AN ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS
OF THE INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN A PUBLIC AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION UNIVERSITY
AND SIX UNITED STATES CORPORATE SUPPORTERS:
AN INSTRUMENTAL, ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY
USING CONE'S CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP SPECTRUM

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by
MORGAN R. CLEVINGER, BSJ, MBA, CFRE
Dr. Cynthia J. MacGregor, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2014

© Copyright by Morgan R. Clevenger 2014

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL PAGE

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”

~ Margaret Mead (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 27)

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation titled

AN ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS
OF THE INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN A PUBLIC AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION UNIVERSITY
AND SIX UNITED STATES CORPORATE SUPPORTERS:
AN INSTRUMENTAL, ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY
USING CONE’S CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP SPECTRUM

Presented by Morgan R. Clevenger

A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

And hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Cynthia J. MacGregor, EdD, Dissertation Advisor
Professor of Educational Administration

Jeni Hart, PhD
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis

---

Beth Hurst, PhD
Professor of Reading and Teacher Education

Robert Watson, EdD
Professor of Educational Administration

DEDICATION

“Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better. It’s not.”

~ Dr. Seuss, The Lorax (Geisel, 1971, p. 58)

My dissertation work is made possible because of support and encouragement from God, all of my teachers throughout my academic career, friends across the decades and social circles, and both my immediate and extended family. All of these individuals have fostered my growth and success. I am truly grateful.

I am thankful to God for providing me with a natural sense of curiosity and investigation. Thinking is difficult work. In America, people often rely upon the federal and state governments, Hollywood, the media, or the fashion world to think for them. However, I have always strived to think independently. Blessed with many gifts and talents, I believe life’s challenges can create so many opportunities to learn. As a result, my aim has always been to share my love of life and learning with others and to glorify God in all my efforts as evidenced by my life verse of Col. 3:23: “Whatever you do, work at it with all your heart, as working for the Lord, not for human masters” (Holy Bible, New International Version, 2013, ¶ 1). I appreciate all the mentors, youth leaders, counselors, and pastors who have nurtured my passion for education and for teaching.

Teachers enter a noble profession. It is their compassion, dedication, and fortitude that creates a fertile, safe environment for others to question, to explore, to research, to discuss, and to wrestle with ideas, issues, and opportunities. I have been extremely blessed from kindergarten through my doctoral degree with amazing teachers and administrators who have encouraged me to dream big, to work hard and wisely, and to

envision a bright future for each chapter of life—not only for myself but for those around me. There are too many individuals to name, but all who have taught and befriended me know who they are.

Friends come from all walks of life. Everyone has something to teach us—some by positive examples and others by unfortunate decisions and their ramifications. I appreciate the kind words, as well as occasional admonition, that were needed to push me in good directions. John Denver said it best in his song titled *Friends with You*. “Friends, I will remember you, think of you, pray for you. And when another day is through, I’ll still be friends with you” (Lyrics Depot, 2012, ¶ 3).

Family is extremely important; I have been blessed with lifelong encouragement from my immediate family as well as from a very large, extended family. I appreciate the support and encouragement of my parents, Ronald and Billie (Cork) Clevenger; my siblings and their families; my grandparents; and my aunts, uncles, and cousins. I will be eternally grateful for three generations of women: my mother, Evelyn (Arbogast) Clevenger, for giving me life; my paternal grandmother, Stella (Ball) Clevenger, for giving me love and wisdom; and my co-parent, Belinda (Shreve) Clevenger, for giving me friendship and wise counsel.

Although I will be forever indebted to all those mentioned, this dissertation is dedicated to my daughter, Regan Elise Clevenger, for giving me laughter and hope. You are my sunshine. Thank you for always having a smile, a kind word of encouragement, positivity, and an unyielding spirit of joy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“We cannot exist without mutual help. All, therefore, that need aid have a right to ask it from their fellow men, and no one who has the power of granting can refuse it without guilt.”

~ Sir Walter Scott (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 138)

Colleagues near and far have discussed and challenged my ideas and thought processes. I appreciate my Team A-2 statewide University of Missouri-Columbia Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis (ELPA) cohort colleagues: Jim Cook, Mary Laughlin, Cheryl Reichert, and Pam Thomas. Additionally, the ELPA program provided me with a surrogate family at Missouri State University—especially Jenny Flat, Julie Horner, and Nathan Hoven—as well as my cohort defense team: Rebecca Donaldson, John Horner, and Susan Langston. Jude Sommerjones with ELPA and Judy Campbell at Missouri State University provided direction, scheduling, and administrative assistance throughout the cohort experience.

I thank Carol Cone, who indirectly enlightened me with an important *aha* moment during a Net Impact conference presentation that created the conceptual framework for my research. I also thank Ann Kaplan, director of the Voluntary Support of Education Survey at the Council for Aid to Education, for assistance with raw data, encouragement, and an historical perspective about higher education resource development.

I sincerely wish to thank institutional champions, lead contacts, staff members, and interviewees at the participating University, at its related University foundation, and at the six corporations and affiliated foundations involved in my dissertation research for their valuable time, insights, and interest in corporate citizenship.

Many Greene County (MO) Public Library staffers, as well as Missouri State

University and University of Missouri-Columbia librarians, offered considerable support. Jeffrey Alves, Anne Batory, Rozanna Carducci, Jeremiah Coopersmith, Bobby Cox, Noah Drezner, Jennifer Edmonds, Maria Grandinetti, Kathleen Houlihan, Lanie Jordan, Kyle Kreider, Cate Loes, Brendan Maxey, Erin McHenry-Sorber, Cameron McCoy, Christopher McCurley, Brent Opall, Ross Perkins, Marianne Rexer, David Siegel, Matthew Sowcik, Marleen Troy, Wagiha Taylor, and Shawn Walker provided moral support, research methodologies, and useful insights throughout my dissertation work. Thank you for the many conversations, ideas, debates, and resources.

Editors always improve writing through thorough proofing and revisions. I am very thankful for Rita Neff and Michelle Nevels for their review, critique, and edits to all of my doctoral work. I am also especially indebted to Dean Frear, Beth Hurst, and Pam Yagle for copiously copyediting and proofreading my dissertation. A special thanks is extended to Chris Jarratt for creating graphic figures and to Kelly Clisham for transcription. I appreciate my dissertation defense host family, Doug and Pam Taylor.

I have been blessed with great teachers throughout my life. I especially appreciate Dr. Joseph Donaldson and Dr. Carol Maher for their wisdom and thoughtful dialogue. My dissertation committee members—Dr. Jeni Hart, Dr. Beth Hurst, and Dr. Robert Watson—provided time, expertise, critical review, and encouragement. Thank you, all.

Finally, I will be forever indebted to my pragmatic dissertation supervisor and mentor, Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, for her unyielding encouragement, guidance, professionalism, knowledge, organization, reflection, patience, and enthusiasm about student work and higher education. Your wisdom and thoughtful responses have helped to foster and to shape my ideas, research, and writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

“The raising of extraordinarily large sums of money, given voluntarily and freely by millions of our fellow Americans, is a unique American tradition... Philanthropy, charity, giving voluntarily and freely... call it what you like, but it is truly a jewel of an American tradition.”

~ John F. Kennedy (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 108)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xvi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvii
ABSTRACT.....	xviii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
Background.....	1
Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study.....	7
Organizational Theory: A Brief History.....	8
Foundational Organizational Behavior Theories for This Organizational Analysis.....	11
Conceptual Framework Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	19
Philanthropy.....	21
Cause-related Branding.....	21
Operational Culture.....	22
DNA Citizenship Ethos.....	22
Others’ Business and Society Concepts, Theories, Models, and Spectrums.....	24

Statement of the Problem.....	27
Purpose of the Study.....	29
Research Questions.....	30
Limitations, Assumptions, and Design Considerations.....	31
Limitations.....	31
Individuals Interviewed.....	32
Type of Higher Education Institution.....	32
Participant Selection Data.....	32
Assumptions.....	33
Design Considerations.....	35
Definitions of Key Terms.....	36
Cone’s (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	37
Business and Higher Education Relationship.....	38
Significance of the Study.....	47
Summary.....	54
2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE.....	56
Introduction.....	56
Historical Pluralistic Interplay: Corporations, Governments, and U.S. Higher Education.....	57
The Early Eras: The Colonial Period through the American Revolution.....	57
The Expansion Era for an Emerging Nation.....	59
The Civil War Era.....	60
The Industrial Revolution Era and University Transformation.....	61

The World War Eras and The Great Depression.....	64
The Post-War Era and Mass Higher Education.....	67
The Vietnam Era and Social Activism.....	71
End of the 20 th Century.....	74
The Challenging New Millennium: A Penurious Era and Vital Pluralistic Interplay.....	77
The New Ecology.....	84
Privatization.....	84
Connection and Observation.....	85
Acceleration.....	85
Multiplication and Diversification.....	86
Reflection.....	87
Accountability, Effectiveness, and Infrastructure.....	87
Strategic Advantages, Cooperative Advantages, Complexity, and Scrutiny.....	88
Relationship Between Corporate America and U.S. Higher Education.....	90
Coordinated Roots in Higher Education.....	93
University Corporate Relations Models.....	98
Three Models of Corporate Behavior.....	100
Organizations Supporting Today's Corporate-Higher Education Relationship.....	104
Sustaining Relationships.....	106
Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Philanthropy.....	107
Classical Corporate Philanthropy.....	110
Corporate Foundations.....	112

Strategic Philanthropy.....	115
The New Philanthropy.....	117
Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Cause-related Branding.....	119
Cause-related Branding.....	120
Partnerships, Collaborations, and Joint Ventures.....	122
Sponsorships.....	124
Sponsored Research, Intellectual Property, and Technology Transfer.....	126
Other Areas.....	130
Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Operational Culture.....	131
Organizational Culture.....	132
Stakeholder Management.....	133
Social Responsiveness.....	135
Employee Volunteerism.....	136
Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: DNA Citizenship Ethos.....	138
Corporate Citizenship.....	140
Leadership and Management Modeling.....	143
Employee Engagement.....	146
Environmentalism.....	148
Accountability and Transparency.....	149
Ethical Principles and Practices.....	154
The Culture of the Western World's Ethical Foundations.....	155
Corporate Ethical Behavior.....	160
Higher Education Ethical Behavior.....	164

The Governments' Ethical Behavior.....	169
The American Public's Scrutiny, Ethical Perspectives, and Expectations.....	171
Summary.....	173
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	176
Introduction.....	176
Research Questions.....	177
Design for the Study.....	177
Qualitative Research Approach.....	178
Embedded, Single-Case Study.....	179
An Ethnographic Perspective.....	181
The Constructivist or Constructionist Paradigm.....	183
Participants.....	186
The Carnegie Classification™ System.....	187
Higher Education Institution Participant.....	188
Corporation Participants.....	191
Higher Education and Corporate Leader Interview Participants...	194
Evidence and Sources.....	194
Human Subject Protection.....	195
Data Collection Procedures.....	197
Instrumentation: Document and Audio-visual Review Protocol.....	198
Instrumentation: Document and Audio-visual Review Protocol for Observed Behavior.....	199
Interview Protocols.....	201

Observation Field Notes.....	205
Data Management and Coding.....	207
Data Analysis.....	207
Document Review.....	210
Audio-visual Analysis.....	213
Interview Transcript Analysis.....	214
Observation Field Data Analysis.....	215
Computer-assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)	216
Data Visualization.....	217
Overarching Themes: Data Analysis and Placement of Corporations on Cone's Spectrum.....	223
Role of the Researcher	225
Trustworthiness.....	226
Summary.....	230
4. DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS.....	232
Introduction.....	232
Organizational Participant Recruitment.....	233
University Participant Recruitment.....	234
University Participant and Setting.....	236
University Foundation and Participant Setting.....	239
University Participant Recruitment of Six Corporate Participants.....	241
Corporate Participant Recruitment.....	242
Background on Types of Corporations.....	243

Small Company A.....	245
Small Company B.....	246
Medium Company A.....	247
Medium Company B.....	248
Fortune 500 Company A.....	249
Fortune 500 Company B.....	250
Data Collection.....	251
Data Management and Coding.....	252
Document and Audio-visual Collection.....	252
Interviews.....	254
University Campus Observation.....	255
Data Analysis.....	256
Document and Audio-visual Materials.....	259
Interview Transcripts.....	260
Campus Observation.....	261
Summary of Data Analysis.....	265
Findings.....	265
Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?...	266
Theme One: Viable Resources.....	267
Theme Two: Student Enrichment.....	277
Theme Three: Real-world Connectivity.....	285
Summary of Findings to Research Question One.....	293

Research Question Two: Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?.....	296
Theme One: Workforce Development.....	298
Theme Two: Community Enrichment.....	305
Theme Three: Brand Development.....	313
Theme Four: Research.....	319
Summary of Findings to Research Question Two.....	324
Research Question Three: What ethical concerns arise in the engaged relationships between corporations and a higher education institution?.....	326
Theme One: Generally No Ethical Concerns.....	327
Theme Two: General Ethical Discussion.....	345
Theme Three: Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas.....	361
Summary of Findings to Research Question Three.....	367
Other Themes.....	369
Culture.....	369
Economic Challenges.....	378
Alumni Connectivity.....	383
Geography.....	386
Summary of Other Themes.....	387
Analysis Across Embedded Units.....	387
Complexity of Engaging Corporations.....	387
Access to Information.....	388

Corporate Citizenship Functionality.....	389
Capacity of Corporations.....	390
Plotting on Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	390
Summary of Analysis Across Embedded Unit.....	394
Serendipitous Findings.....	395
Journey.....	396
Summary.....	399
5. DISCUSSION.....	401
Introduction.....	401
Summary of Findings.....	403
Themes for Research Question One.....	404
Theme for Research Question Two.....	405
Themes for Research Question Three.....	406
Discussion.....	408
Inter-organizational Relationships.....	409
Higher Education’s Perspective of Inter-organizational Relationships with Businesses.....	411
Corporations’ Perspective of Inter-organizational Relationships with Higher Education.....	415
The Environment of Inter-organizational Relationships.....	418
Ethical Behavior.....	427
Reflection on Qualitative Methodologies.....	438
Organizational Resistance.....	439
Interviewing Elites.....	442
Triangulating Data.....	444

Reflecting on Cone's (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum as a Framework.....	446
Considering Transferability.....	452
Examining Ethnography of Inter-organizational Relationships.....	453
Limitations.....	457
Open Systems.....	458
Types of Participants.....	458
Confidentiality of Participant Organizations.....	460
Scope.....	461
Implications for Practice.....	462
Inter-organizational Relationships.....	463
Higher Education Implications.....	466
Corporate Implications.....	472
Summary of Implications for Practice.....	478
Future Research.....	480
Expanding Participants in the Current Study.....	481
Researching Other Audiences.....	481
Using Other Research Methodologies.....	483
Other Considerations.....	484
Summary.....	487
Conclusion.....	488
REFERENCES.....	492
Appendices	
Appendix A: Field of Organizational Theory Concept Map.....	522

Appendix B: AFP Code of Ethical Principles and Standards.....	523
Appendix C: A Donor Bill of Rights.....	524
Appendix D: Alphabetical U.S. Higher Education List of Schools Receiving the Most Corporate Financial Support (2006-2010).....	525
Appendix E: University Participant Recruitment Letter.....	526
Appendix F: University Document and Audio-visual Analysis Protocols Matrix.....	527
Appendix G: Corporate Document and Audio-visual Analysis Protocols Matrix.....	528
Appendix H: University Consent Letter.....	529
Appendix I: University Informed Consent Form.....	531
Appendix J: Corporation Consent Letter To Participate in Study.....	532
Appendix K: Corporate Informed Consent Form.....	534
Appendix L: Participant Recruitment Letter to Subjects/Interviewees.....	535
Appendix M: Subject/Interviewee Informed Consent Letter.....	536
Appendix N: Interview Questions for Higher Education Leaders.....	538
Appendix O: Interview Questions for Corporate Leaders.....	539
Appendix P: Post-interview Debriefing Form.....	541
Appendix Q: University Campus Observation Matrix.....	542
Appendix R: Transcriptionist Confidentiality Letter.....	543
Appendix S: Transcriptionist Acceptance Agreement and Confidentiality Form.....	544
Appendix T: Member Checking Letter.....	545
Appendix U: Peer Coding and Analysis Confidentiality Letter.....	546
Appendix V: Peer Coder Consent and Confidentiality Form.....	548

Appendix W: External Reviewer Agreement.....	549
VITA.....	550

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures

1. Sábato's Triangle.....	3
2. Astley and Van de Ven's (1983) Organization Analysis Matrix.....	10
3. Cone's (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	20
4. U.S. Corporate Giving from 1970 to 2010.....	83
5. Jacoby's (1973) Three Models of Behavior of the Business Enterprise..	102
6. Bruch and Walter's (2005) Four Types of Corporate Philanthropy.....	116
7. Carroll's (1991) Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility.....	158
8. Cone's (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	224
9. A Priori Codes.....	258
10. Plotting Research Question One's Major Themes.....	295
11. Plotting Research Question Two's Major Themes.....	325
12. Plotting Research Question Three's Major Themes.....	368
13. Word Cloud from Document and Audio-visual Materials.....	370
14. Word Cloud from University Interviews.....	373
15. Word Cloud from Corporate Interviews.....	378
16. Plotting the Six Companies on Cone's Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	391
17. Plotting the Themes from Research Questions on Cone's Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.....	448

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

1. Classification of Corporate Participants.....	245
2. Corporate Participants' Alumni Connections and Existence of Corporate Foundation(s).....	246
3. Campus Observation Summary.....	262
4. Campus Observation of Corporate Presence.....	318
5. Evidence of Ethics Expectations and Guidelines Within Each Company....	334
6. Ethics Documentation.....	340
7. General Ethical Discussion Topics.....	346
8. Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas.....	362
9. Summary of Themes.....	400

**AN ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS
OF THE INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN A PUBLIC AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION UNIVERSITY
AND SIX UNITED STATES CORPORATE SUPPORTERS:
AN INSTRUMENTAL, ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY
USING CONE’S CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP SPECTRUM**

Morgan R. Clevenger

Dr. Cynthia J. MacGregor, Dissertation Supervisor

“The most useful and influential people in [America] are those who take the deepest interest in institutions that exist for the purpose of making the world better.”

~ Booker T. Washington (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 151)

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study. This organizational analysis examined corporate citizenship through the inter-organizational relationships between a public American doctoral research university and six of its corporate partners as framed through Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. The World Economic Forum (2002) has universally defined *corporate citizenship* as:

The contribution a company makes to society through its core business activities, its social investment and philanthropy programmes, and its engagement in public policy. The manner in which a company manages its economic, social and environmental relationships, as well as those with different stakeholders, in particular shareholders, employees, customers, business partners, governments and communities determines its impact. (p. 1)

The literature has shown that little research has been conducted regarding the behavior aspects of these corporate-higher education inter-organizational relationships.

Procedures. An embedded, instrumental, ethnographic single-case study viewed organizational participants from 2006 to 2010 and included a public American higher education research university, the university’s foundation, as well as two small, two medium, and two large (i.e., *Fortune 500*) U.S. corporations. Research questions used to

explore this relationship: (RQ1) Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? (RQ2) Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum via philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos? (RQ3) What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationships between corporations and a higher education institution? Triangulation of data was provided by 36 interviews, more than 12,609 pages of documents and audio-visual materials, and a campus observation of 407 photographs.

Findings. Research questions yielded several findings that developed into themes. Three RQ1 themes included: *viable resources*, *student enrichment*, and *real-world connectivity*. Four RQ2 themes included: *workforce development*, *community enrichment*, *brand development*, and *research*. For RQ3, three themes emerged. First, *generally no ethical dilemmas* were found. Second, several *general ethics discussion topics* created five clusters of interest: *public relations*, *solicitation*, *policies and stewardship*, *accountability and transparency*, and *leadership behavior*. Third, *five disparate ethical concerns* were shared; none involved any of the corporate participants. Four other themes emerged relating to *culture*, *economic challenges*, *alumni connectivity*, and *geography*.

Conclusions. This dissertation contributes to the corporate citizenship literature by providing a broad, holistic framework to understand the range of motives and ROI expectations of corporate engagement in the American society as evidenced by inter-organizational relationships with higher education. The research is useful to provide both higher education practitioners and corporations with insights to better design and to manage inter-organizational relationships.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

“There is no cause half so sacred as the cause of a people. There is no idea so uplifting as the idea of the service of humanity.”

~ Woodrow Wilson (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 152)

Background

The United States of America is a pluralistic society through a multitude of groups and organizations that coexist to provide diffusion of power among them, wide decentralization, and diversity (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Eisenstadt, 1981; Jacoby, 1973; Morgan, 2006). Virtues of a pluralistic society include preventing power from being concentrated in the hands of a few, maximizing freedom of expression and balance, minimizing the danger of any one leader or organization being in control, and providing built-in checks and balances. America’s pluralistic environment requires all parties to take interest, ownership, and responsibility for rational behavior and joint ownership for social values (Jacoby, 1973; Saul, 2011).

Three key entities that share a dynamic relationship in this pluralistic society are the U.S. and state governments, higher education, and corporations (Bush, 1945; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Curti & Nash, 1965; Etzkowitz & Dzisah, 2008; Googins, Mirvis, & Rochlin, 2007; Gould, 2003; Liebman, 1984; Norris, 1984; Pollard, 1958; Sears, 1922; Shannon, 1991; Siegel, 2008). First, the state and federal governments exist to give structure to societal functioning, including laws and ethical expectations. Second, higher education exists to continue to foster development of the individual mind and to prepare individuals for careers and life work. Specifically, Rhodes (2001) said “education

provides a foundation for personal growth, professional training, and social mobility” (p. 9). Higher education also is expected to contribute in a multitude of ways to society via science, medicine, art, humanity, and many other disciplines to improve and to enlighten the world (Bush, 1945; Gould, 2003). Higher education—as part of the nonprofit realm—seeks to advance public or societal goals (Fulton & Blau, 2005). Worth (2000) said,

The American system of higher education is acknowledged as the finest in the world and our colleges and universities have been essential to our success as a nation. Now we are living in a new world economy, one that emphasizes ideas over products and the life of the mind over work with the hands. In this environment, higher education is more central than ever to the economic and social progress of all nations. (p. 298)

Finally, the for-profit sector, known as *businesses* or *corporate America*, serves as the economic cornerstone of the U.S. capitalistic economy in a democratic republic (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Drucker, 1946; Gould, 2003). *Sábato's Triangle* (see Figure 1), developed in 1968, illustrates this dynamic relationship and the joint ownership these entities have in society (Hatakeyama & Ruppel, 2004).

Corporations and higher education rely upon each other in an inter-organizational relationship for mutual benefit (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Gould, 2003; Liebman, 1984; Norris, 1984; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Tromble, 1998). For example, higher education institutions yield professionals needed for hire in corporations as well as develop methodologies and make scientific discoveries that are to be transferred to society (Boyd & Halfond, 1990; Elliott, 2006; Gould; Just & Hoffman, 2009; Etzkowitz, Webster, & Healey, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Withers, 2002). However, “in any relationship where one partner has resources and the other seeks access to the resources, a power dynamic is created” (The Center on Philanthropy, 2007, p. 1).

Giroux and Giroux (2004) and Sommerville (2009) argued that the past century of higher education has been stripped of its voice and leadership in America because universities are too corporatized. Siegel (2007) contended, however, that too many academicians and administrators operate on fear instead of information, communication, and close relationships with corporate representatives to create win-win situations for higher education and corporate interests. “The interests and concerns of academic and commercial enterprise increasingly overlap” (Siegel, 2012, p. 30). W. C. Johnson (2006a) summarized:

It’s somewhat ironic that while recent infrastructure developments have enabled us to collaborate and engage with each other more easily than at any other time in history, changes in our thinking, attitudes, beliefs, and motivations have simultaneously placed obstacles in our way that have to be overcome. (p. 212)

Figure 1. Sabato's Triangle, developed in 1968 by Jorge Sabato and Natalio Botana, illustrates the relationship among government, U.S. businesses (labeled *Company*), and the private sector, such as *higher education* illustrated here. The team's thinking was considered “advanced for the time” (Hatakeyama & Ruppel, 2004, p. 2).

One highly visible aspect of interaction between higher education institutions and corporations is financial (Eddy, 2010; Fischer, 2000; Gould, 2003; Rhodes, 2001; Rose, 2011). Higher education is funded by tuition, government aid, and private support, which

includes individuals, foundations, and corporations. As governments cut funding, more of a burden falls on the private sector to help fund higher education purposes and goals (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Drezner, 2011; Gould; Johnson, 2006a; Levy, 1999; Rhodes, 2001; Shannon, 1991). Rhodes identified several factors in the rising costs of higher education; these have created financial challenges: technology expense and implementation; the processing of labor-intensity to educate students wholistically, which comes with a price tag of professionals' costs; new programs to meet current world demands; and opportunity costs of inclusivity for all people to have access. Corporations have a significant financial impact on higher education through charitable contributions, which constitute 16.9% of all funding dollars contributed and nearly 10% of higher education budgets (Kaplan, 2011).

“We need to be concerned about letting corporations dictate our social values, but this is not likely to happen” (Saul, 2011, p. 184). Saul indicated that nonprofits such as higher education institutions should help to set social agendas and then to create value propositions for funding partners such as corporations. Saul explained that corporations are defined as “impact buyers” (p. 184). Funding from corporations often comes with clearly defined expectations and limitations (Fischer, 2000; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Molnar, 2002). Debate about whether higher education institutions should receive corporate funding continues with varying viewpoints. “Companies seldom give resources out of altruistic motivations. Support for higher education is a strategic investment” (Sanzone, 2000, p. 321). “When a corporation funds charitable activities, it may do so with money that would otherwise be paid as taxes on profits...it often chooses projects

with an eye to the good name or long-term interests” (Rhodes, 2001, p. 144). Note, however, that motivations and ethical behaviors have also been a concern of higher education institutions because of some dishonest solicitation, donor manipulation, and institutional mission abandonment, among other factors cited in Caboni’s (2010) quantitative study of 1,047 fundraisers’ behavior in American colleges and universities.

Creating positive, productive relationships requires win-win solutions for both parties (Bruch & Walter, 2005; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Eddy, 2010; Levy, 1999; Siegel, 2012). Bolman and Deal (2008) indicated that the responsibility of organizational leaders is not to answer every question or to get every decision right but, rather, to be role models and catalysts for values—including ethical behavior—in all activities. When corporate self-regulation fails, government and society push for stronger legal and regulatory measures. Solomon (1993), however, called for deeper Aristotelian ethics, which include “honesty, dependability, courage, loyalty, integrity” (p. 105). Bolman and Deal observed that successful corporations engrain virtue and ethics into their corporate character. On the higher education side of the relationship, the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) have promoted self-regulation to ensure ethical behavior of fundraisers and of higher education leaders.

This doctoral research study is an organizational analysis—specifically viewing inter-organizational relationships. The dynamics between American higher education and U.S. corporations provided the opportunity to study inter-organizational relationship behavior. “Inter-organizational relations, as its subject name suggests, is concerned with relationships between and among organizations” (Cropper, Ebers, Huxham, & Ring,

2008, p. 4). An inter-organizational relationship “is concerned with understanding the character, pattern, origins, rationale, and consequences of such relationships” (Cropper et al., p. 4). “Inter-organizational relationships are subject to inherent development dynamics” (Ebers, 1999, p. 31). Four *dynamics* include “the parties’ motives,...the pre-conditions and contingencies of forming inter-organizational relationships,...the content, and...the outcomes” (Ebers, 1999, p. 31). Similarly, Aldrich (1979) indicated four dimensional considerations of formalization, intensity, reciprocity, and standardization of reoccurring behavior. Beyond these dynamics, organizations constantly learn how to act and to react to other organizations (Aldrich, 1979; Ebers, 1999; Guetzkow, 1966; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). The three processes for organizational learning and respective inter-organizational engagement include understanding, revaluation, and adjustment (Ebers, 1999; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). Ebers indicated,

In the course of an ongoing inter-organizational relationship, the parties may for instance learn more about the environmental challenges and opportunities that affect the contents and outcomes of their relationship; they may learn more about one another, for example, about their goals, capabilities, or trustworthiness; and they may learn how they could perhaps better design their relationship in order to achieve desired outcomes. (p. 38)

These dynamics and processes push inter-organizational relationships “to evolve over time” (Ebers, p. 38). “Over time, the interactions among organizations become institutionalized” through routine, formal associations, and frequent interactions (Guetzkow, 1966, p. 24).

A qualitative research approach, with an instrumental case study, provided the lens to explore and to examine these inter-organizational relationships (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2007, 2008; Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Janesick, 2000; Johnson

& Christensen, 2008; Merriam, 1998, 2009; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009) with six corporations and one higher education institution included. Using case study design, behaviors of the motives and expectations for return on investment (ROI) in the relationship with the higher education institution are compared for similarities and differences. This case study required corporate and higher education leaders' interviews to address the research questions that could explore and divulge organizational relationship perspectives and ethical concerns or dilemmas. Such a qualitative approach has been emergent in nature and allowed for an iterative process of data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2009; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009).

This study is important because attention to private support continues to increase as government dollars decrease. Additionally, most research in financial support and engagement of higher education institutions has been atheoretical and offers guidance only for practitioners (Caboni & Proper, 2007; Drezner, 2011; A. E. Kaplan, personal communication, November 4, 2011; Kelly, 1998; Young & Burlingame, 1996). This study can help fill a theoretical void in the literature specifically related to corporate support of American higher education and to the relationship perspective of the corporate citizenship spectrum. New data can usher in future research and engagement of corporations' practices in higher education.

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

Organizations are defined as social units created with some particular purpose (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). The goal of organizational theory is to "attempt to explain and predict how organizations and people in them will behave in varying organizational structures, cultures, and circumstances" (Shafritz et al., 2005, p. 3). This case study is

situated in the field of organizational theory and can be considered an organizational analysis between two major types of organizations: American higher education and U.S. corporations. This section provides background about organizational theory and foundational organizational behavior theories relating to this study and introduces Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, which is used as the conceptual framework for this doctoral study (see Appendix A).

Organizational Theory: A Brief History

The field of organizational theory developed and emerged during the 20th Century, when the problems of managing large national corporations forced leaders to look toward science and academe to maximize outputs and efficiencies; hence, scientific management became the foundation of the field (Shafritz et al., 2005). The first half of the 20th Century focused on internal control issues or *closed systems*, relating to structure, human resource capital, departmental and unit politics, and resource efficiencies (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Shafritz et al., 2005). The latter half of the century shifted to external control issues or *open systems*, considering broader environmental issues such as competition; marketing; the U.S. economy; the global market and economy; and equality and diversity's social issues such as those based on gender, ethnicity or national origin, and sexual orientation (Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005).

Organizational theory was initially grouped by commonalities and typically by the time period in which issues gave cause for research, analysis, and practice (Shafritz et al., 2005). For example, the 1920s and 1930s were concerned with classical issues of scientific management whereas the 1960s and 1970s emphasized social human resource

perspectives, including pro-social behavior. Until about 1950, organizational theory focused on closed systems; and, thereafter, the emphasis shifted to open systems and externalities (Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005).

Four major organizational analysis theories include the *system-structural view*, *strategic choice*, *natural selection*, and *collective action*. First, *system-structural view* dealt with bureaucracy, rules, and hierarchies. Blau and Scott explored that topic in 1962; Fayol, in 1949; Gulick and Urwick, in 1937; Lawrence and Lorsch, in 1967; Merton, in 1940; and Thompson, in 1967. Second, *strategic choice view* considered variables and forces in external control. Bittner explained it in 1965; Blau, in 1964; Feldman and March, in 1981; Strauss, Schatzman, Erlick, Bucher, and Sabshin, in 1963; and Weick, in 1979. Third, *natural selection view* accented organizations' needs to make decisions to survive and to relate to the markets and economy, said Aldrich (1979), Hannan and Freeman, in 1977; Pfeffer and Salancik (2003); and Porter, in 1981. Finally, *collective action view* related to goal attainment through the best alternatives with input of all factors internally and externally. Emery and Trist researched the collective action view in 1973; Hawley, in 1950 and 1968; and Schon, in 1971 (Shafritz et al., 2005).

In 1983 Astley and Van de Ven grouped those four views into a matrix considering organizational analysis as *macro* or *micro* and either *deterministic* or *voluntaristic* (Shafritz et al., 2005) (See Figure 2). The macro-micro vertical continuum focused on communities of organizations versus single organizations, while deterministic-voluntaristic orientation on the horizontal continuum classified the organization's autonomy and self-direction versus behavioral actions determined by structural constraints. Guetzkow (1966) indicated that autonomy is important as it creates

separate social units, which are organizations of various sorts.

In 2003 Scott offered an alternative by organizing the major theories into three perspectives: rational, natural, and open systems (Shafritz et al., 2005). Rational views included bureaucracy, rules, hierarchies, scientific management, administration, specialization, and coordination of work. Natural systems dealt with social systems, informal relations, individuals and groups, human relations, and cooperative systems.

Finally, open systems became the perspective that organizations functioned interdependently within a wider environment and considered interactions with other organizations (Cropper et al., 2008; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005; Thompson, 2005). Carroll and Hannan (2004) defined the environment to include other organizations, natural actors, political structures, technologies, and physical environments.

Macro level	Natural Selection View	Collective Action View
Micro level	System- structural View	Strategic Choice View
	Deterministic Orientation	Voluntaristic Orientation

Figure 2. Astley and Van de Ven's (1983) *Organizational Analysis Matrix* used to organize major thought schools of organizational theories.

Bolman and Deal (2008) dissected four organizational frames within a given organization: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic, or cultural. Although these frames deal with internal operations of organizations, the sub-parts' distinct qualities affect each organization's interactions with other organizations. This dissertation

touches on all four frames. First, the structural frame addressed the two types of organizations and how they positioned themselves to interact with each other for mutual benefit to achieve specific goals. Second, the human resources frame included the collection of individual leaders who were decision-makers and ethical actors representing the university and the corporations. Third, the political frame considered the interactions by the organizations, the U.S. economy, and organizations' brand authenticity. Finally, the symbolic or cultural frame explored the American philanthropic culture, the essence of each participant organization and its reputation, and each individual who accepted or refuted the organizations' behavior. For this study, the emphasis focused on a university as a single unit and six corporations as sub-units—all as organizational actors. Although it is understood that buildings and organizations do not make decisions or behave, the people associated with organizations did and do.

Foundational Organizational Behavior Theories for This Organizational Analysis

This study is situated in open systems theory between organizations or inter-organizational behavior. Rosen (1991) and Yin (2009) included inter-organizational partnerships with organizational theories for case study research. Additionally, individual, group, and societal theories are cited as they relate to ethics, interpersonal interactions, decision-making, and corporate citizenship issues, which ultimately create the basis for inter-organizational dynamics. Shafritz et al. (2005) defined a *system* as any organized grouping of parts that are united through interactions to accomplish goals. According to Shafritz et al.,

Systems theory views an organization as a complex set of dynamically intertwined and interconnected elements, including its inputs, processes, outputs, and feedback loops, and the environment in which it operates and with which it continuously interacts. A change in any element of the

system causes changes in other elements. The interconnections tend to be complex, dynamic, and often unknown; thus, when management makes decisions involving one organizational element, unanticipated impacts usually occur throughout the organizational system. [While open systems are] multidimensional and complex in their assumptions about organizational cause-and-effect relationships...always-changing processes of interactions among organizational and environmental elements...not static, but rather are in constantly shifting states of dynamic equilibrium [and] adaptive systems that are integral parts of their environments. (pp. 476-477)

Jacoby (1973) highlighted the complexity of trying to understand corporations and all their related disciplines:

Corporate law treats of the corporate constitution; economics of corporate pricing, production, and finance; political theory of corporate government; psychology of organizational behavior; sociology of the interaction between corporations and other social bodies; and history in the development of corporate enterprise in the nation. Each of these specialized studies throws light on a significant facet of corporate structure and behavior.... To assess an institution in a static framework is to apply a false test, from which irrelevant or erroneous conclusions are drawn. Only with an understanding of its dynamic social context can the true strengths and weaknesses of corporate business be appraised. (p. xvii)

Individual institutions must be cognizant of operating sound, efficient internal organizations, or *closed systems* (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Thompson, 2005). However, as organizations interact with their outside environments and engage in interdependent relationships with other organizations, those systems are considered *open systems*. In 1966 Katz and Kahn's *The Social Psychology of Organizations* provided the major open systems background by combining classical, neoclassical, human resources, behavioral, modern structural, and systems perspectives. Johnson, Kast, and Rosenzweig (1964) and Evan (1965) defined the theory of inter-organizational relations. Later, Cropper et al. (2008) "described systems theory as a way of integrating diverse internal and external factors" and reached the understanding that "firms were part of larger systems" (p. 4).

The open systems theory considered both inputs and outputs of organizations. Major characteristics of open systems included input of energy; through-put of processing; some type of output; cyclical occurrences; negative entropy; information and communications input, negative feedback, and coding; steady state and dynamic homeostasis; differentiation identity, and equifinality. All of these processes dealt with input and management of activities from an organization's external environment and reaction or proactive behavior. Negative entropy was the organization's intent to survive. Likewise, the steady state and dynamic homeostasis concepts were basic principles to preserve the character of the system or organization. Equifinality of the open system was the concept that there was more than one way of producing a given outcome (Katz & Kahn, 2005).

Organizations must balance internal efficiency with external effectiveness (Carroll & Hannan, 2004; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Touraine (1977) explained,

An organization has an action simultaneously inside and outside itself. On the one hand it defines its objectives and organizes exchanges; on the other, it establishes norms and maintains its equilibrium, which is to say that relations between its parts that are compatible with its integration and with the pursuit of its objectives. It is through its objectives that the organization belongs most directly to a society.... (p. 241)

The two internal and external requirements challenged the internal workings to respond to external dynamics, which are “a problem-facing and problem-solving phenomenon” (Thompson, 2005, p. 494). Organizations are challenged with uncertainty and survival; they must deal with “...constraints which the organization must face, contingencies which the organization must meet, and variables which the organization can control” (Thompson, 2005, p. 503). Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) suggest three major externalities

with which organizations must contend and manage in the inter-organizational environment: effectiveness, information management, and constraints. “To acquire resources, organizations must inevitably interact with their social environments” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 19).

Also germane to understanding organizational behavior for this study is Albert and Whetten’s (1985) organizational identity theory, which is similar to Katz and Kahn’s (2005) differentiation concept. Organizational identity encompasses the essence of an organization by creating a claimed central character; distinguishing one organization from others, creating claimed distinctiveness; and constituting specific features of sameness, consistency, or continuity over time, also called *temporal continuity* (Albert & Whetten; Daw & Cone, 2011). In society, identity helps all individuals and all other organizations to understand what type of institution an organization is, such as public or private, for-profit or not-for-profit, business or education, religious, or governmental. These identity features holistically summarize an organization’s brand essence, reinforced by behavior and ongoing decisions. Typically, organizations solve problems or make decisions “in the easiest, most satisfactory way: by obtaining facts if that is easy, by calculation if that is easy, or by discussing values that are easiest to discuss and on which there will most likely be a consensus” (Albert & Whetten, p. 265).

For this study, organizations must be understood to function as individual units in society. Inherent to a stable organization are distinct internal, rational functions of responsibility and control for maximum efficiency; they include technical, managerial, and institutional processes (Thompson, 2005). To survive, however, organizations must be effective (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). “Organizational effectiveness is an external

standard of how well an organization is meeting the demands of the various groups and organizations that are concerned with its activities. .... The organization can and does manipulate, influence and create acceptability for itself ....” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 11).

Ashforth and Mael’s (1989) social identity theory is rooted within organizational identity. Social identity theory classifies groups of people through common interests, goals, and activities. Thus, individuals create an organization, and organizational identification affects both the individual and the effectiveness of the organization. Hall, Schneider, and Nygren (1970) defined *organizational identification* as “the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent” (pp. 176-177). Such contribution by individuals is called “organizational citizenship behavior” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 3). Individuals—whether moral, immoral, or amoral—within organizations ultimately make decisions. “Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ et al., p. 3). Those individuals then act collectively to consummately make decisions and act as agents for an organization. Therefore, actions of individuals become synonymous with the organization. Such behavior includes strategy, planning, resource prioritization, organizational learning, marketing and brand promotion, and internal self-management.

Individuals’ behavior “would have less effect on organizational outcomes than [it] would [on] an organization’s context” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 9). Supporting thought is that selection processes for new hires are promulgated similarly with current or

future leaders; individuals have limited discretionary decision-making; and many issues affecting organizations are not controlled by individuals but, rather, by external forces such as clients, governmental regulations, the economy, tax policies, and other organizations. Both social identity theory and organizational identity theory claim that distinctiveness of organizations promotes certain values and practices that relate best to those of comparable groups with similar values, practices, prestige, and goals (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Organ et al., 2006). Organizations affiliate and partner with other institutions that embody their salient identities. Such affinity for one another's organizations promotes inter-organizational cohesion, cooperation, and positive interactions. Such reinforcement creates longevous relationships.

Pro-social behavior equals those actions that promote assisting others in both non-emergency and emergency situations. Examples included "helping, sharing, donating, cooperating, and volunteering" (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986, p. 710). The main tenet of pro-social behavior is that "the individual has the freedom to decide whether or not to help" (Bar-Tal, 1976, p. 5). Pro-social behavior can be altruistic, transactional, or reciprocal. Altruistic behavior is voluntary, benefits another, and does not include any expectation of reward. People learn such behavior through reinforcement or modeling. Transactional or exchange pro-social behavior still includes assisting another in some way and comes with non-material or intangible rewards such as prestige or acceptance. Reciprocal pro-social behavior, such as the concept of *pay it forward*, is the assumption that helping someone allows a returned favor in the future either by that person or by the larger aura of life (Bar-Tal, 1976).

