules rely on the Development Foundation and utilize a shorter cultivation period. The Development Foundation, playing the role described as "traffic cop," ultimately has the power to veto the Athletic Department's request to recruit a donor for funding. The reasons could be for lack of perceived interest in athletics or previous plans to maximize the donor's gift for another department. One coordinator described the rejection, "the institution has made a decision that not to take this particular project there. That can be frustrating (Johnson)." When the institution does agree to allow access to a donor, often the cultivation period is much shorter in the Athletic Department. "Some of our larger donors, ya know, we got them involved pretty quickly. And when we need a gift we go back to them. We don't do a lot of cultivation (Jones)." Jones reiterated, "I mean we'll have an ask in and out in six months. Not always, but in a lot of cases, that is the case."

Resources

The agents in the working relationship between the Development office and the Athletic Department utilize resources. Resources are found in two forms, physical and non physical. Both offices utilize similar resources for agency and reported similar sub-themes.

Non-physical

The first non-physical resource the fundraisers utilize is the initial conversation titled here as the "cup-of-coffee." The act has less to do with the cup of coffee and more with the conversation the event generates.

> In that initial cup of coffee, in that first 30 minutes I am there. I'm not there to ask for anything other than to find out a little more about you, essentially what I'm trying to do in that 30 minutes is assess whether or not I think there is the financial capability for this individual to significantly invest in the institution. They could be a wonderful person, but they are just not a major gift prospect because the ability may not be there for them (Jones).

The "cup-of-coffee" helps determine the third factor for a major donor prospect.

The second non-physical resource relates more to the Athletic Department because of its recent growth. The number of askers was raised to three after the department had functioned with two for many years. The coordinator said:

> Now we finally have (a third asker) ... This year in Arizona I think we were 10 times more effective than in the 10 years I've been here because ... we were all seeing somebody different for different reasons... I feel so much better about our

> trip to Arizona because I didn't even see (my asker). I saw her twice. I was teasing her; I said 'hey it is good to see you,' but because she was out to see 10, 15, 20 people. (Jones)

Both the coordinator and the recruiter agreed the addition has helped the department run smoother.

The third non-physical resource is the ability to network within the university. A university is a unique place with very prominent people. Local citizens and those who follow the university like to speak with high profile people such as the University President, Football Coach and the Basketball Coach.

> I mean I get in the door and those guys can really help me. Because they can push you over the top. ... I mean people like to rub shoulders with them. ... A lot of times I can only go so far and by just having (the football coach) pick up the phone or (the basketball coach) pick up the phone, it makes a difference in their lives. (Erickson)

The celebrity contact helps seal the deal after months of cultivation by the askers.

Physical

The first physical resource to be identified as a sub-theme is the visitation reports. Attached in the Appendix is a copy of a blank visitation report. Paperwork and forms are not the main enjoyment of most people's job. One asker summed up visitation reports:

> Well they are a pain in the rear if you ask me. But they are pretty important because what happens is you get good information that you forget after a while. So you go back and it gives someone an idea what is going on with them. (Erickson)

Another asker gave an opinion, "I think they are time consuming but I guess I see so much benefit to it. They are just part of my job. I want to do it. You know, when I get back it might take me a whole week just to do all the follow up from all these visits I just had (Smith)." Smith continued, "Quite often when I'm working it is like I'm 24 hours on the job. And I have a lot of evening meetings. I quite often do them when I get back." Another asker reiterated, "You know if I am down here I just don't get much time to do reports because I'm so busy traveling and when we get back after five and a half weeks on the road you can imagine what it is like (Erickson)." However, the reason visitation reports are so important is because:

> It helps me because when I come back I write the visitation report then maybe six months later I'm going back to the area and it is a good reminder that 'oh yeah, what happened last time I went to see her?' It gets to be a lot of people to keep track of. That's right, they said their son was applying to school at Dartmouth. This time I'll say how did that ever work out? Did Joe get to go to Dartmouth? They love that! They are always saying 'how did you remember that?' I'm always thinking if they only know how hard it was! (Smith)

The information written in the reports is whatever the asker, or coordinator, deems to be important. Personal information, topical interest, hobbies, and many other possibilities. Visitation reports can be cumbersome to create but hold a lot of importance to fundraisers. The reports are centralized and organized by one individual through a computer program.

> Our alumni database ... maintains the giving records and the address and phone numbers and things of that nature. There is a segment within the database that allows us to track contacts. I have an individual on our staff who is the project

> coordinator for the lack of a better term she is our traffic cop. She is the individual who if I have to name someone who looks good on paper does the prospect research and goes out and finds additional information for me.