It is important to discuss the theory of pro-social behavior to better understand

social responsibility and the overarching idea of philanthropy. In the American culture the socially accepted norm is to help others. Variables in peoples' actions include personal background, situational circumstances, characteristics of the person in need, and one's culture. The transactional and reciprocal forms of pro-social behavior also include a cost-reward analysis for action (Bar-Tal, 1976; Saul, 2011). According to Brief and Motowidlo (1986) in an organizational setting,

Pro-social organizational behavior is behavior which is (a) performed by a member of an organization, (b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and (c) performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed. (p. 711)

This definition is intentionally broad to encompass many different behaviors. Managing both functional and dysfunctional pro-social behaviors adds to organizational effectiveness and is "vital for organizational survival" (Brief & Motowidlo, p. 710). Probably, Jacoby's (1973) social environment model, discussed in Chapter Two, exhibits both social identity theory and pro-social behavior to offer a perspective of corporations' options to interact with other organizations. Specifically, pro-social behavior in philanthropy is labeled as the "gift economy" and considered "generosity, charity, compassion, gratitude, and mutuality" (Fischer, 2000, p. 189).

This study mentions three other organizational theories that can add to understanding the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporate America: Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory, dealing with socially constructed practices and norms relating to cultural and environmental influences; Pfeffer and Salancik's (2003) resource dependence theory, which stressed that all organizations must exchange resources with other organizations for survival; and Slaughter and

Rhoades's (2004) academic capitalism theory, concerned with corporate America's unduly influencing higher education through resource contributions and arrangements.

Meyer and Rowan (1977) argued that institutional theory creates three types of pressures in institutions, including in higher education: (a) coercive pressures from legal mandates or influence from organizations upon whom they are dependent, (b) mimetic pressures to copy successful models during high uncertainty, and (c) normative pressures to create homogeneity, which stems from the similar attitudes and approaches of professional groups and associations brought into the organization through hiring practices. The resource dependence theory by Aldrich (1979) and further refined by Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) defined how higher education looks outside itself for resources—including from state and federal governments and corporate support, which highlights Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory pressures. Evan (1965) noted:

All formal organizations are embedded in an environment of other organizations as well as a complex of norms, values, and collectiveness of the society at large. Inherent in the relationship between any formal organization and its environment is the fact that it is to some degree dependent upon its environment. (p. B218)

Aiken and Hage (1968) assumed that “as the need for resources intensifies, organizations are more likely to develop greater interdependencies with other organizations, joint programs, in order to gain resources” (p. 915). However, in the process, “organizations attempt to maximize their gains and minimize their losses...they want to lose as little power and autonomy as possible in their exchange for other resources” (p. 916). Aiken and Hage further discussed a variety of inter-organizational concerns such as goals or complexity of relationships, communications, degree of centralization, and degree of formality for inter-organizational interactions. Touraine (1977) explained that an

organization “is dependent upon both technical constraints and social objectives, but it is autonomous in that it is a decision center that can establish exchanges with the outside as well as internal norms of functioning” (p. 242).

Academic capitalism, defined by Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) in the 1990s, contends that higher education institutions serve as a ground to produce academic products and marketable goods and services to financially benefit the institution as well as society—specifically corporate sponsors or underwriters. However, many view the other side of this entrepreneurial activity of corporate America as unduly influencing higher education in ways like directing curriculum content, swaying decision-making by faculty and administrators, purchasing research and ideas at low costs, recruiting graduates as employees, manipulating vendor relationships, and eroding educational agendas in deference to market demands (Etzkowitz et al., 1998; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Gould, 2003; Haley, 1991; Liggett, 2000; Molnar, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Stein, 2004; Washburn, 2005; White, 2000). This perspective did not favor corporations’ perceived self-serving motivations.

This doctoral study, however, explored a new perspective through Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, which was designed to better understand the complex relationships and behavior of corporations through motivations, strategic goals and objectives, expectations for reciprocal ROI, and potential investment into stakeholders. Higher education is one such organization receiving attention, engagement, and resources from corporations.

Conceptual Framework Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum

All inter-organizational relationship research includes two key frames: “a set of

dimensions describing the organizations and a set of dimensions describing the nature of relationships through which they are linked” (Cropper et al., 2008, p. 9). Several scholars have developed models and theories addressing the relationship between business and society (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Edwards, 2008; Frishkoff & Kostecka, 1991; Garriga & Melé, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Munilla & Miles, 2005; Saia, 1999; Saul, 2011; Sethi, 1975; Stangis, 2007; Waddock, 2004; Young & Burlingame, 1996). Although others have hinted at the existence of a spectrum, Cone (2010) crafted a visual concept about such relationships. Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum (see Figure 3) was used as the conceptual framework for this study.

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)

Figure 3. Cone’s (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum gave visual representation to the range of purposes and motives of corporate citizens and delineates the various relationships corporations have with the non-profit world, including higher education. Parenthetical interpretations were added by the researcher for reader simplicity.

The multidimensional spectrum illustrated a continuum of four categories identifying key corporate citizenship functions: *Philanthropy*, *Cause-related Branding*, *Operational Culture*, and *DNA Citizenship Ethos*—as a continuum from left to right. Cone’s (2010) conceptual framework has not been used for research purposes, and its individual components have developed over time. Her individual concepts have been defined and studied but not previously formally linked in a continuum. Work by Carroll and Buchholtz (2008) has explored, defined, and provided examples for many key

concepts. Additionally, work by Garriga and Melé (2004) and Waddock (2004) have investigated and defined many important theories and approaches.

Philanthropy

Philanthropy, or the Greek word *philanthropia*, meaning *love of humankind* (Walton & Gasman, 2008), requires financial or other resource support be given to a nonprofit to manage as needed to further a cause to enhance the well-being of humanity (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Drezner, 2011; Levy & Cherry, 1996). Typically, corporations give money or in-kind resources or services to non-profits to manage on their own. No expectations of tangible returns typically exist although intangible rewards may be provided. Reporting on a nonprofit's outcomes typically is illustrated in its annual report. In general, philanthropy considers "voluntary giving of time or money for public purposes" (Walton & Gasman, 2008). Philanthropic responsibilities "reflect current expectations of business by the public" (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 43). "The amount and nature of these activities are voluntary, guided only by business's desire to engage in social activities that are not mandated, not required by law, and not generally expected" (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 43).

Cause-related Branding

Cause-related branding is defined as corporate financial support or a partnership developed with a reciprocity, or specific ROI, expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). This scenario requires a mutual exchange of monetary support or other resources from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the nonprofit in a tangible manner. In the higher education setting, examples included naming opportunities, research, and specific initiatives. Performance is monitored carefully.

Operational Culture

Operational culture refers to companies that view nonprofits as a strategic key in their corporate identity and behavior so charitable contributions are given with high expectation of assisting with, or engaging in, implementation. “Culture can be defined as a shared set of values that influence societal perceptions, attitude, preferences, and responses” (Robbins & Stylianou, 2003, p. 206). In *operational culture*, a stakeholder view of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is optimized (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010). The stakeholder view is a corporation’s consideration of all people involved in its business, including not only shareholders but also employees, employees’ families, customers, vendors, suppliers, and their communities. Intertwined with CSR is the concept of strategic philanthropy; in it is “an approach to giving that links a company’s business strengths with community needs” (Brown, 2004, p. 151). Key areas of concern in developing operational culture include philosophy, values, mission, strategy, structure, resource commitment, and style (Hall, 1991).

DNA Citizenship Ethos

Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, more commonly known as the *Brundtland Report*, established corporations’ emphasis on the triple bottom line of sustainability, which included attention to people, profit, and planet (United Nations, 1987). Corporations focus on all three areas simultaneously and typically are involved with a nonprofit’s programming. Morgan (2006) explained corporate DNA this way:

The visions, values, and sense of purpose that bind an organization together can be used as a way of helping every individual understand and absorb the mission and challenge of the whole enterprise. Just as DNA in nature carries a holographic code that contains the information required to

unfold the complete development of the human body, it is possible to encode key elements of a *complete organization* in the cultural and other codes that unite its members.” (p. 99)

Members, therefore, acting collectively, create the DNA of an organization. In this instance, the *DNA citizenship ethos* means that the corporations from the ground up—or in the actual essence and existence of the corporation beyond just culture—considers the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how it goes about doing business (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 2012; Reichart, 1999; Saul, 2011). This DNA citizenship ethos is engrained in the corporation’s mission and philosophy and is concerned with society—both people and the environment—as much as making a profit (Cone, 2010). Most recently, this attention to the triple bottom line has been referred to as “social, environmental, and economic responsibility and sustainability (SEERS)” (Greenberg, McKone-Sweet, & Wilson, 2011, p. 12). Corporations even have designed a special accounting system to measure and to report all efforts in the triple bottom line (Edwards, 2008). The DNA citizenship ethos may be equated with transformative innovation. “Business organizations engage in transformation innovation when they embrace social, environmental, ethical or similar initiatives” (Bright, Fry, & Cooperrider, 2006, p. 28). According to Sheldon (2000),

There has been a very definite shift away from traditional reactive philanthropy to a much more proactive, strategic approach. ... [so] company officials often pre-identify organizations with which they wish to be associated and ... provide a mix of support options.... There is no doubt that a company’s approach to and interest in philanthropy depends in large part on whether it is considered a core value of the company and its employees. All companies fall into a continuum when it comes to philanthropy, ranging from absolutely no interest in (and perhaps even resistance to) giving to a commitment to helping nonprofits as much as possible.... (pp. 12 & 14)

Others' Business and Society Concepts, Theories, Models, and Spectrums

The concept of corporate interaction with society as a spectrum has emerged and evolved in the past several decades. Sethi (1975) suggested an analytical framework to begin measuring and reporting corporations' behavior. He identified three categories: *social obligation, proscriptive; social responsibility, prescriptive; and social responsiveness, anticipatory and preventive*. Sethi's schema considered each corporation's search for legitimacy, ethical norms, social accountability for corporate actions, operating strategy, response to social pressures, activities pertaining to governmental actions, legislative and political activities, and philanthropy. Frishkoff and Kostecka (1991) provided a philosophical framework for charitable business contributions to include (left-to-right): *altruism, shared benefits, enlightened self-interest, charitable investment, and stewardship*. Young and Burlingame (1996) offered four models of corporate philanthropy: the neoclassical/corporate philanthropy model, the ethical/altruistic model, the political model, and the stakeholder model. These four models relate to Cone's (2010) spectrum in three of the four boxes: *ethical/altruistic* as philanthropy, *neoclassical/corporate philanthropy* and *political philanthropy* as cause-related marketing, and *stakeholder* as operational culture; the DNA citizenship ethos was missing. Saia (1999) concluded that corporate giving has become more strategic and also provided a continuum for corporate philanthropy, which included (left-to-right): *altruistic, enlightened self-interest, societal strategy, and fiduciary strategy*. Saia's continuum correlates to Cone's spectrum as *altruistic* relating to philanthropy, *societal strategic* relating to cause-related branding, and *fiduciary strategy* and *enlightened self-interest* relating to operational culture and stakeholder management; the DNA citizenship

ethos was missing. Munilla and Miles (2005) focused on a mini-continuum including *compliance*, *strategic*, and *forced behaviors* by combining ideas from several other scholars. Munilla and Miles' continuum is wholly concerned with stakeholder pressures and relates to Cone's organizational culture or stakeholder management area.

Stages of Corporate Citizenship: A Developmental Framework (Mirvis & Googins, 2006) detailed how a corporation matures in credibility, capacity, coherence, and commitment to the pluralistic society through five stages, which included elementary, engaged, innovative, integrated, and transforming. These five stages related to six dimensions of a corporation: citizenship concept, strategic intent, leadership, structure of the organization, issues management, stakeholder relationships, and transparency. The matrix was used to understand internal efficiencies and perspectives of leaders' developmental challenges. However, the stages' concept did not include organizational effectiveness in relationships with other organizations.

Without elaborating, Stangis (2007) indicated there was a corporate social responsibility spectrum with *responsibility* on one end and *social* on the other end. Likewise, Edwards (2008) noted that corporations' involvement with nonprofits occurred on a spectrum: One end of the spectrum was *corporate philanthropy*, and at the other end was the *triple bottom line*, also called *total corporate responsibility*. Along the continuum existed volunteer opportunities and systems (e.g., higher education) that are concerned with the interactive relationship between corporations and nonprofits. Edwards claimed, "In civil society, social transformation is usually a deliberate goal to be achieved through conscious collective action" (p. 56). W. Johnson (2011) presented a university-industry partnership continuum; however, it wholly fits within Cone's cause-related branding box.

W. Johnson (2011) included these categories (left-to-right): *awareness*, *involvement*, *support*, *sponsorship*, and *strategic partnering*. Finally, Saul (2012) created both a spectrum and a business and society quartile. The spectrum included *accountability* on the left and *business value* on the right with corporations addressing “charity, strategic philanthropy,” and “social innovation” (Saul, p. 9). The quartile labeled the *y axis* to address low to high “social value” and the *x axis* addressing low to high “economic value” (p. 10). The four boxes of the axis included “charity” of “small-scale donations” (low-low), “strategic philanthropy focused on key social outcomes” (high-low), “commercial cause marketing and sponsorships” (low-high), and “social innovation creating economic value through social change” (high-high) (p. 10). Saul’s concept, although an axis instead of a continuum, is the closest to Cone’s concepts, except it lacks environmental concerns found in the DNA citizenship ethos in Cone’s spectrum.

Garriga and Melé (2004) categorized business and society content into four theoretical groupings: instrumental theories (economics), political theories (politics), integrative theories (social), and value theories (ethics). Carroll and Buchholz (2008) and Garriga and Melé indicated that four major considerations surfaced: having long-term perspectives, “...using business power in a responsible way, integrating social demands, and contributing to a good society by doing what is ethically correct” (Garriga & Melé, p. 65). However, the umbrella term for corporate philanthropy, corporate responsibility, corporate social responsibility, accountability, sustainability, sustainable development, global citizenship, and corporate citizenship is *corporate citizenship* (Googins et al., 2007; Waddock, 2004). Corporate citizenship is “the way a company takes responsibility and is accountable for managing its social and environmental impacts on society”

(Pinney, 2009, p. 6). Corporate citizenship today is universally defined as,

The contribution a company makes to society through its core business activities, its social investment and philanthropy programmes, and its engagement in public policy. The manner in which a company manages its economic, social and environmental relationships, as well as those with different stakeholders, in particular shareholders, employees, customers, business partners, governments and communities determines its impact. (World Economic Forum, 2002, p. 1)

Such “citizenship activities, therefore, encompass corporate investments of time and money in pro bono work, philanthropy, support for community education and health, and protection of the environment” (Gardberg & Fombrun, 2006, p. 329).

Statement of the Problem

Varying views have endured on the purposes, merits, consequences, and realities that manifest in the relationship between corporate America and higher education (Abbott et al., 2011; AFP, 2011; Business-Higher Education Forum, 2011; Baruch, 1984; Baumol, 1984; Boyd & Halfond, 1990; Bright et al., 2006; Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Brooks, 1984; Brown, 2004; Buchanan, 1991; Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Burson, 2009; CASE, 2011; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Clark, 1984; Cleland et al., 2012; Cohen, 2010; Connelly, 2006; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Drucker, 1984; Eddy, 2010; Elliott, 2006; Fox, 2006; Gould, 2003; Hearn, 2003; Hickman, 2011; Just & Hoffman, 2009; Karoff, 2004; Kolderie, 1984; Liebman, 1984; Matthews & Norgaard, 1984; McCraw, 1984; Meuth, 1991; NACRO, 2011; Norris, 1984; Pollack, 1998; Reed, 2007; Rose, 2011; Samans, 2005; Sanzone, 2000; Sears, 1922; Sheldon, 2000; Siegel, 2007, 2008, 2012; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Sommerville, 2009; Steele, 2009; Sundquist, 1984; Symonds, 2009a, 2009b; Torgersen-Paul, 2008; UIDP, 2012; von Stein, 1975; Votaw, 1973; Washburn, 2005; White, 2000;

Wilson, 2011b; Worth, 2002; Worthy, 1984; & Young & Burlingame, 1996). Ostrander and Schervish (2002) argued that a two-way social relationship exists between a donor (e.g., a corporation) and a recipient (e.g., a higher education institution). This relationship involves a social cause and financial backing of that cause; however, byproducts or other tangible and intangible benefits exist and can be manipulated. Donors, recipient organizations, and boards all play a role in such manipulative behavior (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Haley, 1991; Ma & Parish, 2006).

Higher education institutions have had various reasons to be engaged with corporations, which have historically had a variety of reasons for being corporate citizens (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Cone, 2010; Fischer, 2000; Fry, Keim, & Meiners, 1982; Gould, 2003; Johnson, O., 1966; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Saiia, 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Examples include: view of shareholder philanthropic support, managerial discretion and passion for social-related causes, ability to give from profitability and economic status, board emphasis on charitable causes, and a host of strings-attached reasons such as ROI, advertisements, relatively low-cost investments such as research, public relations, image, and social currency (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Fischer, 2000; Gould, 2003; Litan & Mitchell, 2011).

In the pluralistic U.S. society, people expect corporations to be profitable as the economic cornerstone of the capitalist system. With this economic motive comes legal and ethical expectations (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Drucker, 1946; Solomon, 1993). The American people expect corporations to obey all laws and regulations, to protect society through safe products and practices, to fulfill contractual

obligations, and to honor promises in guarantees. Ethically, corporations are expected to avoid questionable practices, respond to the spirit and letter of the law, and protect employees and the environment (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Reichart, 1999). Corporate citizenship provides corporations with a direct engagement with higher education institutions. Basically, corporate citizenship or corporate social responsibility is concerned with minimizing harm in society and maximizing benefit through shared value with all stakeholders (Googins et al., 2007; Waddock, 2004). What are the motivations and expectations of both corporate America and higher education in their inter-organizational relationship, and are the motives and expectations of engagement performed ethically? “Complex organizations...are ubiquitous in modern societies, but our understanding of them is limited and segmented” (Thompson, 2005, p. 491).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this organizational analysis, which is an ethnographic, instrumental case study, is to gain a better understanding of the inter-organizational relationship between U.S. corporations and American higher education’s motivations, expected ROI, and ethical concerns. “The causes that companies choose to support often reflect national and international economic pressures and events” (DaSilva & Kerkian, 2008, p. 13). In the past decade education has emerged once again as the highest-priority concern for Americans (DaSilva & Kerkian, 2008).

An instrumental case study of six corporations’ engaging with a higher education institution provided additional awareness and a better understanding of the inter-organizational relationship between corporate America and higher education institutions. Analysis across embedded units allowed for comparison of similarities and differences in

motivations and expected ROI for corporate engagement (Bernard & Ryan, 2010).

“The study of inter-organizational relations has been quite limited in terms of its depth of analysis” (Siegel, 2008, p. 221). Although “existing research offers some guidance for practitioners, the implications are limited by the failure to ground the research in theoretical or conceptual frameworks” (Drezner, 2011, p. 2). “Although thoughtful practitioners and scholars have made important headway, we still have trouble answering the question—‘Why do businesses engage in giving and volunteering?’” (Young & Burlingame, 1996, p. 158). This doctoral study explored Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, which added to the body of knowledge as a conceptual framework. Additionally, this study helped to better describe the relationship between higher education and corporate America.

Research Questions

This qualitative study focused on the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporate America’s behavior as defined through Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Three key questions were used to explore this relationship and to guide this study:

1. Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?
2. Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?
3. What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationships

between corporations and a higher education institution?

Limitations, Assumptions, and Design Considerations

This study examined multiple data sources, including a document and audio-visual review of higher education marketing materials (stating their mission and need for support), a document and audio-visual review of corporate marketing materials (stating their relationship goals for engaging with nonprofit programs), a document and audio-visual review of corporations' actual behavior in supporting and engaging with higher education (via financial documentation and annual reports), interviews from both corporate and higher education personnel, and observation field notes from interviews and a campus tour. However, limitations and researcher assumptions would have had an effect on the conclusion of this study. As with any study, there was potential for researcher bias that may have influenced data analysis or findings; thus it was critical for the researcher to acknowledge bias to increase confirmability (Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013). Such reflexivity involved "self-awareness and critical self-reflection by the researcher on his...potential biases and predispositions as these may affect the research process and conclusions" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 276).

Limitations

Limitations are elements that may hinder or omit information in the research process because of the available sample quality, construct of instruments, time or other resources, or other restraints that needed to be managed to minimize their impact (Mertens, 2005). Limitations of this study included: level of corporate and higher education individuals interviewed, the type of higher education institution involved in the scope of the study, and the self-reported financial data from higher education institutions.

Individuals Interviewed

The first limitation was the type of individuals interviewed. Specifically, corporate and higher education leaders interviewed were a specific group of individuals, who likely serve in leadership roles that help set strategy, priorities, and policy for the organizations involved. Opinions of general employees, faculty, students, alumni, and the community were not considered, but they would likely have different views from the leaders.

Type of Higher Education Institution

Second, the kind of higher education institution studied was a major not-for-profit, public university. While the six corporations' engagement was assigned on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, the same corporations' interactions with other types of higher education institutions may have looked different. Additionally, corporations in other industries may have had different goals. Other types of institutions could be private universities, liberal arts colleges, or community colleges so the major public university might not have been representational of all American higher education institutions.

Participant Selection Data

Finally, financial data examined were for a limited timeframe (2006-2010). This time may or may not have represented behavior of corporations' full ability or behavior to be engaged in higher education as it included tough economic years that affected corporate ability to contribute to charitable organizations and fundraisers' ability to solicit contributions. Philanthropic self-reported data from higher education institutions were used as the basis for university participant selection. From the 4,300 current higher

education institutions in the United States (Carnegie Foundation, 2011), this researcher chose one way of selecting participants. The Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) surveys yielded major research universities—both public and private—on the top list of self-reported data regarding receipt of significant corporate support. Other collation of higher education institutions' yielding a different participant pool could have been used and justified. The VSE is the largest collation of higher education data to include corporate information. While the VSE contains only philanthropic data, it still provided a consistent basis for identification and selection of a participant university. Likely those same institutions are also high on the list of universities participating in various organizational relationships with corporations, including but not limited to cause-related sponsorships, faculty research, and other partnerships of mutual benefit.

The case study approach allowed this researcher to summarize findings to potentially apply, or to transfer, to this type of organizational behavior for American universities and colleges and to similar types of U.S. corporations (Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013; Stake, 2005). The study portrayed the perceptions of the relationship between one university and six corporations interviewed and did not focus on practice for only the participant university. Such an emphasis added to the base of information and to future practice for higher education and U.S. corporations in general.

Assumptions

This study and its credibility relied on the assumption that self-reported financial data were accurate. Higher education institutions raised money and were required to report both financial information and non-profit outcomes reports so the information is

organized consistently by those reporting standards. The Council for Aid to Education (CAE), based in New York City, has conducted an annual survey since 1957 to collect data from higher education and K-12 institutions in the United States. This data included financial support from corporations, foundations, alumni, and other individuals.

The VSE survey is the nation's leading source of data on private giving to education through this annual survey (Kaplan, 2011). The survey was designed to collate information regarding "amounts, sources, donor-specified purposes, and forms of private gifts, grants, and bequests" (Kaplan, 2011, p. VSE-10/37). The VSE survey data were self-reported by each participating institution. Mertens (2005) cautioned that the credibility of self-reported data is always of concern. Because CAE has consistently gathered VSE data annually since 1957, the process was likely credible and was reinforced by the required governmental tax accounting document: *IRS Form 990—Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax*, commonly called *Form 990* (Grabois, 2010; Swords, 2011). Additionally, many fundraising, nonprofit, and governmental agencies use the VSE statistical reports as a benchmark or reference point; among them are *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and *The Non-Profit Times*. Although accuracy was likely reported in the VSE, the data reflected dynamic information representing complex factors at each reporting institution: the importance and effort placed on fundraising, economic climate, and availability of philanthropic dollars.

This researcher brought several biased views to the study after having worked in fundraising roles at a major public university and two private, liberal arts colleges. Additionally, the researcher was intimately knowledgeable about higher education

fundraising and has been a certified fundraising executive (CFRE), recognizing his success in fundraising, marketing, and public relations, since 1997. The researcher is pro-fundraising, which could have influenced data collection as well as interpretation after data analysis. However, Stake (2005) indicated that experiential knowledge of the area of research is a positive attribute as to the researcher having an arsenal of knowledge, acculturation of the field, and credibility to gain access to participants and interviewees.

Finally, a major assumption in this study was that the independent organizations were stable and efficient internally in their closed systems. Each had to have the ability to interact with other organizations and to deal with externalities. Organizations in and of themselves were complex because of internal stabilization and external contingencies and constraints to survive. This study did not look at the closed systems of the independent organizations but rather, through the open-systems perspective of the university's interdependent relationships with each of the six corporations.

Design Considerations

Design considerations were important to minimize the limitations on the research process, findings, and conclusions (Mertens, 2005). Using multiple methods and multiple data sources to address the research questions provided trustworthiness and dependability in this constructivist paradigm (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995). The qualitative approach gave flexibility and was emergent (Merriam, 2009). Information from six corporations allowed for cross-unit analysis and placement on the corporate citizenship spectrum.

Personal perspectives from individual face-to-face interviews helped to develop key ideas, gather information, and identify ethical concerns. Additional individuals were

interviewed in both the university and corporation settings until saturation was reached. Reaching saturation and having patterns emerge added to the trustworthiness and dependability (Creswell, 2007; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Mertens, 2005; Seidman, 1991; Stake, 1995, 2005).

To mitigate researcher bias, a careful third-person or bird's-eye stance was taken to maintain a scientific, realist approach to data collection, interviews, and data analyses (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Erickson, 2011). Additionally, it was important in the process to engage other professionals in the development and implementation of instruments (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Yin, 2009). While *a priori* codes provided a general framework for coding and hypothesizing context within Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship frame, it was vital while analyzing data to be organized in looking for patterns to emerge and not to have any preconceived notions of what might develop in findings and conclusions (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Yin, 2009).

Finally, no research was conducted to investigate the internal systems or efficiency of the organizations involved. The premise was that if the university and corporations were externally interacting with other organizations, their stability and, in general terms, their internal systems must have been inherently stable enough to do so. The focus of this study was on external, open systems.

Definitions of Key Terms

To create an understandable dialogue of vocabulary associated with this study, the definitions section defines and describes applicable concepts and key words. Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum concepts are elaborated here. Additionally, this section defines several business, corporate, and higher education terms.

Cone's (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum

Cone's spectrum is comprised of four key concepts: philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos. Each of these concepts has developed over time. The following provides a brief introduction of each concept.

Philanthropy. *Philanthropy* is “derived from the Greek word *philanthropia*,” which “means love of humankind” (Walton & Gasman, 2008, p. xxiii). In this study philanthropy required financial or other resource support given to a nonprofit to manage as needed to further a cause to enhance the well-being of humanity (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Drezner, 2011; Levy & Cherry, 1996).

Cause-related branding. *Cause-related branding* is corporate financial support given with a reciprocity, or specific ROI, expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010; Sheldon, 2000). This scenario required a mutual exchange of monetary support from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the nonprofit. In the higher education setting, examples included funding provided for a university with branding provided such as building, program, or facility naming opportunities; access to the campus environment for promotions; and other specific initiatives agreed upon by both entities (Andresen, 2006; Bok, 2003b; Eddy, 2010; Fairweather, 1988; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Gould, 2003; Matthews & Norgaard, 1984; Meuth, 1991; Molnar, 2002; Saiia, 2001; Sheldon, 2000; Stein, 2004; White, 2000; Withers, 2002).

Operational culture. *Operational culture* referred to companies that view nonprofits as a strategic key in their corporate identity and behavior, so charitable contributions were given with high expectation of assisting with or engaging in

implementation. A stakeholder view of CSR is optimized (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010). The stakeholder view is a corporation's consideration of all people involved in their business, including not only shareholders but also employees, employees' families, customers, vendors, suppliers, and their communities (Brown, 2004; Carroll & Buchholtz). Additional stakeholders may include coalitions, associations, trade associations, and governments (Mixer, 1993).

DNA citizenship ethos. The *DNA citizenship ethos* means that the corporation, from the ground up, considers the triple bottom line of sustainability (e.g., people, profit, and planet) as strategically integral into how it does business. The purpose of profitability (i.e., profit) is only done while equally considering the actions of the company on the environment (i.e., planet) and all stakeholders (i.e., people). This DNA citizenship ethos is engrained in the corporation's mission and philosophy and is concerned with society—both people and the environment—as much as making profit (Cone, 2010; Martin et al., 2012). Additionally, the environmental conservation ethic considers that nature should be preserved (Reichart, 1999).

Business and Higher Education Relationship

Key definitions relating to the for-profit sector, or business component of America, are provided here. Additionally, terminology relating to fundraising as well as higher education and specifically related to this study is provided. Understanding specific definitions helps to frame the relationships discussed.

Business, company, corporate, corporation. Corporate entities are “an instrument for the organization of human efforts to a common end” (Drucker, 1946, p. 20). A corporate organization is a profit-seeking system of a business company (Acar, Aupperle,

& Lowry, 2001; Jacoby, 1973), which has registered for a certificate of operation from a state government to become a legal entity (Ringleb, Meiners, & Edwards, 1997).

Traditionally, corporate organizations belong to shareholders of some type, whether private or public, whose interests are financial (Acar et al., 2001; Berle & Means, 1968; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). U.S. corporations are legal entities with rights and privileges created under the authority of a state and governed according to that state's laws (Levy & Cherry, 1996). There are three main types of U.S. business organizations: proprietorship, partnership, and corporation. An individual owns a proprietorship; a partnership is an agreement of parties and is separate from personal ownership; and a corporation is chartered in a state and is a distinct legal entity. Many corporations have shareholders, either public or private (Acar et al., 2001; Ringleb et al., 1997). For this study the words *business*, *company*, and *corporation* are used interchangeably to indicate the profitable economic entities in the U.S. democratic, capitalistic society.

Corporate citizenship/good corporate citizen. *Corporate citizenship* means that companies have certain responsibilities and required efforts that they must perform to be perceived as good and contributing to communities in a beneficial way for all people, groups, and organizations as part of the pluralistic society (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Cone, 2010; Eisenstadt, 1981; Sheldon, 2000). Key concepts in corporate citizenship include: corporate social responsibility, emphasizing obligation and accountability; corporate social responsiveness, emphasizing action or activity; and corporate social performance, which emphasized outcomes or results (Carroll & Buchholtz; Saiia, 2001; Saul, 2011). Corporate citizenship today is universally defined as,

The contribution a company makes to society through its core business activities, its social investment and philanthropy programmes, and its engagement in public policy. The manner in which a company manages its economic, social and environmental relationships, as well as those with different stakeholders, in particular shareholders, employees, customers, business partners, governments and communities determines its impact. (World Economic Forum, 2002, p. 1)

Such “citizenship activities, therefore, encompass corporate investments of time and money in pro bono work, philanthropy, support for community education and health, and protection of the environment” (Gardberg & Fombrun, 2006, p. 329).

Corporate foundation. *Corporate foundations* are a formalized type of nonprofit organizations created by parent corporations as independent entities. They are used to direct corporate funds for program-specific interests and programs for nonprofits influenced by the corporations’ goals and values; they usually maintain close ties. Funding is given in the form of foundation grants (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Mixer, 1993; Sheldon, 2000; Walton & Gasman, 2010; Worth, 2002). In 2009, there were 2,733 U.S.-based corporate foundations (Giving USA Foundation, 2011).

Corporate-foundation relations. (*CFR*). *CFR* is the term used in higher education to refer to the office(s) and staff that deal with corporate and foundation relations (NACRO, 2011).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR). *CSR* is a long-standing concept defined differently by academics, economists, nonprofits, and corporations. *CSR* is the generic term generally used to describe community relations programming—including financial support to nonprofits (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Drucker, 1984; Votaw, 1973). *CSR* also considers “a comprehensive set of policies, practices, and programs” that “involves operating a business in a manner that meets or exceeds the ethical, legal, commercial, and

public expectations that society has” (Karooff, 2004, p. 242). CSR has recently become just *corporate responsibility*, or CR, as it goes beyond social concerns to consider the planet’s environment and animals, not just people.

Corporate philanthropy. *Corporate philanthropy* is often the general, umbrella term used to discuss a company’s attention to and engagement with nonprofits, or the third or independent sector (Benioff & Adler, 2007; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010).

Cultivation. *Cultivation* is the process university representatives use to interest corporations in engaging with an institution and its programs (Sheldon, 2000).

Direct corporate giving. *Direct corporate giving* is cash allotted to nonprofits from the direct bottom line. Forty-six percent of corporate support is allocated this way. (Rose, 2011).

Employee matching gift programs. Many companies offer special funding to match contributions of their employees to eligible academic, as well as other nonprofit, entities in the United States. Company employees often support institutions of which they are alumni. Companies then match donations one-to-one, two-to-one, or even three-to-one. General Electric Corporation was the first to establish such a program in the 1950s (Sheldon, 2000).

Engagement. *Engagement* is the act of being engaged or committed and involved in activity (Merriam-Webster, 2011). In this study *engagement* is more specifically defined as the process of both parties—the university and each corporation—in a relationship taking reciprocal active interest in each other.

Ethics or ethical principles. “Ethics is a code of conduct, based on moral duties

and obligations, which indicates how we should behave. Ethics deals with the ability to distinguish right from wrong and with the commitment to do right” (Lister, 2008, p. 4). Ethics or ethical principles, which stem from values, beliefs, morals, and acceptable decision-making, include a variety of ideas and concepts from many cultures and philosophers. Carroll and Buchholtz (2008) summarized that all ethical decisions eventually fall under the *Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*. Examples of ethical principles include the categorical imperative, conventionalist ethic, disclosure, the Hedonistic ethic, the intuition ethic, market ethics, means-end ethic, might-equals-right ethic, organization ethic, professional ethic, proportionality, revelation ethic, and utilitarian ethic. Individuals function on these principles. When they are not functionally universal, laws are created by people to define behavior and to protect individuals (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). Ringleb et al. (1997) defined *ethics* as duties of one member of society owed to all other members. Finally, in the American culture, Aristotelian virtue ethics are the foundation of society (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Hosmer, 2008; Shaw & Post, 1993). Business ethics “...is the application of the discipline, principles, and theories of ethics to the organizational context” (Conley, 2011, ¶ 2).

Financial support. *Financial* means relating to finances, and *support* means to promote the interest or cause of (Merriam-Webster, 2011). For this study *financial support* is the monetary contribution given to aid a cause, purpose, or program.

Form 990. *IRS Form 990 – Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax*, is an annual reporting form required for all tax-exempt organizations. The *Form 990* divulges an organization’s revenue, disbursements, and expenses. These documents are available to the public (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Grabois, 2010; Swords, 2011).

Grant. *Grants* are a traditional type of financial support funded by corporate foundations. An agency submits an application as part of a competitive review process. Proposals typically include a letter of focus, an IRS nonprofit designation status determination letter, a list of the nonprofit's board members, a program budget including transparency of other funding partners, audited financial statements, letters of endorsement, information about the nonprofit such as mission statement, data on key staff to engage with the corporation, third-party endorsement of the nonprofit, *Form 990s*, and a completed grant application form, if applicable (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Sheldon, 2000).

GuideStar. *GuideStar* is a nonprofit advocacy agency founded in 1994. Its purpose is to provide information to the American public about nonprofit organizations in the U.S. (GuideStar, 2011).

Higher education institutions. Higher education institutions are those organizations, such as colleges and universities, that offer educational development post-secondary in the United States (Merriam-Webster, 2011). In this study no differentiation is intended in the use of the terms *academe*, *academy*, *college*, *school*, or *university*. However, the researcher was knowledgeable that in practical usage today, a *college* is typically centered upon a discipline, and a *university* is a group of colleges and/or schools.

In-kind support/Gift-in-kind. Non-cash support with value (like services) is provided by some corporations to nonprofit organizations (e.g., printing, accounting, legal, technology), loaned staff or executives for special purposes, facility usage, equipment, or goods and products. Such donations are usually tax-deductible for the

corporation (Meuth, 1991; Sheldon, 2010; Worth, 2002).

Laws. *Laws* are defined as rules that govern behavior and protect the weak in society; inherently by protecting the weak, the strong were also protected (Cheeseman, 2012). When people and corporations could not function alone, then laws were created. Laws work from the top down in the United States. The U.S. Constitution set expectations; when silent, state constitutions' laws are enforced. Other legal frames include federal and state statutes, administrative agency rules and regulations, presidential executive orders, judicial decisions, and, finally, local ordinances (Cheeseman, 2012). Laws keep peace in society and make certain activities illegal. Laws shape moral standards and promote social justice. Laws preserve the status quo to protect overthrow of governments. Laws are dynamic in the United States and reflect changing issues of importance through an orderly process and planning. Laws provide for a basis of compromise and flexibility, and they serve to maximize freedom (Cheeseman, 2012).

Management discretionary funds. Some companies provide line-item funds for senior management to allocate to nonprofits based upon their own discretion. Such funding is typically not promoted and reserved for special relationships management has with other individuals representing worthwhile interests of benefit to the manager's organization (Sheldon, 2010).

Motivation. *Motivation* is a force, stimulus, or influence (Merriam-Webster, 2011). In this study *motivation* is the process to excite and to cause one to take action.

Nonprofit or not-for-profit organization. Organizations in the United States that emphasize social characteristics register with the IRS as 501 organizations. Examples include higher education institutions, foundations, nonprofit hospitals, museums, and

fraternal organizations (Acar et al., 2001). Nonprofits may be either revenue-generating or non-revenue generating. Typically, governmental agencies are non-revenue generating nonprofits.

Philanthrocapitalism. *Philanthrocapitalism* is the expectation that nonprofits will operate as businesses do (Edwards, 2008). Philanthrocapitalism is also considered venture philanthropy, social philanthropy, social entrepreneurship, or investment philanthropy. Today's benefactors desire to build infrastructure for nonprofit organizations while also seeing results with measurable, high impact (Bishop & Green, 2008; Boverini, 2008; Byrne, Cosgrove, Hindo, & Dayan, 2002; COP, 2007; Edwards; Saul, 2011; Wagner, 2002).

Proactive corporate philanthropy. *Proactive corporate philanthropy* is the term noted to indicate corporations' being proactive in their consideration of nonprofit activities, support, and engagement. This philanthropy began in the 1970s (Sheldon, 2000).

ROI. *Return on investment*, or *ROI*, is the measure of the efficiency of an organization or program. ROI is calculated as the ratio of net income received to the expended funds. In more recent times, ROI is also calculated looking at the success of an organization or program and not just monetarily (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Levy & Cherry, 1996). Lim (2010) highlighted that expected ROI equals the outcome or benefit times probability of success divided by cost. Saul (2011) indicated that organizations "can demonstrate ROI by showing a direct correlation between inputs...and outputs" (Saul, p. 117-118). Inputs are the dollars and resources invested while the outputs are "the quantifiable benefits produced" (Saul, p. 118). This metric then is added to the impact of

the organization to “produce social or economic value” (Saul, p. 117). “ROI can be measured for stakeholders in three ways: producing the same outcomes at a lower cost, generating more results for the same cost, or creating direct economic value to end beneficiaries” (Saul, p. 125).

Reactive philanthropy. *Reactive philanthropy* is the act by corporations to respond to inquiries for engagement and support (Freeman, 1991).

Research and development funds or sponsored research. Special funds that are available to colleges, universities, and research organizations are narrowly focused and aimed at specific ideas or knowledge that a company seeks. Corporations utilize external expertise of significant research capacities outside their own organization for efficiency (Sheldon, 2000).

Social return on investment (SROI). *SROI* is a term attempting to define or to quantify social benefits of corporate support, which are difficult to measure (Sethi, 1975). Corporations develop balanced scorecards to try to track metrics of SROI as well as the general ROI of their engagement and funding (Kaplan & Norton, 1996; Karoff, 2004).

Sponsorship. *Sponsorship* is the financial and conceptual endorsement of an organization or cause, which is tax deductible only as a business expense when established with a nonprofit for charitable purposes and with no exchange transaction (Levy & Cherry, 1996; Sheldon, 2000). Some agreements termed *sponsorship* may be contracts with exchange benefits formally agreed to and are, therefore, not tax-deductible.

Stewardship. *Stewardship* is the process of thanking and recognizing a corporation for its support. Examples included thank-you letters, reports, press releases, awards, public recognition, and logo recognition (Sheldon, 2000).

Strategic philanthropy. *Strategic philanthropy* considers how giving by the corporation matches a company's goals and business strengths to serve community needs (Brown, 2004; Bruch & Walter, 2005; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Freeman, 1991; Saiia, 2001; Sanzone, 2000; The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012).

Volunteerism. Many companies allow employees to volunteer on company time for nonprofit organizations. The Xerox Corporation was the first such corporation providing staff to a nonprofit in 1971. The Social Service Leave program provided "...nearly 500 employees fully paid one-year leaves of absence to volunteer their time on a community project of their choice" (Sheldon, 2000, p. 37).

Significance of the Study

"Relatively little scholarly attention has been devoted to studying developmental processes of inter-organizational relationships" (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994, p. 91). "The particular configuration of universities, corporations, government agencies, and non-profits has not been studied in depth" (Siegel, 2008, p. 224). Participation by corporations in supporting higher education remains highly visible and controversial for academicians and practitioners (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Caboni, 2010; Caboni & Proper, 2007; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cicone & Jacob, 2009; Cone, 2010; Gould, 2003; Kelly, 1998, 2002; Meuth, 1991; Slaughter & Rhoads, 2004; Siegel 2007, 2012; Sommerville, 2009; Walton & Gasman, 2008). Spradley (1980) suggested the need for ethnographic research to study "socially responsible corporations that operate in the public interest as well as in the private interest" (p. 18). While best practices can be found, too many gray areas exist in the actions and motivations for corporate citizenship behavior in relation to higher education (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Gould, 2003; Molnar, 2002;

Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Sommerville, 2009). Although Walton and Gasman advocated “the significance of the cultural phenomenon of philanthropy as a salient force shaping higher education, both historically and today” (p. xxiii), limited exploration exists about the specific inter-organizational relationship between U.S. corporations and American higher education.

In 1975 the report by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs—more commonly known as the Filer Commission, named for the chair—called attention to nonprofit needs in America. In 1980 the founding of the Independent Sector—a consortium of leaders from corporate giving programs, foundations, and nonprofits—helped to organize and to give attention to the nonprofit sector. The Independent Sector’s (2011) mission is “to advance the common good by leading, strengthening, and mobilizing the nonprofit and philanthropic community” (Independent Sector). Its vision is to create “a just and inclusive society and a healthy democracy of active citizens, effective institutions, and vibrant communities” (Independent Sector). Through support of sponsored research in the nonprofit sector and philanthropy, the Independent Sector and the Filer Commission helped to make scholarship and research more of a national agenda since the 1980s (Drezner, 2011).

Brittingham and Pezzullo (1990) called for a more focused research agenda in American higher education fundraising because available research was limited, fragmented, and of marginal quality. Kelly (2002) noted that only since 1987 had much theoretical research been started to undergird the field of fundraising instead of mere anecdotal practices’ being shared. Kelly explained that a “move toward a scientific basis is critical to the well-being of practitioners, the organizations they serve, the charitable

sub-sector in which they play a unique role, and the democratic society that depends on voluntary action for the public good” (p. 40). Furthermore, Caboni and Proper (2007) claimed “little progress has been made to increase the volume or quality of research focused on fundraising” (Caboni & Proper, p. 16) at the conclusion of their review of 241 dissertations from 1991 to 2006. This assessment was made because 222 focused specifically on a single institution without connecting the topic to national fundraising trends and concerns; conceptual frameworks were fragmented and grounded in 11 different fields of study; and only 23% were theoretically focused. The remainder emphasized “improving practice or providing direction to some institution’s fundraising operation” (Caboni & Proper, p. 14).

Major content for areas researched included: motives for giving by individuals, nonprofit sector issues, individuals’ giving habits, corporate donor behavior, and tax laws. Knowledge gained from the studies focused on alumni giving, fundraising productivity, cost-benefit analysis in corporations, processes in fundraising, fundraising models, and roles of fundraisers. Kelly (1998, 2002) argued that much of the work was too focused on single institutions’ dynamics or concerns or specific donors’ behavior. Finally, Kelly (1998, 2002) suggested that much of what is written in philanthropy or fundraising-related dissertations is never published in journals because of limited utility; she estimated that two-thirds of important work never is published.

Several journals exist to share scholarly fundraising work, such as the *CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement*, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *The Review of Higher Education*, and *Voluntas* (Kelly, 2002). However, A.

E. Kaplan (personal communication, November 4, 2011) and Kelly (2002) indicated that a very low percentage of articles in any of the journals related to fundraising.

Additionally, awards are available for scholarly philanthropic work, including two awards of *The John Grenzebach Research Awards in Philanthropy for Educational Advancement* presented by CASE and the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel Trust for Philanthropy for Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation and Outstanding Published Scholarship, and two *Alice L. Beeman Research Awards in Communications and Marketing for Educational Advancement Awards* for Outstanding Master's Thesis or Doctoral Dissertation and Outstanding Published Scholarship.

Scholars have avoided much research in the field of resource development and charitable engagement because they were “reticent” about the topic as it is too “complex, value-laden, [and]...burdened by issues of the unequal distribution of power” (Walton & Gasman, 2008, p. xxiii). Previous studies in fundraising and philanthropy have focused on individuals' philanthropic giving because it constitutes more than 80% of charitable dollars contributed annually in the United States (Kaplan, 2011). While the field of fundraising has grown during the past 60 years, little information is available on corporate philanthropic behavior related to higher education.

Significant and meritorious academic books on fundraising, American higher education, American philanthropy, and the U.S. nonprofit sector include: American Association of University Professors' 2014 book titled *Recommended Principles to Guide Academy-Industry Relationships*, Ciconte and Jacob's (2009) *Fundraising Basics: A Complete Guide*, Cohen's (2010) *The Shaping of American Higher Education: Emergency and Growth of the Contemporary System*, Curti and Nash's (1965)

Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education, Hall's 1992 *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector*, Hammack's 1998 *Making the Nonprofit Sector in the United States*, Scanlan's 1997 *Corporate and Foundation Fund Raising: A Complete Guide from the Inside*, and Walton and Gasman's (2008) 896-page anthology of *Philanthropy, Volunteerism & Fundraising in Higher Education* the past two centuries. However, while these thorough works provided historic information, corporate foundation perspectives, and *how to* advice on grant proposals and sponsored research, they offered little relevant content in the matter of corporate behavior relating to higher education.

Additionally, *Corporate Philanthropy Report*, *The Corporate Citizen*, and *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship* had no articles relating to the relationship between higher education and corporate America. It is noted, however, that all three publications are invaluable sources on the general topic of corporate responsibility in today's world. *The Corporate Citizen* has a few articles about education, but emphasis was on K-12 and/or assessment of skills. Shannon's (1991) *The Corporate Contributions Handbook: Devoting Private Means to Public Needs*, though dated, provided an excellent corporations' perspective in five areas: their vital role in society, leadership for successful corporate philanthropy, key issues in corporate funding and engagement, corporate grantmaking, and achieving success in corporate involvement in the nonprofit and community processes—including employee engagement, ethics, and accountability. Young and Burlingame's (1996) *Paradigm Lost* outlined an excellent and comprehensive research agenda regarding corporate engagement because scholars, researchers, practitioners, and policy makers recognized the need to study such corporate behavior and importance in the U.S. societal framework. Finally, Googins et al.'s (2007) *Beyond*

Good Company provided an in-depth look at business perspectives regarding corporate citizenship and related topics but had no mention of higher education.

Early corporate research studies focused on cost-benefit analysis, economic and tax issues, business morality, and attitudes of managers and stakeholders toward corporate philanthropy (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Curti & Nash, 1965; Fry et al., 1982; Johnson, O., 1966; Meuth, 1991; Smith, P. R. G., 1968; von Stein, 1975; Whitehead, 1976). Other rationale for previous studies of corporate behavior has tended to focus on altruistic reasons versus motivations for engagement. This phenomena was not U.S.-centric but was found in other countries such as Australia, China, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, and the United Kingdom (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Ma & Parish, 2006; Sanchez, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Little research is available on the behavior of small and medium companies; most attention has been focused on large corporations, particularly *Fortune 500* (Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Mixer, 1993; Rubenstein, 2004).

Five dissertation research studies dealt with corporate ethical concerns. They include: Bushong's study of corporate managers' ethical dilemmas in 1990, Howes's study on business morality in 1993, Yeager's study on moral values in business organizations in 1998, Schell-Busey's quantitative study regarding ethics codes in 2009, and Swimberghe's study of controversial business decisions, corporate policies, and consumer values in 2009. More recent studies about corporate engagement have focused on student recruitment by Soliz in 1997, corporate philanthropy by Saiia (1999), business support for the arts by Moir in 2004, responsibility by Kleinrichert in 2007, new models of corporate social engagement by Gil in 2009, academic capitalism in student affairs by

Carducci in 2010, global corporate philanthropy of education by van Fleet in 2011, and equitable corporate work environments for GLBT (i.e., gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender) people by Opall in 2012.

Buchanan's (1991) dissertation explored the relationship of corporations and Michigan higher education institutions as they reflect an understanding of corporate goals and character, institutional character, and corporate/institutional linkages through a Likert survey of 25 higher education institutions (13 public and 12 private) and 54 corporations. Her findings indicated that the organizations spoke different languages and ranked importance of relationship variables differently. These findings indicated a need for a deeper exploration into the inter-organizational relationship between U.S. corporations and American higher education. VanderKelen completed a 1997 study regarding corporate development officers' advocacy of corporate interests. VanderKelen claimed no other previous studies explored the behavioral relationship of higher education and corporate America. McCoy completed a 2011 master's thesis titled *Toward an Understanding of Causes and Identified Types of University-Industry Relations in U.S. Public Research Universities*. That thesis explored the operation of six university corporate relations offices, internal and external variables affecting university-industry relations, and the process of knowledge creation and transfer. Most recently, Gann submitted a 2012 dissertation titled *Understanding the Environment of Commercializing University Research: Cases for Commercial Success*, which addressed intellectual property and faculty roles in commercial ventures.

This doctoral study has aided in the understanding of corporate citizenship behavior via engagement by exploring in-depth one higher education institution and six

of its corporate supporters. This research provides an understanding of Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum to better define and to understand motives and expectations of both higher education institutions and corporations. Finally, the research has added to the dialogue about defining expectations and boundaries, evaluating and implementing ethical standards for corporate citizenship, and highlighting the potential need for policies to ensure appropriate behavior in the inter-organizational relationship of corporate America with higher education.

Summary

As a pluralistic society, the United States has a multitude of groups and organizations. Three such entities are the state and U.S. governments, higher education, and corporations. As governments cut funding, more of a burden falls on the private sector (i.e., corporations) to help society, including higher education institutions (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Drezner, 2011; Gould, 2003; Levy, 1999).

This organizational analysis, instrumental case study helped to gain a better understanding of the inter-organizational relationship between U.S. corporations and American higher education regarding motivations, expected ROI, and ethical concerns. Previous studies of corporate behavior have focused on altruistic versus enlightened self-interest motivation for engagement in higher education. Additionally, most research in support of higher education institutions has been atheoretical in nature and offers only guidance for practitioners (Drezner, 2011; Walton & Gasman, 2008).

Varying views have existed about the purpose, merits, consequences, and realities

in the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporations. This study fills a gap in the literature relating to corporate support of American higher education as well as explores Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

Chapter One introduced the researcher's organizational analysis, instrumental case study between one higher education institution and six corporations by using Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. In addition, background information, conceptual underpinnings, and key terms serving as the foundation to the study were cited. Chapter Two provides a literature review related to pluralistic interplay in the history of corporate engagement, government support, and American higher education. Additionally, Chapter Two adds background about motivations in each area of Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum and addresses ethical expectations by society and within universities and corporations. Chapter Three outlines the methodology involved in participant selection and in conducting a study including data analysis. Chapter Four summarizes the data collection, data analysis, and findings of the study, which were derived from themes that emerged from data collected and analyzed from document and audio-visual analysis and from semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with corporate and university representatives. Additionally, placement of each corporation was made onto Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum. Chapter Five offers a discussion of findings and considerations for future studies. Finally, the author hopes this study will assist future higher education administrators, fundraisers, corporate representatives, and society in better understanding the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporate engagement including any ethical considerations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

“The highest use of capital is not to make more money but to make money do more for the betterment of life.”

~ Henry Ford (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 87)

Introduction

Case studies are often rooted to “cover many years and describe how the preceding decades led to a situation” (Merriam, 1998, p. 31). Given the complexities of American higher education, legalities and emerging strategies of corporate behavior, and the complicated dynamics of the state and U.S. governments, this study included a consideration of more than three centuries of the development of the culture and environment that undergirded, surrounded, and established the inter-organizational relationships observed in this study. “The forces for shaping American higher education came not from within academia—a loosely federated collection of cultures and societies focused on narrow goals—but from an outcry to bring order from chaos” (DeMillo, 2011, p. 96). Chapter Two discusses the history of funding and U.S. corporate engagement in American higher education, the development of and understanding of a relationship between two types of institutions, the four categories of motivations in Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, and ethical issues of both corporate concern and higher education as well as governmental controls and public expectations. This literature review created the backdrop for understanding the environment to observe inter-organizational relationships and illuminated the rich history, pluralistic American societal issues, and relevant milestones.

Historical Pluralistic Interplay: Corporations, Governments, and U.S. Higher Education

Alexander et al. (1997) said, “America is the richest, most generous nation on Earth. In no other country do individuals, communities, foundations, corporations, and other private philanthropists give so many billions to such a wide variety of worthy causes and organizations” (p. 13). U.S. higher education is no exception. In 2010 corporate America provided \$15.29 billion to nonprofit organizations, with \$4.5 billion going to education (Giving USA Foundation, 2011).

The history of funding for American higher education has always been a preeminent issue for administrators, faculty, students, organizations, the U.S. and state governments, and society. The mix of resources has included tuition, public support, and private contributions. Private contributions come from individuals, alumni, nonalumni, corporations, foundations, and venture philanthropists (Boverini, 2008). Initial support from the 17th to 19th Centuries came from generous benefactors, religious organizations, and estate bequests. In the 20th Century, a variety of community, family, and corporate foundations emerged as well as alumni giving. As capitalism grew in the democratic republic, expectations have grown—as well as differing viewpoints and debates—regarding funding from the state and U.S. governments and corporate America. The debates about public versus private institutions, public versus private funding, and higher education being an intellectual pursuit versus career preparation for functioning and economic viability are not new (Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Sears, 1922; Walton & Gasman, 2008).

The Early Eras: The Colonial Period through The American Revolution

“In early colonial America there was little theorizing as to who should build

colleges or as to how such schools should be financed. ...higher education was a serious interest of the people, and one which early found practical expression” (Sears, 1922, p. 10). It all began in 1635, when John Harvard established the first higher education institution in the United States of America with philanthropic support of individuals—New College, renamed Harvard College in 1638. Eight other colonial colleges had similar roots, including College of William and Mary in 1692, which became public in 1906; The Collegiate School of Connecticut in 1701, renamed Yale College in 1718; College of New Jersey in 1746, renamed Princeton University in 1896; King’s College in 1754, renamed Columbia College in 1787; College of Philadelphia in 1755, renamed University of Pennsylvania in 1791; Rhode Island College in 1764, renamed Brown University in 1804; Queen’s College in 1766, renamed Rutgers University in 1825; and Dartmouth College in 1769. All higher education institutions existed to develop leaders, to create productive citizens, to foster moral character, and to develop well-rounded, educated individuals in a civilized society (Curti & Nash, 1965; Sears, 1922; Smith, P. R. G., 1968). While heavy influence came from England and political and religious organizations, generous funding by colonists, churches, and educational societies provided for buildings, libraries, professorships, and student aid. The major issue was scarcity of money, and philanthropy at the time included “all gifts except those from the State” (Sears, 1922, p. 10). In summarizing higher education during the colonial period, Sears said “...in the light of the economic conditions under which a group of young colonies were forming, it [educational philanthropy] was extensive and...consciously focused upon a vital social problem” (p. 31).

Dartmouth College was the first to establish an “eleemosynary corporation

endowed by private individuals” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 44). Such an endowment provided investment principle and subsequential interest for perpetual funding. Other “colleges founded between the Revolution and the Civil War had similar financial histories” (Curti & Nash, p. 44). Endowments were controversial as for organizations worrying about the future versus current demands (Sears, 1922).

“The gifts from England practically ceased at the time of the Revolution” (Sears, 1922, p. 33). The first recorded state governmental support of higher education was the State of Maryland in 1784 when it began “making a small annual appropriation for Washington College” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 45). The first official public higher education institution was the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill that opened its doors in 1789 (Fox, 2006). Sears identified two key issues:

First, States were themselves in the process of making and had no traditions of precedents to follow in such matters; second, private and church-endowed education had centuries of precedent and traditions to point the way. In other words, society had been accustomed to using the church and private agencies for handling its college problems, and it is not surprising that it was slow in placing that function upon the State. (p. 34)

The Expansion Era for an Emerging Nation

A cultural and philosophical concern developed in the American people that only the elite had access to education, and that the colleges and universities only provided classical academic knowledge with little practical or utilitarian curriculum. “With the force of big money behind them, scientific, technological, and commercial instruction chipped substantial niches in the standard course of study” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 60). “In the 1820’s the first attempts to offer a scientific and technical education instead of the time-honored program received contributions of interested businessmen and industrialists of communities in which they were founded” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 63).

Additionally, education of women became “another important educational movement...along with Jacksonian democracy, antislavery legislation, the great westward movement, and early women’s rights” (Sears, 1922, p. 44). The first female institution was Troy Female Seminary founded in 1920. As more and more colleges began, each became specialized in focus based on organized religious denomination, professional career, manual or technical labor, or teaching (Sears, 1922).

The Civil War Era

It was in the 1850s that the broader creation of universities to serve multiple disciplines, professions, and both liberal arts and utilitarian programs began to become a national agenda. Other cultural and philosophical concerns led to the Civil War. In its midst, The Morrill Act of 1862, known as the Land Grant College Act, provided the first federally funded higher education institutions (Christy & Williamson, 1992). The land-grant act was introduced by Vermont Congressman Justin Smith Morrill, who envisioned the financing of agricultural, mechanical, and home economics education accessible to all social classes. President Abraham Lincoln signed the bill, which gave each state 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative based on the 1860 census. Most of the land was sold and proceeds were either used to create an educational institution or endowment fund to provide support for the colleges in each of the states. Unfortunately, at the time, there was a separation of races, and blacks were not allowed to attend these institutions. Although there was a provision for separate but equal facilities, only Mississippi and Kentucky established educational institutions for blacks. The Second Morrill Act was passed in 1890 and expanded the system of grants to establish colleges and universities allowing blacks equal opportunity for education. The two Morrill Acts

provided for ongoing federal government support to higher education. Additionally, the Hatch Act of 1887 created federally funded state agricultural experiment stations (Just & Huffman, 2009; Rhodes, 2001). “The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 provided additional funds for extension programs, designed to bring their communities the benefits of new campus-based research” (Rhodes, 2001, p. 6). The creation of public educational institutions shifted emphasis from the classical, liberal arts and religious studies to more applied studies (Christy & Williamson, 1992; Curti & Nash, 1965; Fox 2006). Johns Hopkins University was founded in 1876 as America’s first research university (Fox, 2006).

The Industrial Revolution Era and University Transformation

From 1865 to 1918 there was a “rapid increase in population” and “the rapid development of machinery...commercial expansion and remarkable means of communication and travel” (Sears, 1922, p. 53). Acceptance of “the corporate method has been widely adopted, and large private fortunes have been amassed” (Sears, p. 53). The U.S. Department of Education was established in 1867 to help states create effective educational systems (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Jacoby (1973) indicated,

The post-Civil War era was marked by freewheeling private enterprise, unrestrained by governmental regulation. The reaction to its excesses was the Farmers’ Cooperative movement, the Populist movement, the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, and the Sherman Act of 1890.... For the first time, the federal government began to constrain corporate behavior, and state regulations were also tightened. Nevertheless, business continued to have relatively wide freedom of operation for the rest of the 19th Century and the first quarter of the 20th Century. Government then imposed little restraint on the processes of production, the products, the employee relations, the marketing tactics, or the financing methods of corporations. (pp. 5 & 153)

In the late 19th Century and the turn of the 20th Century, “...the emergence of a new elite in American society” of “entrepreneurs, financiers, and industrials encroached

on the stronghold of social and economic preeminence” of “merchants and traders” who were “businessmen who built railroads, extended commercial networks, and directed the operations of factories” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 61). “They were well aware that the graduates coming from the campuses of the classical colleges were totally unprepared to meet the problems involved in building a bridge, operating a bank, or designing a machine” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 61). Oddly, the new elite were uneducated, but also refused “to perpetuate what they considered a sterile tradition” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 62). Curti and Nash offered,

The Americans who patronized practical education did so in the belief that they themselves could have profited from a few years of intensive training at the beginning of their own careers. Their benefactions sought to correct a defect they perceived in the preparation America offered its young men and women by reorienting higher education in a utilitarian direction.
(p. 62)

Great industrialists—such as Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, Edsel and Henry Ford, and J. P. Morgan—forged the roots of corporate American philanthropy (Chernow, 1998; Cohen, 2010; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeMillo, 2011; Elliott, 2006; Jacoby, 1973; McIlroy, 1998). Rockefeller’s most important concept impacting philanthropy was wholesale (i.e., focused) giving as opposed to small, scattershot contributions (Chernow, 1998). In the early days, tycoons’ philanthropic emphases were aimed at religion, higher education, medicine, and the arts—relating to social and moral conditions of society. Rockefeller promoted research and education whereas Carnegie supported facilities for access by the ordinary people such as libraries, music and arts facilities, and athletic arenas (Chernow, 1998).

Initial corporate contributions were made by individuals who earned their money from large corporations—Rockefeller with the Standard Oil Company; Carnegie with the

U.S. Steel Corporation; Morgan with Edison General Electric and Thomson-Houston Electric, which merged to form General Electric; and the Fords with the Ford Motor Company. However, such individuals transitioned giving to family foundations because of government regulations to insulate large portions of their wealth from inheritance taxes (Chernow, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965). “The concept of charitable trusts was not invented by Rockefeller; Benjamin Franklin, Stephen Girar, and Peter Cooper had set up such trusts. What he [Rockefeller] brought to the concept was unprecedented scale and scope” (Chernow, 1998, p. 563). Rockefeller created The General Education Board in 1902, and Carnegie established the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association in 1903. Rockefeller and Carnegie both supported creating national standards for admission to college and university and minimum institutional requirements (Curti & Nash, 1965).

In 1913 the Sixteenth Amendment was ratified, which created the first federal income tax. The top rate was 6%. Rockefeller felt that “When a man has accumulated a sum of money, accumulated it within the law, the government has no right to share in its earnings” (Chernow, 1998, p. 566). Chernow summarized the state of transition:

As taxes became steeper and more progressive in the coming decades, it became a daunting task for any businessman to amass the money that Rockefeller had earned in a laissez-faire world devoid of antitrust laws. His own wealth, in fact, was the text for many sermons in favor of using taxation as a way to check the acquisition of huge fortunes, to redistribute wealth, and to reduce social tensions. (pp. 566-567)

“Rockefeller believed that nonprofit institutions should be even more circumspect with money than business organizations” (Chernow, 1998, p. 328). He thought that banks or a trust company,

...need only assure the depositor or investor that his funds will be duly cared for during the limited time in which they may be deposited. But a university invests the funds of those who are seeking to make an

investment of money for the good of humanity, which shall last, if possible, as long as the world stands. (p. 328)

Sears (1922) summarized the pluralistic concerns regarding higher education: “The State, the church, and the individual philanthropist were in a fairly real sense competitors in the field.... This rivalry has continued, but it has become increasingly friendly with the passing years” (p. 81).

The World War Eras and The Great Depression

In 1918 “alumni support gained momentum” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 186) for both private and public colleges and universities. Also in 1918, the Dayton Hudson Corporation, known since 2000 as Target, created the Dayton Foundation, known today as the Target Foundation, and is credited as the first official corporate foundation. Other notable companies creating corporate foundations prior to 1935 included Bausch & Lomb; Lincoln National Life Insurance Company; and Sears, Roebuck, & Company. Corporate foundations were subject to the same regulations as family and community foundations and were required to distribute a minimum of 5% of interest income from assets annually (COP, 2007; Sheldon, 2000). In 1921, the IRS allowed corporations to give directly to educational institutions as long as they served the needs of their employees (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009). Prior to 1935, companies supported and engaged with nonprofits with no tax benefit. “Companies, unlike foundations and other grantmaking organizations, don’t exist to give. Their main responsibilities are to their employees, customers, shareholders, and the bottom line” (Grabois, 2010, p. xi).

The Great Depression created bad publicity for America’s corporations. “This crisis shook the faith of the American people” (Jacoby, 1973, p. 154). The Roosevelt administration imposed several new governmental agencies to regulate corporate

behavior such as “the Securities and Exchange Commission [(SEC)], the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission” (Jacoby, 1973, p. 154). General corporate taxes were increased, and several taxes were also created such as payroll taxes, pensions, and unemployment insurance.

Curti and Nash (1965) expressed concerns:

Public-relations experts increasingly warned corporation executives that words were not enough to restore confidence in the image that had been shaped in the golden 1920’s.... The characteristic American response to social crisis was to emphasize the fuller role that education might play; hence aid to education was almost bound to suggest itself as a means of rehabilitating the reputation of big business and of creating a more effective alliance with the intellectuals and especially with academic leadership. (p. 240)

In 1936 Edsel and Henry Ford created their philanthropic agency because “...the new laws of the Roosevelt administration had devised in an effort to trim the surplus wealth from America’s richest families” through the inheritance tax (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 228). Both Fords died within seven years, and “about 90 percent of the Ford Motor Company stock with an estimated value of more than \$2 billion” went into their foundation (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 229). In their lifetimes and legacies, Carnegie contributed an amount roughly equal to today’s value of \$350 million, Rockefeller \$1.7 billion, and the Fords \$3 billion (Chernow, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965).

Foundation philanthropy differed in two major respects from previous patterns of giving to higher education in the United States. First, it did not seek to establish new institutions but to increase current institutions to the highest quality and eliminate weaker ones. Second, it created a position of “‘philanthropoid,’ an individual who made a career of giving the money of others” to serve “the foundations as a collector of information, an evaluator of applications for aid, and a dispenser of advice, encouragement, and

criticism” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 213). However, many colleges and universities became wary of philanthropic foundations, their benefactors, their boards, and their restrictions and created policies to not allow expectations for the funds. “From the standpoint of the shaping of American higher education, foundation philanthropy’s principal importance has been helping to make the college or university a center for research and advanced study” (Curti & Nash, p. 236). Curti and Nash said,

On summing up the impact of philanthropic foundations on higher education on the eve of World War II, Ernest V. Hollis [of the U.S. Department of Education] termed them “the most influential of the external agencies that have modified higher education as a process or institution.” He went on to praise their creativity, saying that “the trend of foundation influence in higher education has increasingly been toward supporting ideas and institutions that are usually considered close to the grow edge of culture.” And he cited examples such as their pioneering work with fine arts, librarianship, medicine, engineering, adult education, the art of teaching, and the formulation of standards for colleges. (pp. 226-227)

The significance of philanthropic foundations was important in this study because most of the funding originated from the business world and the entrepreneurs, financiers, inventors, and philanthropists who established them regardless of motive. Other major philanthropists of the 20th Century included George Eastman of the Eastman Kodak Company; Andrew Mellon, who was a banker and U.S. Secretary of the Treasury; and Alfred Sloan of General Motors (Curti & Nash). In fact, “Since the Civil War most of the money that came to the colleges and universities in the form of philanthropy, whether from friends, alumni, foundations, or corporations, was made in the world of commerce, finance, and industry” (Curti & Nash, p. 238).

Corporate charitable giving gained attention when the Revenue Code of 1935, effective in 1936, was issued by the IRS, which permitted up to 5% of pretax income to

be given directly to nonprofit charitable causes, designated by the IRS as 501(c)(3) organizations, for a tax deduction (Curti & Nash, 1965; Fry, et al., 1982; Jacoby, 1973; Pollard, 1958; Sheldon, 2000). Many higher education institutions took advantage of the new law and promoted it in publications to attract individual and corporate support (Pollard, 1958). Many court cases were brought by charities, business partners, and stockholders with a variety of concerns of corporate fund management use or a corporation not fulfilling its promises. This issue caused controversy over a corporation's power, *ultra vires* in Latin, and appropriate responsibilities. The 1935 tax break began official governmental legislation providing corporations incentive for engagement in nonprofit support (Smith, P. R. G., 1968). Corporate giving from 1900 to 1950 was not planned or managed as part of any "ongoing business policy" (Buchanan, 1991, p. 13) and was "ad hoc." Tromble (1998) indicated "In the 1950s and 1960s the civil rights movement began to awaken the social conscience of corporate America" (p. 93).

The Post-War Era and Mass Higher Education

World War II brought about rising costs of higher education, so college and university administrators sought additional funding. Given the economy and the personal income tax laws, "great individual fortunes comparable to those of Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford were...likely to be a thing of the past; it was natural to turn to corporations" (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 241). Additionally, the pressure of the world on the United States as a leader in industry, medicine, and business created a national culture dictating pressure on American corporations to have "large responsibilities for the general welfare" of society as the economic cornerstone (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 239). Business executives were very concerned that professors and academic leadership "were becoming alienated

from capitalism, heightened by the ideological disputes of the Cold War and McCarthyism, figured heavily in the great spurt of corporation giving to higher education after World War II” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 240). Other sentiment was a concern that federal aid—even if available—“would bring unwanted government control” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 245). Corporations continued to have increased regulations and increased taxes (Jacoby, 1973). Himmelstein (1997) said,

Supporting higher education seemed a likely way of restoring the reputation of big business and a good place to stem the growth of big government. After all, what was more reputable in American culture than education? And where was the need to restore faith in big business greater than among intellectuals and academic leaders? (p. 19)

From 1935 to 1951 there was a lack of clarity of what types of nonprofit organizations the corporations should support. Until the early 1950s companies were restricted to give to charities related to their business focus. Essentially, then, the government restricted the cause or purpose of giving, not companies with self-directed motives. Additionally, most companies initially restricted engagement geographically with nonprofits in areas where the company had operations or where their employees lived and worked (Buchanan, 1991; Curti & Nash, 1965; Sheldon, 2000).

Publicly traded companies are owned by shareholders—individuals or other companies. Oftentimes stockholders resented management giving away their money. To clarify corporations’ role in supporting higher education, “New Jersey amended its corporation law to empower corporations chartered in the state to contribute, as a public policy, to educational institutions” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 242). However, the board of directors of a pre-existing New Jersey equipment company, the A. P. Smith Company, was upset with the discretion given to the corporation as a legal person and challenged

the law. Curti and Nash (1965) summarized,

Both the Superior Court and the Supreme Court of the state upheld the company's right to contribute in language that might well have encouraged corporations' contributions all over the country. In his opinion in the Superior Court, Judge Alfred P. Stein declared such contributions necessary to assure a "friendly reservoir" of trained men and women from which industry might draw. Stein's words were well considered: "I am strongly persuaded by the evidence that the only hope for the survival of privately supported American college and university lies in the willingness of corporate wealth to furnish in moderation some support to institutions which are so essential to public welfare and therefore, of necessity, to corporate welfare. ...I cannot conceive of any greater benefit to corporations in this country than to build and continue to build, respect for and adherence to a system of free enterprise and democratic government, the serious impairment of either of which may well spell the destruction of all corporate enterprise. (pp. 242-243)

Support of the unprecedented Smith Case was widely received. Articles in *The New York Times*, *Harper's Magazine*, and the *Atlantic* called attention to the news. A majority of states passed similar legislation removing "the legal barriers to corporate giving to higher education" (Curti & Nash, p. 243). While corporations generally supported the attention, resentment grew as to the purpose of their role and support. In 1953, Opinion Research Corporation published a poll of stockholders' view regarding giving to higher education. Only 31% supported unrestricted giving (Curti & Nash). "Their enthusiasm declined when direct benefits were not clear" (Curti & Nash, p. 244). An average of 90% supported scholarships for company employees or students in the company's field, 88% to finance college research, and 81% to educational institutions providing technical or professional hires to their company (Curti & Nash).

Financial data were available to view corporate support of higher education. The Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE) was founded by corporate executives interested in higher education in 1952. Today, CFAE is called The Council for Aid to

Education (CAE), and has conducted an annual survey since 1957 to collect data from higher education and K-12 institutions in the United States. This data included financial support from corporations, foundations, alumni, and other individuals. The Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey is the nation's leading source of data on private giving to education through this annual survey (Curti & Nash, 1965; Kaplan, 2011). The survey is designed to collate information regarding "amounts, sources, donor-specified purposes, and forms of private gifts, grants, and bequests" (Kaplan, 2011, p. VSE-10/37). While the number of participating higher education institutions fluctuates annually, a core group of nearly 1,000 institutions contribute data. Kaplan claimed that about 85% of total voluntary support received by higher education institutions is captured. Fundraising data is also readily available in the non-profit sector, including higher education institutions, as those entities recording annual receipts of \$25,000 or more are required by federal, state, and local jurisdictions to file IRS *Form 990—Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax*, a report which details philanthropic support and is available to the public (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Grabois, 2010; Swords, 2011).

The Informal Committee for Corporate Aid to American Universities, formed in 1957, was composed of individuals with an interest in higher education and corporate America with the intent of universities' coordinating efforts to approach corporations for support. They compiled a list of 500 corporations to approach and identified 190 top prospects. The Committee "concentrated on obtaining aid for the major universities that maintained graduate schools and conducted research," (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 249) which included 23 private and 15 public universities. The Committee's intent was to continue to foster the American systems of democracy, capitalism, and free enterprise.

“The point of a free enterprise system is not to make profits per se; the point is to improve social well being” (Fischer, 2000, p. 187), which included higher education. “Both for-profit and nonprofit organizations exist fundamentally to serve the public good” (Fischer, 2000, p. 188). By 1960, “the corporations did not seem to fear federal aid to higher education as much as they once did” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 256) and saw each of the three major entities in the pluralistic society as equally responsible for higher education: the state and federal governments, U.S. corporations, and colleges and universities.

The Vietnam Era and Social Activism

“By the 1960s the baby-boom group was more determined to question social values and take part in attempts to rectify perceived injustices” (Cohen, 2010, p. 215). Many social protests were “against parietal rules, college grading systems..., faculty who expected students to remain as passive learners, curricular irrelevance, civil rights for ethnic minorities, ...the draft and the Vietnam War” (Cohen, 2010, p. 203).

In the 1960s “[corporate] giving was often based on the personal preferences of the company president without any thought of whether such a gift was strategic or complimented the company’s business plan” (Sheldon, 2000, p. 13). Giving and engagement were often reactionary and determined through interest by the nonprofit. CFAE’s 1960 “survey reported that most companies were motivated in giving to higher education by a desire to meet community responsibilities” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 255). Other interests included creation of educated workers, insuring free enterprise, public relations, fostering new knowledge, research, and tax savings. Unrestricted support allowed academic administrators and faculty to devise programs as they saw fit, and

restricted funding was geared toward “student support, new buildings, or salaries” (Curti & Nash, 1965, p. 255). At this same time, governmental regulations continued to increase including the establishment of: “...the Water Quality Standards Act in 1965, the Air Quality Act in 1967, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act in 1966, the Highway Safety and Motor Vehicle Safety Standards Act in 1966, and the Consumers Protection Act in 1968” (Jacoby, 1973, p. 155).

Studies from the 1950s indicated that socioeconomic status, measured and labeled as *SES*, found “a high correlation between college entrance and graduation and family SES” (Cohen, 2010, p. 212). The Higher Education Act of 1965 later provided grants for libraries, undergraduate student services, and guaranteed student loans (Cohen, 2010). In 1972 the Pell Grant, named for Senator Claiborne Pell, D-Rhode Island, and originally known as the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, was created. The Pell Grant is considered to be the foundation of a student's financial aid package and is sponsored by the U. S. Department of Education. “The shift toward enhancing access [to a higher education] was on” (Cohen, 2010, p. 280).

The late 1960s found widespread student and public rebellion against “an unpopular war, civil rights, access to college, curricular and instructional forms, environmental issues, and what they perceived as the evils of a corporate world” (Cohen, 2010, p. 216). “A rapidly declining economy, campus unrest, liberalization of education, the end of the Vietnam War, declining campus enrollments, and most assuredly Watergate, all created ... serious concerns” (von Stein, 1975, p. 19) whether corporations would continue to support higher education. Additionally, von Stein indicated that corporate executives were concerned about the quality of graduates and that supporting

education was important. However, von Stein's study of 21 corporations concluded: "although corporations have, or say they have, a philosophy or policy on contributions, such philosophy or policy is rarely written; and even when it is written, copies are not available to persons and organizations seeking contributions" (p. 74).

From the 1930s to the 1970s, personal and social relations were studied extensively through 10 major studies. Positive results included: "links between college attendance and job satisfaction, participation in political activities..., pursuit of cultural interests..., international relations, and development of personal values, goals and philosophy" (Cohen, 2010, p. 291). Higher education was proved to be contributing greatly to society. Additionally, in 1973, Cohen said,

The Carnegie Commission translated the traditional purposes of higher education—teaching, research, and service—into five sets of goals: (1) providing opportunities for the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical, and skill development of individual students; (2) advancing human capability in society at large; (3) enlarging educational justice; (4) transmitting and advancing learning; and (5) critically evaluating society for the sake of society's self-renewal. (pp. 292-293)

As a pluralistic society, higher education, the state and federal governments, and corporations were all rallying behind quality, accessible education. A major shift occurred in the 1970s as U.S. corporations became larger global entities. The corporations began embracing their engagement and charitable involvement with nonprofits as a strategic action (Cone, 2010; Sheldon, 2000).

Additionally, corporations were more comfortable with their relationships "to openly reveal" their processes, "to put out annual reports," and "to talk about the company's social contributions" (Cummings, 1991, p. 299). "Stakeholders rely on information from annual reports, rating agencies, news releases, magazine articles,

websites, blogs, and corporate social reports” (Greenberg et al., 2011, p. 115). Annual reports may also be labeled as: “social report, public-interest report, values report, integrated report, ethics report, integrity report, sustainability report, or triple-bottom-line report” (Kaptein, 2007, p. 71). Regardless of name, such reports and other information “portray the relationship between a corporation and society” (Lydenberg & Wood, 2010, p. i.). Such reporting adds to the perspectives of corporate accountability, communication, environmental, financial, human rights, and social concerns (Greenberg et al.; Kaptein; Lydenberg & Wood). Such reports often include perspectives of stakeholders as well as endorsement of certain codes of behavior (Lydenberg & Wood, 2010). “From 1964 to 1987, corporate philanthropy grew every year in inflation-adjusted dollars from a base of \$3.35 billion to a high-water mark of \$7.49 billion” (Levy, 1999, p. 108).

End of the 20th Century

The last quarter of the 20th Century saw increased trends in American society, including “an aging population, increased participation in education at all levels, a higher ratio of women in the workforce, and more children being reared in single-parent homes” (Cohen, 2010, p. 307) as well as the end of the Cold War, increased globalization, increased divorce rates, more single parents, grandparents as parents, and significant immigration to the United States from “Central and South America and Eastern Asia, not Europe” (p. 307).

On the 25th Anniversary of the CFAE, Chairperson Garvin (1975), who was also chair of Exxon Corporation, said,

Corporate support for education ought to be viewed as a kind of capital investment. Such an expenditure, while it has an intangible component, is

by no means speculative. It is not geared for a quick profit, and many of us won't be around when the real dividends are paid. Yet although the ultimate return may never be quantifiable, the investment is nevertheless most necessary. At the very least, it manifests a faith in the future, a belief in what young people entering college can contribute to improve the quality of life in the years ahead. ... One of the strengths of our higher education system has been the pluralistic basis of its support. (pp. 5-6)

He contended that diverse resources helped to strengthen higher education and to rely less on the government. Additionally, he noted “that the growth rate of corporate support for our colleges and universities has not been keeping pace with the more rapid increase in tax-supported assistance to these schools” (Garvin, p. 6). State governments have always provided more “institutional development and continuing support” (Cohen, 2010, p. 379) for higher education than the federal government. From 1975 to 1994 federal government support decreased from 16% to 12% (Cohen, 2010). Pressure for increased accessibility to higher education has continued, and institutional accountability, assessments, accreditation, and associations have increased steadily.

The Reagan and Bush Administrations saw major tax cuts for the wealthy and decreased regulations (Giroux & Giroux, 2004). The Tax Reform Act of 1986 increased the direct giving corporate tax ceiling from 5% to 10% of pre-tax income (Meuth, 1991; Mixer, 1993). “In the period from 1986-1994, corporate cash giving declined in constant dollars by 20 percent, from \$7.49 billion to 6.11 billion, averaging a 2.8 percent loss per year” (Levy, 1999, p. 108). The 1990s saw higher education being concerned with declining resources (Cohen, 2010; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000). Higher education institutions continued to operate efficiently, eliminate replication of programs and services, increase technology and communication systems, and provide relevant degrees. “Extrinsic demands create other complications. Funding comes from many sources, and

some...specify how their monies shall be allocated” (Cohen, 2000, p. 388).

Each corporation, however, had a variety of elements affecting their charitable contributions. Examples included: view of shareholder philanthropic support, managerial discretion and passion for social-related causes, ability to give from profitability and economic status, board emphasis on charitable causes, and a host of strings-attached reasons such as ROI, advertisement, relative low-cost investments such as research, public relations, image, and social currency, to name a few (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Fischer, 2000; Gould, 2003; Litan & Mitchell, 2011; Sanzone, 2000). Additionally, as corporations adjusted over time, they may have also changed their positions, goals, and strategies.