This database also keeps track of who is in charge of coordinating the donor. (Johnson)

The second physical resource found to be a sub-theme is lists. Askers in a previous section stated finding donors is one of the tasks of their job. Searching through lists of alumni, called data mining by one interviewee, can prove fruitful. "We have a database with all the alums and the supporters of the university. Our database then would say when that person graduated, what they have given over the years (Smith)." These lists can either lead directly to a donor, or snowball into more prospects, "I might start with my list and then I'm visiting a donor who might say gosh, you really need to see my friend Joel. He has been so successful, you know about him? And sometimes we don't know about him. So I'll add him to my list. Next time I am out here I'll give him a call (Smith)."

The third physical resource found to be a sub-theme is university items. *University items* refer to any document, material, object, or memento found on the MWSU campus.

> We will try to take (the donor) something. We usually have note cards that have the MWSU gates on them, we have luggage wraps, they just love getting little MWSU something. We try to always take them something. If we have done our annual report from the university we might have the annual report with us. There are so many things produced on campus, it is just a matter of us getting them (Smith).

The asker can get most items by walking on campus and requesting them, "if it is baseball, I'll call over to athletics and maybe talk to the current coach of baseball and say can you get me this? I'm going to take your schedule next time I go [see the donor] (Smith)."

The final physical resource found to be a sub-theme is the proposal. After many visits and cultivation, the asker will reach a point to ask for a donation. Often times the asker will create a document to represent the donation and visualize what the money will help.

> Every time there is a fundraising project or campaign, we put together something to be able to take to that donor. And if we're asking them for money then we put together a proposal to take to them so that they actually have something written saying we would like you to consider a gift for 5,000 dollars to Generic Hall. We try to have all these things ready ahead of time. These usually have the floor plans. If we have a room naming and we are asking them to name a room, we show them on the floor plan which rooms are available. We always have things like this (Smith).

Agency

The theme of agency demonstrates the ability for individuals to be purposive in social settings. In this section, Gidden's term *agency* is supplemented by definition with Schutz' explanation of motivated action. The Development Foundation represents the sub-theme "genuine because-motive" and the Athletic Department represents the sub-theme "in-order-to motive."

Genuine Because

The *genuine because-motive* represents the agent's purpose deriving from past events or prior experience. Three areas emerged from the genuine because-motive: control, design, and indecision.

Control. The askers feel comfortable when the donor takes control to what area of MWSU to donate. This is accomplished, according to an asker, through cultivating a relationship. "That is where you get to know these people; the easier it becomes to know what to take to see them and what they're are interested in (Smith)." The donation could wind up to any department, as long as the donor has a vested interest. "Really, it is just so all over the place. I would say that it is generally focused around the colleges more than just the specific programs. But, if that is their interest... (Smith)" The askers enjoy this role, it is considered following the path. The askers' opinion is that those in athletics have a more challenging task.

> So I like the fact that we're working for the whole university. In some ways I feel like we have an advantage over what the poor athletic fundraisers are doing because they are just coming down to this one little narrow piece. I'm able to focus on the whole thing and let the donor tell me what they want to do and what is important [said playfully]. (Smith)

Sometimes the conflicting motives are visible.

> But to me, it was kind of a sign of; sometimes I do think the donors feel more pressure from athletics. Maybe I'm reading between the lines, but there have been a couple donors that have kind of lead me to think 'don't worry, you can do whatever you like.' That kind of has come up. (Smith)

Design. The asker will sometimes bring a project to a donor they know has an expressed interest in the campaign. "We've done feasibility. This is how much it is going to cost; this is what we think we can raise. Now you can go get it. You can tell us which donors would be interested (Johnson)." For some donors, this cultivation period could last a long time. "After seven, eight year long relationship that way, we're able to present him with the (project). Bob was more than enthusiastic and had the ability to actually help us to make it happen (Johnson)." Sometimes projects do not have enough perceived interest, and asking donors to spend money on projects outside of their interest may not be a possibility. "It is difficult for people who believe in the library, they say 'ya know that money could be going to the library,' when in reality if it's not going to (a different project) it is not going to MWSU (Johnson)."

Indecision. An asker may not know where the donor would like to donate. The reasons could be many but there have been solutions to this situation.

> This one gal out in Pennsylvania came to me and she likes to give. She goes, tell me about some of the projects you're working on that I can give to this year. So I told her about (two random projects). Okay that's good, I think I'll just give to those two. So she took her stock gift and divided it out to those two projects. (Smith)

Some decisions are not decided by the asker or coordinator, rather, the decision is the donor's.

> If we don't know we'll present both and say 'do you have a preference?' 'What road can we take you down?' We may look and say 'ya know here are a lot of people who can support (a project), but there is only a handful of folks who can

support this particular effort so that's the road we're going to take them.' Those are all parts of the discussion that come into play when you're making the decision. (Johnson)

In-order-to

The in-order-to motive represents the agent's purpose deriving from future conditions and ambitions. One coordinator defined the difference in motivation, "there is an unwillingness of athletics to give (their own fundraising ability) up. I'd certainly, right now today, would not give that up. Not because I don't trust them -- I trust them immensely -- it is just they fundraise differently (Erickson)." Two areas emerged from the in-order-to motive: under fire and passion.

Under fire. The annual budget, combined with future growing aspirations, creates a difficult atmosphere for a fundraiser. "The reason for that is because we're always under the gun. If the budget needs 13 million, you can't wait for gifts. See they can wait for gifts (Erickson)." The pressure to get gifts creates a sense of urgency in comparison to other fundraising motives.

> One of the setbacks is the getting the gift now or tomorrow. For us, right now, we have to act fast. So we have to do things that are a little different than what they do. And they are not helping us during that process because we are not on their radar screen. We are basically doing it ourselves, and that is a little harder. We are more aggressive (Erickson).

The conflict of motives appears to be a conflict of style and can create a sense of disunion.

> They are not under the gun where they have to get it done. (Our project) has been a major project forever, ya know. We are much more under the gun. And

> they contributed nothing to it. You know they have eight people that could be working on it. So you know we're a lot more aggressive. (Erickson)

The repeated reference of aggression is seen through shortened cultivation periods:

> One of our golf coaches, his friend was not a graduate, but his daughter goes to MWSU. She said to me 'I can get you in the door.' The second time I see him I'm asking for a quarter-million dollars and he gave it to us. Now if I had to do that and I didn't know him at all, do you think he'd give that to me? (Erickson)

The reference can also be seen though repeated use of the same donor. "The Bob Smith's of the worlds, and some of our larger donors, ya know, we got them involved pretty quickly. And when we need a gift we go back to them. We don't do a lot of cultivation (Jones)."

The in-order-to motive may be best summarized by the following:

> I mean I look for how can we get this done? And they say well you can't do it that way. Well I can do it that way! I think that is athletics though. Because you're used to 'we have to get this done.' How can we beat them? ... And they're good people over there, don't get me wrong. They have rules and regulations that they follow, but I gotta get the job done. (Erickson)

Passion. The in-order-to motive may succeed because of a loyal support different from regular university support.

> People will come to a university that maybe have no tie to the university but get that way through the athletics. They become a fan. There are also donors out there that graduate from the university that may have amazing passion a love for athletics. (Jones)

A shortened cultivation period is made possible because of "fan" support. "Not always, but in a lot of cases, that is the case because of that passion. They come to you. You know pretty quickly if they are a fan (Jones)." Athletic Department askers do still cultivate, though. "I mean so, if the guy wants to give right out of the gate he just wants to get rid of ya. I want to build a relationship where I can get lots of money (Erickson)."

Production, Reproduction, and Transformation

The *production, reproduction, & transformation* theme describes the ongoing acceptance or rejection of the current rules. Rules, as described earlier, shape agents' action. The process keeps the social system -- the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department -- continuous. The theme is broken into three sub-themes: production, reproduction, and transformation.

Production

Production represents positive adherence to established rules. The continual use of the prospect coordination system affirms value. The same applies to the system for checking marketability. The positive affirmation may be unsaid, but repeatedly asking the Development Foundation to run feasibility on a proposed project also shows value. The asker saying he or she does not want to step on another asker's toes shows faith in the rules.

Reproduction

Reproduction is the rejection of the current rules. The rejection may resolve for better or for worse. The example where one asker told the other about how the donor would like to give to athletics and another organization on campus but did not think it was possible is a reference to rejecting the rules "not to step on toes." However, this example turned out for the better. A negative example is illustrated in this narrative:

> (The donor's) main thing he wanted to talk about was his athletic scholarship. (The other asker) didn't know I was meeting with him. 'Great!' He said. You know James is always like, 'you know whatever you can do to help us out, that will be fine.' Well, later I did find out pharmacy was furious. They felt I had gone and only presented athletics to this donor. So I kind of got a scolding from them. Like 'how come you didn't...' I was like 'wait a minute the donor decided he wanted to talk about athletic scholarships. That doesn't mean he is not going to give to pharmacy.' You have to be kind of careful that way. The college and athletics are going to argue over who gets the donors money and I'm not going to get in the middle of their argument. (Smith)

The rule would be for the asker to continue talking to the donor but because of the negative reproduction, the asker hesitates.