Debate about whether higher education institutions should receive corporate funding continued with varying viewpoints. “An important finding of this literature is that pure altruism is rarely a satisfactory assumption” (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995, p. 937). Giroux and Giroux (2004) indicated that students are confused as to the purpose of education: “customer satisfaction is offered as a surrogate for learning” (p. 275). Students are bombarded with commercialism on billboards, advertisements, credit card offers, premiums, and many other commodities. However, despite criticisms, Cohen (2010) stated,

The higher education system that had evolved over the centuries since the colonies were formed had reached a stage of diversity, complexity, and comprehensiveness that could never have been foreseen. It had become a set of institutions [public and private, universities, baccalaureate colleges, community colleges, and specialty higher education institutions] related by a medium of exchange and arranged by principles of sequence loosely followed. Each institution maintained courses, curriculum, student and faculty relationships, and requirements that looked decidedly like those in similarly labeled activities in other institutions. Higher education had become, in effect, a national system that could not be described merely by

examining its legal arrangements or the structure of its institutions. It was more a social system with its various parts standing in certain relationship to each other. It had rules of conduct, sets of shared beliefs, and expectations on the part of the students, staff members, and the public. (pp. 329-330)

Rhodes (2001) further explained the importance of American higher education and its full impact on the nation:

Higher education has been the doorway to advancement and participation for countless citizens and dozens of immigrant groups. It has been the path to social attainment for millions from impoverished backgrounds, the generator of the nation's leaders in every area of life, the key to vastly improved professional services from health care to technology. It has been the foundation of growing national economic prosperity and manufacturing success, vast improvements in the products of agriculture and industry, and undreamed-of access to new means of communication. And beyond all those benefits, it has provided to successive generations the opportunity for meaningful careers, for service in a free society, and for access to the riches of human experience, aspiration, and achievement. For all its shortcomings, the American university has been an unambiguous influence for good. To a degree unknown elsewhere, it has educated a steadily growing proportion of the population and thus nurtured the democratic spirit and enlivened the nation. It has trained the workforce, enriched the individual experience, and enlightened public life. It has quickened the social conscience and empowered and inspired each rising generation. (p. 1)

However, Rhodes also indicated that “the three major changes in the character of the American university over the last half century—growth in inclusiveness, growth in professionalism, and the influence of science—have contributed to the loss of community” (p. 56). Higher education functions only within the framework of the pluralistic society—not in a vacuum. The changes, however, “reflect[ed] parallel and profound changes in the character of American society, and they have contributed substantially to the nation's strength and prosperity” (Rhodes, p. 56).

The Challenging New Millennium: A Penurious Era and Vital Pluralistic Interplay

“Because knowledge has become the dominant economic force, the importance of

the university can only grow and its influence increase in the new millennium. But this growth will occur in a rapidly changing environment” (Rhodes, 2001, p. xi).

Saul (2011) said,

The increasing economic influence of social outcomes is bolstered by the fact that we are not just living through an economic downturn, we are also living through a social and environmental downturn. Things are getting worse. The poverty rate in America in 2008 (13.2 percent) was the highest poverty rate since 1997. Public high school graduation rates declined from a high of 77 percent in 1969 to 70 percent in 2000. Between 1970 and 2002, average SAT scores declined from 1049 to 1020. The percentage of workers with health insurance declined from 70 percent in 1979 to 63 percent in 2000. The number of Americans with asthma has more than doubled in the last twenty years. Childhood obesity has almost tripled, from 6 percent to 16 percent, in the last twenty years. The number of Americans in prison or on probation or parole has more than tripled from 1.8 million in 1980 to 6.6 million in 2001. Overall, violent crime increased by 42 percent from 1970 to 2000. And that’s just people. The environment isn’t much better. (p. 16)

Diminished governmental and public resources continued to create emphasis on private support for higher education (DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000). The Post-9/11 higher education agenda seemed to have lost attention by the federal government because of concerns for national security, public safety, the war on terror, wars, the housing and stock market collapses, renewable energy, and other world issues (Cohen, 2010). Two recessions in a decade challenged corporations and corporate foundations to streamline giving (Lawrence, 2009). Emphasis shifted to focused efforts relating specifically to housing and basic human necessities such as food, utilities, and medical care. Corporations were “focusing strongly—but by no means exclusively—on addressing the impact of the economic crisis in their home communities” (Lawrence, 2009, p. 1).

Giroux and Giroux (2004) believed that corporations had taken over both American politics, decisions for democracy, and higher education. Their concerns

indicated that corporations are too involved in everything, which eroded civic engagement and public values. Giroux and Giroux admitted that such concerns were not new, but the issues of democracy and thoughtful higher education were more tandem issues now than separate concerns: “an educated and active citizenry is indispensable for a free and inclusive democratic society; democratic politics requires the full participation of an informed populace” (p. 4). Furthermore, they contended that corporations have bought the opinions of politicians by funding their campaigns and therefore control the state and federal governments. Giroux and Giroux argued that there is a clash between democratic values and commercial values. A major concern was that higher education had become too commercialized and controlled by corporations.

“For freedom to flourish in the public realm, citizens have to be educated for the task of self-government” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 223). “Education in this context was linked to public life through democratic values such as equality, justice, and freedom, rather than as an adjunct of the corporation, whose knowledge and values were defined largely through the prism of commercial interests” (p. 223). Perspectives of time investment for processes, anticipated outcomes, and key deliverables are viewed differently by corporations and higher education. Higher education needs time to inquire, research, think, and act, whereas corporations demand accelerated response time and try to operationalize and to measure everything. Rewards were given to productivity and not for intellect. “It is politically crucial that educators at all levels of involvement ... be defended as intellectuals who provide a significant service to the nation, particularly in their attempts to exercise and protect academic freedom” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 277).

Corporate culture has taken over every aspect of American life and created “cynicism, insecurity, and despair” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 249). Democracy has shifted “...economic power into the hands of the few” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 250) as it has eroded American income and productivity, subordinated societal needs to market economy, and reduced “education to job training” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 250). Those in agreement with Giroux and Giroux have labeled some higher education institutions as *corporate universities* that have lost focus. Hall (1991) said “it will be interesting to see how these programs exemplify corporate cultures of their sponsoring companies” (p. 117) in regard to receiving organizations’ morphing or changing their mission or values because of corporate influence, support, and/or engagement. Corporations have even engaged the Internet and social media to allow consumers to vote on causes the corporations will support. This innovation was labeled *crowdsourcing* (Giving USA Foundation, 2011).

The College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007 and the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 both provided for transparency of higher education to justify tuition increases, to set annual cost reduction, and to strive to create access for all students. Other current variables affecting the inter-organizational relationships among higher education, corporations, and the governments included state fiscal crises, “growing budget deficits, record-breaking unemployment rates, a soaring federal debt” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 260), and heavy military investment. These issues diverted public resources by both federal and state governments away from education and to other pressing American needs. Additionally, corporations were faced with refocusing corporate citizenship issues and dealing with the unstable economy (Goldberg, 2010;

Lawrence, 2009; Mayer, 2010; Nonprofit Research Collaborative, 2010; Pinney, 2009).

“The strength or weakness of national and international business and industrial climates have a direct influence on the size and scope of corporate and foundation support programs” (Murphy, 1989, p. 136). The 5-year period framing this study from 2006 to 2010 included the most recent challenging economic recession (Cohen, 2010; Drezner, 2011; Goldberg, 2010; Kaplan, 2011; Lawrence, 2009; Mayer, 2010; Nonprofit Research Collaborative, 2010; Pinney, 2009; Rose, 2011; The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012). Many believed the recession was the greatest “economic and financial turbulence unequalled [in the United States] since the Great Depression” (Pinney, 2009, p. 9). Pinney provided examples of recession indicators such as the Dow Jones’ dropping “more than 50% to 6,547 in March 2009 from its high of 14,000 in 2007,” the “30 percent” plummeting of the housing market, and cautiously watching that “corporate profits were down 10.1% in 2008...and fell another 17.6% in 2009” (p. 7). Education funding dropped 7% by corporations in 2009 compared to 2007 (Pinney). Yet “some 54% of U.S. senior executives believe corporate citizenship is even more important in a recession” including attention to “public education” (Pinney, p. 4, 9). A 2012 study indicated,

Corporate citizenship programs in medium-sized companies were most hindered by the economy, those in small businesses were most hindered by pressure to deliver short-term results, and those in large businesses were most affected by the U.S. economy and pressure to deliver short-term results. (The State of Corporate Citizenship, p. 7)

“Foundations are required to give away a percentage of income from their assets. Corporations are under no such mandated requirement” (Murphy, 1989, p. 136). The national average of corporate giving as a percentage of corporate pretax profits to all

nonprofits was 0.9% in 2010 (Giving USA Foundation, 2011). Corporate giving based on pretax profit has not risen above the 2% level since 1986 as illustrated in Figure 4 (Mixer, 1993; Rose, 2011). Some industries have created the Two Percent Club to recognize giving of 2%, whereas the 23 corporations in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota have established the Five Percent Club as positive peer pressure for maximum pretax contributions to nonprofits (Benioff & Adler, 2007; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009). Carlson Companies was the charter member. The legal allowance remains 10% of pre-tax profits (Grabois, 2010; Mixer, 1993).

In 2010 46% of corporate support was direct cash, 35% corporate foundation cash, and 19% non-cash such as pro bono services, products, and use of equipment or facilities (Rose, 2011). Education overall received 25% of all corporate support: higher education received 11% and K-12 received 14% (Rose, 2011). Other priorities for corporate support were health and social services, 30%; community and economic development, 14%; art and culture, 5%; civic and public affairs, 4%; environmental issues, 4%; and disaster relief, 4% (Rose, 2011).

Corporate foundations addressed the tough economic times by holding steady, engaging with stakeholders and partners, providing flexible funding, and reducing paperwork and turnaround times (McCray, 2012). While direct corporate giving was reduced, corporate foundations remained flat. “In many areas of practice, we saw little change” (McCray, 2012, p. 9). Overall, multiyear support by foundations decreased 28% because of the economy in 2008, but “those grantmakers that engaged with their grantees and their peers were more likely to offer multiyear, general operating and capacity-building support” (McCray, 2012, p. 2). A tough economy forces strong relationships.

Figure 4. U.S. Corporate Giving from 1970 to 2010 as a percentage of corporate pretax profits (Giving USA Foundation, 2011).

Corporations, however, have more flexibility than foundations regarding their engagement and monetary commitments. A 2007 report by The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University said,

Unlike foundations, which are required by law to pay out five percent of their assets annually, corporations give more or less entirely voluntarily. Corporations in general are undertaking this process [of self review and prioritization] to make their corporate giving programs more proactive, more accountable, and more measurable. Companies also want their giving to generate maximum impact, whether as a way to distinguish themselves as leading corporate citizens, realize the benefits on the reputations and/or bottom lines, enhance their marketing efforts, or generate goodwill among key constituents. In most cases, companies are looking to do a combination of all of these things. (p. 1)

“Concerns about education are not new. But a confluence of economic and demographic trends makes it more critical for companies to step up and play an active role in collaborative efforts to improve education” (Wilson, 2011b, p. 26). While corporate America has spent 25 years on a quest to improve K-12 and higher education,

there remains a gap and no common table (Symonds, 2009a). A forum does not exist for governmental leaders, corporate leaders, and academic administrators to create a dialogue for the United States (Symonds, 2009a). “The increasing economic influence of social outcomes is bolstered by the fact that we are not just living through an economic downturn, we are also living through a social and environmental downturn” (Saul, 2011). These issues posture colleges and universities to work with governments and corporations to develop solutions.

The New Ecology

There is “a new ecology—a context deeply different from that in which many of today’s institutions, assumptions, and habits were formed” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 4). Many dynamics interplay thus creating a new era of resource development in the United States, and the world, in a new century. “Seven major forces—privatization, connection, acceleration, multiplication, diversification, observation, and reflection—and the ways they are combining...create a new ecology of social benefit” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 4). Additionally, three key areas of concern included “the pressure for accountability, the demand for effectiveness, and the need for infrastructure” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 5). Four principles effecting decision-making and the overall environment in the new ecology included strategic advantages, cooperative advantages, complexity, and scrutiny (Fulton & Blau, 2005).

Privatization

In the United States, there has been a “shift of power away from governments or other public institutions toward businesses [and other private entities]” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 11). Such privatization has shifted financial strength to many individuals and

corporations. “Some corporations have grown to a size and reach that exceeds that of many national governments... Walmart was the sixth largest revenue-producing entity in the world, behind only the governments of the U.S., Germany, the U.K., Italy, and Japan” (Fulton & Blau, p. 11). Annually only 5% of private support comes from corporations, yet the dollars are significant to warrant attention. “Although the importance and power of governments has not necessarily diminished, the stage on which they work—and the actors with whom they must interact—has been transformed” (Fulton & Blau, p. 11).

Connection and Observation

The new century has greatly increased the “advances in communication and transportation that promote global connection and commerce” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 12). Such expediency creates opportunity and awareness for institutions. Yet such connection has increased public scrutiny on accountability, transparency, and ethical behavior of all individuals, corporations, and other organizations. Additionally, nonprofits have come under scrutiny about measuring and proving their impact on society. Individuals, corporations, and other funders have much greater information and comparison information to make choices on which organizations to support, partner with, and engage on mutually beneficial initiatives. Such connection has also increased competition among universities and nonprofits for customers and resources. “The information to pass judgment is widely available: on the Web, in the mainstream media, and in the growing number of trade press publications dedicated to nonprofits and philanthropy” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 16).

Acceleration

The expediency of information and transportation has increased greatly each year

since the advent of the Internet. Fulton and Blau (2005) said,

By increasing the density, speed, and scope of connection, our society has accelerated the rate at which information is communicated, the rate at which it can be incorporated into other processes, and the number of people who can use that information to create new ideas, make new discoveries, and synthesize new inventions. Not only is the creation and diffusion of knowledge accelerating, but so is everything that depends on it: science, technology, commerce, fads, culture, and efforts to create social benefit. Even the pace of acceleration is, itself, accelerating. (p. 13)

Who better than universities, colleges, and research organizations to continue to be the primary source for information, innovation, and solutions to key needs, opportunities, and problems as well as to prepare the next generation of workers and leaders? Corporations become the vehicle to harness that information to expedite its delivery into the world. Thus the partnership between corporations and higher education continues to grow and be vital in the new century—with added pressure for acceleration of ideas and answers for the country and world’s most pressing issues.

Multiplication and Diversification

“Everything associated with the domain of social benefit has grown significantly in the last 25 years, making it both a more active and more crowded environment” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 14). The positive viewpoint is that social concerns and issues have taken main stage in the 21st Century. Yet “the environment in which any individual actor chooses issues, formulates strategies, and makes contributions is increasingly crowded with competitors, potential collaborators, and even people or organizations working at cross-purposes” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 14). Such multiplication created added pressure for performance to become the differentiator among all organizations in a pluralistic society. Both universities and corporations continue to develop key relationships needed to address quality outcomes to impact our country and world.

Creating diversity—a major facet of a pluralistic society—has become a goal in nearly every aspect of life: financial investments; workplace demographics of skill sets, backgrounds, and experience; and strategic organizational partnerships.

Reflection

“In the last 25 years, people in the social sector have benefited from the enormous advances in their ability to reflect on their own work and the work of others” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 17). Such reflection has increased the knowledge base and best practices to create ideas and solutions in nearly all fields. Specifically relating to resource development, “University programs devoted to nonprofit leadership and philanthropy have sprung up across the country, newspapers and journals devoted to social-sector work have been launched; and the number of infrastructure organizations...has grown rapidly” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 17). These resources have allowed university fundraisers and corporations’ community affairs people to create an ongoing dialogue and relationships to building healthy, productive inter-organizational relationships able to be harnessed for producing effective outcomes and impact.

Accountability, Effectiveness, and Infrastructure

“Organizational effectiveness is a multifaceted concept, where the effectiveness of the organization depends on which group, with which criteria and preferences, is doing the assessment” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 33). Accountability addresses what an organization does with its resources and reports on such. Governments have required organizations to report on certain information, but transparency of more detailed information has become required. “Efficiency is an internal standard of organizational performance [and measures] how well an organization accomplishes its stated, or

implied, objectives given the resources used” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 33). Thus internal, closed systems, must be fully efficient for organizations to be ready to inter-organizationally interact with other organizations (Katz & Kahn, 2005). On the other hand, “effectiveness is an external standard applied to the output or activities of an organization” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 34). This effectiveness, or ROI expectation, is the evaluation of organizations’ performance (Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). Accountability, then, is “the responsibility...to provide evidence to stakeholders and sponsors” (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004, p. 200). “Where evaluation was historically done only retrospectively, many funders are now conducting formative evaluations, which review programs in progress to help grantees and funders identify problems and make mid-course corrections” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 30). In order to perform, organizations have had to create infrastructures for planning, implementation, and record keeping to summarize their inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact (Katz & Kahn, 2005; Rossi, et al., 2004). Corporations, governments, and universities have had to develop “a much closer and more active relationship...[and] achievement of measurable goals” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 24). Accountability “is creating new codes of ethics, new standards for basic compliance, new governance recommendations, and renewed interest by the IRS and Congress” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 45).

Strategic Advantages, Cooperative Advantages, Complexity, and Scrutiny

Organizations have had to develop strategic advantages, cooperative advantages, ability to respond to complexity and to navigate scrutiny to build success (Fulton & Blau, 2005). The dialogues have shifted from a hands-off approach to philanthropy to organizationally centered attention of program development and execution to “creating a

lasting and collaborative relationship between a donor or collection of donors and an organization or group of organizations devoted to a shared set of goals and objectives” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 23). “A key tenet of partnering is that a [mutual] benefit comes from...[it]” (Eddy, 2010, p. 2). Given the tough choices of which organizations to fund during especially penurious times, corporations have had to focus on specific goals, fewer organizations, and require partners and programs to be sustainable and scalable (Goldberg, 2010; Mayer, 2010; Nonprofit Research Collaborative, 2010). However, corporate relations officers at both universities and corporations have indicated that it is an increased “time to build relationships” (Mayer, 2010, p. 3). Such a challenging environment has provided an opportunity for inter-organizational relationships to deepen. The best relationships are “based on mutual interests and shared goals” (Eddy, 2010, p. 18). Rhodes (2001) admonished that strategic planning for higher education finances must involve “all constituencies, on and off campus, in identifying the university’s most important goals and priorities” (p. 159). Fulton and Blau have summarized,

Many in the field feel overwhelmed by the growing needs, choices, and pressures in this environment, leading to frustration and confusion. ... The old norms and practices don’t feel completely successful, but no new shared set of models, approaches, or ideas has yet settled into place. Many go about business as usual, doing what they have always done in traditional ways, while some motivated people try new things as part of a larger, uncoordinated quest for a better fit. Put all the trends and themes together, though, and what emerges are more options and opportunities, more creative experiments, and the potential for real gains. (p. 41)

Higher education has had to continue to be creative in the new millennium on how it addressed resources (Eddy, 2010). “With calls for accountability, innovation, and expanding access coupled with significant economic recession and increased public skepticism about institutions’ ability to deliver effective and efficient educational

experiences for increasingly diverse learners, the future looks no less demanding” (Eddy, 2010, p. xiii). The new ecology has forced corporations, governments, and higher education to evaluate how they individually and collectively address issues, set goals, develop and grow partnerships, and impact society. “The new ecology hasn’t just increased the likelihood of greater oversight, it has also opened up a wide range of opportunities to reinvent and improve” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 22).

Relationship Between Corporate America and U.S. Higher Education

“An organization’s goals and values may be shared by other organizations” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 23). “A good relationship, however, does not happen by itself. ... Each party involved must actively participate in building a good relationship” (Cummings, 1991, p. 301). Relationships between organizations should yield clear wins for each partner by ensuring that partners have compatible agendas (Andresen, 2006; Crutchfield & Grant, 2008). Additionally, inter-organizational relationships require the individual organizations involved to maintain their individual missions while cooperating in joint efforts (Fischer, 2000). In building a relationship between a higher education institution and a corporation, the onus begins on the higher education side to develop and to foster the relationship (Tromble, 1998).

Assessing organizational compatibility is an important first step (Fischer, 2000). After determining the common agenda, organizations must weigh the pros and cons of being associated. Inter-organizational relationships require “mutual understanding and shared values” (Fischer, 2000, p. 190). Once mutually compatible goals are established, the relationship works through a plan to help stay on track. Ring and Van de Ven (1994) identified three key processes for successful inter-organizational relationships:

negotiations to identify needs and expectations, commitments to solidify and formalize intentions, and execution of commitments. Andresen (2006) said,

No partnership is perfect. The bottom line is to go into the partnership with eyes open, more positives than negatives in regard to fit and benefits, and a plan for compensating for weaknesses within the alliance. Inevitably, the benefits that partners receive will change, and one partner may perceive diminishing value. (p. 105)

Partners are valuable because they help reach audiences and advance common causes through communication and marketing channels, distribution systems, political connections, and resources of expertise, efficiency, human capital, image, and funding to create win-win propositions over time to achieve success (Andresen; Eddy, 2010). The key to successful relationships is being “authentic” (Cummings, 1991, p. 303).

A two-way social relation exists between a donor and a recipient, such as a corporation and a higher education institution (Ostrander & Schervish, 2002; Saiia, 2001; Tromble, 1998). This relationship can be mutual and provide benefits and responsibilities for both parties. “When executed well, the process and outcome of contributing to nonprofit institutions strengthen the donor as much, if not more than, the donee” (Levy, 1999, p. xxi). External environmental factors have created various crucial circumstances for organizations (Fulton & Blau, 2005; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Saiia, 2001; Young & Burlingame, 1996). For the organizations to be successful and survive, they must realize legitimacy comes from external validation, employ external assessment to internal values, and depend on externally fixed entities to reduce turbulence and strive to maintain stability. Furthermore, incorporating socially legitimized elements maximize the organization’s legitimacy and increases its ability to attract and maintain relationships and resources.

“Direct relationships exist between business and academic institutions to the benefit of both...[and]...both parties...maintain separate identities...[yet]...often complementary missions” (Elliott, 2006, p. 59). One study identified why public universities rationalized seeking corporate engagement and support as early as 1967 (Smith, Jr., L., 1968). Traditionally private universities sought private support from alumni and corporations whereas public universities were funded by the state and federal governments. The tough economic times pushed all higher education institutions to diversify funding. Private institutions sought governmental support as public institutions’ enrollments swelled, and public universities better organized private foundations for seeking alumni giving and corporate interest (Smith, Jr., L., 1968). “The distinction between public and private universities is close to meaningless today” (Litan & Mitchell, 2011, p. 142). Buchanan (1991) indicated,

As higher education attempts to carry out its mission of education, research and service with reduced fiscal resources from the state and federal levels, revenue from the private sector has become increasingly important. ... Cooperation between business and education is a necessity due to the interrelationships existing between these segments of society.
(p. 1)

“The qualities of a university’s ideas, faculty, and programs are what matter. In the end, all schools are chasing the same dollars,” (Litan & Mitchell, 2011, p. 142). “The good news for corporations is that giving back, when conceived and executed thoughtfully, creates a win-win scenario for businesses and the public” (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xii). “Tapping the extensive resources of the corporate world to strategically match social, community, and public needs can create immense benefits for all parties” (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xv). As citizens in a pluralistic society, corporations are willing to engage and support universities. McGowan (2012) said,

Corporations have multiple choices to form partnerships with universities to advance common interests, and they prefer academic partners who:

- See the mutual advantages of working together
- Appreciate the inherent differences in their cultures
- Allocate experienced resources to manage the interactions
- Strive to remove barriers to effective, timely agreements
- Share in risks as well as benefits. (p. 2)

Such clarity exhibits a willingness to form inter-organizational relationships in an organized manner. Additionally, clear expectations help create a framework for universities.

“In recent years, America’s premier corporate leaders have warned that the shortcomings of American schools [at all levels] increasingly threaten the future of the United States” (Symonds, 2009b, p. 27). Symonds (2009b) highlighted Harvard Professor Tony Wagner’s *Seven Survival Skills* that are a must for 21st Century functioning. The skills include: “critical thinking and problem-solving, collaboration across networks and leading by influence, agility and adaptability, initiative and entrepreneurialism, effective oral and written communication, assessing and analyzing information,” and “curiosity and imagination” (Symonds, 2009b, p. 27). Corporate America is concerned “that the nation has surrendered the lead it long held in educational achievement and attainment” (Symonds, 2009b, p. 27).

Coordinated Roots in Higher Education

In 1958 the Greenbrier Report evolved from a 3-day meeting underwritten by the Ford Foundation. Attendees included higher education presidents, college and university trustees, fundraisers, public relations organizations, and business and industry executives. The effort was to coordinate efforts within higher education institutions to include fundraising, marketing, public relations, and alumni relations and collectively was

classified as *institutional advancement* (Elliott, 2006; Worth, 2002). Jacobson (1978) defined *institutional advancement* as “primarily responsible for maintaining and improving the relationship of an institution of higher education with society and selected publics in a way that most effectively contributes to the achievement of the institution’s purposes” (p. 2).

The purpose of the meeting was to better coordinate college and university interactions with corporations to coordinate the relationship. Coordination of fundraising efforts helped insure against individual fundraising projects conflicting or threatening the overall success of a college or university’s efforts (Pollard, 1958; Worth, 2002). In 1974, the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Associations merged to create the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

Higher education had much to offer corporations and other community organizations including: skills and abilities for enriching the community, laboratories to advance ideas, and mutually beneficial ventures that could serve the greater public (Fischer, 2000; Pollard, 1958). “Organizations should perform due diligence on potential corporate partners, doing as much research as they can to make sure their motives, goals, and integrity are aligned, rather than rushing in when a company dangles a grant” (Crutchfield & Grant, 2008, p. 76).

Corporations and corporate interests were one of the six major power roles in higher education (Gould, 2003). Other roles included executive boards and college administrations, faculty, students and alumni, the higher education market, and governmental legislatures. Gould proposed,

Corporations and corporate interests, sometimes in alliance with political concerns, wield considerable power in the shaping of universities both

through strategic alliances with campuses and as disseminators of commodity knowledge. They also wield power through representation of their culture...along with specific company interests in being represented on boards of trustees. They are noted for their philanthropy, investment in research, special consulting alliance with institutions, and above all, the encouragement of a corporate management style that has been the strongest influence in the past fifty years on how colleges and universities organize themselves and present themselves to the public. Because colleges and universities recognize that their survival depends on their managerial efficiency, a natural connection has grown up between academic and corporate culture. (pp. 84-85)

In alignment with Katz and Kahn's (2005) open systems theory, Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory argued that three types of pressures are created in institutions, including higher education: (a) coercive pressures from legal mandates or influence from organizations they are dependent upon, (b) mimetic pressures to copy successful models during high uncertainty, and (c) normative pressures to homogeneity stemming from the similar attitudes and approaches of professional groups and associations brought into the organization through hiring practices. Sommerville (2009) noted that during the tough economic times of the 1980s, higher education institutions looked to business to maximize enrollments and profitability, and since that time, business has taken over higher educational roles in society.

Also supporting Katz and Kahn's (2005) open systems theory was the resource dependence theory by Aldrich (1979) focused specifically by Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) that defined how higher education looked outside itself for resources—including government and corporate support. The theory denoted that higher education was resource-dependent on corporate support. Higher education is funded by tuition, government aid, and private support; as governments cut funding, more of a burden falls on the private sector to help fund higher educational purposes and goals (Arulampalam &

Stoneman, 1995; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Gould, 2003; Levy, 1999). Corporations have a significant financial impact on higher education through charitable contributions, which constituted 16.9% of budgets in 2010 (Kaplan, 2011). Higher education institutions have “become so entrepreneurial and civic-minded that a dominant organizational discourse...is inevitable” (Gould, 2003, p. 88).

Academic capitalism was defined in the 1990s as a concern for corporate America unduly influencing higher education, such as curriculum, decision-making by faculty and administration, purchasing research at low costs, recruiting graduates as employees, and eroding educational pursuits (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This perspective does not favor corporations’ perceived self-serving motivations. Today’s higher education environment seems to favor knowledge with market exchange value over knowledge that provides cultural value (Gould, 2003). Too many academicians and administrators operate out of fear instead of based upon information, communication, and close relationships with corporate representatives; these factors are key to understanding each party’s roles and to negotiating terms to create win-win situations for higher education and corporate interests (Siegel, 2007).

The process of building a relationship with a corporation from a university’s perspective is called *cultivation* (Sheldon, 2000). To attract corporate attention, support, and engagement, universities identify ways to engage corporations with them such as advisory boards, corporate consultants, and hosting fact-finding or on-site visits (Sheldon, 2000). “How long donors stay involved and how long they keep giving is related directly to the time and effort given to support the ongoing relationship”

(Greenfield, 2008, p. 20). The key, however, is to realize that individual staffs turn over; it is organizations that remain (Greenfield, 2008). It is important, then, for strong inter-organizational relationships to be constructed. Thompson (2005) noted,

Instrumental action is rooted on the one hand in desired outcomes and on the other hand in beliefs about cause/effect relationships. Given a desire, the state of man's knowledge at any point in time dictates the kinds of variables required and the manner of their manipulation to bring that desire to fruition. (p. 497)

Both public and private universities have had to diversify funding for higher education (Hearn, 2003). In 2002 tuition accounted for only 18% of public colleges and universities and 24% of private higher education institutions. Other sources of funding included government appropriations, government grants and contracts, investment returns on endowments and property, sales and services of educational activities, sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, and private gifts, grants, and contracts (Hearn, 2003). "Examples of nontraditional revenue-generating initiatives" (Hearn, 2003, p. 7) included instructional initiatives such as online programming and special-interest programs, research, pricing strategies for various constituents, investment tools, franchising, licensing, third-party activities, auxiliary enterprises, special financing arrangements and discounts, and facility rental and other user fees. Many of these have corporate funding and relationships involved.

Birnbaum's (2000) *Management Fads in Higher Education* highlighted and cautioned about management fads developing in business or government and being applied in higher education. Higher education relationships with other organizations often create the mimetic pressures noted by Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory (Birnbaum). Pressures are experienced by higher education administration attempting to

apply business management, marketing, or other ideas into their environment. Examples included managing a portfolio matrix, questing for excellence, line-item budgeting, zero-based budgeting, strategic planning, management by objectives, total quality management, continuous quality improvement, and benchmarking (Birnbaum). While operating an efficient and effective organization is certainly a goal for higher education, the loose hierarchy and collegial environment does not often institutionalize management trends.

Additionally, the new ecology of resource development in the 21st Century requires university administrators and fundraisers to not only create a case for support and engagement but to rethink the value propositions for corporations and other partners. (Brock, 2007; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). Brock (2007) and (2011) Saul both indicated that understanding corporations' values and needs; speaking their language; creating solutions for business problems, opportunities, and needs; and assuring efficiency and effectiveness catapult relationship success. Brock recommended to those needing resources: "Understand important trends and directions driving the industry. Understand their key measures of success. Try to anticipate the problems, challenges, and opportunities they face" (p. 2). Corporations and other partners are operating in a more and more complex environment with multiple needs and goals. Quantifying impact is the key for organizations such as universities to engage in today's complex resource environment (Brock, 2007; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011).

University Corporate Relations Models

There were three primary corporate relations models found to be operating within a university setting: philanthropic focused; centralized, industrial-focused; and decentralized (Johnson, J., 2008). McGowan (2012) advocated that "one model does not

fit all” (p. 7). Each relationship depends on what type of focus, the university’s staff size, dependence on a centralized or decentralized approach, and availability of resources that corporations are interested in tapping.

The philanthropic model is the traditional approach and focused on matching corporate direct engagement and corporate foundations with programming at the university; measurement is based on financial support. The decentralized model allows each college or school at a university to build appropriate relationships with companies; measurement is based on each unit’s objectives. The centralized, industrial-focused model coordinates university-wide efforts and maximizes interface with corporations; measurement is based on a number of factors. Jacobson (1978) indicated a centralized corporate relations program,

Establishes working relationships with business in interests and university activities; solicits gift support from business and industry in a systematic manner; [and] provides a centralized office for assistance, guidance, and coordination of all matters as needed involving contact between corporations and university programs. (p. 22)

In 2008 42% of universities operated within the philanthropic model; 33%, in the decentralized model; and 25%, in the centralized, industrial-focused model (Johnson, J., 2008).

The decentralized system tended to be more cost effective but uncoordinated and potentially duplicating efforts (Johnson, J., 2007b). The centralized, industrial-model and the philanthropic model were more costly to operate and labor intensive but better organized the relationships and represented the universities in maximizing networks and publicity (Johnson, J., 2007b; Pollack, 1998). The total impact of relationships was very difficult to measure given the large number of intangibles involved (Johnson, J., 2007a).

There were a number of risks and rewards identified with university-industry relationships (Robbins, Cirillo, Kaylor, Larson, & Reed, 2007). Industry risks included scarcity of time and resources, concern of ROI, and bureaucracy for approvals, whereas university risks included scarcity of time and resources, academic freedom, and maintaining a strong reputation. Rewards for industry included recruitment of highly-qualified employees, access to consulting, tailored continuing education, research collaborations, joint ventures, and accessibility to new customers. University rewards included placement for graduates, support for curricula and research, joint ventures, and resources and support for programs and students.

Additionally, collaborations on campus have been encouraged in recent years (Burson, 2009). Previously, the traditional approach yielded non-central efforts, silo creation, duplication of efforts, and individualistic interactions. The integrated approach for collaboration has created coordination, central relationship contact for a designated corporation, communication, concerted institutional representation, shared learning, and increased performance. Abbott et al. (2011) said,

No two universities will have identical corporate relations programs: public or private; size of faculty and student populations; the size and quality of its business, engineering, and medical schools; importance to the local economy; and unique campus cultures will all shape the opportunities and dynamics of each university's program. (p. 2)

Three Models of Corporate Behavior

“Legally the corporation is a creature of the state, endowed in the interest of society with legal existence, legal rights and privileges” (Drucker, 1946, p. 209).

“Companies are not experts in working with educational institutions” (Sanzone, 2000, p. 323). To understand corporations' perspective of interacting with higher education,

other nonprofits, and their communities, Jacoby (1973) developed the social environment model and compared it to the classical market model and to Berle and Means' (1968) managerial model as illustrated in Figure 5. Jacoby contended that "the business corporation has contributed powerfully to meeting the evolving needs of our economy" (p. xiii). Figure 5 illustrates important characteristics of business considerations regarding corporations' market concern for costs, revenues, and profits as well as their social interaction with non-market issues. The model "reconciles the principle of enlightened self-interest with corporate concern for social responsibility" (Jacoby, p. 196).

The classical market model primarily is concerned with profitability in the short-run and emphasized a business-only perspective; this model was entrepreneur-focused and created the great industrialists. Berle and Means' (1968) managerial model placed more responsibility on management as well as broader external concerns of effectiveness and environmental considerations. Attention to social and charitable concerns was primarily at the discretion of management—not an organization-wide concern, per se—and was typically reactionary.

Jacoby's (1973) social environment model combined the best of the classical market and managerial models to integrate internal efficiency and external forces to maximize all parties' interests. The social environment model became more accepted when companies became publically traded. In a pluralistic society the opportunity for wide individual ownership of larger corporations was a natural checks and balance of interest for the American people (Jacoby). Measurement of social investment was considered on a cost/benefit analysis.

Motives included reduction of costs for legal issues and lawsuits, self-regulation

instead of heavy government regulation (including penalties for noncompliance), and decreased vandalism of corporate property by activists. The social environment model was said to have “no conflict between profit maximization and corporate social activity” (Jacoby, p. 196).

Characteristic	Classical Market Model	Managerial Model	Social Environment Model
Nature of the Economy	Perfectly Competitive	Monopolistic-Oligopolistic	Effectively Competitive
Level of Profits	Normal	Super-normal	Normal
Enterprise Goal	Short-run Profit Maximization	Security and Growth of Business Volume	Long-run Profit Maximization
Locus of Decision-making Power	Entrepreneurs	Managers	Stockholders/ Board of Directors
Nature of Competition	Price	Price, Product Variation, Selling Costs	Multi-vectored Dynamic Process
External Constraints on Enterprise Behavior	Markets	Markets	Markets, Public Opinion, Political Pressures
Determinants of Social Activity	None	Social and Charitable Propensities of Managers	Long-run Profit Maximization

Figure 5. Jacoby’s (1973) Three Models of Behavior of the Business Enterprise, p. 192.

Jacoby was actually so bold as to say “...the contemporary corporation must become socially involved in order to maximize its profits” (p. 197). Both the governments and society agreed that corporations should take responsibility as corporate citizens and have

responsibilities to improve the environments in which they operate. Jacoby also contended: “Governmental legislation or regulation is necessary to “trigger” corporate social action” (p. 201), which is more powerful than political social pressure by individuals, groups, and organizations.

Traditionally, corporations have supported higher education for three main reasons: to improve society, to support political interests that benefit corporations, and “to increase a company’s reputation and image” (Withers, 2002, p. 155). Carey (2012) indicated that corporations connect to universities for “research, recruiting, revenue, [and] relationships” (p. 4). “Corporations have a long and distinguished tradition of advancing the needs of higher education” (Elliott, 2006, p. 62). Corporations supported nonprofits—including higher education—by offering cash as direct corporate giving, which constituted 75% of overall giving (Sheldon, 2000). Other types of engagement included foundation grants, in-kind products or services, marketing, public relations, promotions, employee volunteers, sponsorships, employee matching gifts, funds from managers’ discretionary accounts, research contracts, discounts on sales, and judicial settlements relating to corporate misconduct (Sheldon, 2000).

Decision-making on behalf of companies differs with large, medium, and small firms (BBIC, 2002; Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Frishkoff & Kostecaka, 1991; Pinney, 2009; Rubenstein, 2004). Larger corporations typically have sophisticated systems, processes, staffing, and agendas decided by consensus of a management group. Medium corporations, those with 101-500 employees, typically have a single corporate relations officer determining implementation and priorities of the company’s goals. Finally, at small corporations, those with 100 or fewer employees, decisions regarding

support and engagement with nonprofits are made by the owner or proprietors. Larger corporations contribute more financially to education than do small and medium firms; and small-sized firms (based on number of employees) contribute proportionately more [overall] than large and medium-sized firms (BBIC, 2002; Frishkoff & Kostecka, 1991). Medium and small “contributions programs are not just down-sized versions of large companies’ programs but have unique characteristics” (Krieg, 1991, p. 249). They often focus only on the local community or on regular annual commitments to specific causes (Krieg, 1991). The larger the firm, the more complex and important corporate citizenship becomes (Pinney, 2009). However, corporations of all sizes generally have the same goals of helping communities, building brand reputation, recruiting students, networking with faculty, leveraging resources, developing new technologies, continuing education, leadership development, and participating in a pluralistic society (BBIC, 2002; Carey, 2012; Hoerr, Kucic, Wagener, & Nolan, 2012; Philip, 2012; Rubenstein, 2004).

Organizations Supporting Today’s Corporate-Higher Education Relationship

Several organizations have been created to bring corporate America and U.S. higher education closer together. The Business-Higher Education Forum (BHEF), the Committee to Encourage Corporate Philanthropy (CECP), the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), the Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers (NACRO), and University-Industry Demonstration Project (UIDP) are five current organizations providing leadership and attention to these inter-organizational collaborations. These organizations all strive to create win-win relationships between corporate America and U.S. higher education.

The BHEF is comprised of higher education administrators and business leaders

dedicated to solutions for U.S. education and workforce training and development (BHEF, 2011). BHEF promotes the United States' global competitiveness through support of science, technology, engineering, and math as well as college- and work-readiness programming. CECF is "an advocacy body that works with a diverse range of top corporate leaders, nonprofit partners, the media, the independent sector, and government institutions" (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xi). CECF works to create a venue for corporate chief executive officers' (CEOs) ideas to be heard, to promote business discipline in corporate philanthropy, and to set standards for philanthropy practice and measurement.

Formed in 2007, NACRO promotes university relations with corporate interests "because of the lack of corporate expertise available by CASE" (M. Thomas, personal communication, February 2, 2012). NACRO's goal is to assist practitioners to develop strategies and maximize the relationships between higher education and industry and to develop metrics for measuring and reporting success. NACRO members *are typically* from research-based, four-year universities (NACRO, 2011). NACRO indicated several benefits to corporate-higher education networks, including: student and professional placement, faculty and center expertise, fellowships, university-industrial research, consulting, university event participation, continuing and executive education, rental of equipment and facilities, economic development, technology transfer, and good will (Abbott et al., 2011; Cleland et al., 2012; Johnson, J., 2007a, 2008).

GUIRR, created in 1984, serves as a forum to address scientific training, globalization, and the impact of governmental regulations and policies (Fox, 2006). UIDP was formed in 2006 to foster a stronger relationship between universities and

companies—of all sectors—to “discuss contracting and intellectual property policy, publication and technology transfer preferences, and other issues” (UIDP, 2012, ¶ 1). UIDP had previously been the University-Industry Partnership formed in 2003. The group has yielded policies and best practices relating to intellectual property and other legal frameworks that perpetuate university-industry relationships.

Sustaining Relationships

“Key supports to develop and sustain strategic partnerships include strong relationships nurtured over time, trust, frequent and open communication, shared values and vision, and a common understanding of what it means to be involved in the partnership” (Eddy, 2010, p. xi). Motivations for the relationship between higher education and corporations can be either intrinsic or extrinsic. When both parties have intrinsic motivation, partnerships are likely to develop and to be long lasting. Extrinsic motivation for resources or a network are also important; but if either part of the relationship is forced on the other, limited, short-term, or ill-fitting relationships ensue (Eddy, 2010). Additionally, although resources may be at stake, the greatest benefit of mutual relationships is the social capital or social benefit to society (Eddy, 2010; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). A balance of roles and responsibilities leads to successful relationships.

There are a number of political and cultural issues that organizations must have faced and managed in relationships, such as formal authority, rules, regulations, decision making, control of boundaries, technology, interpersonal alliances, network capacities, control by counter organizations, management control, and other unknown variables (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Herman, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Saiia, 2001). Seven key “push-

and-pull factors of partnerships” (Eddy, 2010, p. 52) that must find equilibrium for successful relationships included conflict vs. trust, individual motivations vs. relationships, institutional loyalty vs. shared values, changed objectives vs. open communication, lack of resources vs. organizational resources, shift of key players vs. a strong champion, and individual focus vs. partnership focus. All of these items must continually be monitored and balanced to foster and to maintain positive, productive partnerships. Careful evaluation of relationships is important. The business practice of a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis and a political, economical, social, and technological issues (PEST) analysis should be performed (Birnbaum, 2000).