Transformation

Transformation is a change in the rules. Typically it results from repeated reproductions. For instance, many rejections from negative donor coordinating efforts created a positive new idea where the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department created an event, the golf outing in New Jersey, for both offices. This example was detailed earlier; however, the result changed rules. The next quote defines transformation for this working relationship.

> Ya know I'd say our relationship with them based on our setup is good. It has gotten better. And not because I've been here. I think they have done a great job

of trying to make it more cohesive. And I think we've done a better job of trying to communicate, and that has been a real positive. (Johnson)

CHAPTER FIVE. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This study examined the current relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU through application of Anthony Gidden's structuration theory (1984). A case study resulted showing one relationship out of over 300 possible Division I Athletic Departments. The case had no prior implication or intentions other than to showcase one example of a relationship between a central fundraising office and an athletic department. This study used in-depth interviews with members from both the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department who have critical roles in major gift fundraising as methodology. This chapter will review the method used to study the relationship, summarize the results, and discuss the results.

Review of Method

This study used a case study approach guided by Anthony Gidden's structuration theory (1984). Four in-depth interviews conducted with members from the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department, were transcribed verbatim, coded for elements relating to Gidden's theory, and analyzed for emerging themes. Emerging themes were labeled: *structure; agents; system; rules; resources; agency; and production, reproduction, and transformation.*

Summary of Results

The seven emerging themes yielded many pages of data to analyze. Several themes yielded sub-themes for further explanation. This section will summarize the results of each theme

Structure

The theme *structure* described the relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department's framework or backbone. Five sub-themes emerged: *Development Foundation, Athletic Department, independence, coordination, and prospect coordination.*

The *Development Foundation* sub-theme described the framework of the Development Foundation and highlighted major responsibilities such as the office's role and the power to assess marketability to projects. The office's role in major gift fundraising is dispersed among two coordinators and four agents. The university also asks the office to predict the marketability for future projects and campaigns.

The *Athletic Department* sub-theme described the framework for the Athletic department in relation to major gift fundraising. The role as an office and of the "askers" was defined. The department is continually trying to balance a budget comprised of scholarships, department costs, and future growth. The department has two *askers*, defined as employees seeking major gift donations, who report to a coordinator.

The *Independence* subtheme defined the fundamental reason for this study. Two independent offices are striving for similar goals in a confined area. Here, excerpts defined the expressed national frustration as well as concerns for MWSU's working relationship.

The *coordination* subtheme shows how two offices striving for the same goal can work in a confined area. The structure for coordination involves meetings and working together. Askers and coordinators from both offices meet regularly. The goal is to meet every month, but the goal may or may not be met. The purpose of the meetings is to strengthen communication and for the offices to work together. Working together was brought up in the interviewee in every in-depth interview. Working together involves communication within each office and between each office.

The *prospect coordination* subtheme differs from the last because it specifically involves the donor. There is not a defined structure for determining future prospects, and many conflicts arise because of prospect coordination. Both coordinators admit it one of the most challenging aspects of fundraising.

Agents

The theme *agents* describe the role each person connected with major gift fundraising plays. Each office, the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department, has coordinators and askers. The development foundation has two coordinators and four major gift askers. The Athletic Department has one coordinator and two askers.

The coordinators and askers have a similar yet hierarchical relationship. The coordinator is in charge of the asker and assigns potential donors to each asker. The coordinator also divides the askers by either geographic location or estimated gift value. The asker then plays the role of fundraiser. An array of resources is available to generate a gift. The method to acquire the gifts is different from asker to asker and especially from office to office.

System

The theme *system* defines observable patterns in the social hierarchy of MWSU. Two sub-themes emerged for system: *coordination* and *cultivating*.

Coordination focuses on the patterns between the askers in both offices. Repeatedly, askers made references to not interfering with another asker's progress, especially if they are in another office. Askers also stated communication was easier when physical contact occurred regularly. *Cultivating* includes two different methods of prospect relationship. One way is to cultivate for an extended period of time until a specific project arises. Another is to requests gifts in a shorter amount of time and more frequently. Cultivating can create problems among askers who communicate with the same prospect because of coordinating breakdowns.

Rules

The theme *rules* shape the agent's action and create situations for production, reproduction, and transformation. Different rules for the working relationship between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department at MWSU exist. The Development Foundation protects the donor relationship. The Athletic Department relies on the Development Foundation and cultivates over a shorter time period.

Resources

The theme *resources* supply agents in the working relationship at MWSU. Resources are found in two forms, physical and non-physical. Both offices utilize similar resources for agency and reported similar sub-themes. Non-physical resources include the experience of the first cup of coffee, the number of askers in a department, and the asker's ability to network. Physical resources include visitation reports, prospect cultivation through lists, and items representing the university (such as a pen, a document, or a proposal).

Agency

The theme of *agency* demonstrates the ability for individuals to be purposive in social settings. Two sub-themes emerged: *genuine because* and *in-order-to*. The genuine because-motive represents the agent's purpose derived from past events or prior experience. Letting the donor have control, waiting until a specific project meets a donor's interest, and sorting indecision are factors of genuine because. The in-order-to motive represents the agent's purpose deriving from future conditions and ambitions. Reacting from annual budget pressure and feeding of fanatic passion describe the in-order-to motive.

Production, Reproduction, and Transformation

The *production, reproduction, and transformation* theme describes the ongoing acceptance or rejection of the current rules. The process keeps the social system -- the working relationship at MWSU -- continuous. Production is established in examples of the continual use of the prospect coordination system. Reproduction is seen when askers redefine proper ways of communicating with other askers over donors. Transformation is evident though the example of the two offices coordinating the golf event for individual motives.

Recommendations

This study showed one example of a relationship between a central fundraising office and an athletic department at a Division I collegiate level. The results showed a positive working relationship at MWSU. Even though each university has a unique setup and the results are not generalizable, several findings draw particular interest. The first is the difference in motives. Second, the structure of the relationship benefits the Development Foundation. Third, consistent coordination results in positive results. Last, visitation reports are very important but are a great nuisance. From these findings I created a list of recommendations directed toward both offices.

The first finding is the use of agency. One of the most frequently mentioned, and most divided, theme was the different forms of agency. In reality, the difference makes sense. The Development Foundation is in charge of overseeing the entire campus' needs for fundraising, except for the Athletic Department. The askers "wear many hats" during their sales pitch. It is like a Home Depot worker assigned to the entire store as an expert in every department. The expert, in all truth, really doesn't care which department you purchase from, lumber, paint, or tools, just as long as you leave the store with something. The Athletic Department on the other hand strives for one goal. They are the nursery at Home Depot only they are focused on selling every last flower. Their goal is not just to sell for Home Depot but to sell their product and all of it. Here is where tension is created.

Recommendation

The breadth of projects and tasks for the askers on the Development Foundation side makes it difficult to become truly invested into the outcome. Repeatedly, members of that office cited the opportunity to represent every department, and every college, and the whole university. The whole university has many projects and many future plans in place. To counter the perception of favoritism, the askers present plans to potential donors on a perceived donor-based fit. Systematically, this approach is universally fair and is politically correct. However, it creates little excitement for the asker to generate funding for a particular task. Conversely, the Athletic Department has only one or two major projects on the table and the passion to complete those rivals the passion to win a championship. The difference in agency creates tension. The view from the Development Foundation sees projects as a resource, a means to accomplish the task of raising money. The Athletic Department sees the project as not just a goal but the goal. The act of agency is the resource to accomplish the task.

Now, my recommendation is not to convert one side or the other into accepting a new agency, but I argue there are elements from each that would be beneficial for the other. For the Athletic Department, the Development Foundation is not overlooking the current project right now. The reason the help seems to be little to non-existent is because they do wait for the perfect fit. Additionally, a majority of the candidates are assigned to Athletic Department askers. As for the Development Foundation, I argue a greater level of personal involvement would be helpful for the askers. Building a friendship and a long cultivation period are completely necessary for long term sustainment. However, a donor has a need to give, and waiting until the ask fits the exact mold could be waiting too long. Assign the askers to departments on campus as well to help make projects personal. The departments which require greater attention would be split up between the askers. There can still be overlapping in coordination and help across projects, that will never diminish. But a project can be easier to sell when the asker truly wants to accomplish the task.

The second finding is the favored structure. The Development Foundation has what Giddens calls *legitimacy* (Jones & Karsten, 2008). The term can also be thought as legitimate power. As described, they have the legitimate power to market, to project, and to prioritize each project for their askers. Also, they hold the legitimate power to decide which asker, across all departments, will be the primary asker. Obviously, no one likes to hear their project is not marketable or they may not speak to the donor. Someone does need to make the decisions to avoid confusion among the askers.