Each of Cone’s (2010) categories in the corporate citizenship spectrum pulls together these relationship concepts and includes expectations as well as potential or perceived ROI. The spectrum illustrates a continuum of four categories identified as key corporate citizenship functions; they include philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos. Both higher education and the corporate community need to work together to make the most of their relationship to succeed in the years to come (Sheldon, 2000).

Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Philanthropy

“Nearly all Americans believe it is their obligation to support charitable causes. This altruistic philosophy stands in marked contrast to that in many other countries where philanthropic giving is often exclusively a government responsibility” (Sargeant, Lee, & Jay, 2002, p. 11). “Regardless of income, age, education, race or ethnicity, most Americans give back to their communities” (Gardyn, 2003, p.47). “While philanthropy

was a small actor on the world stage, its disciplined and catalytic role was critically important” (Karooff, 2004, p. xxi). The pro-social behavior of the American culture provided expectations for all entities to help one another (Bar-Tal, 1976). Altruistic philanthropy was typically money given by corporations to non-profits to manage on their own with no expectations in return. Reporting on the nonprofit’s outcomes typically is illustrated in the organization’s annual report.

Charity is defined as *assistance to alleviate human suffering* (Wisely, 2008).

Philanthropy is delineated into three categories: *relief*, *improvement*, and *social reform*.

Relief is found to be that altruistic concern to relieve suffering and involves compassion often seen in orphanages, medical environments, and operations serving the poor. In the United States, some confusion evolved from the term *charitable* because of legal tax implications (Edie, 1991). The evolving lexicon includes “activities that promote health, education, science, culture, art, the enhancement of knowledge, the environment, religion, human values, social welfare, and human rights all fall under the broad definition of charitable activities” (Edie, 1991, p. 202).

Philanthropy for causes such as higher education is categorized as either improvement or social reform or both. *Improvement* supports the idea of progress and maximized human potential. Social reform addresses social problems and operations from a point of justice. Most corporations take a utilitarian view of philanthropic activities realizing they were part of a wider society and trying to serve the greatest good for the greatest number (Shaw & Post, 1993). Additionally, Aristotelian virtue ethics undergird American corporate behavior for citizenship with “such character traits (virtues) as liberality, magnificence, and pride” (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 746) that would

translate in the U.S. today as “public spiritness, generosity, and compassion” (Shaw & Post, p. 746).

The social relationship in philanthropy differs from other social exchanges such as commercial transactions and voting. A major issue is that, typically, “the relation between the two parties is not an equal one” (Ostrander & Schervish, 2002, p. 70). The donor has “substantially more active choice than recipients about how to define the philanthropic transaction and how to take part in it” (Ostrander & Schervish, 2002, p. 70). In commercial transactions consumers and suppliers exchange demands for money; and in electoral politics a vote is exchanged for needs or interests of voters. “Social exchange is noncontractual, more open, less bounded by time constraints and specified returns than a contract agreement, but it does assume that something of value accrues to each organizations” (Mixer, 1993, p. 67). Organizations such as higher education institutions were, therefore, “dependent on donors for their organizational existence and for the well-being” (Ostrander & Schervish, 2002, p. 74) of their students. Ideally, Ostrander and Schervish support a mutual dialogue to manage donor-recipient relationships, which can be accomplished through several different tactics. Likely corporations’ responses and engagement vary based on each corporation’s size, philosophy, and view of its role in society. “Corporate, small business, and foundation giving...fits the social exchange model” (Mixer, 1993, p. 1). Such “corporate giving is essentially a transaction between two kinds of organizations, profit and nonprofit” (Mixer, 1993, p. 66). Corporate philanthropy includes classical views, the role of corporate foundations, strategic philanthropy, and the new philanthropy. Each of these areas seems to have developed over time.

Classical Corporate Philanthropy

The roots of corporate philanthropy were owed to the great industrialists at the turn of the 20th Century (Chernow, 1998; Cohen, 2010; Curti & Nash, 1965; Elliott, 2006; Jacoby, 1973; Sears, 1922). “Corporate philanthropy is one major component of a firm’s relationship to society at large” (Levy, 1999, p. 12). Formal giving by corporate America in the 1950s was generally embraced as an “accepted role of corporate citizens” (Pollard, 1958, p. 181). Corporate America’s initial attitude and behavior toward philanthropic support of the nonprofit sector and higher education was a reactionary gesture of goodwill (Jacoby, 1973; Pollard, 1958). “Making contributions out of earnings is a new thing for most companies, and a problem” (Pollard, 1958, p. 181) because there were no formal systems in place. Additionally, corporations soon shifted to transactional or reciprocal pro-social behavior, for which they expected recognition and prestige in the community. “The guiding motive for corporate giving is enlightened self-interest” (Pollard, 1958, p. 182). Higher education leaders were once expected to “present a clear and strong case” (Pollard, 1958, p. 182) for corporate support and illustrated “the nation’s strength...rather than merely their need for help” (Pollard, 1958, p. 182).

A pulse of the capacity of interested constituents was measured by alumni giving: if alumni do not support their alma mater, who else would want to? Corporate executives asked two questions: “What do colleges need in order to excel?” and “What’s our fair share?” (Pollard, 1958, p. 182). In many cases, shrewd corporate leaders wanted to be assured of efficient and effective management and financial practices; executives often required financial statements from higher education institutions, but corporations realized they were expected to do their part. “In general, the impact has been to awaken

management, and stockholders as well, to the importance of companies accepting responsibility for corporate citizenship” (Pollard, p. 193). Through the 1960s, according to Sheldon (2000),

...a company’s philanthropic program was often a reflection of the...attitude of the company president or chief executive officer. ... Many times the same charities would receive funding each year simply because they had received similar support in years past. Giving was purely philanthropic and not tied to company business objectives. (p. 11)

This was called the *checkbook* or *bank approach* (Freeman, H. L., 1991; Fulton & Blau, 2005). Corporate executives lamented: “colleges do not meet the companies half way with clear cut proposals or statements of their needs” (Pollard, 1958, p. 196).

Administrators and faculty at colleges and universities quickly learned how to prepare priority lists of ideas and needs, case statements, and proposals, and to meet expectations of business executives to garner support. “A working relationship based on mutual confidence and understanding is an excellent thing for a college and for a company. Colleges need have no fear of intrusion in their internal affairs” (Pollard, 1958, p. 206). Such a mutual relationship between higher education institutions and the communities in which they are located was once labeled “town and gown” (Pollard, 1958, p. 210).

One major struggle with large, publicly held companies in the early years was identifying who had authority of philanthropic activities: the shareholders or management (Berle & Means, 1968)? Ultimately, authority was found to be with management as part of their overall duties (Brudney & Ferrell, 2002; Shaw & Post, 1993). Motivations for philanthropy became “an amalgam of altruism, good citizenship, prudence, and sound investment strategy” (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 745) that promoted enlightened self-interest of the corporation that pleased owners, managers, and employees (Grabois, 2010).

Corporate Foundations

Corporations have created their own foundations to manage philanthropic programs and to promote the company, its goals, or its agendas. “Foundations...often maintain close ties with their sponsoring company and most giving reflects that company’s interests” (Grabois, 2010, p. xi). Historically, corporate foundation creation surged in the 1950s. In the 1960s and 1970s corporations truly became corporate citizens with the goal of helping society-at-large in a variety of areas. Additionally, “corporations discovered the power of doing good” (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009, p. 178). “Corporate foundations, however, can be considered direct agents of their sponsoring firms” (Mixer, 1993, p. 83). Typically, motivation for corporate philanthropy included “response to community obligations” or “large, visible signature programs that tackle critical issues” (Lim, 2010, p. 4).

A corporate foundation “is a separate legal entity organized under state law either as a nonprofit or as a charitable trust” (Edie, 1991, p. 205). “Foundations operate like corporations and individuals in their social exchange behavior. Foundation grants are provided to nonprofit agencies in exchange for activities that satisfy the interests of founders, trustees, and managers” (Mixer, 1993, p. 83). The corporate foundation has its own board and staff. Legally, foundations are required to distribute a minimum of 5% of interest income annually (COP, 2007; Sheldon, 2000). “The most attractive feature of a company foundation is its ability to serve as a holding tank (or reserve) for funds...not to cut back on its normal level of charitable support” during less-profitable years for the corporation (Edie, 1991).

Eighty-one percent of U.S. companies have established a corporate foundation

(Rose, 2011). In 2009 there were 2,733 corporate foundations (Giving USA Foundation, 2011). Corporate foundations were one of the three methods of corporate giving. The other two ways were direct giving and in-kind donations or services (Giving USA Foundation, 2011; Rose, 2011). No matter which of the three methods are involved, benefits are typically expected, identified, and monitored (Tromble, 1998). More recently, Fulton and Blau (2005) reported that foundations:

are experimenting with ways to put more of their endowments to philanthropic use: through socially responsible investing, ensuring that funders aren't investing in businesses antithetical to their missions; through shareholder activism that allows foundations to advocate for changes in corporate policy; and through 'program related investments' (PRIs) and loans from the corpus in ventures with a social benefit that may generate enough cash to repay the investment. (p. 25)

Corporate foundations come in a wide range of sizes and vary greatly in governance and management philosophies. Pinney (2012) said,

In some cases, corporate foundations are managed almost autonomously from the company and its broader corporate citizenship strategy. In other, the corporate foundation and its philanthropy are directly integrated and managed as part of corporate citizenship, which in turn is integrated with business strategy. Some foundations are led and staffed from outside the company by individuals with nonprofit or academic backgrounds but little or no experience in business. Others are led from within the company by those with strong business backgrounds but limited experience working outside that realm. Given this broad mix, it is unsurprising to see a range of opinions on the role and value of corporate foundations. (p. 10)

Corporate foundations—as with most foundations—may have established guidelines, timelines, and processes (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Tromble, 1998). Size of the foundation makes a difference in its processes, timelines, and requirements. “Small foundations more closely resemble individual donors. Large foundations...see themselves as innovators, agents of change on a large scale, the Research and Development branch of society” (Locke, 1996, p. 21). Although it is possible to build

relationships between higher education fundraisers or executive management and appropriate corporate foundation officers, it is necessary to identify relevant areas of interest to pursue (Tromble, 1998). “Foundations operate like corporations and individuals in their social exchange behavior” (Mixer, 1993, p. 83). Additionally, corporate foundations “require tangible evidence of impact, progress, return on dollars invested” (Locke, 1996, p. 20). Effective foundations “nimble address systematic problems...take stock of what’s being learned and share this information with others, engage stakeholders...and collaborate with other funders” (McCray, 2012, p.1). Traditionally, foundations conducted evaluations retrospectively for internal consumption, while today both formative and summative evaluations are conducted “to assess the effectiveness of their programming and to increase organizational learning” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 29).

McIlnay (1998) admonished that foundations have had a confounding history in the 20th Century from their inception to a host of political and economic forces that have challenged and enhanced their abilities to function. The most recent decades have created great competition for their resources. In the 21st Century Pinney (2012) indicated that the role of corporate foundations needs “to align and engage their efforts more closely with business” goals (p. 4). Additionally, corporate foundations are challenged to improve communications, to integrate with business activities, to continue to measure outcomes, collaborate, and to use activities as competitive advantages. Corporate foundations are “an important instrument for value creation” (Pinney, p. 7). As governments have failed to meet needs and as society has increased demands, corporations and corporate foundations are turned to for resources and delivery systems (Pinney). “Corporate

foundations and giving programs are well situated to exemplify philanthropy as an innovative investment in society” (Pinney, p. 18). McIlnay believed that corporate foundations have a variety of roles to play including citizen, activist, and partner.

Strategic Philanthropy

In reviewing the corporate philanthropic landscape, Kelly (2002) said, “Contrary to popular opinion, empirical evidence does not support the notion that marketing objectives dominate corporate contributions” (p. 47). Reasons for philanthropy have included peer pressure among senior management, creating social currency, public relations, employee relations, social responsibility, tax savings, and marketing. “Companies understand the power of publicity and that charitable giving builds a strong community image. Giving’s necessity, however, means companies expect concrete rewards for their generosity” (Grabois, 2010, p. xi). However, “the shape, scope, and motivation behind corporate giving has changed dramatically in recent years” (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xii).

“Most companies’ philanthropic activities lack a cohesive strategy and are conducted in a piecemeal fashion, causing investments in corporate philanthropy to often dissipate” (Bruch & Walter, 2005, p. 49). Bruch and Walter viewed corporate behavior based on external and internal demands. As illustrated in Figure 6, external demands of market orientation and internal competence orientation create a matrix to describe corporate philanthropic behavior.

Market orientation is concerned with everything from shareholders’ concerns to all environmental factors external to a corporation. Internal competence was the corporations’ area(s) of expertise and main business interest. The combination of the two

orientations created corporations' philanthropic perspectives. Bruch and Walter (2005) and H. L. Freeman (1991) argued that strategic philanthropy best serves external demands and rallies internal competence to create win-win relationships with other organizations. The least ideal is dispersed philanthropy. Corporations with a low market concern and low competence concern were ambiguous and often decentralized in their approach. The management, employees, nor the community knows what the corporation was trying to accomplish. Both peripheral and constricted philanthropy served one interest effectively, but the other is ignored and typically counter productive. Peripheral philanthropy relied on external demands and overlooks the natural interest and expertise of the corporation, which yields forced, ill-fitting programming that is short-lived.

Market Orientation	High	Peripheral Philanthropy	Strategic Philanthropy
	Low	Dispersed Philanthropy	Constricted Philanthropy
		Low	High
		Competence Orientation	

Figure 6. Bruch and Walter's (2005) *Four Types of Corporate Philanthropy* determined corporations' goals based on a combination of market orientation, or external concerns, and competence orientation, which involved internal expertise and focus.

Constricted philanthropy related well to the core competencies the company can provide but does not match with needs or demands. With strategic philanthropic management, leaders and employees are interested in the corporations' goals. Successful programs track impact, define exit strategies to end relationships respectfully, engage all

constituents, and communicate and promote what they are doing to build synergy and recognition (Bruch & Walter).

Corporations must have both commitment and integration “to commit time, talent, resources, and ideas to a philanthropic program as well as money” (Freeman, H. L., 1991, p. 248). Strategic philanthropy has changed the question of “whether to give to a combination of questions, namely, how to give, how much, to whom or what, and with what objective. ... There is no one formula for success; a company’s strategy must fit its unique position in the business world” (p. 247).

The New Philanthropy

The past 2 decades have revived a period of American moguls wielding their profits for social causes. “Not since the Gilded Age...has philanthropy been as bold and ambitious” (Byrne et al., 2002, p. 82). Today’s most generous philanthropists—like the great industrialists—earned their fortunes from corporations. Major contributors (listed highest to lowest) to education included: Bill and Melinda Gates, Microsoft; Gordon and Betty Moore, Intel; Eli Broad, SunAmerica; the Walton Family, Walmart and Sam’s Clubs; Donald Bren, real estate tycoon; Martha Ingram, widow of Ingram founder; James Rogers, Sunbelt Communications; Peter Lewis, Progressive; William Coleman, BEA Systems; Sandy and Joan Weill, Citigroup; John Jackson, Katie Petroleum; Leon Levy, investor; James and Sally Barsdale, Netscape; Robert and Tom Pritzker, Hyatt Hotels; Kenan Sahin, Kenan Systems; Frank Batten Sr., Landmark Communications; Charles Bauer, AIM Funds; and Frank Levinson, Finisar (Byrne et al., 2002). Bishop and Green (2008) termed this magnitude of giving as *billanthropy*. Additionally, individuals have been called *celanthropist* because of their notoriety and recognition.

Philanthrocapitalism is identified as the latest trend in the relationship of corporations and nonprofits (Bishop & Green, 2008; Boverini, 2008; Edwards, 2008). The expectation was that nonprofits will operate the same as businesses do. However, Edwards indicated that nonprofits exist for different purposes than businesses do, that society should “differentiate the two” (p. 8), and humanity operations are difficult to quantify and measure. Edwards claimed, “The stakes are very high” (p. 9) in this relationship as \$55 trillion in resources is expected to be conveyed in the next 40 years. Another current trend was the concern that nonprofits have a profit center and be entrepreneurial; this concept is called *social entrepreneurship*. As higher education has expectations for corporate behavior, so corporations had expectations of nonprofits such as higher education (Edwards).

Venture and investment philanthropy by venture capitalists, philanthrocapitalists, or social entrepreneurs required direct involvement to see high impact (Bishop & Green, 2008; Boverini, 2008; Byrne et al., 2002; Edwards, 2008; Wagner, 2002). These “success-oriented and achievement-focused” (Wagner, 2002, p. 348) philanthropists provided money, expertise, their networks, and their clout. A major concern was that nonprofits lack “infrastructure and capacity building” (Wagner, 2002, p. 343). Investment philanthropists wanted to see enhanced capacity of organizations for stability and growth in order to execute their strategies with the greatest long-term success. Often these philanthropists had an idea, project, or program and were in search of an organization to engage.

Letts, Ryan, and Grossman (1997) said, “The venture capital model emerged from years of practice and competition. It is now a comprehensive investment approach that

sets clear performance objectives, manages risk through close monitoring and frequent assistance, and plans the next stage of funding well in advance” (p. 36). Today’s philanthropists “demand accountability” (Wagner, 2002, p. 348) and “results” (Byrne et al., 2002, p. 82). “Venture philanthropy and/or social entrepreneurship is often promoted as an antidote to the shortcomings of mainstream philanthropy” (Wagner, p. 346), which Wagner labeled as *responsive philanthropy*. Today’s philanthropists push innovation, long-term support through infrastructure building, and results, but not all organizations can handle such requirements.

Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Cause-related Branding

Meuth’s (1991) ex post facto research with 368 corporations found a positive correlation of corporations’ giving to higher education institutions was based primarily on business enlightened self-interest more than altruism. While Meuth’s study was a snapshot in time and not longitudinal when measuring attitude and behavior, it did compare similarly with previous empirical corporate studies. However, Eddy (2010) argued that “Colleges and universities must select from an array of opportunities” (p. xi), so the relationship interest is reciprocal in nature that they must also find value in the partnership. Hence, cause-related branding or marketing shifts in pro-social behavior to direct reciprocity with tangible returns and moves beyond altruistic philanthropy of any sort. Again, altruistic pro-social behavior only provides intangible transaction or reciprocal benefits (Bar-Tal, 1976).

Cause-related branding “collaborations can come from a variety of motivations” (Eddy, 2010, p. vii). Higher education partnerships included: “educational reform, ...economic development, ...dual enrollment..., ...improve student learning, save on

resources, obtain a shared goal or vision, and create international partnerships” (p. vii). “Partnerships range from informal ventures to more formal affairs with operating procedures and governance systems” (p. viii). Bok (2003b), Stein (2004), and White (2000) labeled this behavior of corporate support of American higher education as *commercialization* or *commodification* of higher education. Several types of cause-related branding opportunities were created including cause-oriented activities, partnerships, sponsorships, and sponsored research and technology transfer (Bok, 2003b; Fairweather, 1988; Lauer, 2000; Matthews & Norgaard, 1984; Miller & Le Bouef, 2009). All of these arrangements led to tangible benefits for each party involved with mutual expectations of ROI. W. Johnson (2011) presented a university-industry partnership continuum, which wholly fits within Cone’s cause-related branding box. W. Johnson included the categories (left-to-right) of: awareness, involvement, support, sponsorship, and strategic partnering. W. Johnson also noted that 40% of small companies “have strong ties to university researchers” (p. 4).

Cause-related Branding

There is a defined difference between cause-related marketing and cause-related branding. Cause-related marketing focused attention on audiences and on determining what they want people to do (Andresen, 2006; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Giroud, 1991; Lauer, 2000; Saul, 2011; Withers, 2002). Specifically, audiences are led to think, feel, and act in the short-term. Andresen promoted that such cause-related actionability comes through establishment of connection, promise of rewards, and inspiration. “The total value of these efforts is estimated to be more than \$700 million per year in the United States” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 28).

The American Express Company is credited with the origin of cause-related marketing in the 1980s when the company agreed to provide a contribution for the renovation of the Statue of Liberty each time someone used an American Express credit card for a purchase (Sheldon, 2000). Cause-related marketing was also desirable for many local and regional nonprofits to partner with hotel and other travel industry businesses, department or grocery stores, and real estate firms for reciprocal benefit of funding for discounts, premiums, or matching funds for client's participation and tangible benefits (Giroud, 1991; Sheldon; Withers, 2002). However, many fundraisers grew worried about cause-related marketing (Gurin, 1991). Gurin said it was "a serious threat to philanthropy... [and] commercializes and degrades so much of what was altruistic and priceless in the voluntary sector" (p. 71). A major concern was exploitation of nonprofits for for-profit benefits. Gurin explained,

Economists and political scientists have noted that the twin failures of business and the ballot box—the limitations of market economics and the democratic norms that constrain government—necessitate[d] a third, or voluntary sector. Philanthropy picks up on social needs that business and government do not meet because they would not yield a profit or because a majority of the population might not want their tax dollars to pay for them. (pp. 72-73)

Gurin argued that outright philanthropic dollars had to be reassigned for cause-related marketing to gain an ROI.

Cause-related branding related to the nonprofit world was defined more recently as corporate financial support given with a reciprocity, or specific ROI, expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010). Such reciprocity, or *quid pro quo*, is tracked and measured (Fischer, 2000). This scenario required a mutual exchange of monetary support from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the

nonprofit. Such cause-related branding was innovative and helps a corporation maximize gains in the future (Freeman, H. L., 1991). However, Porter and Kramer (2002) argued that cause-related marketing focused too much on publicity and not enough on social impact. Cause-related branding, however, invests in a long-term strategy. In the higher education setting, examples included naming opportunities, regular access to the campus environment for brand promotions, and specific initiatives agreed upon by both entities. Performance is monitored carefully.

Today nonprofits and higher education are also savvy about brand management and maximizing the cause-related branding strategy (Daw & Cone, 2011). Brand strength and value as well as connection, centers on the differentiation of the organization. Emotional ties and expectations create a specified cause and seek a reaction or outcome. Finally, the long-term goal is to build relationships and on-going engagement and commitment (Daw & Cone, 2011). The “three-dimensional value proposition” (Daw & Cone, 2011, p. 21) included rational value of the head, emotional value of the heart, and engagement value of the hands. All three of these are key to creating successful cause-related relationships. Successful cause-related brand engagement shift from activities to mutual benefits, transactions to relationships, from organizational silos to integration, from competition to cooperation, and ultimately yield win-win strategic investments for both parties (Daw & Cone, 2011).

Partnerships, Collaborations, and Joint Ventures

Historically, the United States has experienced key events that forced “the importance of government, universities, and industry working together to create new knowledge” (Johnson, W. C., 2006b, p. 100). Examples included America’s need for

scientific advances after World War II, the development of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1958, and “the race to put a man in space” (p. 100). The trend of corporate-higher education partnerships increased in the 1980s and 1990s (Crutchfield & Grant, 2008; Miller & Le Bouef, 2009). “Revenue shortfalls, reductions in funding from all sources, changes in legislation, [and] global competition...have caused both companies and universities to intensify their focus on revenue generation, cost cutting, and accomplishing more with less” (Johnson, W. C., 2006a, p. 215). Most recently the advent of the Internet and increased national security in response to 9/11 emphasized partnering to safeguard America (Johnson, W. C., 2006b).

“Partnerships and collaborations provide an opportunity to solve challenging issues facing higher education by parleying resources, knowledge, and skills of individual partners to achieve joint goals and objectives” (Eddy, 2010, p. vii). Collaborations were typically focused on a cause or issue from the higher education side. Partnerships are between or among higher education and corporations. Often faculty collaborations become corporate partnerships. “Formal multi-year partnership[s]” have “contracts and terms, and with both partners participating in the responsibilities and the benefits” (COP, 2007, p. 3).

“These relationships are complex...” (Withers, 2002, p. 162). Partnerships and joint ventures have to work both ways. Higher education has a lot to offer including “...expert knowledge, highly educated people, and scientific discoveries....yet profit seeking has undoubtedly helped in some instances to improve academic work and to enhance higher education’s value to society” (Bok, 2003a, p. B7). “Many corporations support social and academic causes without attaching conditions or extracting

concessions. Corporate America tends to respect the university's independence and idealism and to honor its boundaries" (Boyd & Halfond, 1990, p. A44). Seven key traits lead to effective partnerships: trust, clarity of roles and responsibilities, core organizational competencies, professionalism, respect, focus on mutual benefit, and understanding of needs "...with a focus on building... capacity and capability rather than creating dependence" (Samans, 2005, p. 6). For universities, there are five steps identified to prudently partner with corporations: rely on a cross-section of administrators and faculty to protect the institution's interests and values—not a single person or unit; review each opportunity on a case-by-case basis; create, promote, and adhere to standard rules that protect academic values; maintain transparency and regularly review projects for perceived or actual conflicts of interest; and continue to keep a diverse interest and funding in all programs to sustain the longevity of projects and not endanger them should support, interest, or funding shift or be eliminated (Bok, 2003a).

Partnerships between higher education and industry were not only necessary but also vital to America's continued presence globally (Fairweather, 1988; Matthews & Norgaard, 1984; Miller & Le Boeuf, 2009). Corporations needed innovative ideas and a continued competitive advantage. Higher education faced financial pressures, declining enrollments, and shortages in research support. However, Worth (2002) cautioned that partnerships blurred lines between philanthropy and business relationships.

Sponsorships

Sponsorship is defined as the financial and conceptual endorsement of an organization or cause, which is tax deductible as a business expense when established with a nonprofit (Levy & Cherry, 1996; Sheldon, 2000). The history of sponsorships by

corporations has evolved and separated from concerns of direct advertising. In 1993, the IRS allowed non-advertising sponsorships. In 1997 the “Tax-payer Relief Act...qualified corporate sponsorships from tax if there was no expectation of a substantial return benefit” (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009, p. 176). Finally, in March 2000, the IRS clarified that corporate sponsorships were fully tax deductible as long as no comparison of products or services were involved with multiple sponsors. Gray areas that continued included exclusivity arrangements, trade shows, and periodicals. Sponsorships, however, “can be lucrative to the nonprofit organizations” (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009, p. 176). Sponsorships are “typically a business decision rather than a philanthropic one” (COP, 2007, p. 17).

In higher education, athletic programming is a prominent location for sponsorships (Withers, 2002). Athletic sponsorships tend to serve four main interests: “the business interest of the sponsoring company, the best interests of the event and participants, ...positive influence on the sponsor’s direct customers, and benefit the customer [e.g., a higher education institution]” (Sawyer, Hypes, & Hypes, 2004, p. 113). Athletic sponsorships also created networking opportunities for university officials to be exposed to corporate executives and clientele, alumni, and other constituents in the athletic realm. “The goal is to develop a win-win strategy that benefits both the sponsoring corporation and the sport organization” (p. 114).

A variety of athletic sponsorship platforms and levels have existed, including local, regional, national, international, and global levels as well as special emphasis on a specific type of event or event specific athlete. Such sponsorships have gone beyond advertising to include integrated value strategy, brand building, public awareness, media benefits, sales objectives, good will, and networking. Sponsorships have come in a

variety of sizes and financial commitments, including exclusive sponsorship with an overarching signature sponsor; primary sponsorship of specific activities or events; subsidiary sponsorship, which may have included products or services; and vendor or supplier sponsorship (Sawyer et al., 2004). Measurement is determined by consumer attitude, sales generation, and brand awareness (Withers, 2002).

Sponsored Research, Intellectual Property, and Technology Transfer

Vannevar Bush's (1945) model of research collaboration among higher education, government, and industry after World War II was a key for the United States in medicine, national security, and public welfare. "The publicly and privately supported colleges, universities, and research institutes are the centers of basic research" (p. 7). Bush—working with President Franklin Roosevelt, heads of U.S. companies, and academicians across the country—forged an aggressive scientific research agenda, which included federal funding and the creation of several support organizations. This model promulgated America's prominence and dominance globally until the late 1970s.

In the 1980s "federal funding was holding constant or declining, research was getting increasingly expensive, and Congress looked for a way to encourage higher education to keep up the good work" (Elliott, 2006, p. 63). This reality exhibited Aldrich (1979) and Pfeffer and Salancik's (2003) resource dependence theory regarding the need for financial, physical, and information resources. It is important to note, however, that "dependencies are often reciprocal" (p. xii). Governments, universities, and corporations were in need of innovative partnerships (Miller & Le Boeuf, 2009). "Since the 1980s, university scientists at research universities have faced stronger incentives to pursue discoveries that can be patented and licensed" (Just & Huffman, 2009, p. 1103).

The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 “gave universities the right to retain patents to intellectual property that they developed with federal support” (Elliott, 2006, p. 63). “In the wake of Bayh-Dole and the substantial increase over the past several decades in U.S. government funding for university-based research...lead to commercially successful products” (Litan & Mitchell, 2011, p. 126). “Universities had incentives to give priority to research that was likely to result in marketable or patentable products, and business was more interested in funding research that could contribute to the bottom line” (Elliott, 2006, p. 63). Higher education, corporations, and the state and federal governments all played a role “...in the innovation system” (Etzkowitz et al., 1998, p. 8). All three entities have high stakes in “...translating knowledge into marketable products” (Etzkowitz et al., 1998, p. 8). “University research no longer is used only to inform the research in industry; it can contribute directly to it” (Connelly, 2006, p. 225). “Collaboration is also helpful to the education mission of the university, offering students practical training in contact with the industrial research setting” (Connelly, 2006, p. 229). Similar to *Sábato’s Triangle*, Etzkowitz and Dzisah (2008) identified in the 1990s the specific concern of technology transfer and innovation as the *Triple Helix* when discussing university-industry-government relations.

Withers (2002) said, “While more common at research universities than smaller institutions, and especially prevalent at universities with strength in fields such as engineering, medicine, and science, such partnerships continue to grow as...relationships between higher education and the corporate world” (Withers, p. 162). Prior to the Bayh-Dole Act, universities generated fewer than 400 patents annually; by 1989 that figure had jumped to 1,100 and more than 3,000 annually in the 1990s (Just & Huffman, 2009).

These patents included both intellectual property and technology transfer.

Managing different cultures in the university and corporations was a key issue (Miller & Le Boeuf, 2009; Steele, 2009). The university culture required academic freedom for teaching, research, publishing, and service. The major duty was to students. Researchers were employees. The industry culture was proprietary and commercial. Focus was on the customer as well as ROI. Publicity and confidentiality were managed through access to key people (Steele, 2009). Major processes were navigating common language, goals, and operations. A vital process was developing trust given the multi-layered goals and competing priorities. Trust was developed through practice—one project at a time. Trust required transparency, frequent communication, honor guidelines, respect, shared vision, shared governance, and vetted ideas to keep everyone focused (Anderson, 2009). Miller and Le Boeuf (2009) indicated,

The true value of university-industry collaborations depends on strong university-industry relations. ...The challenges, however, are significant and even daunting. Few of the highest-level academic leaders have experience in university-industry relations or technology transfer. Few senior company executives have participated directly in management of the most relevant operations of university-industry relations, hence relations are constantly at risk for sheer lack of understanding. All too often, operations on the university side are left entirely in the hands of nonacademics and operations in companies can be driven more by lawyers than other relevant professionals. Consequently, relationship-building falls by the wayside—the victim of perceived short-term financial gain or conservative risk management on the university side and by low-cost access and legal protection on the company side. (p. vi)

A concern of behavior on both the parties of universities and corporations in maximizing their relationships was labeled academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Academic capitalism concerned itself with several factors: business concerns of capitalism, economics, finance, market behavior and

marketlike functions such as competition, globalization, and usage of land, labor and capital; corporate profitability desire; human capital utilization such as professionalism of faculty, faculty leverage for individual rewards and recognition, and competition for resources; and higher educational needs for additional funding and venues for transfer of knowledge and technologies. This behavior is not U.S.-centric but also found in Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Academic capitalism was not isolated to one discipline, but found across campuses in business, pharmacy, public health, medicine, agriculture, energy, biology, and science and technology (Etzkowitz et al., 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Business schools in particular “...require[d] close relationships with corporate America to accomplish their mission of education and research, yet must also maintain detachment to preserve the integrity of their scholarship” (Boyd & Halfond, 1990, p. A44). Corporate identification is seen throughout business schools from endowed chairs to facilities. However, corporate engagement and branding can also be seen campus wide.

“Business-university partnerships raise[d] three areas of concern” in research including “the selection of research questions, biasing of research questions, and the public’s perception of science” (Elliott, 2006, p. 60). Major issues for faculty to manage included: time, reward, recognition, and disciplinary norms (Eddy, 2010). “Rather than defend the public role of the university, academic freedom, and worthy social causes, the new corporate heroes of higher education now focus their time and energies on selling off university services” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 232) to generate funds.

Other Areas

“Attaching strings, particularly strings that lead to the company’s bottom line, is a given of business-university partnerships” (Elliott, 2006, p. 64). Aside from cause-oriented activities, partnerships, sponsorships, and sponsored research and technology transfer, corporations also financing support and engaging with higher education for other purposes. Additional corporate goals included economic development, entrepreneurship, research and development, recruitment of undergraduate and graduate students, cost-effective training programs for executives, exit-strategies for products, and affinity programs—all with cause-related branding as a goal (Carey, 2012; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Connelly, 2006; Grimm, 2011; Hickman, 2011; Hoerr et al., 2012; Hume, 2011; Litan & Mitchell, 2011; Philip, 2012; Reed, 2007; Schmidt, 2008; Torgersen-Paul, 2008). Examples of companies recently involved in such goals included Agilent Technologies, AstraZeneca, Hewlett-Packard, John Deere, Principal, and Yahoo! (Connelly, 2006; Grimm, 2011; Hickman, 2011; Hume, 2011; Reed, 2007; Schmidt, 2008; Torgersen-Paul, 2008).

Confusion exists in the public eye as well as even with functional corporate and higher education leaders as to the differences of philanthropic versus transaction exchange activities. The IRS allows “voluntary donation to tax-exempt organizations exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes” (Gregory, Brenton, Alexander, & Deuser, 2012, p. 3). Under cause-related branding initiatives, most activities are transaction oriented. “Exchange transaction having potential commercial benefit or profit that does not support charitable purposes” is not tax deductible (Gregory et al., 2012, p. 3). Note, however, that either type of engagement

with a non-profit, such as higher education, can require a variety of accountability tools such as recordkeeping, accounting, disclosure, restrictions, progress reporting, enforceable milestones, and specific performance (Gregory et al., 2012). Additionally, philanthropic dollars may contain a *clawback provision* requiring unexpended funds to be returned.

Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: Operational Culture

Organizational culture promotes “appropriate attitudes, values, and norms” (Morgan, 2006, p. 145). Such organizational culture is manifested in the organization’s operational culture and practices. “When we observe a culture, whether in an organization or in society at large, we are observing an evolved form of social practice that has been influenced by many complex interactions between people, events, situations, actions, and general circumstances” (Morgan, 2006, p. 146).

Benioff and Southwick (2004) said, “Philanthropy must be woven into every thread of corporate existence so that it becomes a part of the cultural fabric and cannot be pulled out without pulling apart the corporation itself” (p. 17). Operational culture referred to companies that viewed nonprofits as a strategic key in their corporate identity and behavior, so charitable contributions were given with high expectation of assisting with or engaging in implementation. A stakeholder view of corporate social responsibility is optimized (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010).

There are five key questions regarding stakeholders: “Who are the firm’s stakeholders? What are the stakeholders’ stakes? What opportunities and challenges do stakeholders present? What responsibilities does the firm have toward its stakeholders?” and “What strategies or actions should the firm take to best address stakeholders?”

(Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 95). The stakeholder view is a corporation's consideration of all people involved in their business, including not only shareholders but also employees, employees' families, customers, regulating agencies, and their communities (Bruch & Walter, 2005; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). The utilitarian perspective creates harmony to develop and maintain lasting relationships with all stakeholders.

Organizational Culture

Culture exhibits itself as observed behaviors, norms, values, corporate philosophy, written and unwritten rules, and overall climate in an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Liggett, 2000; Morgan, 2006; Schein, 1985). The essence of culture is deeper and operates unconsciously in "an environment's view of itself and its environment" (Schein, 1985, p. 6). Such invisible factors included the organization's environment, its nature of time and space, the nature of its people, the nature of both the organization's and the employees' relationships internally and externally, and the activities and behaviors of both the organization and its agents. CEOs create a culture of corporate citizenship, including ethics (Herman, 2008). Sirsly (2009) labeled this "tone at the top" (p. 78). Sirsly indicated that "the tone of the organizational culture is the foundation upon which corporate social responsibility is also built" (p. 97). Brief and Motowidlo (1986) indicated,

Several aspects of the organizational context and work environment likely determine or, at least, covary with expressions of pro-social organizational behavior. They include factors such as reciprocity norms, group cohesiveness, role models, reinforcement contingencies, leadership style, organizational climate, stressors, contextual determinants of organizational commitment, and anything else that might affect moods and feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. (p. 718)

As organizations adapt, cope, manage, and survive in their environment,

consideration of interrelated cultural concepts may be adjusted to ensure survival; they include mission, vision, and values; short- and long-term strategies; resources of people, time, and technology; and capital. Interaction with other organizations required conceptual understandings, common language, organizational learning, definition of roles and boundaries, establishment of power and status, intimacy, rewards and punishments, and ideologies (Schein, 1985). Manifestation of all of these functions are deep in the behavior of the organization through myths, heroes, ceremonies, symbols, rituals, and specialized language (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Dion, 1996). Cultural paradigms are formulated dealing with humanity's relationship to nature, the nature of reality and truth, the nature of human nature, the nature of human activity, and the nature of human relationships. Each of these underlying assumptions and functionalities created the conscience and decision making of organizations (Liggett, 2000; Schein, 1985). Additionally, organizational culture provided the basis for organizational ethics and decision making (Dion, 1996).

Stakeholder Management

The term *stakeholder* first appeared in 1963 in an internal memorandum at the Stanford Research Institute to refer to primary interest parties such as “shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, lenders, and society” (Freeman, R. E., 1984, p. 32). The stakeholder concept grew into strategic management of corporate planning, systems theory, corporate social responsibility, and organization theory (Freeman, R. E., 1984). In the mid-1980s, corporations supported community projects and educational institutions as citizenship duty to help enlighten and stabilize society and to generate positive corporate image for the communities of its employees and customers (Elliott, 2006; Freeman, R. E.,

1984). “Businesses provide sufficient value to society if they operate efficiently, use resources judiciously, provide employment, and deliver goods and services that support a healthy economy” (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xi). Additionally, many state governments have highly encouraged “business-university partnerships as a way out of the fiscal drain that public higher education puts on state budgets and as providing a method for economic development for the state as well” (Elliott, 2006, p. 61).

Principles of stakeholder management included managers’ acknowledging and monitoring all legitimate concerns, listening to and communicating with stakeholders about all issues, adopting processes and modes of behavior to protect stakeholders’ interest, recognizing the interdependence of all efforts, cooperating with all entities both public and private, avoiding activities that jeopardize human rights, and navigating potential conflicts (The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics, 1999). The stakeholder view was a corporation’s consideration of all people stakeholders involved in their business, including not only shareholders, but also employees, employees’ families, customers, vendors, suppliers, and their communities.

“How about aligning it [giving money] to your employee passions and then leveraging the unique skills and products/services your companies deliver to build stronger communities and perhaps even grow your business for your shareholders?” (Stangis, 2007, ¶ 6). Strategic stakeholder management satisfied both external market concerns and interests while also providing core competencies existing in the corporation to best serve social needs. “In particular, they align corporate philanthropic initiatives with their companies’ abilities and core competencies. In so doing, they avoid distractions from core business, enhance the efficiency of their charitable activities and

assure unique value creation for the beneficiaries” (Bruch & Walter, 2005, p. 50). In summary, stakeholder management viewed as the operational culture of a corporation considered long-term perspectives and balanced productivity of employees “...and the company’s relationship with customers, investors, and other stakeholders” (The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics, 1999, p. 43) by utilizing best practices.

A key in stakeholder management is stakeholder engagement (Mirvis, 2010; Saia, 2001; Sloan, 2009). “Stakeholder engagement can be defined, in very general terms, as the process of involving individuals and groups that either affect or are affected by the activities of the company” (Sloan, 2009, p. 26). Regular dialogue allows stakeholders to express relevant interests and concerns. Stakeholder engagement can “guide choices about a company’s portfolio of social and environmental investments and visibly convey that the enterprise is interested in its customers’, employees’, and other stakeholders’ points of view (Mirvis, 2010, p. 19). The most progressive companies in the U.S. who have developed stakeholder engagement as a core competency are General Electric, IBM, Lockheed, and Unilever Martin (Mirvis, 2010; Sloan, 2009). “The goal is to have relationships that create sustainable, high-performance organizations—not only economically and financially, but socially and environmentally as well” (Sloan, 2009, p. 25).

Social Responsiveness

Benioff and Adler (2007) said, “While the reasons for giving are as diverse as the companies that practice philanthropy, most companies cite both societal and business reasons for giving. The most often-mentioned benefits to society are: improved quality of life and capacity-building for the nonprofits themselves” (p. xiii). Brown (2004)

indicated,

Corporate philanthropy's inherent strength is its potential to apply the discipline of the market economy to the issues of civil society. In today's tough business environment, a corporation has no choice but to approach its philanthropy from the perspective of its business interests. While that may sound like a conflict of priorities, it is in fact where things get interesting. The truth is that the needs and expectations of shareholders are aligned in substantive ways with the needs and expectations of employees and communities with regard to critical issues facing society in a number of arenas—education, health care, economic development, and persistent poverty among them. (p. 162)

In Whitehead's (1976) study of corporate giving, social responsibility, and profit maximization, Whitehead found a positive correlation in the "...relationship between giving and dividends..." (p. 64). At the time, profit motive was the "strongest" (Whitehead, 1976, p. 74) reason for giving, and "...the social responsibility concept is not found to be a significant motive" (Whitehead, 1976, p. 74). Corporate funders asked several key questions, such as "Will the giving generate publicity? Will it associate us with a good cause? Are there sufficient opportunities for employee involvement? Will it create a base of future customers?" (Nucifora, 1998, p. 20).

Employee Volunteerism

"Time contributed by volunteers on behalf of businesses represent a significant contribution by companies to their communities" (Frishkoff & Kostecka, 1991, Chapter 5, p. 1). Employees volunteering for nonprofit organizations increased productivity, encouraged team-building, improved interpersonal communications, broadened skill base, enhanced employees' understanding of a broader culture, and showed the corporation's commitment to the community and world (Freeman, H. L., 1991; Sheldon, 2000). "Organizations that have service as a core value of their culture will see both intrinsic and extrinsic returns. ...companies that provide the opportunity will find that it

energizes employees and executives” (Benioff & Southwick, 2004, p. 17). Shaw and Post (1993) indicated that engagement “contributes to employee morale” and “loyalty” (p. 747). Additionally, Vitaliano (2010) said, “By adopting socially responsible policies...companies can reduce turnover” (p. 569).

Individuals embracing volunteerism are likely exemplary with pro-social behavior. Such factors contributing to this behavior included “empathy, extraversion, social responsibility, neuroticism, educational level, age, achievement motivation, the protestant work ethics, and mood” (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986, p. 720). Volunteerism has become a central component of the organizational culture motivation. In 2010, 25% of all U.S. employees volunteered at least one hour on company time (Rose, 2011). The National Council on Workplace Volunteerism developed definitions and measures for Employee Volunteering and Giving Programs (EVGPs) (Boccalandro, 2009). The six measures, or drivers, for EVGPs included: (a) cause-effective configurations “to support social causes and nonprofit partners productively,” (b) strategic business positioning “to contribute toward business success,” (c) sufficient investment of staff and budget, (d) organizational culture to encourage employee volunteerism, (e) strong participation, and (f) actionable evaluation (Boccalandro, 2009, pp. 8-9). In a 2009 study, 203 *Fortune 500* companies indicated a need for growth in all six drivers; success measures of accomplishment were: (a) 32%, (b) 38%, (c) 13%, (d) 36%, (e) 6%, and (f) 28% (Boccalandro, 2009). Additionally, the EVGP “make[s] a measurable difference in business functions,” including “employee recruitment; employee retention, morale, or work-life balance; employee skill development; employee team building; future workforce development; and public relations, branding, and reputation; and sales”

(Boccalandro, 2009, p. 15). While acceptance of employee volunteerism is widespread, “*Fortune 500* EVGPs are relatively immature in terms of effectiveness” (Boccalandro, 2009, p. 10). Only 5% have an overall compliance of 70%; more than 50% are less than 30% compliant (Boccalandro, 2009).

Motivation for Corporate Citizenship: DNA Citizenship Ethos

The triple bottom line of sustainability for corporations includes attention to people, profit, and planet (United Nations, 1987). Corporations focused on all three areas simultaneously and typically are involved in the programming with the nonprofits or organizations receiving funding. The *DNA citizenship ethos* means that the corporation from the ground up—or in the actual essence and existence of the corporation—considers the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how it does business. The purpose of profitability is only done while also equally considering the actions of the company on the environment and all stakeholders. This DNA citizenship ethos is engrained in the corporation’s mission and philosophy and is concerned with society—both people and the environment—as much as making profit (Cone, 2010).

“Eighty percent or more of all executives, across all business types and industries, confirm that environmental, social, and governance investments create financial value for their companies” (The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012, p. 3). “Business organizations engage in transformative innovation when they embrace social, environmental, ethical or similar initiatives” (Bright et al., 2006, p. 28). Additionally, geographic boundaries have disappeared, and corporations must prioritize issues that affect quality of life locally, nationally, and globally (DaSilva & Kerkian, 2008).

Corporate social responsibility of ethics, human rights, financial accountability,

consumer product and professional service liability, profitability, and environmental concerns created an integral landscape of corporations' scope and consideration in their role in today's pluralistic society. Newer companies that considered people, profit, and planet from their start have engrained all facets of concern into their make-up, or DNA. Primary examples were General Electric and Google (Bishop & Green, 2008). A mix of high social benefit and high economic benefit provided a progression for maximizing long-term, sustainable citizenship. "In the long run, then, social and economic goals are not inherently conflicting but integrally connected" (Porter & Kramer, 2002, p. 7). The process of companies with an engrained DNA ethos partnered with the best organizations, signaled other funders and organizations to follow, improved performance of the nonprofit involved, advanced knowledge and concepts contributing to society and long-term interests, and created value both economically for the company and socially for all stakeholders as well as the environment.

According to Googins et al. (2007),

Ten Precepts for 21st Century Business [dictate that]

1. Compliance is not enough
2. Size invites scrutiny
3. Transparency is a requirement
4. Cutting costs can raise risks
5. Reducing risks means engaging society
6. Stakeholders are a link to society
7. Society's needs are growth opportunities
8. Global growth requires global gains
9. Sustainable corporations need sustainable societies
10. Society needs business, NGOs, and government. (p. 70)

Likely Bright et al.'s (2006) multidimensional matrix considering corporations' behavior as a benefit to society versus benefit to business as transformative innovation encompasses most of the DNA citizenship ethos compartment addressed on Cone's

(2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Considerations of compliance and disclosure, social responsibility and environment, sustainability, and strategic issues development are incorporated into the conceptual framework yielding a “zone of mutual benefit” (Bright et al., p. 21). Transformative innovation “increases both business profitability and the health of society-environment—it is mutually beneficial” (Bright et al., p. 18).

Corporate Citizenship

Corporate citizenship is holistic to include “...the issues of business ethics, corporate governance, environmental responsibility, fair employment practices, and community relationships...” (Brown, 2004, p. 161). Likely Jacoby’s (1973) social environment model was ahead of its time. The model considered beyond people stakeholders to include the environment and long-term sustainability and profit maximization. Monitoring the longevous variables included: social sensors to identify “...public values, attitudes, and expectations” (Jacoby, p. 202); feedback processes from internal leaders such as the board of directors and external official government stakeholders; communication with social groups as “two-way channels of communication...with consumers, employees, students, and leaders of political, labor, religious, and educational institutions, as well as the mass media” (Jacoby, p. 202); social accountability through systematic record keeping and reporting, as well as disclosure; and a social audit to “measure the company’s progress toward the social goals” (Jacoby, p. 203). A corporation “...incurs responsibilities to various groups other than its stockholders” (Whitehead, 1976, p. 24). All constituents are vitally important including employees, customers, and even regulating agencies (Bruch & Walter, 2005). “Corporate citizenship contributes to enhancing reputation, managing and meeting expectations of

consumers, maximizing long-term profits, and reinforcing corporate traditions and values” (The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012, p. 25). Corporate citizenship also “generates intangible assets, such as reputational capital, corporate culture, and legitimacy” (Gardberg & Fombrun, 2006, pp. 330-331).

In Benioff and Adler’s (2007) book, *The Business of Changing the World: Twenty Great Leaders on Strategic Corporate Philanthropy*, case studies of 20 major U.S. corporations and moguls highlighted the emphasis of the DNA citizenship ethos from the start of the companies through today. The case studies included AOL, Carlson Companies, Cisco Systems, Citizens Financial Group, Dell Computer, Glaxo SmithKline, Hasbro, Intel, Levis Strauss & Co., NEC Corporation, Safeway, Starbucks, Timberland, UPS, and Working Assets as well as American entrepreneurs Steve Case, Peter Gabriel, Michael Milken, and Charles Schwab. Benioff and Adler (2007) highlighted successful examples of corporations’ holistic investment into society, which was the essence of the DNA citizenship ethos.

“The notion of interdependence—that you are your brother’s or sister’s keeper—was always part of our business model, said Jeffrey Swartz, President and CEO, Timberland (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. 43). Steve Case, cofounder of AOL, said, “Too many people act as if the private sector and the social sector should operate on different axes, with one all about maximizing profits and the other all about maximizing social impact. A better approach is to integrate these missions” (Benioff & Adler, p. 261).

“While it is imperative for colleges and universities to cobble together sufficient funding to support current and future activities that relate to the mission, money is but one of the many resources necessary to promote the fulfillment of the academic mission” (Elliott,

2006, p. 59). Benioff and Adler (2007) said,

A strong corporate philanthropy program directly supports employee recruitment, retention, skill-building, teamwork, and morale. Similarly, it can foster improved relationships with customers, vendors, and suppliers. In some cases, philanthropy initiatives have facilitated the creation of new products and the penetration of new markets regionally and internationally.... Often, a mixed portfolio of cash, in-kind contributions, volunteerism, and pro bono services is the most sustainable solution.
(p. xiv)

There is no “perfect corporate giving strategy...What is good for GM may not be good for Chrysler or Ford, or Citicorp, or Siemens, or Sony, or Singapore Airlines” (Freeman, H. L., 1991, p. 247). “Companies that align corporate citizenship strategy with overall corporate strategy are more likely to achieve important business objectives” (The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012, p. 3). Additionally, “duration of investment in corporate citizenship appears to have an impact on the success with related business objectives” (The State of Corporate Citizenship, p. 3).

Most recently, the Corporate Citizenship Management Framework (CCMF) was developed by Chris Pinney at Boston College’s Center for Corporate Citizenship (Corporate citizenship: New balancing act for business, 2008). The framework looks at market strategy, responsible business practices, community engagement to address social challenges, and corporate culture of vision, mission, and values through strategy, accountability, and transparency. “This management framework is designed to relieve some...burden by offering a systematic way to look at the key questions being asked by socially responsible investors and shareholder activists focused on social and environmental issues” (Corporate citizenship: New balancing act for business, p. 19). The CCFM tool may help companies to conduct an internal gap analysis of policies, goals, and activities to create a holistic picture to manage corporate citizenship processes.

Leadership and Management Modeling

In 1982 White and Bartolomeo conducted the first study of CEOs and included a broad cross-section of American corporate and business leaders. “It had long been assumed that the CEO is the most important influence, both in a company’s level of giving and degree of attention it gives to philanthropy. However, very little had been done to test or document that assumption” (White & Bartolomeo, 1982, Introduction ¶ 4). Five key findings emerged: American corporations were found to be “quite generous” in giving, CEOs dominate decision making although boards and other top executives were influential, corporate giving was determined “enlightened self interest,” “many CEOs believe their giving programs are under achieving their major corporate and social objectives,” and “corporate giving is a relatively underdeveloped, poorly understood function in most companies” (p. 7).

Implications and findings suggested the need for more communications with board members on important agendas, maximization of tax provisions, “greater formalization and professionalization of the corporate giving function, refinement of...corporate goals and societal needs,” and “greater emphasis on the part of recipients to demonstrate return (White & Bartolomeo, 1982, pp. 17-21). It was noted in the study that “educational institutions are the clear front-runners” of organizations to receive attention and support (p. 27). CEOs recognized key issues: proactive planning, information on important matters, formal structures, appropriate staffing, benchmarking of peer institutions’ activities, and better understanding of tax benefits. “Top management is often involved in the committee that makes the giving decisions, but less likely to unilaterally fund pet projects than in the past” (Saiia, 2001, p. 63).

CEOs' attitudes and personal commitment and involvement in corporate engagement with nonprofits and community sets the tone and sends the message both internally and externally about corporations' seriousness of today's engagement with nonprofits (Benioff & Adler, 2007; Freeman, H. L., 1991; Garvin, 1975; Levy, 1999; MacAllister, 1991; Sirsly, 2009). Googins et al. (2007) called this awareness *consciousness*. Leaders create culture and reinforcement of cultural behavior based on what they "pay attention to, measure, and control" (Schein, 1985, p. 224); how they react "to critical incidents and organizational crises" (Schein, 1985, pp. 224-225); how they role model, teach, and coach others; how they allocate "rewards and status" (Schein, 1985, p. 225); and their "criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication" (Schein, 1985, p. 225) of employees. The responsibility of social responsibility "demands the active participation of top management" (Garvin, 1975, p. 7). Such a hands-on approach sends "a clear signal from the top" (Garvin, 1975, p. 7) to the organization. CEOs must learn about key issues and be personally involved, involve others internally and externally, be innovative, be strategic, set objectives and expect results, and recognize and reward good work (MacAllister, 1991). "The onus is clearly on the executive to not only establish the corporate values, but to ensure these values form the foundation of corporate actions throughout the organization" (Sirsly, 2009, p. 80).

"Successful corporate citizenship leaders demonstrate a unique set of competencies. This includes personal attributes such as maturity and optimism, an ability to take a systematic perspective and create strong relationships...leadership abilities and [strategic] influence skills" (Kinnicutt & Pinney, 2010, p. 27). Key leadership abilities also included visionary thinking, collaboration, and peripheral vision.

Futurist Andrew Zolli, Founder of Z+ Partners, indicated that CEOs have “to carefully monitor shifts in population, generational attitudes, cultures, and consumer behaviors” (Connolly, 2008, p. 23). Zolli believes there is a shift in capitalism to include both Milton Friedman’s shareholder profit maximization along with “managing the company’s interface with society” (p. 23), which does not work in a vacuum in the United States, but is global (Joseph, 1991). Additionally, Zolli said,

Five macro-trends that will create economic opportunities for business [that effect both corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship] include 1) the global population shift from rural to urban that is creating new mega cities, 2) emerging innovation that transforms waste to reliable products, 3) expansion of economic lateralism among the world’s poor, 4) the rise of conscious consumerism, and 5) the use of bio-science and nature-based products to solve real problems. (Connolly, 2008, p. 24)

Zolli’s predictions have no mention of higher education. He indicated that corporate citizenship has to personally relate to each stakeholder, be tangible, consider current and future behavior over historical, and be desirable to all parties (Connolly, 2008).

Governmental leaders, policymakers, and institutional leaders can have a significant role in inter-organizational relationships (Eddy, 2010; Guetzkow, 1966). The more they are involved in creating goals, objectives, and partnerships, the more supportive they are able to establish networks and links. Leaders, therefore, hold a vital responsibility in corporations, government, and other organizations to model appropriate behavior to their entire organizations. “Emerging global, social, environmental, and economic realities” require “leaders to consider issues beyond profit creation” (Greenberg et al., 2011, p. 17). Such “leaders must operate out of a different world-view of business” to understand “inherent tensions and political systems” and complex “relationships” (Greenberg et al., p. 17)

Employee Engagement

Benioff and Adler (2007) quoted Michael Milken, financier, philanthropist, and Chairman of The Milken Institute,

In order to ensure a prosperous future, we must make a significant commitment to building human capital. The way to do that is through investing in the two things that drive people's ability and productivity: enhancing their skills through education and keeping them alive and well through good health care. (p. 107)

Employee fit to an organization is important as noted both in social identity theory and pro-social behavior. Most organizations falling into the DNA citizenship ethos attracted individuals who aligned with the organization's values (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Googins et al., 2007). These individuals were attracted to organizations that are concerned with social causes and have expectations to be a part of that process; these individuals "go beyond specified role requirements" (Brief & Motowidlo, p. 710).

In 2011 there were more than 100-million full-time employees in the United States (Clifton, 2011). Through a Gallup study yielding behavioral economic data, employees are classified as engaged, not engaged, or miserable. Only 28% are engaged; 53%, not engaged; and 19%, actively disengaged or miserable (Clifton, 2011). To be fully engaged, employees must have needs met in 12 general areas, including such concepts as knowing what is expected to perform; having all resources needed to complete work successfully; having skills matched with appropriate work; being recognized and praised; having a manager who cares about personal development, maintaining work-life balance, and growth; committing to success, and having a healthy work atmosphere (Clifton, 2011).

Pro-social behavior on behalf of the organization provokes these individuals into “cooperating with coworkers, taking action when necessary to protect the organization from unexpected danger, suggesting ways to improve the organization, deliberate self-development and preparation for higher levels of organizational responsibility, and speaking favorably about the organization to outsiders” (Brief & Motowidlo, p. 710). Employees are the stakeholder who have “the potential to have by far the greatest influence” on “customers...their neighbors and family” (McIntire, 2012, p. 1). It is important for companies to harness the energy and influence of employees. “The essential elements are: culture, authenticity, credibility, and activation” (McIntire, 2012, p. 1). “The values and expectations of a corporation must be institutionalized” (McIntire, 2012, p. 1).

Employees must be acculturated from the first day regarding “values about integrity, personal responsibility, community service, environmental stewardship, and customer service” (McIntire, 2012, p. 1). Authenticity is important because behavior has to match the company’s assertions; employees are the first stakeholders to notice incongruence or to challenge inauthenticity. “Credibility means taking a measured and quantifiable approach to sustainability” (McIntire, 2012, p. 2). Such third-party assessment accolades champions of quality and methodological actions while chastising violators. Finally, activation is the key to motivating employees into action. Oftentimes goal-setting, rewards, and recognition are required to activate employees but to create passion and commitment. Examples of employee engagement include involvement in volunteer and nonprofit relationships, review of proposals, leadership development roles in key external partnerships, developing new skills, and coordination of policies and

corporate interface with nonprofits (Levy, 1999). “Employee engagement is critical to contemporary corporate philanthropy” (COP, 2007, p. 19).

In 2010, 89% of companies offered employee-volunteer programs (Rose, 2011). Employee engagement was done on company time and even on employees’ own time. Some companies offer special grant money on top of employees’ time. Fifty-nine percent of all U.S. companies offered paid-release-time programs (Rose, 2011). “The current generation of employees wants an employer that shares their values and that they can trust” (Wilson, 2011a, p. 14). The win-win for the company is that engaged employees teach leadership skills, develop teamwork, foster retention, make valuable business connections, and aid in recruitment.

Environmentalism

Many roots of environmental issues—sanitation, pollution, waste, and crowding—were likely a product of corporate success, modern society growth, increased income and related household consumption, and population (Jacoby, 1973). As a citizen in the pluralistic society, corporations had to assume some responsibility for solutions. Additionally, corporations turned to higher education to help devise viable options and solutions and also served as mass network and delivery systems. “Preserving the environment benefits not only society but companies too, because reducing pollution and waste can lead to more productive use of resources and help produce goods that consumers value” (Porter & Kramer, 2002, p. 7).

When stakeholder management emerged, it was initially concerned with all people associated in a primary or secondary way to the corporation. Primary stakeholders included shareholders, employees, vendors, suppliers, and customers. Secondary

stakeholders included the community, employees' relatives, and value chain members associated with vendors and suppliers (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). Eventually, concern for the natural environment—including both the planet and animals—merged, which caused corporations to add environmentalism into the stakeholder concept. The Exxon Valdez oil spill in March 1989 drew wide attention to environmental concerns. The result was

The Valdez Principles: protection of the biosphere, sustainable use of natural resources, reduction and disposal of waste, wise use of energy, risk reduction, marketing of safe products and services, damage compensation, disclosure, environmental directors and managers, [and] assessment and annual audit. (Barnard, 1990, p. 33)

Environmentalism permeated politics, economics, and culture. “The relationship between humankind’s business organizations and the environment is being redefined by economists, business ethicists, and management scholars in response to growing environmental concerns” (Reichart, 1999, p. 5). Likewise, the U.S. government continued to monitor and incentivize corporations for conserving resources, taking responsibility in resources and waste management, and supporting environmental causes. Organizations and corporations that considered the environment as well as their profitability and all people in the process from the ground up are categorized with the DNA citizenship ethos. “Environmental sustainability programs received the greatest increases in funding over the past three years and are expected to continue to be a funding priority over the next three” (The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012, p. 3).

Accountability and Transparency

“Maintaining an atmosphere of healthy trust among the nonprofit [i.e., higher education], the corporation, and the public is paramount” (Fischer, 2000, p. 196).

Transparency and accountability of measurement, reporting, and problems have become expected of all institutions today—including corporations and higher education (COP, 2007; Greenberg et al., 2011; Joseph, 1991). “Part of the transparency issue is to specify and communicate a company’s...philosophies and policies” (COP, 2007, p. 17). While defining outcomes, measurements, and ROI, it is important to realize that “philanthropy is at best a messy science, and thus all attempts to organize, strategize, and measure are bound to be incomplete” (Karoff, 2004, p. xxii). Corporations, governments, higher education institutions, and nonprofit organizations must operate efficiently internally, but quantifiables—dealing with organizational effectiveness in open systems—in education and other human actions “are not reducible to the same kinds of categories that define profit margins” (Sievers, 2004, p. 133) that are easily measured and understood in external relationships and productivity. Additionally, Sethi (1975) indicated that measurement and reporting is “culture-bound” (p. 59): Decisions and views of behavior may be acceptable at one time and not another, in one set of circumstance and not another, or in one environment and not another. Furthermore, Wood and Jones (1995) indicated that appropriate reporting depends on the purpose, audience, and intent needed. “Measurement should be viewed as a process whereby the greatest value is achieved through organizations building up and learning from data and evidence over time” (Lim, 2010, p. 5).

“Corporate America has come to understand that everything it undertakes, even if measured in purely economic terms, affects society” (Acar et al., 2001, p. 27). However, “social and business benefits are often long-term or intangible, which make systematic measurement complex” (Lim, 2010, p. i). Such measurement began the 1970s with basic

questions: “(1) What is socially responsible behavior? (2) How can it be measured? and (3) To whom should the corporations be responsible?” (Sethi, 1973, p. 219). Today, three key questions raised are: “(1) What social good do they serve? (2) How do they distribute their resources from whom they derive their legitimacy? (3) What standards are normative in distinguishing between public and private interests?” (Joseph, p. 6).

Society expects full reporting on corporate social performance (CSP) of their corporate citizenship or corporate social responsibility. CSP encompassed economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic concerns for corporations but needs “...to identify a particular philosophy, pattern, mode, or strategy of responsiveness” (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 57). “Transparency is recognized as a core component of corporate citizenship and social reporting has largely become the preferred vehicle for communication about corporate citizenship” (Berezin, 2010, p. 11). In 2010, “nearly 80% of the world’s largest companies produce a report” (Berezin, 2010, p. 11). “In general, the momentum for reporting has been driven by external stakeholders, government agencies, multistakeholder initiatives, and leading companies” (Berezin, 2010, p. 12).

“With a wide range of stakeholders interested in companies’ activities, there is a recurring problem of identifying an audience for reports, and deciding on content” (Berezin, 2010, p. 12). Balanced scorecards were developed in the 1990s as a performance measurement tool (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). Considerations for measurement of outcomes included cause-and-effect relationships, performance drivers, and linkages to the financial bottom line. In the process social considerations were also included. Balanced scorecards required alignment with guiding principles and goals and included tangible and intangible information, such as financial objectives and efficiency,

business operations, customer satisfaction, business innovation, human resources, organizational learning, growth objectives, management performance, staff performance, information management, marketing, compliance, and social acceptance (Kaplan & Norton, 1996). “When deciding how to balance these competing demands, companies use a range of tools including internal discussion, stakeholder engagement, mapping key corporate citizenship risks and opportunities, and linking to...priorities” (Berezin, 2010, p. 12). Reports included relevant social issues, a company’s response or interest in such issues, identification of gaps, and any indicators (Kapstein, 2007).

In 2008 the Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship and the Reputation Institute created the Corporate Social Responsibility Index (CSRI) (DeMasi, 2010). The CSRI evaluates corporations on social impact and economic and market-driven results. Social impact includes citizenship, governance, and workplace environment. Economic and market-driven results included products and services, innovation, leadership, and performance. These seven categories affect all stakeholders and influence reputation. The CSRI assists boards and management in strategic planning, policies, and activities contributing to corporate social responsibility (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010). Companies showing improvement and consistent growth included AMD, Adobe, Apple, Caterpillar, Dell, Dunkin’ Brands, Goodyear, Intel, Johnson & Johnson, Starbucks, Texas Instruments, and Unilever. Consistently top performers included Apple, Johnson & Johnson, Kraft Foods, Microsoft, and The Walt Disney Company (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010).

Many higher education institution and nonprofit representatives argued that human action cannot be understood “in terms of linear, sequential steps” and that social

change is “stochastic (non-linear, incapable of precise prediction), self-referential, and multi-variant” (Sievers, 2004, p. 135). Yet, Saul (2011) explained,

Because such a high value is now being placed on solving social problems and on outcomes (not just activities), people actually need to know whether we nonprofits are really producing change or just trying to. “I don’t know” becomes a very expensive proposition when people are attaching economic value to actual results. Nonprofits will no longer be able to duck the measurement question by citing the complexity of their work. Moreover, the capabilities for measuring social impact have advanced significantly, with a wide range of affordable tools, software, and classes now available within the sector. (p. 21)

“Evaluation assures spectators that an organization is responsible, serious, and well managed” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 304). However, Saul (2011) explained that “this ‘accountability’ mind-set drives a reporting and measurement regime based on compliance, not performance” (p. 19). While reporting and transparency support an ethical and fiduciary response to all parties, they do not address expectation of performance outcomes and impacts, which are really the ultimate goals of the programs and initiatives being supported and fostered (Saul).

Market institutions and investments were part of the capitalistic economy in America and served public interests, but they cautioned that the triple bottom line has more at stake (Giroux & Giroux, 2004). Some believed that giving corporate America so much power during the past 20 years has shifted national dialogues to focus on commerce for good, deregulation for growth and prosperity, and attention to social responsibility that dissuade the average citizen away from real issues of independence, personal responsibility, political activism, democratic methods, and independent voices (Giroux & Giroux; Gould, 2003; Sommerville, 2007).

However, “a growing performance culture renewed trust in the nonprofit sector as

a whole, drawing in not only more resources of money and talent, but also more resources targeted at the areas of greatest need” (Fulton & Blau, 2005, p. 42). “Strategic thinking calls for more research, more due diligence, and increased measurement of program results, all of which will presumably increase the odds for positive impact” (Karoff, 2004, p. 13).

Ethical Principles and Practices

It is important to separate ethics from etiquette, law, and religion (Hoffman, Frederick, & Schwartz, 2001). Etiquette is defined as socially acceptable behavior and does not deal with decision making regarding right or wrong. “The ethical responsibilities of a business firm are those societally defined expectations of business behavior that are not part of formal law” (Acar et al., 2001, p.30). Laws “embody the social norms of society” (Hoffman et al., 2001, p. 2) and have the goal of being amoral but can be ethical or unethical. For example, driving on the right side of the road is not moral or immoral; it’s amoral. An example of an unethical law was previous separate but equal laws in the United States. Finally, while nearly all religions provided for a moral law or code, many argued that religious beliefs are not always ethical. For instance, some religions minimized women’s role in society, and other societies have promoted equality and called such religious doctrine unethical (Hoffman et al., 2001).

Moral means knowing right from wrong and choosing to do right. Immoral means knowing right from wrong and choosing to do wrong. Amoral means choosing behavior based on circumstance and not necessarily considering right or wrong. Amoral business thinking was adapted from moralism-pragmatism and included pure dogma, revealed dogma, rational-legal truth, truth from conflict and debate, truth that works functionally

from pragmatic standards, and truth established through scientific methods (Hosmer, 2008; Schein, 1985). The goal of amoral business functionality was uncertainty avoidance or tolerance for ambiguity, which were paramount in open systems and management of the external environment. However, “ethics and morality have an important role to play in business” (De George, 2009, p. 614); the amoral business functionality is considered a myth. Finally, it is organizational culture that created organizational ethics (Dion, 1996).

The Culture of the Western World’s Ethical Foundations

Culturally business ethics in the Western world and, specifically, in the United States of America, evolved from an amalgamation of numerous roots. Pre-Socratic Greece from 490-422 BC contributed long-term interest principles, with which they could make decisions. Today such thinking is termed *enlightened self-interest*. Aristotelian personal virtues developed from 384-322 BC, which included temperance, honesty, openness, truth, pride, and humility. Judeo-Christian values added compassion and kindness toward others to the Aristotelian virtues as contributed by St. Augustine in 354-403 AD and St. Thomas Aquinas from 1225-1274. The *Golden Rule* emerged during this time period, and a sense of community was born (Hosmer, 2008).

While Socratic, Aristotelian, and Judeo-Christian ethics were honorable, not everyone abided by them. A central authority had to be formed, which established the concept of social contracts under governmental rule. English philosophers Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Locke (1632-1704) were credited with proposing respect for “...each individual’s rights to life, liberty, and property” (Hosmer, 2008, p. 12). Additionally, English philosophers Jeremy Bentham (1747-1832) and John Stuart Mill

(1806-1873) forged social benefit thinking, which emerged into the *utilitarian* concept of the greatest good for the greatest number. German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) universalized the utilitarian concept stated as “never take any action that you would not be willing to see others, faced with the same or a closely similar situation, also be free and even forced to take” (Hosmer, p. 12).

As the U.S. formalized both state and federal governments’ roles in society, all of the ethical decisions became the foundation for law. Laws, known commonly as *distributive justice* and defined by 20th Century American philosopher John Rawls (1921-2002), forced society to consider positions so that even “...the least among us will be harmed in no way” (Hosmer, 2008, p. 13). Finally, American political philosopher Robert Nozick (1938-2002) promoted *contributive liberty*, which protected all from extremes of the law or markets. Resounding deeply with the rudiments of higher education, contributive liberty admonished, “Never take any action that will interfere with the rights of others for self-development and self-improvement” (Hosmer, p. 13).

A “capitalistic market morality presupposes a rule utilitarian world-view that fosters trust, fairness, loyalty, respect for the well-being of community members, and generally minimizes harm in the process of promoting the public good” (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 746). “Benevolence forms the underlying dimension of trust in a relationship which implies that one partner is genuinely interested in the other partner’s welfare and motivated to seek joint gain rather than an egocentric motive” (Malloy & Agarwal, 2003, p. 228). In the relationship between higher education and corporations, several perspectives of ethical behavior must be taken into account including the perspectives of the public, the state and federal governments, higher education, and corporations.

“Higher education enjoys an autonomy that must be protected. The best defense will be meaningful codes of ethical standards and vigilant enforcement of those ideals” (Boyd & Halfond, 1990, p. A44).

Several scholars have created business ethics models, including Kohlberg in 1969, Ferrell and Gresham’s *Contingency Framework* in 1985, Hunt and Vitell’s *General Theory of Marketing Ethics* in 1986, and Carroll’s (1991) *Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility* (Carroll, 1991; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ferrell, Gresham, & Fraedrich, 1989). Each of the models considered decision-making implementation of ethics including teleological, egoism, utilitarianism, deontological, justice, and relativism (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Conley, 2011; Ferrell et al., 1989). Teleological decisions are based on their results. Egoism actions are based individually regarding the consequences of one’s own behavior. Utilitarian actions maximized the greatest good for the many, so focus on others as well as the self. Deontological decisions are based on intentions of the actor, not the actions nor the consequences. Justice is implementation of fairness determined by distributive, procedural, or interactions. Finally, relativism are subjective decisions based on relevant factors, and is defined by each individual, group, or culture (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Conley, 2011; Ferrell et al., 1989; Hosmer, 2008; Sethi, 1975; Shaw & Post, 1993).

As shown in Figure 7, the *Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility* identified and illustrated a representation of a U.S. corporation’s basic responsibilities to society, which included economic (required), legal (required), ethical (expected), and philanthropic (desired) areas (Carroll, 1991). The base of the pyramid was economic responsibilities. Businesses in the United States—no matter what the legal incorporation,

size, or identity—are created to be profitable as the economic cornerstone of the capitalistic economy (Berle & Means, 1968; Carroll, 1991; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Drucker, 1946, 1984; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Gould, 2003). If corporations are not profitable, they fail to exist and cannot perform any other functions in society; therefore, they must be profitable. The next step of the pyramid was legal responsibilities.

Figure 7. Carroll's (1991) Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility. This pyramid interrelated the corporations' responsibilities of citizenships to society, which included economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic characteristics.

Corporations are required to obey all laws and regulation. Laws are "...society's codification of right and wrong" (Carroll, 1991, p. 42). Such laws may be local, state, or federal, and establish fundamental fairness of the free enterprise system. Ethics is the

third layer of the pyramid. Carroll indicated “ethical responsibilities embrace those activities and practices that are expected or prohibited by societal members even though they are not codified into law.... This would include such principles as justice, rights, and utilitarianism” (p. 41). Finally, atop the pyramid was philanthropic responsibilities, which encompassed voluntary contributions to society as a corporate citizen. Corporations were expected to contribute resources to create a pleasant quality of life.

Note, however, from a stakeholder ethics’ perspective, ethics would be the base, then law, then economics, and then philanthropy. When people—and corporations acting as persons—have self-governance or self-regulation, society functions on its own. It is when people and corporate persons, or other institutional persons, do not get along or have different definitions of issues or competing perspectives that laws and regulations were created. Laws are defined as rules that govern behavior and protect the weak in society; inherently by protecting the weak, the strong were also protected (Cheeseman, 2012). When people and corporations cannot function alone, then laws are created. Laws work from the top down in the United States. The U.S. Constitution sets expectations; when silent, state constitutions’ laws are enforced. Other legal frames included federal and state statutes, administrative agency rules and regulations, presidential executive orders, judicial decisions, and local ordinances (Cheeseman, 2012).

Business is created as the economic cornerstone of the capitalistic democratic society. Corporations must have acquired resources in order for them to be available to institutions such as higher education. Navigating ethical behavior is an ongoing process among all organizational actors and their respective agents thus establishing organizational behavior, which created the organizations’ ethics (Dion, 1996).

Corporate Ethical Behavior

“The law has recognized corporate legal status as that of a separate and distinct person...and...at that a corporation can only act through its agents or managers” (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 748). American business magnate, Michael Milken, said, “...all organizations—whether they be nonprofit, for-profit, or government—are defined by the people who work for them. It is their ideas, their talents, their skill sets, their vision that is any organization’s greatest asset and that has the ability to make it great” (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. 107). “To achieve a sustainable and robust approach to corporate philanthropy, companies must direct their charitable engagement from both an ethical and an economic point of view” (Bruch & Walter, 2005, p. 50). However, Lacy and Pickard (2008) explained,

One could argue that the contract that business holds with society is now under more pressure than at any other time in history. Companies are wildly expected to deliver beneficial, equitable, and sustainable reward across stakeholder chains and to society at large. (p.140)

There was an “enormous diversity of grounds” (Jacoby, 1973, p. 4) of criticism of American business. Examples included too many businesses, corporate control of the markets, operation dictated by management instead of stockholders, corporate control of government agencies supposed to regulate them, arms issues, multinational corporations’ reach, exploitation of workers, cheating customers, degrading the environment, price fixing, suppressing improvement of products, corruption, and materialistic values over moral, intellectual, and cultural values. Many economists promulgated such claims, and the growth of mass communication impounded public awareness of any and all infractions and opinions.

Corporate ethics are defined as those systems of rules guiding “business conduct

and the resolution of conflicts over corporate duties, corporate obligations, and corporate values” (Cloniger, 1985, p. 6). Three perspectives in corporate ethics included classical, legal, and constituency. The classical perspective was that the corporation exists to produce profit for the owners. The legal perspective indicated that the corporate organization must be responsible for its actions via its managerial decision making, products and services, and be held accountable for its involvement in society. The constituency perspective supported the corporate social responsibility of corporate interactions with all stakeholders and society (Cloniger, 1985; Saia, 2001; Waddock, 2004). “It is always valuable to try to determine the conventions and standards that have been followed in the profession over the years” (Evans, 2000, p. 365). In general, however, to mitigate ethics and accountability, emphasis must be placed on obeying laws, avoiding excessive and egregious behavior, sound decision making, standard operating procedures and controls for regular routines, and strategies for handling unusual circumstances (Dunn & Babbitts, 1991; Evans, 2000).

Corporate actors included the board of directors, the stockholders, and the management (Jacoby, 1973). Decision making for any actor has come from a variety of sources including one’s personal upbringing, the situation at hand, peers, policies, superiors’ behavior, and the moral climate of the organization, industry, corporation, and society (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). Additionally, “...the behavior of managers has been identified as the most important influence on the ethical behavior of organization members” (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 317).

“Prior to the 1960s, business was primarily considered to be an amoral activity...” (Hoffman et al., 2001, p. 3). Issues of worker safety, product liability, and civil rights

emerged as issues for corporations to sort out. “During the 1970s, the field of business ethics took hold in academia...” (Hoffman et al., 2001, p. 3). As corporations interacted with higher education and other nonprofits, issues of relationship management and proper behavior became important. The 1980s saw a more formalized business ethics field as well as public interest. Mass communications and the media made business ethics a household concern given issues of corruption and scandal in both business and the nonprofit world—from Enron, Tyco, and Worldcom to the American Red Cross, the Olympics, and the United Way.

Corporations have modes of operation and principles for action to guide their decision making and behavior. Corporations typically have codes of conduct that serve as the ethics benchmark for the organization considering: economic viability, sociopolitical realities, substantive issues, performance standards, and proper implementation (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Kidder, 2006; The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics, 1999). Such codes include values, virtues, and standards for appropriate behavior and cognizant recognition of ethical issues (Kidder, 2006).

An example of ethical decision making for corporate employees was the PricewaterhouseCoopers’ Code of Conduct, *The Way We Do Business* © 1999 (Hoffman, et al., 2001). The framework included: recognizing the event, decision, or issue; thinking before acting; deciding on a course of action; testing the decision; and proceeding with caution. Each step of the framework enumerated sub-questions for consideration and guidance. Hoffman et al. included the main ethical perspectives for consideration:

- Is it legal?
- Does it feel right?
- How would it look in the newspaper?
- Will it reflect negatively on you or the firm?

Who else could be impacted by this (others in the firm, clients, you, etc.)?
Would you be embarrassed if others knew you took this course of action?
Is there an alternative action that does not pose an ethical conflict?
Is it against firm or professional standards?
What would a reasonable person think?
Can you sleep at night? (p. 128)

Bright et al. (2006) indicated that organizations change logic and behavior based on norming forces. Instead of moral, immoral, and amoral, Bright et al. reviewed five dimensions of leadership ethics, orientation to employees, reaction to societal demands, the natural environment, and culture. These dimensions were measured as normal, negative deviance, or positive deviance. Normal forces created ethical decision making, support and retention of employees, mutual benefit to society, maintenance and renewal of the environment, and compromise or tolerance for cultural differences. Negative deviance is considered weakness, and must be corrected. Negative deviance included unethical leadership behavior, exploiting or abusing employees, being defensive to society, exploiting and destroying the environment, and fostering conflict. Positive deviance, on the other hand, is extraordinary above normative expectations. Such positive actions included virtuous leaders, engaged and respected employees, mutuality to society, fostering environmentalism, and collaborating toward acceptance (Bright et al.).

United Way CEO Brian Gallagher said, “Standards for accountability, when it all comes down to it, should be about three things—consistency, clarity, and transparency” (Beiser, 2005, p. 18). “So we need to raise the bar. It’s not just about doing what’s legal, or even about what’s ethical. It’s more than that—it’s about inspiring truth and confidence in all of our stakeholders” (Beiser, 2005, p. 19).

Beiser (2005) said, “Ethical behavior means an organization must consistently act in a manner that would allow auditors, and even to some extent the general public, to

examine the details of an organization at any time without fear they will find any ‘questionable’ behavior” (pp. 18-19). Issues with corporations were more than just ethical; there were general concerns with accessibility, control, and decision-making that affect higher education, politics, and American social issues (Giroux & Giroux, 2004). Each of these areas needed to be addressed to establish and maintain credibility and transparency in the corporations’ citizenship.

Higher education representatives are concerned that corporations behave appropriately. University officials are prudent and transparent about relationships plus cautious about reputational concerns. Corporations’ unethical behavior, as exhibited by Arthur Andersen, Enron, Exxon, Goldman Sachs, Tyco, and Worldcom, gave pause to higher education desiring corporate engagement.

Higher Education Ethical Behavior

Where are ethical lines crossed in relationships or unethical behaviors acted upon? Oftentimes, fundraisers or administrators have accepted gifts or corporate engagement to build rapport, power, and political landscapes for themselves instead of acting in the best interest of their institutions. Additionally, corporate gifts can be directed by board members, shareholders, or management so multiple layers of corporate involvement appeared in universities (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Haley, 1991; Ma & Parish, 2006).

Nearly all higher education institutions promoted ethical behavior through their values or beliefs statements. Additionally, higher education professional associations and those holding professional field credentials typically agreed to a code of conduct and/or code of ethics to maintain their membership and/or certifications respectively. Although

such agreement does not guarantee ethical behavior, the process created cognizant recognition for individuals to culturally speak a similar language and to strive for such performance.

In a study of more than 1,000 higher educational fundraisers, Caboni (2010) found six major areas of ethical behavior of concern. The three most relevant to relationships with corporations included dishonest solicitation, donor manipulation, and institutional mission abandonment. Dishonest solicitation included the fundraiser taking advantage of the autonomy of professional duties to be untruthful with contributors, thus risking the relationship with the funding source. Donor manipulation involved mishandling the delicate relationship with a donor and using unsound judgment by soliciting inappropriately. Finally, institutional mission creep occurred where the fundraising representative accepted funding to create or to change academic programs according to the whim of the funder.

In 1935 the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel “was the first to issue a Fair Practice Code” (Gurin, 1991, p. 61). Such a code promoted ethical behavior by fundraisers and nonprofit organizations. Many other national and international organizations developed and expanded ethical codes as appropriate in subsequent decades.

CASE is established as the international association for higher education institutions and has 64,000 members at 34,000 colleges and universities in 74 countries (CASE, 2011). CASE also has included a category of corporate membership. Members of CASE do not sign an annual ethical behavioral agreement; however, the organization promoted ethics such as truth, fairness, free speech, nondiscrimination, confidentiality,

credibility, honesty, transparency of disclosure, and admonishment of other institutional advancement professionals (CASE, 2011).