Recommendation

I argue the power as is creates a timid atmosphere for the Development Foundation. The rules and regulations, currently, are confining to a point that limits fundraising potential. The easy way not to break rules is to remain conservative. If some of the legitimate power is removed from the Development Foundation, the freedom for focused agency, rather than conservative agency, can surface. The power to determine marketability needs to remain in the Development Foundation simply because it is one of the office's major tasks. However, the decision who is the assigned asker for which donor representing which department should fall in the hands of someone removed from overseeing the projects. When there is a discrepancy the asker, or the representative from the given department, can create an argument as to why they should be the primary contact for this donor. Asking for a donation earlier avoids waiting until a project perfectly fits a donor and benefits the atmosphere focused on the project and agency. My suggestion for the third party would be someone on the president's cabinet who already understands the institution's needs and vision.

The third finding is the positive results from positive coordination. The nature of every fundraiser in face-to-face communication is to praise the good and hush the bad. However, almost every time a topic of coordination came up, each person was eager to state the pleasure of the working relationship when quality coordination occurs. Each side mentioned how coordination as been increasing over the last few years and offered individual reasons why. The two that were emphasized were the benefit of monthly meetings and the combined effort of the two offices for the same event. Increasing the frequency of these occurrences can greatly impact the positive working relationship of the two offices.

Recommendation

It was hard to gauge the interest in attending the monthly meetings, or the depth of sharing at each meeting, but because of the relationship dynamics attendance every month for every person is almost a necessity. The problem is this group of people is very spread out and may be in any part of the country at any time. New media needs to be incorporated when possible to create more options to attend the meeting while traveling. Understandably attendance could fail but incorporating new media and generating using a flexible meeting time would help increase attendance and, more importantly, coordination.

Also, combining efforts at a major level such as a golf outing with donors from multiple interests is a great positive. I argue the askers from both departments should work with each other more on many levels. First, hold events such as these in every geographic area with many potential donors. This method generates interest for the institution and helps donors feel connected. Second, bring this mentality into other aspects of fundraising. Many comments from askers had the underlying tone of "us versus them." More openness and more help from each office with the other will work toward the positives of coordination.

The last finding was the universal comments about visitation reports. The visitation reports are seen as the backbone of coordination. Every person commented sternly on the demand and necessity of complete visitation reports every time. Visitation reports are a non-negotiable fact of operation, and rightfully so. However, every person also commented on the displeasure of filling them out as well. One person put a positive spin on them as said "they are just part of my job (Smith)," as only a fundraiser could do. The system of creating the forms cannot be changed because of the source of knowledge and confidentiality. Only the person visiting the donor really knows what goes into the reports and cannot share the information with anyone outside of the small family of fundraisers. Also, the form itself is created well, and the information on the form is pertinent for daily use. The argument could be made that the form needs more variables; however, that argument would not be very popular.

Recommendation

I argue the visitation reports needs another option for filing. The current form needs to be typed up and sent though a computer with internet connection. When traveling, the fundraiser has limited capability options for filing, either in the hotel room at night or upon return to campus. The traveler today spends much down time driving, in airports, or waiting between destinations. Also, a major prerequisite for every fundraiser is the ability to talk. I argue for visitation reports to have more options to file such as an audio recording system which can be transmitted easily. A fundraiser then could complete the visitation report immediately after the visit on the drive home or during their time in the hotel afterward. The audio recording would still be transferred to the same person who reads the typed reports. This option would use the fundraiser's strength, talking, and work toward more complete reports. The complaint from the askers of time constraints would be addressed and the complaint about report depth would also be addressed. The option for typing would still be available but another option, geared toward a frequent traveler, would also be available.

Summary

In this study I compared Anthony Gidden's (1984) structuration theory to a case study of the professional relationship at MWSU between the Development Foundation and the Athletic Department in terms of coordinated fundraising efforts. The case study involved four in-depth interviews with current MWSU employees involved in the relationship. I used Gidden's terms *structure; agents; system; rules; resources; agency; and production, reproduction, and transformation* as themes to analyze qualitatively. I argue several recommendations which stem from the results:

1) The current tension over fundraising agency can be eased. Clashing agencies – how an agent acts in a setting – does not leave one office in the right and one office in the wrong. Both offices can retrospect and benefit from the other office's agency.
2) The Development Foundation could increase an agent's involvement in a major project by assigning them to a specific department on campus. I used the analogy of Home Depot to explain Development Foundation's agency. Assign an asker to the painting section so they can become an expert in painting. Literally assign askers to specific departments on campus so the projects reflect personal involvement.

3) Eliminate the Development Foundation's legitimate power to decide a donor's representative asker. Many instances of miscommunication stem from donor assignment disagreement. A better way to reduce the miscommunication is to bring overlapping recruiting requests to a natural third party.
4) I argue the member for the third party should be a member on the President's cabinet. The President's office already approves major campaigns before conception, and it also understands the pulse of the campus. Understandably, there are members on the cabinet who would not be neutral. My recommendation for MWSU, based on the current staff, would be to assign this task to the Vice President for Student Affairs.
5) The process for appeal to a third party for donor assignment would run very simply. The departments who claim the donor for their best interest would develop a case to claim the donor's rights. The case can involve current projects, future projects, or long-term cultivation requests. Based on the cases presented, the third party would decide which department, or asker, is the primary role for communication with the donor.
6) Attendance at monthly meetings needs to be improved. The nature of the job eliminates the possibility for perfect face-to-face monthly meetings. However, video conferencing has become increasingly simpler with technology improvements. For instance, Skype – a free internet video communication tool – gives each person a chance to

attend the meetings from a hotel room or wherever from a laptop – a resource each person has from the university -- can connect to the internet. Teleconferencing from cell phones while driving or traveling can also be utilized. Using either of these methods, even if calling to report only on his or her status that particular month, would help improve coordination. Other new media sources could also be considered.

7) The Athletic Department should coordinate more major events with the Development Foundation; such as how the two offices coordinated the event in New Jersey. Askers for the Development Foundation assigned to specific geographic location have access to constituent bases that are possibly untapped. Currently, the coordination is largely with the Alumni Association. Off-campus major events should include all three offices.

8) Visitation reports need additional, new media approaches as outlets. Every person stressed the importance of visitation reports. Every person also expressed concern over the Athletic Department's method of completing visitation reports, and complained over the process of filing visitation reports. The time immediately after a meeting with a donor could be spent filling out the report if the report accepted audio. Doctors fill out reports in a similar way. Provide each asker with a digital audio recorder. After each meeting with a donor, while traveling to a new destination, the asker could dictate the report, and then report could be submitted electronically.

REFERENCES

Aranzadi, J., Rodriguez, A, Turmo, J. & Vera, O. (2009). The praxeology of L. von Mises aand the theory of action Alfred Schutz. *New Perspectives on Political Economy*, 5(1), 17-32.

Banks, S. & Riley, P. (1993). Structuration theory as an ontology for communication research. *Communication Yearbook*, 16, 167-196.

Bates, F. & Harvey, C. (1975). *The Structure of Social Systems*. New York: Gardner Press.

Branch, D. (1990). Athletic Director leader behavior as a predictor of intercollegiate athletic organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 161-173.

Breneman, D.W. (1981). *Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2005). Confronting the ethics of qualitative research. *Journal of Constructivist Psycology,* 18, 157-181.

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Information*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Craib, I. (1992). *Anthony Giddens*. London: Routledge.

DeSanctis, G., & Poole. M. S. (1994). Capturing the complexity in advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organizational Science*, 5, 121–147.

Eisenhardt, K. & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and Challenges. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50 (1), 25-32.

Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach od inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 5(1), 1-10.

Gaski, J., & Etzel, M. (1987). *Collegiate athletic success and alumni generosity: Dispelling the myth in Yiannakis et al. Sport Sociology: Contemporary Themes.* Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Giddens, A. (1974). *Positivism and sociology.* London: Hinemann.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretative sociologies.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradictions in social analysis.* London: Macmillan.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structure.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press

Giddens, A. (1989). *Social theory and modern sociology.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age.* Stanford, CA: Blackwell Publishers.

Giddens, A. (2005). The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration: Elements of the theory of structuration. In Spigel, G., *Practicing History.* New York: Routledge.

Goldhaber, G., & Barnett, G. (Eds.). (1988). *Handbook of organizational communication.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Guest, G., Bunce, A, & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews is enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Family Health International,* 18(1), 59-82.

Gynnild, V. (2002). Agency and structure in engineering education: perspectives on educational change in the light of Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 27, 297-303.

Infante, D., Rancer, A., & Womack, D. (1990). *Building communication theory.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Jablin, F., Putnam, L., Roberts, K., & Porter, L. (1987). *Handbook of organizational communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jones M., & Karsten, H. (2008). Giddens's structuration theory and information systems research. *MIS quarterly,* 32(1), 127-157.