AFP was created for the development and growth of fundraising professionals—including the promotion of high ethical behavior. Three basic value commitments of fundraisers included supporting the organizational mission, developing quality relationships, and maintaining personal integrity (Fischer, 2000). In 2010 AFP celebrated its 50th Anniversary and had 30,000 members in 38 countries. AFP members are required to sign an annual oath to abide by the *AFP Code of Ethical Principles and Standards*, adopted in 1964 and amended in September 2007 (AFP, 2011). The *Code of Ethical Principles and Standards* (see Appendix B) included 25 items in four categories: member obligations, solicitation and use of philanthropic funds, presentation of information, and compensation and contracts. Additionally, AFP members also have agreed to support the 10 points from *A Donor Bill of Rights* (see Appendix C). *A Donor Bill of Rights* was developed by the AFP, the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy, CASE, and the Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Non-Profits. Additionally, the bill is endorsed by the Independent Sector, the National Catholic Development Conference, the National Committee on Planned Giving, the Council for Resource Development, and the United Way of America (AFP). *A Donor Bill of Rights* provided a transparent and clear means to provide accountability and stewardship to all contributors, which included corporations.

Additionally, fundraisers with five or more years of experience are qualified to take the Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) examination. Certification programs in fundraising had been separately maintained from 1981 to 1996 by the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy and the AFP, formerly titled the National Society of Fundraising

Executives (CFRE, 2011; Hale, 2011). In 1997 the organizations merged the certifications and created an independent board, now called *CFRE International*. The CFRE exam was accredited in 2009 by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies, part of the National Organization for Competency Assurance. In November 2011 there were 5,322 CFREs, which included 4,422 in the United States. The higher education sector held 21.8% of those, or 1,161 individuals (CFRE, 2011). In 2011 there were more than 4,300 academic institutions in the United States (Carnegie Foundation, 2011). The CFRE credential must be renewed every three years' by documenting professional activities, continuing education, and voluntary nonprofit service.

Advanced fundraising professionals with 10 or more years' experience are qualified for the Advanced Certified Fundraising Executive (ACFRE) credential, administered by the ACFRE Certification Board (AFP, 2011). The process included a written examination, a portfolio review, and an oral peer review. The credential is defined as permanent and terminal; no additional recertification is required. As of November 2011 there were fewer than 100 individuals with an ACFRE credential.

Issues of ethical concerns usually included truth-telling, promise-keeping, accountability, fairness, fidelity of purpose, accountability, conflicts of interest, ethical and legal issues, privacy and confidentiality, and trust (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; De George, 2009; Hosmer, 2008). While professional association membership and credentialing does not guarantee ethical behavior, it created a platform for professional and ethical principles and codes of conduct. Additionally, members and organizations in the institutional advancement profession have strived for ethical accountability demanded by the American public, the governments, and donors—including corporations. CFRE

and ACFRE certification validated public trust, reassured good stewardship, exhibited professional expertise, and upheld ethical conduct (Hale, 2011; Levy, 2012). Fundraisers and higher education administrators also often participate in training to create an awareness and understanding of ethics sponsored by both AFP and CASE. Levy (2012) promoted organizations considering ethics curriculum for board members and staff, supporting staff members to pursue the credentials, and for all fundraisers to abide by ethical codes. Additionally, Kidder (2006) proposed that ethical behavior must include discussion and discourse, modeling and mentoring, practice, and persistence. Marion, Donahue, and Josephson (2012) created five key questions in evaluating ethical issues. Content of the five questions address critical facts, values at stake, identifying all stakeholders, driving forces, and effects or impacts that would result from the decision(s). Marion et al. (2012) promoted a holistic approach to properly address ethical issues and appropriate paths for resolving them.

Conflicts of interest have arisen with faculty, too (Elliott, 2006). Corporate funding often conflicts with university research agendas and places research faculty in a difficult position (Bok, 2003b; Eddy, 2010; Fairweather, 1988; Gould, 2003; Hartford, 2000; Liggett, 2000; Matthews & Norgaard, 1984; Meuth, 1991; Stein, 2004; White, 2000; Withers, 2002). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2011) was created in 1915 by Johns Hopkins and John Dewey primarily to protect the academic freedom of professors but also to champion other causes such as diversity, protection of free speech and other constitutional rights, and protection from abuse (AAUP, 2011). The AAUP provided a number of detailed ethics principles, including usage for academic freedom, curriculum, classroom behavior, research, creation of intellectual property,

tenure, ethics, speech, electronic communications, government of colleges and universities, family responsibilities, discrimination, increasing the number of minority persons and women, sexual harassment, collective bargaining, freedoms of students, graduate students, and faculty dismissal proceedings (AAUP, 2011). Faculty and academic leaders are often actors within a higher education institution; they contribute to the inter-organizational behavior in the relationship and decision-making with companies.

The Governments' Ethical Behavior

“Government intervention is part of the American economic system” (De George, 2009, p. 162). The capitalistic economic system only operated “...in a broader social system of reasonable security and stability” (De George, 2009, p. 164). Governments protect individuals and organizations to provide life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The governments enforced contracts, developed safety nets to redistribute wealth, and provided for the welfare of all citizens through taxation—such as create access to education, provide adequate freedom of the marketplace, control economics cycles and money circulation, and correct unfair tendencies and market failures (De George).

De George said,

Business is an activity in which human beings associate with one another to exchange goods and services for their mutual advantage. It is not an end in itself. It is a means by which people endeavor to attain a good life for themselves and their loved ones. Business is a central activity of society and a type of human association. Too often it is seen in terms of dollars and cents rather than in terms of people. Although a firm may be established for profit, the profit earned is simply a means to an end and not an end in itself. When this fact is obscured and profit becomes an end, then people are poorly served because they are forgotten and ignored in the business process. (p. 614)

Governments, therefore, are created to build a good society. “The United States has a pluralistic system in which profit-making and not-for-profit sectors work

interdependently to produce what people want” (Madden, 1977, pp. 48-49). A good society has enforced justice—or ethics—for individuals and institutions. “Government ...exercises influence over business through legislation, law enforcement, administration of justice, taxation, spending, and regulation” (Madden, 1977, p. 49). Examples included the Sherman Act of 1890, established to control monopolistic behavior; the Securities Act of 1933, created to regulate publicly traded stocks; and, most recently, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) of 2002, formulated as a response to the Enron and other corporate accounting scandals dealing with publicly held companies (Herman, 2008; Jacobs, 2004; Jacoby, 1973; Madden, 1977; Saul, 2011; Welytok, 2006). SOX has required strict accounting and auditing protocols, mandated financial monitoring and disclosure—particularly conflicts of interest, prohibited internal corporate loans to management, restricted forms of executive incentives, mandated codes of ethics, and increased enforcement of regulations and penalties (Jacobs, 2004; Welytok, 2006). Note, however, that closely held companies do not fall under SOX. The closely held companies must abide by state and federal, industry-specific guidelines, which are much more limited in divulging information. SOX also included two provisions relating to nonprofits: whistleblowing protection and document destruction protocols (Herman, 2008). “Though much of the Act is focused on public companies, many nonprofit boards [including higher education institutions] have still benchmarked their accountability practices against the requirements of this Act as a precautionary measure” (Saul, 2011, p. 36).

The federal government has required IRS *Form 990* to be completed by all nonprofit tax-exempt organizations. The *Form 990* compliance divulges an organization’s revenue, disbursements, and expenses. These documents are made

available to the public for inspection (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Grabois, 2010; Swords, 2011). “In June [2011], the IRS revoked the tax-exempt status of 275,000 nonprofits that did not file a Form 990 for three consecutive years” (Collins, 2011, p. 37). Such reporting is one method of requiring disclosure and ethical transparency for nonprofits, including private colleges and universities and foundations of public higher education institutions.

“Regulatory pressures have failed to guarantee ethical behavior and social responsibility in corporate America, and efforts at self-management have fallen short time and again” (Guthrie, 2012, ¶ 1). To push corporations to behave appropriately, governments typically created either regulations or tax incentives or sometimes both. Guthrie (2012) indicated there is a social compact for corporations, the governments, and nonprofit organizations to work together. “What is needed is a mutually beneficial philanthropy where corporations work with government and nonprofit organizations to create networks of capital, policy, and practice” (Guthrie, ¶ 4).

The American Public’s Scrutiny, Ethical Perspectives, and Expectations

“The public demands that corporations be active citizens” (COP, 2007, p. 2). “Scandals are reported with numbing frequency in corporate, public, and not-for-profit worlds. Although some ethical and legal transgressions are blatantly clear, more nuanced judgment and cultural interpretation is required when we assess behavior that is deemed questionable or inappropriate” (Lister, 2008, p. 3). In 2002 *Time* and other media were critical of the “actual or presumed violations of the public trust within the philanthropic/nonprofit sector. To many there were troubling analogies with the abuses of fiduciary trust that seemed to be running rampant in corporate America” (Karoff, 2004, p. xviii). The American public has expected an awareness of shared values, including

“honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness, and compassion” (Kidder, 2001, p. 31); transparency; accountability; commitment from leaders; and justice.

In a 2010 Harris Poll, survey respondents were asked to rank the level of confidence in several American institutions, which ranked in order from highest to lowest as: the military, small business, major educational institutions—such as colleges and universities, medicine, the U.S. Supreme Court, the White House, organized religion, the courts and the justice system, public schools, television news, major companies, organized labor, the press, law firms, the U.S. Congress, and Wall Street (PollingReport.com, 2011). Results were similar to a 2006 poll in which Elliott (2006) contended,

Considering that major companies are near the bottom of the list and that education is near the top, too close an association between the two is likely to diminish trust in education rather than elevate trust in business. Americans have learned that who controls the purse strings generally wins over principle. Business support of higher education is not intrinsically problematic, but it must be achieved in a way that promotes the more vulnerable party in the relationship—higher education within its traditional mission. (p. 61)

Many Americans have believed that ethical behavior can—and must—be taught and standardized (Finn, 1990). This consideration includes organizational institutions such as corporations, higher education, and governments. Most recently, The Center for Ethical Business Cultures at the University of St. Thomas-Minnesota has created the *Ethics Assessment Inventory*™ (EAI). The instrument reviewed six characteristics: accountability, adherence to standards, courage to address ethical and/or unethical issues, integrity, transparency, and trustworthiness. The EAI was designed as a self-assessment and was not designed as an examination (Shoemaker, 2011). The EAI is based on interdisciplinary research and organizational theories (The Williams Institute, 2011).

Ethical codes and understandings “cannot provide specific answers for particular circumstances, especially when conflicting values are present” (Gurin, 2001, p. 61). Beyond understanding the principles of ethical situations, the main concern is considered moral courage—the ability to recognize issues and concerns as well as taking the necessary time and appropriate action steps to safeguard ethical behavior (Fischer, 2000; Kidder, 2006). Moral courage must be taught, supported, and expressed (Kidder, 2006). Organizations continually face ethical dilemmas (Fischer, 2000). “Disagreement about values is at the root of decision impasses.... As these dilemmas are resolved, the solutions and processes at arriving at them will become part of that organization’s history” (Fischer, 2000, p. 5). Oftentimes, however, emphasis is placed on right versus wrong behavior or decisions. It is important to recognize that ethical decision making may include deciding a course of action between or among multiple right actions (Kidder, 2006). These opportunities may be in conflict with a multiplicity of goals—especially when inter-organizational behaviors are considered. Ultimately, a risk-benefit test, which includes consideration of all parties potentially affected, must be performed to resolve the dilemma (Kidder, 2006).

Summary

America’s pluralistic environment requires all parties to take interest, ownership, and responsibility for rational behavior and joint ownership for social values (Jacoby, 1973; Saul, 2011). Examples included rapid governmental response, individuals voting, businesses responding to change, environmental action, business leadership development, and stewardship of all resources and actions. Major considerations in the process included population growth, scientific and technological advancements, mass

communications, globalization, expedient travel, and the United States' role in the world. Finally, complexity within higher education's financial stabilizations, expectations of corporations in a pluralistic society, and "the inability of overburdened governmental resources...reinforce[d] the necessity for expanded...corporate giving" (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 750).

Cohen (2010) indicated that higher education,

...had evolved over the centuries since the colonies were formed...reached a stage of diversity, complexity, and comprehensiveness that could never have been foreseen. ... Higher education had become, in effect, a national system that could not be described merely by examining its legal arrangements or the structure of its institutions. It was more a social system with its various parts standing in certain relationship to each other. It had rules of conduct, sets of shared beliefs, and expectations on the part of the students, staff members, and the public. (pp. 329-330)

Specifically considering the research universities in higher education, Rhodes (2001) summarized,

The future of our universities is a matter of far more than academic interest. The degree of public understanding and support that they enjoy will determine whether we either neglect a treasure that has taken more than 350 years to build or affirm the faith in the importance of knowledge and the value of full and fair enquiry that has enabled our universities to serve society well. It is our universities that will also shape the kind of society we are, the kind of nation we hope to become. The university's unique function is not only to provide technical skills of the highest order, but also to bring each new generation together with a community of more senior scholars to reflect on the great issues of life and to confront the overarching challenges of society. The university equips young scholars to play an informed, energetic, and responsible role in addressing such issues and challenges. That experience leavens the life and promotes the well-being of the nation. (pp. xiv-xv)

With such a vital role in society, governments and corporations have a vested interest in the success of American higher education. "The corporation has long played a stellar role on the American social stage" (Jacoby, 1973, p. 249). "Corporations have contributed in

many ways to enhancing the quality of life in our communities” (Fischer, 2000, p. 184). Likewise, the U.S. and state governments have contributed greatly to societal functioning, including support for free market enterprise and higher education (Cohen; Jacoby, 1973; Madden, 1977).

Chapter Two provided a literature review relating to the pluralistic interplay in the history of corporate engagement, governments’ support, and American higher education. Additionally, Chapter Two provided background about motivations in each area of Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Chapter Two also addressed ethical principles and practices of corporations, higher education, and the governments as it highlighted society’s expectations.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

“The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.”

~ Franklin D. Roosevelt (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 131)

Introduction

There is a lack of information about the inter-organizational relationship between corporate America and higher education. “To understand the behavior of an organization you must understand the context of that behavior—that is, the econology of the organization. . . . Organizations are inescapably bound up with the conditions of their environment” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 1). Corporations and higher education have relied on each other for mutual benefit (Brennan, 2000; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Elliott, 2006; Gould, 2003; Pollack, 1998; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Sanzone, 2000). Varying views have existed on the purpose, merits, consequences, and reality that exist in the relationship between corporate America and higher education (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Elliott, 2006; Gould, 2003; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Spradley (1980) encouraged “ethnographic research to understand this form of social organization...and to know the extent to which corporations affect all our interests” (p. 19).

Chapter Three addresses the research questions, explains the qualitative nature and design for the study, and defines the selection process of participants involved from higher education and corporations. This Chapter explains data collection, instrumentation, data analysis, the role of the researcher in the study, and trustworthiness.

Research Questions

This qualitative study focused on the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporate America's behavior as defined through Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Three key questions are used to explore this relationship:

1. Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?
2. Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?
3. What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationship between corporations and a higher education institution?

Design for the Study

Design for the research was an organizational analysis. The approach was a qualitative, instrumental case study situated in the constructivist paradigm to focus on understanding motivations, expected ROI, and ethical concerns of the relationship behavior between one American higher education institution and six U.S. corporations. A qualitative study involved an inquiry process to understand a social inter-organizational problem, or dynamic. The examination is based upon building a complex, holistic picture from a purposeful participant selection group (Creswell, 2007; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Stake 2005). Such a small, purposeful, nonrandom, strategic selection allowed for a descriptive study that provided a deeper understanding, information-rich discovery, and meaningful findings (Merriam, 1998, 2009; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2005; Wolcott, 1994).

Qualitative Research Approach

The qualitative approach provided an opportunity to view an historical backdrop, a sociological perspective, and an organizational analysis for the framing of the study (Stake, 1995). “Qualitative design looks at relationships within systems or cultures” (Janesick, 2000, p. 385). This qualitative approach was emergent and allowed for iterative and ongoing data collection and data analysis to explore the inter-organizational relationships (Bryman, 2004; Merriam, 2009; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009). A qualitative study allowed for five key advantages: the understanding of meaning, the learning of a particular context between American higher education and U.S. corporate interaction, identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences, discovering the process of an organizational analysis of inter-organizational relationships, and developing relational explanations (Guetzkow, 1966; Maxwell, 2013). “The data for qualitative analysis typically come from fieldwork....the researcher spends time in the setting...[with]...an organization...or wherever situations of importance to a study can be observed, people interviewed, and documents analyzed” (Patton, 2002, p. 4).

An instrumental case study emphasized “interest in understanding something more general than the particular case” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 408). Creswell (2008) said an instrumental case study “serves the purpose of illuminating a particular issue” (p. 476). This instrumental case study focused the researcher’s attention on the inter-organizational relationships, not the particular case institutions. As an instrumental case study, this particular research provided “less particularistic and more universalistic” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 408) findings from transferable questions within a particularized type of relationship—specifically, inter-organizational relationships

between higher education and corporations (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell, 2013; Stake, 2005). Additionally, the semi-structured interview component allowed for dynamic discovery to emerge through open-ended questions about the relationships (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Seidman, 1991).

Embedded, Single-Case Study

A case study format allowed for an iterative process from the conceptualization to planning and from design to analysis (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, 2000, 2005, 2011; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009; Yin, 2009, 2014). “A case study is both a process of inquiry about the case and the product of that inquiry” (Stake, 2005, p. 444). This single case method was valuable to investigate an in-depth relationship between two types of American institutions (Creswell 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, 2000, 2005, 2011; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 1998, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Stake, 1995, 2005; Yin, 2009). A case study format allowed for consideration of “other contexts, such as economic, political, legal, and aesthetic” (Stake, 2005, p. 447). Additionally, a single case format allowed for exploring Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum as a new theory in organizational analysis (Yin, 2009). Specifically, this embedded case study focused on one university with analysis of its inter-organizational relationships with six corporations, which formed the embedded units (Yin, 2009, 2014). The main unit of analysis was the university, and the “embedded unit of analysis” included the six corporations (Yin, 2014, p. 238). Each embedded unit was “a unit lesser than the main unit of analysis, from which case study data also [were] collected” (Yin, p. 238).

This case study was descriptive in nature (Merriam, 1998, 2009; Wolcott, 1994; Yin, 2009) as it portrayed the relationships between one university and six corporations and their exchange in reciprocal inter-organizational relationships as established over a 5-year period from 2006 through 2010. Documents and audio-visual materials were reviewed for the entire time period and historic dynamics discussed. However, this study was not longitudinal in nature as the snapshot of the relationship was discussed at only one point, which was during the interview process (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). The university was selected because of its consistent engagement with the six corporations during the 5-year period, which included a challenging economic recession (Cohen, 2010; Drezner, 2011; Kaplan, 2011; Rose, 2011). “Vivid material” (Merriam, 1998, p. 31) included interviews, quotations, news articles and media coverage, document review, audio-visual materials, and information from a wide variety of sources. Additionally, the relationship was two-way, so “viewpoints of different groups” (Merriam, 1998, p. 31) were considered. The study illustrated complexities of the relationships that likely included many factors contributing to the dynamics, influence, and situations.

Attention to one university allowed for in-depth description and analysis of the relationship regarding corporate citizenship and engagement. Because Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum has four categories, the number *six* was selected to determine the number of corporations to involve to have enough variation to understand all four facets of the spectrum and to perform analysis across embedded units among the corporations, yet a small enough participant pool to maintain a manageable bounded case study (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Creswell, 2007; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Merriam,

1998, 2009; Miles et al., 2013; Stake, 2005). Burlingame and Frishkoff (1996), Frishkoff and Kostecka (1991), and Levy (2001) indicated that different sizes of companies have differing motives and behaviors. The case was bounded by including only a U.S. focus with participation of an American higher education institution and six U.S.-based corporations, which all must function in the American culture, under U.S. tax laws, and American-based corporate citizenship.

An Ethnographic Perspective

“Ethnography is...a style of research...to understand people’s actions and their experiences of the world, and the ways in which their motivated actions arise from and reflect back on those experiences” (Brewer, 2000, p. 11). Ethnography focuses “on human society and culture” (Merriam, 2009, p. 27). “Culture...refers to the beliefs, values and attitudes that structure the behavior patterns of a specific group of people” (Merriam, p. 27). Robbins and Styliano (2003) indicated that such culture can “influence societal perceptions, attitudes, preferences, and responses” (p. 206). “A case study is an important type of ethnography” (Creswell, 2008, p. 476).

This ethnographic case study research design enabled the researcher to understand the inter-organizational relationships and behavior patterns or reasons for the university to engage with the corporations and, likewise, the patterns or reasons for the six corporations to engage with the higher education institution (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000; Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, 2000, 2005, 2011; Emerson et al., 1995; Erickson, 2011; Gubrium & Holstein, 2001; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 1998, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995;

Tedlock, 2000; Yin, 2009). “Ethnographers have only three basic kinds of data: information about what people say, what they do, and what they leave behind in the form of manufactured artifacts and documents” (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999, p. 1). This ethnographic study allowed for the four types of organizational information that culturally represented the university and corporations to be reviewed including document analysis, audio-visual materials, face-to-face interviews, and field observation (Creswell, 2007; Guba, 1978; Hodder, 2000; Mertens; Rapley, 2007; Rosen, 1991; Spradley, 1980; Tedlock, 2000; Wolcott, 1994). This study allowed for cross-unit analysis for comparisons and contrasts across the corporations (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Yin, 2008). This design was used as it involved intensive and detailed study of the six corporations’ real-world engagement with one higher education institution through self-reported documents, reports, and audio-visual materials; face-to-face interviews; and observation field notes.

Ethnographic studies in organizational environments and workplace settings became more popular after World War II (Erikson, 2011; Rosen, 1991). This time period coincided with a shift in America when higher education was an expected forum for career preparation, and it has gained corporate attention (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Gould, 2003). This case study was ethnographic in nature as it focused on society’s formal organizations and related culture in the pluralistic environment of the United States by investigating the “intensive and detailed” (Mertens, 2005, p. 237) experiences at one university. The relationship between higher education and corporate America was viewed and analyzed to uncover and describe “beliefs, values, and attitudes that structure behavior” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). This study was bound as a single university’s

engagement with six specific corporations, which were the embedded units.

The sociocultural analysis of this unit created this ethnographic viewpoint; “the cultural context is what sets this type of study apart from other types of qualitative research” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). Creswell (2007), Emerson et al. (1995), Rosen (1991), Spradley (1980), and Tedlock (2000) detailed the focus of an ethnographic case study to describe and interpret a culture-sharing group, which can be an organization (Ybema, Yanow, Wels, & Kamsteeg, 2009). In this study, that culture or environment is that of the individual organizations and their actions with inter-organizational relationships. Corporate engagement with higher education is unique from alumni, foundations, and other organizations. Such a perspective allowed for “a better understanding of the beliefs, motivations, and behaviors” (Tedlock, p. 470).

The Constructivist or Constructionist Paradigm

As a qualitative research project, this case study is situated in the constructivist, or constructionist, paradigm. The formation of the U.S. and state governments, the behavior of U.S. corporations, and the operation of American higher education institutions are all socially constructed, which is the epistemology of the design. The United States and each of the participating organizations define culture and their respective roles for society and how they interact (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Neyland, 2008; Rosen, 1991). Additionally, the view of relationship between a higher education institution and six corporations yielded multiple realities with each inter-organizational relationship. “Corporate culture is a concept about meaning and its construction, about ideas, values, beliefs and assumptions” (Rosen, 1991, p. 6).

The constructivist paradigm included the “study of interpretive understanding

called ‘hermeneutics’” (Mertens, 2005, p. 12). “Hermeneutics focuses on interpreting something of interest...include[ing] interpreting interviews and observed actions” (Patton, 2002, p. 497). The epistemology of the constructivist paradigm included the assumption “that data, interpretations, and outcomes are rooted in contexts...apart from the researcher and are not figments of the imagination. Data can be tracked to their sources....” (p. 15). Patton identified key questions for guidance: “How have the people in this setting [i.e., the organizations] constructed reality? What are their reported perceptions, ‘truths,’ explanations, beliefs, and worldview? What are the consequences of their behaviors and for those with whom they interact?” (p. 132).

Qualitative methodologies included data collection from multiple sources. Additionally, after selection of the university participant, the study was emergent and evolved (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008). Janesick (2000) indicated that “qualitative research design has an elastic quality...[because] qualitative design is adapted, changed, and redesigned as the study proceeds, due to the social realities of doing research among and with the living” (p. 395). The lead contacts, or *key informants*, at the university and university foundation aided in review of data and selection of the corporations approached to participate (Bryman, 2004; Neyland, 2008). Additionally, the contacts assisted in gaining each corporation’s participation and the recruiting of interviewees. Within each corporation, a lead contact, or key informant, assisted in coordinating document collection and interviews. “Key informants [were]...particularly knowledgeable about the inquiry setting and articulate about their knowledge” (Patton, 2002, p. 321). Such informants, who were insiders, served a vital role in accessing key data for the study (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Neyland, 2008).

Constructionist analytics aided in understanding Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum through a closer look at the relationship (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Rosen, 1991; Ybema et al., 2009). This study helped to understand the purpose, merits, reality, and consequences of actions between a university and six corporations by "map[ping] the translocal processes of administration and governance that shape[d] lives and circumstances by way of the linkages of ruling relations" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 350). The context, as well as "consciousness" by "forms of representation" through "written, spoken, visual, digital, or numeric" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 351), are reviewed in the data. "Such texts provide[d] mediating linkages between people across time and place, making it possible to generate knowledge separate from individuals who possess[ed] such knowledge" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 351). Such constructionist underpinnings helped to gain an understanding of the "...resources and constraints [that] affect[ed] social life and social forms" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 351) through "forms of consciousness and organizations [that] are objectified or constituted as if they were external to particular people and places" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 351). Finally, this constructionist perspective aided in understanding how "concerted actions—produced, used, and oriented by actual persons in ongoing, institutional courses of action" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011, p. 351) were manifested. This case study provided an understanding of the specific relationship between a university and each of the six corporations. Such research is "an outgrowth of and simultaneously embedded in the culture of its producers" (Rosen, 1991, p. 6).

It is important to point out that while this study was ethnographic in nature, the goal was to understand the behavioral intent and actions of the relationship between

organizational actors: U.S. higher education and corporate America through the snapshot of one single, embedded, bound, case study—not to understand this specific university’s practices and successes nor to be prescriptive in nature for future actions, per se, at solely the institutions studied (Yin, 2014). Erickson (2011) indicated that qualitative educational studies with a realist, ethnographic viewpoint have gained importance and value to contribute to both education and business in today’s research. Tedlock (2000) said that such “experience is intersubjective and embodied, not individual and fixed, but social and processual” (p. 471).

Participants

Institutional participants were selected from an organized, purposeful list based upon simple characteristics (Johnson & Christenson, 2008; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2005). One American higher education institution and six U.S.-based corporations that supported and were engaged with the higher education institution in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 served as the basis for the research. This time frame included the most recent available data. In addition, these years included both stable and challenging economic years in the U.S. (Cohen, 2010; Drezner, 2011; Kaplan, 2011; Rose, 2011). Individual participants were selected based on an emergent design of involving appropriate individuals after securing the organizational participants (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008). The process of establishing research relationships was vital in the study. Gaining entry and building rapport with the university, the university foundation, and corporate participants took time and finesse, and the study emerged because of the reflexivity and design decisions based on the participants’ involvement (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Maxwell, 2013; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009; Ybema et al., 2009).

The Carnegie Classification™ System

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching™ was founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1905 and was endorsed by the U.S. Congress in 1906 as an independent policy and research center. The Carnegie Foundation developed the Carnegie Classification™ system for all higher education institutions in 1973 as a framework to recognize and to describe institutional diversity (Carnegie Foundation, 2011). This classification system is helpful to understand and to establish the context for the university participant prospect list that emerged from the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) report data compilation for university participant selection.

The Carnegie Classification™ system was updated in 1976, 1987, 1994, 2000, 2005, and 2010 to reflect appropriate adjustments and changes for colleges and universities. The main purpose of the system was aimed at grouping institutions with peer institutions for research purposes and to ensure adequate representation of institutions for sampling based on institution type, faculty, or students. Higher education institutions were divided into five major categories, and then each category was sub-divided into public and private institutions. The five categories included doctoral-granting universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, associate's colleges, and specialized institutions (Carnegie Foundation, 2011; Kaplan, 2011).

Doctoral-granting universities conduct research and award at least 20 doctoral degrees, excluding doctoral-level degrees for professional fields, such as medicine, law, pharmacy, etc. Master's colleges and universities award at least 50 master's degrees but fewer than 20 doctoral degrees annually. Baccalaureate institutions award at least 10% of all degrees at the baccalaureate level but fewer than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral

degrees annually. Associate-level colleges award only associates degrees or less than 10% of all degrees as baccalaureates. Finally, special focus institutions are those institutions awarding baccalaureate or higher-level degrees in a single field or set of related fields; tribal colleges are inclusive of those institutions related by membership in the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (Kaplan, 2011). Rhodes (2001) highlighted these points:

America's colleges and universities still display a remarkable diversity and pluralism: public and private, large and small, urban and rural, general and technical, religious and secular, coeducational and single sex...two-year colleges, women's colleges, land-grant universities, liberal arts colleges, four-year universities, [and] multicampus state university systems. (p. 21)

For this study, there was no intent to select any type of institution over another. In the selection process for a higher education institution, the doctoral, research-based category emerged from the VSE data, which yielded 33 universities as a prime potential for selection as discussed in the next section. Both public and private institutions were on the list. For the purpose of this study, any type of higher education institution exhibiting strong, consistent corporate engagement would have sufficed.

Higher Education Institution Participant

Financial fundraising data were available to view corporate support of higher education from the 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 CAE's VSE surveys, which is the nation's leading source of data on private giving to education through an annual survey (Kaplan, 2011). The survey collated information regarding "amounts, sources, donor-specified purposes, and forms of private gifts, grants, and bequests" (Kaplan, 2011, p. VSE-10/37). Reporting categories in the VSE included alumni, parents, faculty and staff, students, other individuals, foundations, corporations, religious organizations,

fundraising consortia, and other organizations. In Kaplan's (2011) VSE reports, corporations were defined as:

Corporations, partnerships, and cooperatives that have been organized for profit-making purposes, including corporations owned by individuals and families and other closely held companies. Also included in this category are business-sponsored foundations, i.e., those organizations that have been created by business corporations that have been funded exclusively by their companies. You will find industry trade associations included here as well. (p. VSE-10/39)

Excluded from consideration in the corporate VSE details, among other categories, were advertising revenue, contract revenues, sponsored research funds, and discounts on purchases (Kaplan, 2011). These categories were important to highlight as *not* being included in the corporations' funding reported by higher education institutions; however, they are considered in the broader inter-organizational relationships in this study.

The 2006-2010 VSEs (Kaplan, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011) were reviewed from printed copies, and a consolidated 5-year list was compiled to identify all higher education institutions that received corporate philanthropic support in any year as shown in Appendix D. It was coincidental, not incidental, in participant consideration that all 33 institutions were designated in the Carnegie Classification™ system as doctoral/research. "Research universities are distinguished chiefly by having a substantial number of doctoral students and a significant commitment to organized research. Perhaps 125 or so institutions might be grouped as research universities" (Rhodes, 2001, pp. 18-19). In explaining the classification of these institutions, Rhodes said, "The research universities, for all the importance of their contribution, occupy only a small niche within the larger framework of higher education" (p. 20).

The next step was selecting a university from the 33 higher education institutions

through “negotiating research relationships” (Creswell, 2008, p. 90). The university selected was through networking by the researcher to find appropriate *gatekeepers* to access the appropriate *champion, or sponsor*, within a university to grant access to conduct research (Bryman, 2004; Neyland, 2008; Saul, 2011; Yin, 2009). This process is called “negotiating research relationships” (Creswell, 2008, p. 90). The process included direct overt explanation regarding the project with intent to gain access to closed organizational settings (Bryman, 2004; Neyland, 2008). Such networking to recruit a participant university included initial telephone calls and emails to known colleagues at several of the potential participant universities. No champion was able to secure a commitment from a university using this initial strategy. Further networking was required and included sending a recruitment letter (see Appendix G), a formal abstract proposal, and the researcher’s résumé to all 33 universities’ presidents on high-quality stationery and mailed first class U.S. Postal Service in catalog envelopes. The abstract proposal included a summary of Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, sample interview questions, and the matrices for document and audio-visual collection. Follow-up was made to each institution by telephone to identify an individual of authority to review and accept or reject the project, selling the research scope, and recruiting a university for the study.

The first institution that agreed to allow accessibility for the study and agreed to engage six corporations was formally invited to participate. Selection of one university in the top 33 was based on accessibility and willingness to participate. Access to organizations required an internal *champion*. “A champion is someone who sees the value in what you do and is willing to advocate on your behalf inside an organization or

to a third party” (Saul, 2011, p. 163). However, gaining such access was not a one-time initiative. “Simply because you have gained access to an organization does not mean that you will have an easy passage through the organization. Securing access is in many ways an ongoing activity. It is likely to prove a problem in closed contexts like organizations” (Bryman, 2004, p. 299). To recruit corporations, recruit individual participants within the corporations, and to gather mute data—such as documents and audio-visual data—and coordination of campus tours for observation “require[d] ongoing negotiation and renegotiation” to maintain access and support given by the university participant’s champions (Creswell, 2008, p. 90).

Corporation Participants

The six corporations were selected from those U.S. corporations that were actively engaged with the university and consistently contributed financially from 2006 to 2010 to the higher education institution selected for the study. Resources included any and all types from the corporations such as corporate cash direct from net income profits, in-kind goods and services, corporate foundation grants, public-partner arrangements, partnerships, sponsorships, research contracts, and employees engaging as volunteers.

Using only U.S. companies allowed the study to concentrate on a discrete corporate population. Businesses in the U.S. are classified on a number of factors including type of registration, gross annual revenues, number of employees, and industry classifications (Carty & Blank, 2003; Ringleb et al., 1997; U.S. Census, 2008; U.S. Small Business Administration, 2011). Currently there are more than 6-million companies operating in the United States (Clifton, 2011). Three types of participants of U.S. corporations are considered: large (i.e., *Fortune 500*), medium, and small (Levy, 2001).

Fortune 500 companies are the largest U.S. companies and listed annually “from the latest reported financial data as of January 31 through the efforts of teams of reporters, accountants and analysts gathering data, organizing and analyzing the information, and then releasing a list in April” (Carty & Blank, 2003, ¶ 5) in *Fortune Magazine*. Carty and Blank (2003) defined the *Fortune 500 Index* as:

The list consists of the 500 largest domestic U.S. companies [publicly held] ranked by total operating revenues, as reported in their latest fiscal year, including revenues from discontinued operations. ... Components for the *Fortune 500* are ... based on four eligibility criteria: 1) A stock must be publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange or the Nasdaq National Market. 2) It must have a minimum average daily trading volume of 100,000 shares during the 25 consecutive trading days preceding initial inclusion. 3) It must have a minimum reported price equal to or in excess of \$5 per share during that period. 4) The company must have a minimum market capitalization equal to or in excess of \$100-million during that period. The criteria used in compiling the *Fortune 500* are rigorously followed by the Fortune Index Committee, resulting in the index being objectively derived and completely transparent with respect to its constituents. (¶ 5-11)

Medium and small companies vary in size and may be publicly or closely held (Cheeseman, 2012). Publicly held companies have shareholders; privately held are owned by only a few shareholders, such as a specific family. Classification as medium or small is determined by both the number of employees and annual corporate revenues (Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Levy, 2001). Medium companies typically have 101-500 employees although some have more in a few industries where revenue constitutes classification as medium. Medium companies typically have between \$10 and \$100 million in revenues. Small companies typically have fewer than 100 employees and gross under \$10 million in revenue (Levy, 2011). Some industry definitions record employee numbers for small companies as high as 1,500 but are typically under \$7 million annually in revenue (U.S. Small Business Administration, 2011).

Since the 1930s, businesses in the United States were classified under the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system, which was most recently revised in 1987 and allows for 1,004 industry codes. The SIC had been criticized as lacking modern codification in industries such as technology, so the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) was devised in 1997 with 1,170 industry code categories (Boeninger, 2010; U.S. Department of Labor, 2012). NAICS codes are six digits providing thousands of specific business types. For the purposes of this study, the 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index (CSRI) with only 20 industry codes is more simplistic than the SIC or NAICS and further provides confidentiality to participant companies. Additionally the CSRI industry codes provide specific framing of companies specifically for corporate citizenship. The CSRI key industry classifications in the United States include: airlines and aerospace, automotive, beverage, computers, consumer products, electrical and electronics, energy, financial—banking, financial—diversified, financial—insurance, food manufacturing, industrial products, information and media, pharmaceuticals, retail—food, retail—general, services, telecommunications, transport and logistics, and utilities (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010).

Only U.S. corporations were considered for the study to keep a consistent alignment and compliance with U.S. government regulations and American cultural and political ideals, which included such concerns as tax allowances and incentives, education initiatives, and regulatory policies. To select the corporations, the leaders at the higher education institution were consulted. The corporations must have been engaged significantly during the 5 years to align with how the university was selected. All corporations meeting those criteria were organized into the three corporation types and

then further arranged from largest to smallest amount of giving as well as the subjective opinion of the university foundation administrators from most engaged to least engaged. The top six (two in each category) willing to participate were recruited to participate in the study.

Higher Education and Corporate Leader Interview Participants

Participants from the higher education institution and six corporations were identified for the face-to-face interviews. Contacts recommended participants at each organization and included those leaders involved in the process of decision making regarding the relationship. At a minimum, at least one participant per organization had to be identified. Ideally, as many as five individuals per organization created enough information for saturation.

Evidence and Sources

The researcher used multiple methods and data sources to address the three research questions. Such methods included several types of document review, audio-visual materials, face-to-face interviews, and observation of field notes. Brock (2007), Neyland (2008), and Saul (2011) supported and confirmed that reviewing such evidence and sources illustrated the relationship between organizations to have a deeper understanding of their expectations and behaviors. Document and audio-visual review data included both records and organizational documents as well as audio-visual materials such as marketing materials of the educational institution and six corporations and to understand their missions and stated intended behavior. Document and audio-visual review of actual behavior data were observed from records such as audited financial reports and *Form 990s* as well as organizational documents and audio-visual

materials such as annual reports and press releases. Additionally, third-party documents and audio-visual materials were researched and reviewed relevant to the participating institutions, such as general media and news articles, trade journals, industry press, books, analyst reports, television interviews, the SEC's website, and business publications. Audio-visual materials were also reviewed from participating organizations—such as websites and presentations and the NACRO website. The NACRO materials included presentations from corporate relations staff from major research universities and corporations regarding their operations and interactions with each other. Face-to-face interviews with semi-structured and open-ended questions were conducted with leaders of the educational institution and the corporations, transcribed verbatim, and were used to develop emergence of themes and patterns from transcription analysis of the interviews (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013; Seidman, 1991; Spradley, 1980). Two types of observation field notes provided information: observation related to interviews and a university campus visit. The observation field notes from the interviews related to the behavior of the individuals interviewed for congruence or discomfort. Finally, a visit to the university provided the opportunity to see if and how each of the six corporations were celebrated, recognized, or promoted on the campus environment in a visual or physical way through artifacts.

Human Subject Protection

Because this study involved interviewing leaders from a higher education institution and six corporations, application was made to the Campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri-Columbia, which ensured compliance and

required all research involving humans to comply with the federal regulations governing human subject research. All human subject research must be reviewed, approved, and subject to continued oversight by the IRB to assure the safety and welfare of research participants remains in compliance with governing federal regulations and guidance.

After formally seeking approval from IRB, an informed consent agreement was signed by the university to provide confidentiality to the institution (See Appendices H and I). Likewise, an informed consent agreement was signed by each of the corporations to provide confidentiality to them (See Appendices J and K). Informed consent defined rights and responsibilities of participating organizations (Patton, 2002). Responsibilities included providing access to information, cooperation by participating organizations, and the minimal level of risk. Rights included the option of confidentiality versus being named in the study, ownership of the data and maintenance of information for 7 years, and consideration to withdraw from the study.

Subject/interviewees were recruited for the university and each of the six companies (see Appendix L). Informed consent was sought from the interview participants and addressed the project via a letter to explain the project and to explain rights and responsibilities as well as to offer confidentiality to participants (Patton, 2002) (see Appendix M). The University of Missouri-Columbia does not require a signed consent form as such a signature would be the only traceable link to participants. To safeguard confidentiality, the process is explained to participants. The researcher identified participants by assigned codes, roles, or titles for documentation—not by name.

Following proper research planning and implementation required ethical practices on the part of the researcher (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Mertens, 2005). Such practices

included the three ethical principles and six norms guiding research involving human subjects. While these practices were designed specifically for protection of human subjects in biomedical and behavioral research, they seemed universally important. The three principles included: beneficence to maximize good conclusions for humanity and to minimize or avoid risk, respect to treat people with dignity, and justice to ensure that reasonable, nonexploitative procedures are fairly administered. The six norms included: valid research design, a competent researcher, identification of consequences of the research, proper participant selection, informed consent, and whether harm would be compensated.

Data Collection Procedures

Once the higher education institution was selected, all of their corporate supporters were reviewed to determine six to invite to participate in the study. Assistance from the university foundation contacts aided in the best selection of potential corporate participants. Additionally, university and university foundation officials helped to introduce the researcher where needed to explain the study and elicit participation.