Keyton, J. (2006). *Communication Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kelly, K. (1991). *Fundraising and public relations: A critical analysis.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Knapik, M. (2007). The qualitative research interview: Participants' responsive participation in knowledge making. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 5(3), 1-13.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Macintosh, N., & Scapens, R. (1991). Management accounting and control systems: A structuration theory analysis. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, 3, 131-158.

Marciani, L. (1991). Mining for Division II gold. *Athletic Business*, 49-52.

May, S., & Mumby, D. (Eds.). (2005) *Engaging organizational communication theory & research: Multiple perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morrow, R., & Brown, D. (1994). *Critical Theory and Methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MWSU. (2009). *Midwestern State University Development Foundation.* Retrieved November 8, 2009 from the Midwestern State University website http://www.MWSUfoundation.com/staff.htm

MWSU Athletics. (2009) *Team Makers – An investment in excellence!* Retreived November 8, 2009 from the Midwestern State University website http://www.gobison.com/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=2400&KEY=&ATCLID=70120

Norton, T. (2007). The structuration of public participation: Organizing environmental control. *Environmental Communication,* 1, 146-170.

Olufowote, J. (2009). Structurational analysis of informed consent to treatment: (Re)productions of contradictory sociohistorical structures in practitioners' interpretive schemes. *Qualitative Health Research,* 19, 802-814.

Poole, M. S., Siebold, D. R., & McPhee, R. D. (1985). Group decision making as a structurational process. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 71, 74-102.

Poole, M. S., & McPhee R. D. (1983). A structurational analysis of organizational climate. In L. Putnam and M. Pacanowsky, (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Poole, M. S., & McPhee, R. D. (2005). Structuration theory. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication: Theory & research* (pp. 171-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pozzebon, M., & Pinsonneault, A. (2005). Challenges in conducting empirical work using structuration theory: Learning from IT research. *Organization Studies*, 26, 1353-1376.

Robinson, M., Peterson, M., Tedrick, T., & Carpenter, J. (2003). Job Satisfaction of NCAA Division III Athletic Directors. *International Sports Journal*, 7(2), 46-59.

Rose, J. (2005). The double dance of agency: A socio-theoretic account of how machines and humans interact. *Systems, Signs & Actions*, 1(1), 19-37.

Schwieger, D., Melcher, A., Ranganathan, C., & Wen, J. (2004). Appropriating electronic billing systems: Adaptive structuration theory analysis. *Human Systems Management*, 23, 235-243.

Sewell, W. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1-29.

Shutz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World.* Northwest University Press.

Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50 (1), 20-24.

Slack, T. (1991). Sport management: Some thought on future directions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 5, 95-99.

Sperber, M. (1990). *College sports, Inc.: The Athletic Department vs. the university*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Stier, W. (1992). Understanding fundraising in sport: The conceptual approach. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 1,* 41-46.

Stinson, J., & Howard, D. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: Major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13, 129-140.

Tanggaard, L. (2008) Objections in research interviewing. *International Institute for Qualitative Methodology*, 7(3), 15-29.

van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experiences: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, ON: Althouse.

Walker, S. (1994). *Athletic Fund Raising in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Member Institutions*. Masters Thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Wheeler-Brooks, J. (2009). Structuration theory and critical consciousness: Potential applications for social work practice. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 36, 123-140.

Witmer, D. (1997) Communication and recovery: Structuration as an ontological approach to organizational culture. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 324-49.

Wittington, R. (1992) Putting Giddens into action: Social systems and managerial agency. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29, 693-712.

Yates, J., & Orlikowski, W. (1992). Genres of organizational communication: A structurational approach to studying communication media. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17, 299-326.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A provides a list of questions used as a base for each in-depth interview. Conversation often strayed from these questions. However, the core questions were asked of every participant and were used to guide the interview.

Questions about the specific office structure:

1) Can you tell me about the largest donation you've helped to receive?

2) Can you tell me the process for identifying a potential large gift donor for (the specific office)?

3) What are tasks you perform on a daily or weekly basis that involve NDSU fundraising for large gifts?

4) What resources are available for you and others to recruit potential donors?

Questions about the communication between Development Foundation and Athletic Department:

1) Are there scheduled meetings between the Development Office and the Athletic Department? If so, who attends and what is discussed?

2) How does the Athletic Department voice its goals for fundraising to the Development office? How is communication reciprocated?

3) Does the current working model for communication between the Development Office and the Athletic Department at NDSU meet your satisfaction? Explain why or why not.

4) If the (other office) had one major complaint about the working relationship between your two offices in relation to fundraising, what do you think it would be?