Instrumentation protocols were developed to guide the research of documents, audio-visual materials, interviews, and campus observation (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Yin, 2009). Instrumentation aided in organizing what information needed to be found, how data was collected, and the purpose of specific data (Miles et al., 2013). Protocol matrices were developed for document and audio-visual materials and campus observation to determine what to look for and defining its purpose. Interview questions and a debriefing form were created for the semi-structured interview protocols.

Instrumentation: Document and Audio-visual Review Protocol

An inventory matrix served as the tool to determine what types of documents and audio-visual materials needed to be collected, for what purpose(s), and where to find the information. Appendices E and F detailed both the university and corporation information needed. Initial documents and audio-visual materials were those representing each organizations' claimed mission, focus, and identities. Careful selection of documents and audio-visual materials aided in the research. Documents, records, and audio-visual materials are not necessarily created for research purposes, so extra care was required to locate materials relating to the research questions and to find evidence of the inter-organizational relationships being explored (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Merriam, 2009). "Texts are one aspect of the sense-making activities through which we construct, sustain, contest and change our sense-making of social reality...institutional texts are inextricably linked to the social contexts in which they are produced" (Miller, 1997, p. 77).

Furthermore, Miller enlightened,

An intriguing aspect of institutional texts is their relationship to the institutional practices and worlds on which they report. Indeed, they are often constructed within the very setting about which they report. Observational methods are especially appropriate for studying text construction and use in institutional settings, then because they immerse researchers in the settings in which the texts are constructed and used. The immersion not only makes it possible for researchers to see and analyze the interrelations between institutional texts and contexts, but also to appreciate the practical and sociological significance of interrelations.
(p. 81)

Document and audio-visual review protocol for stated mission and focus of the University. The University's and University foundation's fundraising materials were reviewed to determine the mission or purposes of the institutions and their purposes for engaging in support from corporations. "*Mission* refers to the reason for the existence of

an organization” (Jacobson, 1978, p. 20). “The mission statement defines, directs, and justifies the organization” (Fischer, 2000, p. 34). “The mission, therefore, is usually stated in broad, philosophical, and sometimes inspirational terms” (Jacobson, p. 20). Identifying the purpose of the university and university foundation and their purposes and focuses in society indicated potential resource needs to support such a mission and goals (Fischer, 2000; Sheldon, 2000). (See Appendix E.).

Document and audio-visual review protocol for stated mission and non-profit support by the six corporations. Each of the participating six corporations’ grant-making or funding opportunity materials were reviewed to determine the mission or purpose of each corporation and its purpose for engaging in supporting nonprofits, specifically higher education (Sheldon, 2000). *Mission* defines the purpose of an organization (Jacobson, 1978). “The mission statement defines, directs, and justifies the organization” (Fischer, 2000, p. 34). “The mission, therefore, is usually stated in broad, philosophical, and sometimes inspirational terms” (Jacobson, p. 20). Identifying the purpose of corporation and related corporate foundation and their purposes and focuses in society indicated potential programs or areas of interest that could be funded via higher education (Fischer, 2000; Sheldon, 2000). (See Appendix F.).

Instrumentation: Document and Audio-visual Review Protocol for Observed Behavior

The inventory matrices in Appendices E and F also defined what types of documents and audio-visual materials regarding observed actual behavior needed to be collected, for what purpose(s), and where to find the information. This information is prepared annually post hoc by each organization and describes what actually transpired. Additionally, third party sources were considered here, such as news articles, which often

analyze or report on behavior including ethical concerns.

Document and audio-visual review protocol for observed behavior by

University. For 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, the university foundation's *Form 990s*, University and University foundation's annual audited financial statements, and fundraising and/or annual reports were viewed online at their respective websites or on a nonprofit site called *GuideStar*, or requested in soft or hard copy from the university.

Reviewing the annual reports illustrated actual support and/or engagement received from corporations as well as potential engagement (Kaptein 2007; Sheldon, 2000).

Additionally, public sources were searched to discover any press releases or marketing promotions that illustrated the university's engagement with the six specific corporations or the public's recognition of such organizational behavior including any potential ethical concerns. Audited financial statements were provided by an external accounting or auditing firm. The *Form 990s* and financial statements illustrated the financial health and focus of funding of the institution including major income from corporations.

Document and audio-visual review protocol for observed behavior by

corporation. For 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, the corporate *Form 990s*, annual financial statements, and corporate annual reports were viewed online at their respective websites or on a nonprofit site called *GuideStar*, or requested in soft or hard copy from each company. Reviewing the annual reports of the six corporations selected helped to illustrate actual involvement and/or financial support of the university to further explain their reasoning to support nonprofits, particularly higher education (Sheldon, 2000).

Corporate annual reports may have included a section titled, Corporate Community Affairs, Corporate Social Investment, or Corporate Social Responsibilities. Additionally,

public sources were searched to discover any press releases or marketing promotions that illustrated the corporations' engagement with the university (Kaptein 2007; Sheldon, 2000). Any of these documents could have included feature articles, photos, or logo recognition for the relationship between the corporation and the university. Audited financial statements illustrated the financial health and focus of funding of the institution including major support and engagement with the university or university foundation.

Interview Protocols

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews with higher education and corporate leaders provided both perspectives in the inter-organizational relationships, identified any ethical concerns or dilemmas, and provided flexibility for respondents to offer any additional information. Thirty- to 60-minute interviews were conducted with the 36 leaders from corporations and the university. Interviews, however, are more complicated than just a researcher asking questions (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001; Seidman, 1991). The environment, the level of individual being interviewed, and the researchers' persona all added to the complexity of gathering data. Advance planning and careful construction of questions and the interview process were required for maximum results (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001; Seidman, 1991). A major consideration of this study was interviewing corporate and higher education leaders in person versus via the telephone or using other technology. Various pros and cons existed with each scenario (Shuy, 2001). Advantages of in-person interviewing included high relating with contextual awareness, more thoughtful self-generated answers, higher interaction with the researcher, more effectiveness on complex or sensitive issues, and more ideal for aging or hearing-impaired individuals. Telephone interview advantages included time and cost

efficiencies, uniform researcher delivery, and safety (Shuy, 2001). Ultimately, all interviews were conducted in person, face-to-face.

Another major consideration in this study was the interactions with highly-educated and/or high-level individuals. Odendahl and Shaw (2001) labeled these types of individuals as *elites*. Accessing and interacting with elites—people with status, power, decision-making roles, and/or higher levels of education—required sensitivity and finesse. It was advantageous that the researcher working on a doctoral degree and having many years of experience in higher education and fundraising added credibility. Odendahl and Shaw encouraged a high sensitivity to meet elites in their environments on their schedules, which was adhered to strictly for the success of this research.

Prior to the beginning of each interview, the researcher explained to participants about the goals of the study as well as their rights and guaranteed confidentiality (see Appendix L). Confidentiality protected the identity of research participants. While individuals' identity was known by the researcher, identification was relabeled with codes for transcription and sub sequential usage (Johnson & Christenson, 2008; Seidman, 1991). Based on research questions, the researcher developed protocols for obtaining answers to the interview questions (see Appendices M and N). Ten open-end questions were developed for the higher education leaders and eight open-ended interview questions for corporate interviewees. Open-ended questions were developed to encourage story-telling, and additional prompts were provided for each question to enhance the richness of the responses. The participant interviews were scheduled in advance at a location chosen by the participant and limited to 30-60 minutes in duration. During the interviews, participants were asked their opinion and were not asked to make

generalizations about their perspectives about the nation, state or federal funding, or higher education. The interviews were electronically recorded on a digital recorder—as well as an iPhone app *VoiceRecorder*^{HD} for back-up—and later transcribed. The interview transcripts were then used in the identification of themes. The interview process included important skills by the researcher including tact, good listening skills, exercising adaptiveness and flexibility, and having a firm grasp of the issues being studied (Yin, 2009).

University interviews protocols. Face-to-face interviews included open-ended questions (see Appendix N) to understand the historical relationship, motivation for engagement, ROI expectations, and any ethical concerns. Interviews focused on the rich, thick description (Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002) needed to understand the motives for the university engaging with each of the six corporations. Additionally, the university interviews were completed first to help with the emergent process in finalizing the questions for corporate interviews (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008). “Description is thus balanced by analysis and interpretation” (Patton, 2002, p. 503).

The face-to-face interviews began by asking confidence-building questions about the participant’s role and length of service with the institution. The goal for this background question was to obtain information about the individual’s perspective and level of responsibility or authority in the engagement process as well as being a confidence builder for the interviewees to relax and openly share information (Patton, 2002). For the higher education leaders, some questions focused descriptive or knowledge characteristics of corporate engagement (questions 2, 4, 5, and 6), and others

emphasized opinion or value-based questions on motivations and expectations (questions 3, 7, 8, and 9).

The background or demographic question helped “the interviewer locate the respondent in relation to other people” (Patton, 2002, p. 351). Knowledge or descriptive questions “inquire[d] about the respondent’s factual information” (p. 350) about formal structures, relationships, and protocols. Finally, the opinion and values “questions aimed at understanding the cognitive and interpretive processes of people ask[ed] about opinions, judgments, and values” (p. 350) relating to the inter-organizational relationships. The final question provided an opportunity for the interviewees to provide any other information not already covered; this process also adds to “the spirit of emergent interviewing” (Patton, 2002, p. 379). Additionally, follow-on questions were used for participants to elaborate on answers.

Corporate interviews protocols. Face-to-face interviews included open-ended questions (see Appendix O) to understand the historical relationship, motivation for engagement, ROI expectations, and any ethical concerns. Interviews focused on the rich, thick description (Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002) needed to understand the motives for the corporations engaging with and giving financially to the higher education institution.

The interviews began by asking confidence-building questions about the participant’s role and length of service with the corporation or corporate foundation. The goal for this question was to obtain information about the individual’s perspective and level of responsibility or authority in the engagement process. For the corporate leaders, some questions focused descriptive or knowledge characteristics of corporate

engagement (questions 2, 4, 5, and 6), and others emphasized opinion or value-based questions on motivations and expectations (questions 3, 7, 8, 9 and 10).

The background or demographic question helped to build rapport and comfort for the interview process as well as for “the interviewer locate the respondent in relation to other people” (Patton, 2002, p. 351). Knowledge or descriptive questions “inquire[d] about the respondent’s factual information” (p. 350) about formal structures, relationships, and protocols for the corporation’s interactions with the University. Finally, the opinion and values “questions aimed at understanding the cognitive and interpretive processes of people ask[ed] about opinions, judgments, and values” (p. 350) relating to the inter-organizational relationships.

Observation Field Notes

Observational techniques are used to view human activities in organizations and their physical settings (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000; Neyland, 2008; Wolcott, 1994). This study included observation of interviewees “to note body language and other gestural cues that lend meaning to the words of the persons being interviewed” (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000, p. 673). Additionally, the study explored the university setting to observe the presence of the six corporations in this study in the campus environment. Two campus tours of university facilities were given by the university from two viewpoints: admissions and development. The admissions tour took about 1 hour and gave a brief history of each building on campus and most programs. The development tour was 3 hours and illustrated a *money walk* view that would be given to prospective constituents, such as corporate representatives. A total of 4 hours was spent touring during two separate outings.

Interview observation field notes. In addition to descriptive interview narratives, reflective observations were recorded including “notes about your experiences, hunches, and learnings” (Creswell, 2007, p.135). These descriptions provided an opportunity for the researcher to fully describe a picture of the interview. The observation field notes were created to document any noticeable changes in behavior, language, demeanor, or level of comfort during the interview. This documentation occurred initially on the post-interview debriefing form (see Appendix P). The interview protocol included a place to record appearance, interviewees’ state of mind, and various behaviors such as facial expressions, posture, tone, and animation. Since the interviews were conducted at the participant’s choice of location, the environments varied but were also observed. The post-interview debriefing form captured overall non-verbal clues to confirm or contradict the stated responses. Additionally, the post-interview debriefing form allowed the researcher to determine key issues and important information gathered as well as note illuminating or salient ideas (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

University campus observation field notes. The university campus was visited to observe any visual or physical presence or artifacts of the six corporations (Bryman, 2004; Wolcott, 1994; Yin, 2009). Such items would be an additional indication of corporations’ relationships with the university. Potential items to look for (see Appendix Q) included branding logos, named buildings or facilities, donor recognition walls, photos, and trophy or display cases highlighting engagement (Sheldon, 2000). The process of visiting each building on campus to search for artifacts and the taking of photographs to document items took 4 days.

Data Management and Coding

Data collection included documents and audio-visual materials, face-to-face interviews, and campus observation. Identification of data sources for this dissertation included the following identification codes for pagination, audit trail, and citing:

DAV Document/Audio-Visual

I Interview

CO Campus Observation

Because all participant organizations opted for confidentiality and were unnamed in the study, each interviewee was identified only by type of organization as:

UN University

UF University foundation

CFA Corporate—*Fortune 500* Company A

CFB Corporate—*Fortune 500* Company B

CMA Corporate—Medium Company A

CMB Corporate—Medium Company B

CSA Corporate—Small Company A

CSB Corporate—Small Company B

Data Analysis

“Data analysis is the process of making sense out of the data” (Merriam, 2009, p. 175). This process was iterative in nature (Merriam, 2009; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009). “The role of iteration in qualitative data analysis, not as a repetitive mechanical task but as a reflexive process, is key to sparking insight and development of meaning” (Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009, p. 76). This iterative process included collecting various

types of data, analyzing it, and having it help to shape additional collection and further analysis. Such “continuous meaning-making and progressive focusing [was] inherent to analysis processes” (p. 76). “Immersion in the details and specifics of the data [are used] to discover important patterns, themes, and interrelationships; [the process] begins by exploring, then confirming; [and finally is] guided by analytical principles rather than rules [and] ends with a creative synthesis” (Patton, 2002, p. 41).

Data analysis included data condensation from the document and audio-visual materials, interviews, and campus observation (Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002). The process of data analysis is dissected as “preparing and organizing the data...reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and condensing codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables...[and] discussion” (Creswell, 2007, p. 148). Data analysis included content analysis, categorization, summarizing, and theorizing (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). Content analysis involved sketching ideas, developing field notes, identifying codes, coding, development of patterns and themes, and summarizing (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Miles et al., 2013). Categorization in the coding included both *inductive codes* and *a priori codes* (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). *Inductive codes* were “generated by...directly examining data” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 539). *A priori codes* were those identified at the beginning of the study—mainly relating to Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

However, data analysis was not saved as a final act after complete data collection. Rather, collecting data and analyzing was a “simultaneous process” that was “recursive

and dynamic” (Merriam, 2009, p. 169). Such ongoing or interim analysis helped to shape the emergent process of determining additional materials needed, appropriate individuals to add for interviewing, and adjustment of interview questions (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Merriam, 2009). “Data that have been analyzed while being collected are both parsimonious and illuminating” (Merriam, 2009, p. 171). Srivastava and Hopwood (2009) proposed,

Patterns, themes, and categories, and themes do not emerge on their own. They are driven by what the inquirer wants to know and how the inquirer interprets what the data are telling her or him to subscribed theoretical frameworks, subjective perspectives, ontological and epistemological positions, and intuitive field understandings. ... Reflexive iteration is at the heart of visiting and revisiting the data and connecting them with emerging insights, progressively leading to refined focus and understanding. (p. 77)

Yin (2009) indicated five types of data analysis for case studies: pattern matching, explanation building, time-series analysis, logic models, and cross-unit analysis. This study allowed for patterns to emerge identifying behavior related to Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, explanation building regarding each organization’s planned and actual behavior, logic models relating to complex “chain of events over an extended period of time” (p. 149) that is another form of pattern creation, and cross-unit analysis of the six corporations’ behavior.

Data analysis included review of documents, audio-visual materials, interviews, and field observation. Patterns, themes, and overarching ideas were developed based on salience and centrality (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Creswell, 2007; Emerson et al., 1995; Stake, 1995). Pattern development emerged in a variety of ways including declaration, frequency, omission, similarity, co-occurrence, corroboration, sequence, and *a priori* hypothesizing (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).

Once data was analyzed, interpretations of what was found as well as what was missing were made to develop findings, themes, and conclusions (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Wolcott, 1994). “Interpretation means attaching significance to what was found, making sense of findings, offering explanations, drawing conclusions, extrapolating lessons, making inferences, considering meanings, and otherwise imposing order on an unruly but surely patterned world” (Patton, 2002, p. 480). Based on the data analysis, interpretations, findings, and conclusions, the goal was to place each corporation on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum as appropriate as determined by their actual behavior in supporting and engaging with the university.

Document Review

“Qualitative document review involves immersion, exploration, contextual understanding, and emergent insights into social meanings, relationships, and activities” (Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, & Schneider, 2008, p. 134). Such an “understanding a subject matter is consistent with what is meant by ethnography” (p. 134) to explore the inter-organizational relationships (Altheide et al., 2008; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Emerson et al., 1995). “A document may be defined as the symbolic representation that can be recorded and retrieved for description and analysis” (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 127). Many documents are physical such as books, papers, and records. In the 21st Century, some sources of information often take the medium of a virtual presence, or electronic media, that may have previously been a printed document. Electronically created texts and scanned documents may take the form of a portable document file (PDF). Sometimes these documents may never have been printed, but are documents nonetheless (Maxwell & Miller, 2008).

“Mute evidence...[such as] written texts and artifacts...unlike the spoken word, endures physically and thus can be separated across space and time from its author, producer, or user” (Hodder, 2000, p. 703). However, “language is never treated as a neutral, transparent, means of communication” (Rapley, 2007, p. 2). In document review, it is important to not only focus on content, but also to examine how and why the documentation examined came into existence and for what use or purpose (Prior, 2008). “Indeed once a text or document is sent out into the world, there is simply no predicting how it is going to circulate and how it is going to function in specific social and cultural contexts” (Prior, 2008, p. 117). Documents may be viewed as objects or sometimes they take on a life of their own and become an actor in today’s society (Prior, 2008). Documents may “influence episodes of interaction” (Prior, 2008, p. 125). Such consideration is important as we study the dynamic relationship between a university and corporations in inter-organizational behavior. Texts “seek to enroll us into a specific way of knowing, acting, being in, and understanding the world” (Rapley, 2007, p. 123).

Altheide et al. (2008) indicated,

Document analysis becomes ethnographic when the researcher immerses himself or herself in the materials and asks key questions about the organization, production, relationships, and consequences of the content, including how it reflects communication formats grounded in media logic. The focus initially is on exploration, reading, looking, reflecting, and taking notes before more systematic and focused observations are undertaken. (p. 135)

There are three broad categories of documents: records, personal representation, and third-party discussion (Hodder, 2000). Records “attest to some formal transaction” (Hodder, 2000, p. 703). In this study, *personal* documents were organizational representations. A third type of documents included to explore the university-corporation

relationship were third-party sources such as other organizations, magazines, and newspapers. Documents were collected from the university, the university's foundation, the corporations, and public sources. To create an audit trail, documents and audio-visual materials were carefully organized and labeled; this is called *pagination* (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These labels appear in findings as the credited sources for quotations, summaries, and conclusions found. Documents were carefully reviewed according to the matrices in Appendices E and F.

Form 990s and audited financial statements are legally required records that illustrated the behavior of an organization. Examples of organizational documents included annual reports, press releases, and marketing materials, which contextually highlighted what was most important to the university and each respective corporation. Such emphasis included humanitarian and altruistic behavior (i.e., philanthropy); high ROI such as yielded research, students available for hire, promotion of products and services, or corporate recognition (i.e., cause-related branding); engagement of programs with corporate volunteers and their families (i.e., operational culture); and/or consideration of the environment along with programming and profitability (i.e., DNA citizenship ethos). Finally, third-party documents such as reviews of the university or corporations by outside organizations, magazine and newspaper articles, and scholarly publications were reviewed relevant to the inter-organizational relationships. Altheide et al. (2008) claimed,

Documents emerge and change and in the process become more apparent and relevant to social science research as data. Documents are more stable, more reflective of social organizations, activities, meanings, and social rules than most other forms of data. ...Many relevant social activities, identities, meanings, and relationships 'exist' in documents. (p. 132)

“Social research must accommodate emergent meanings and activities that often accompany technological changes, which help create new documents and social relationships” (Altheide et al., 2008, p. 131). As technology and communication have progressed, so has the complexity of recording technologies for both documents and audio-visual accessibility (Altheide et al., 2008). However, “Mixing media in data records is still undeveloped” (Dicks & Mason, 2008, p. 571).

Audio-visual Analysis

Traditionally, audio-visual materials included “photographs, compact disks, and videotapes” (Creswell, 2007, p. 129). Sometimes data exists only visually today and not in a printable form. Audio-visual representations, called multimedia, may be found on the Internet, called *cyberspace*. Information viewed on a computer screen is considered *hypermedia* (Dicks & Mason, 2008). “Hypermedia is clickable multimedia” that “may be made up of a diversity of sounds and images alongside writing” (Dicks & Mason, 2008, p. 572). Online hypermedia information is found at organizational websites and may take the form of a hyperlink to on-screen content, a visual text, a hyperlink to another virtual site, photographs, music, slide presentations, video, or database (Altheide et al., 2008; Dicks & Mason, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Prior, 2008). For example, previously printed or electronic annual reports may be virtual documents, called hyper text mark-up language (HTML), or multimedia—hypermedia—presentations online today (Dicks & Mason, 2008). Websites allow corporations, universities, and other organizations to communicate a variety of information (Robbins & Stylianou, 2003). “Corporate websites have become important mechanisms for communicating the economic, environmental, and social goals of the corporation, for mobilizing stakeholder support, and for enhancing reputation of

the firm” (Paul, 2008, p. 64). Such corporate websites contain “annual reports, press releases, mission statements, consumer information, advertisements, and other elements” (Paul, 2008, p. 65). It is noted, however, that such online resources are dynamic; “the webpage cited today may be gone tomorrow or the content changed so radically as to be unrecognizable” (Merriam, 2009, p. 159). Altheide et al. (2008) contend that cyberspace is “symbolic communication” and therefore “ethnography...oriented toward description and clarification of perspective and meaning” (p. 135). Additionally, Dicks and Mason (2008) agreed that the environment of hypermedia created a trail of information that is ethnographic to express culture and societal relationships.

Interview Transcript Analysis

Interview protocols were followed and implemented including recording face-to-face interviews on a digital recorder and an iPhone app, *VoiceRecorder*^{HD}. After completing all face-to-face interviews, they were transcribed verbatim. To categorize the data, the researcher utilized an open coding system to determine the major themes (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Emerson et al., 1995; Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Seidman, 1991; Stake 1995). To begin the coding process, the researcher reviewed individual interviews and identified key words or phrases that emerged from the interview transcripts. Next key words or phrases were clustered according to their meaning to develop patterns, themes, and commonalities as well as distinct differences in the sub units (Mertens, 2005). Themes were organized and charted by corporation. The researcher collected any significant content and statements and then compared them to the conceptual framework. Using inductive data analysis the researcher built patterns and themes from the bottom up by organizing the data into abstract pieces (Creswell, 2007;

Emerson et al., 1995; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009; Stake, 1995). Next an interpretation was made of what was understood to be significant and central to the research questions by examining the patterns of statements (Patton, 2002; Wolcott, 1994). The researcher provided a textual description of the emerging themes as he used these perceptions to discover how each representative experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Emerson et al., 1995; Patton, 2002; Wolcott, 1994). This process led to the findings of primary themes central to the relationship of the corporations to the university. Interview transcripts with both corporate and higher education leaders allowed the researcher to see what patterns emerged to understand corporate motives and ROI expectations and engagement for giving as well as any ethical issues that arose.

Observation Field Data Analysis

Physical artifacts served as the final source of data to explore the inter-organizational relationship between the six corporations and the university (Yin, 2009). Similar to mute evidence in documents, artifacts from the university campus visit yielded “intended and unintended residues of human activity” (Hodder, 2000, p. 705). Such “material traces of behavior give an important and different insight” (Hodder, 2000, p. 705). Seeing what organizations did may or may not be congruent with what the organizations claim they intended to do. “The study of material culture is thus of importance for qualitative researchers who wish to explore multiple and conflicting voices, differing, and interacting interpretations” (Hodder, 2000, p. 705). Often “material culture is designed specifically to be communicative and representational” (Hodder,

2000, p. 706). “Material evidence” of organizational culture “endures, it can be reobserved, reanalyzed, and reinterpreted” (Hodder, 2000, p. 712).

Computer-assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)

Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) refers to any “computer software that can assist in the use of qualitative data analysis” (Bryman, 2004, p. 417). Such software programs “enable the researcher to store, categorize, retrieve, and compare data” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 110). “CAQDAS, unlike the human mind, can maintain and permit you to organize evolving and potentially complex coding systems into such formats as hierarchies and networks for “at a glance” user reference (Saldaña, 2009, p. 24). CAQDAS allows words or passages to be coded under multiple categories for co-occurrence coding (Maxwell, 2013; Saldaña, 2009). “There is no industry leader among the different [qualitative software] programs” (Bryman, p. 417).

Dedoose (2013) software for Macintosh was selected as the CAQDAS and used as “a qualitative computer program to facilitate the process of storing, analyzing, and sorting the data” (Creswell, 2008, p. 247). The software served as an efficient way to manage the data “to enable human analytic reflection” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 22). “Analysis goes much better when you can see organized, compressed information in one place rather than in page after page of unreduced text” (Weitzman & Miles, 1995, p. 14). The researcher coded and analyzed the data, though, not the CAQDAS program (Creswell, 2008; Saldaña, 2009). “Computers are absolutely incapable of comprehending meaning of words or sentences” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 276).

The *Dedoose* (2013) software was especially helpful to collate and summarize information to answer the research questions, and to provide filtering and sorting to allow

for cross-unit analysis of the six corporations (Dickinson, 2010; Miles et al., 2013; Morris, Fitz-Gibbon, & Freeman, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Weitzman & Miles, 1995). The CAQDAS permitted “the researcher to shift quickly back and forth between multiple analytic tasks, such as coding, analytic memo writing, and exploring patterns in progress” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 26). Flexibility in electronic data management provided the “ability to recode, uncode, rename, delete, move, merge, group, and assign different codes to shorter and longer passages of text with a few mouse clicks and keystrokes” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 26).

The software also efficiently tracked rich, thick description to provide key narrative for discussion (Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002). Using the software program provided the efficiency of analyzing multiple forms of data as seen in condensed form, which supported triangulation of the data sources (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Janesick, 2000; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Mertens, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009; Stake, 1995; Weitzman & Miles, 1995; Yin, 2009).

Data Visualization

While narrative is the primary medium for sharing qualitative data, various forms of data visualization are also used to guide and to assist readers in understanding key ideas and data. “Researchers seek ways to summarize and display their data and findings such that they maximize communication of their findings” (Ramlo, 2011, p. 101). Data visualization illustrates findings and themes and may be used to enhance narrative in qualitative studies (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Dickinson, 2010; Joyce, Neill, Watson, &

Fisher, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Morris et al., 1987; Ramlo, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Weitzman & Miles, 1995).

Examples of data visualization include figures, tables, and word clouds (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006; Creswell, 2008; Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003; Lozovsky, 2008; McNaught & Lam, 2010; Miles et al., 2013; Morris et al., 1987; Nichol & Pexman, 2010; Ramlo, 2011; Spradley, 1980; Steinbock, 2013). “Tables and figures...convey major data summaries” to assist readers in understanding themes and concepts (Morris et al., 1987, p. 46). Visuals such as word clouds aim at “getting closer to some of the themes in the content” (Viégas & Wattenberg, 2008, p. 51). “Visual presentation is especially important because patterns are more easily discerned and themes magnified” (Ramlo, 2011, p. 102).

“When reporting the findings of qualitative research studies, it is typically very important to display data” (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006, p. 1). Visual representations aim to enhance the clarity of research findings and assist readers digest large amounts of data in summary form (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Dickinson, 2010; Friedman, 2008; Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003; Ramlo, 2011). The use of “data visualization creates images—images whose content transcends the spoken word. For the viewer, this unspoken message can be more potent than spoken or written communication. Visual language is therefore an effective vehicle of both context and content” (Dickinson, 2010, p. 472). Data visualization may be used to organize ideas, to illuminate concepts, to show relationships between ideas or themes, or to highlight contrasts and comparisons of data (Dickinson, 2010; Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003; Miles et al., 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Weitzman & Miles, 1995).

Careful attention was given to craft appropriate data visualization for this study. “The point is to find design strategies that reveal detail and complexity” (Tufte, 1990, p. 53). “Effective layering of information is often difficult” (Tufte, 1990, p. 53). Visualization includes “image[s] constructed to convey information about data” (Keller & Keller, 1993, p. 222). “To convey ideas effectively, both aesthetic form and functionality need to go hand in hand, providing insights into a rather sparse and complex data set by communicating its key-aspects in a more intuitive way” (Friedman, 2008, p. 1). Both structural cues and stylistic cues assist readers with data (Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003). Structural cues “help readers to identify boundaries and hierarchical relationships” while stylistic cues “attend to pragmatic matters of credibility, emphasis, and tone” (Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003, p. 100). *Credibility* is achieved through “familiar type style...economizing space and ink to achieve objectivity and precision...and including contextual elements readers can relate to” (Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003, p. 101). Likewise, *emphasis* directs “the reader’s attention to selected pieces of information,” and *tone* projects “a serious, authoritative voice” (Kostelnick & Hassett, 2003, p. 101).

One of the most common methods of data visualization is tables (Lozovsky, 2008; Morris et al., 1987; Nicol & Pexman, 2010). Aside from quantitative data summaries, “the table is an important medium...for summarizing large amounts of textual information” (Nicol & Pexman, 2010, p. 3). “Tables, with their columns and rows of information, interact primarily with our verbal system” (Lozovsky, 2008, p. 1). The use of tables therefore highlights key data from narrative from both interviews and document and audio-visual materials. Nicol and Pexman indicated,

Tables can be used to (a) summarize the important elements for the reader,
(b) provide a quick and easy means of communicating information,

(c) identify what is important (as presented and interpreted by the author), (d) present trends, and (e) provide other researchers with data that can be used for subsequent analysis. (p. 3)

Additionally, “tables...are visual representations...used to organize information to show patterns and relationships” (Joyce et al., 2008, p. 1). Tables in Chapter Four help compare and contrast higher education versus corporate perspectives as well as comparing and contrasting information among the six corporate participants.

Additionally, word clouds are used in Chapter Four to illustrate data. “Pictorial representation of data can organize and summarize research data in a way that tabular versions of the same data cannot” (Ramlo, 2011, p. 99). *Word clouds* help create a visualization to represent text data (Dickinson, 2010; McNaught & Lam, 2010; Ramlo, 2011; Steinbock, 2013; Viégas & Wattenberg, 2008). The software *TagCrowd* was used to create word clouds for findings in Chapter Four (Steinbock, 2013). “A word cloud is a special visualization of text in which the more frequently used words are effectively highlighted by occupying more prominence in the representation” (McNaught & Lam, 2010, p. 630). Using word clouds helps to “provide a point of entry into a complex” topic and helps the reader to quickly glean key contents (Viégas & Wattenberg, 2008, p. 52). Generating the word clouds revealed theme findings, which supported triangulation of the data sources (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Janesick, 2000; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Mertens, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009; Stake, 1995; Weitzman & Miles, 1995; Yin, 2009).

Word clouds illustrate “word frequency in a text passage” (Viégas & Wattenberg, 2008, p. 51). LeCompte & Schensul (1999) indicated that frequency is one method of pattern development for themes to emerge. Ramlo (2011) explained,

In a typical text analysis, words of interest are placed in a rectangular form. The font size and color [i.e., value] of the words that are placed into the word cloud to represent frequency and usefulness, respectively. ...The more prominent (larger the size) the word is in the word cloud, the more frequently it appeared in the text provided. (p. 103)

Word clouds help “viewers to have an overview of the main topics and the main themes” from texts (McNaught & Lam, 2010, p. 630). Additionally, word clouds serve as “a validation tool to further confirm findings and interpretations of findings. The word clouds thus provide an additional support for other analytic tools” (McNaught & Lam, 2010, p. 631). Using word clouds from multiple sources of data such as interviews and document and audio-visual materials allow for “comparison of word clouds generated from different texts [that] should quickly reveal the differences between the ideas contained in these texts” (McNaught & Lam, 2010, pp. 630-631).

Note, however, that multiple representations of data such as narrative, tables, figures, and word clouds are complementary and work together to highlight findings and themes. Tables, for instance, “only provide part of a story” (Joyce et al., 2008, p. 2). Likewise, “word clouds have certain limitations, and we need to be well aware of them” (McNaught & Lam, 2010, p. 641). Word clouds denote “frequency” not “context” of words from data (McNaught & Lam, 2010, p. 641).

Aside from narrative, figures, tables, and word clouds are used in Chapter Four to illustrate and summarize key data, findings, themes, and information of interest to compare and contrast. Narrative provides the rich description found in data analysis that

developed into findings and themes (Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002). Key descriptive information is provided in tables for readers to understand organizational participants. “Tables allow complex data to be expressed in a tidy format” (Nicol & Pexman, 2010, p. 4). Additionally, “a good table presents findings in a manner that makes it easy to read and easy to identify trends” (Nicol & Pexman, 2010, p. 6). Finally, word clouds in Chapter Four were generated separately from document and audio-visual data as well as interview data divided into sub-groups of higher education and corporate.

The 12,906 pages of document and audio-visual materials were coded and condensed to a 70-page transcript. The transcript was uploaded into the TagCrowd generator yielding a word cloud. One word cloud included only content concepts to have a context of important themes highlighted. Another word cloud included content concepts and organization identifiers to compare and contrast how significant the participant organizations were found. The number of pages from interviews was too large to be uploaded into the word cloud generator, so the interviews were divided into two sub-groups of higher education and corporate interviews with removal of researcher questions or discussion text. Word clouds were generated to show only content concepts to have a context of important themes highlighted by each group. Other word clouds included content concepts and organization identifiers to compare and contrast how significant the participant organizations were found. The document and audio-visual word clouds included researcher categorization and more context-driven illustrations from the condensation of the data into the 70-page transcript. The interviews, however, were generated mainly from word counting, or enumeration, and not influenced by researcher contextualization. The various word clouds from interviews of higher education and

corporate participants allow for cross-unit analysis to compare and contrast content among contrasting viewpoints as well as among the six corporate participants to understand the significance of individual corporations' visibility and engagement with the University.

***Overarching Themes: Data Analysis
and Placement of Corporations on Cone's Spectrum***

Reading all data resulted in "notes" and "ideas about categories and relationships in the data" (Maxwell & Miller, 2008, p. 465). Next, similarity and contiguity of data was established (Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994). "Similarity and contiguity refer to two fundamentally different kinds of relationships between things, neither of which can be assimilated to the other" (Maxwell & Miller, 2008, p. 462). Similarity analysis involved categorization of data through identification of similarities and differences. Contiguity, on the other hand, involved "juxtaposition in time and space" where "relations" and "connections" were identified and established (Maxwell & Miller, p. 462).

From all data sources collectively, similarity was established through key-words-in-context lists as well as word counts, or enumeration, from coding and categorization to establish a baseline of theme development (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell & Miller, 2008; Merriam, 2009; Miles et al., 2013; Prior, 2008; Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Also from all data sources collectively, contiguity was established for each organization's behavior through "seeing actual connections between things" (Maxwell & Miller, 2008, p. 462). Such overarching analysis of data created a holistic organizational behavior pattern for the university and each of the corporations (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). Theme development from coding, textural and structural relationship

components, descriptions, and cross-unit analysis were yielded from data analysis of documents, audio-visual materials, interviews, and observation field notes (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Creswell, 2007, 2008; Emerson et al., 1995; Merriam, 1998, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013; Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Wolcott, 1994). Themes often are illustrated through direct quotes that exemplify “concepts” and “theories” (Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

Ultimately, the themes from data analysis helped to assign each company’s corporate citizenship behavior onto Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum (see Figure 8) as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos. The culmination of all the companies’ placements illustrated if corporations’ engagement with the University.

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)

Figure 8. Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum gave visual representation to the range of purposes and motives as corporate citizens and was used to delineate the various relationships corporations have with the non-profit world, including higher education. Parenthetical interpretations added by researcher for reader simplicity.

Six corporations’ behavior allowed for cross-unit analysis to discover similarities or disparities in reasoning and motivation for engaging with the university. Consistencies allowed for organizational behavior identification to be made (Mertens, 2005). The final interpretive phase allowed meaning to develop in this organizational analysis and the inter-organizational relationship between this university and these six corporations. The

six corporations were assigned onto Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, which provided a continuum of four categories identifying key corporate citizenship functions based on motivations and ROI expectations, including philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos.

Role of the Researcher

“Qualitative design requires the researcher to become the research instrument. This means the researcher must have the ability to observe behavior and must sharpen the skills necessary for observation and face-to-face interview” (Janesick, 2000, p. 386). For this ethnographic, instrumental case study, the researcher was an *observer-as-participant*. “In this role, the researcher is mainly an interviewer. There is some observation but very little of it involves any participation” (Bryman, 2004, p. 301).

Such qualitative design also required “description of the researcher's own biases and ideological preference” (Janesick, p. 386). As with any study, there was potential for researcher bias that may have influenced data collection, analysis, findings, or conclusions; thus it was critical for the researcher to acknowledge bias to increase confirmability (Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013). In this study, both the researcher and participants were involved in the higher education process of corporate relationships, so brought an “experiential knowledge” view supporting such activity (Creswell, 2008, p. 44). Additionally, the researcher maintained key elements while conducting ethnographic research that Rosen (1991) indicated were important: working knowledge of topics being researched, trust by participants to maintain organizational secrecy, and clarity of role and action. Such experiential and working knowledge aided in the process to identify information to look for rather than being eliminated. To minimize impact of

bias, it was important to identify and manage thought processes, viewpoints, and conclusions (Mertens, 2005; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009).

The researcher brought several ideological views and experiential knowledge to the study having worked in fundraising at a major public university, three private liberal arts colleges, and a global nonprofit with 200 of the *Fortune 500* companies as sponsors. The researcher was intimately knowledgeable about higher education fundraising and has attained and maintained the CFRE credential since 1997, recognizing his success in higher education fundraising, public relations, and marketing. The researcher was also recognized in 2002 as the Outstanding Fundraising Professional in the West Virginia Chapter of AFP. The researcher was pro-fundraising, which had potential to influence the data analysis. The researcher has been engaged in AFP since 1993.

To safeguard researcher bias, a careful bird's-eye stance was taken to maintain a systematic, focused objective approach to data collection, interviews, and data analyses (Erickson, 2011). "An empathetic stance in interviewing seeks vicarious understanding without judgment (neutrality) by showing openness, sensitivity, respect, awareness, and responsiveness; in observation it means being fully present (mindfulness)" (Patton, 2002, p. 40). The goal of objectivity was to have "good, solid, craftsmanlike research, producing knowledge that has been systematically cross-checked and verified" (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, p. 242). The researcher is "absent from analysis" (Rosen, 1991, p. 18).

Trustworthiness

In the constructivist paradigm, researchers desire trustworthiness, credibility, and confirmability to substantiate findings (Bryman, 2004; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Miles et al., 2013). Using multiple methods and multiple data sources to address the research

questions provided trustworthiness and dependability (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell, 2013; Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013). Triangulating data is important so that interpretation and conclusions were confirmable (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Mertens, 2005; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Stake, 2005; Wolcott, 1994). Confirmability means that qualitative data and the interpretation of what it represents were real (Mertens, 2005).

Triangulation is analytic induction using different independent sources and research methods to show agreement or repeated verification in findings (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Bryman, 2004; Janesick, 2000; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). “Triangulation can be understood most broadly as drawing on different kinds of sources or analytic tools in trying to understand a phenomenon” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009, p. 60). Miles and Huberman summarized,

The aim is to pick triangulation sources that have different biases, different strengths, so they can compliment each other.... In effect, triangulation is a way to get to the finding in the first place—by seeing or hearing multiple *instances* of it from different *sources* by using different *methods*.... (p. 267)

This study included multiple types of data including document review, audio-visual materials, interviews, and observation field notes for triangulation (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). These multiple sources aided in convergence and corroboration of data (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). Triangulation also included “cross-checking information and conclusions through the use

of multiple procedures” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 276) including: creating an audit trail, member checking, participant feedback, peer coding, and peer review (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009).

An *audit trail* was created for all documents, audio-visual materials, campus observation photographs, and field notes from observation by labeling materials; this process is called *pagination* (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These labels are used to credit sources in the findings and discussion. *Member checking* was utilized for each interviewee to review his or her interview transcription for accuracy and clarity as well as confirmation of comfort to include all information provided (Janesick, 2000; Merriam, 2009; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). Participant feedback included “discussion of the researcher’s interpretations and conclusions with the actual participants...for verification and insight” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 276). Two colleagues were recruited to review and code data to identify themes (See Appendices U and V). This process is called *peer coding* and provided *intercoder reliability* for the researcher (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Finally, peer review included “discussion with a disinterested peer” who could “be skeptical and play the devil’s advocate, challenging the researcher to provide solid evidence for any interpretations or conclusions” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 276). Three external peer reviewers were recruited with different professional and academic backgrounds to review and critique this dissertation. Each signed a consent agreement. (See Appendix W).

Higher education institutions typically raised money faithfully and were required

to report both financial information and non-profit reports, so the information was organized consistently by those legal, reporting, and auditing standards. It was important to note that the survey data on the VSE surveys was self-reported by each participating institution; Mertens (2005) cautioned that the credibility of self-reported data is always of concern. Since CAE has consistently gathered the VSE data annually since 1957, the process was likely credible and was reinforced by the required governmental accounting document mentioned earlier, called *Form 990s*. Additionally, many fundraising, nonprofit, and governmental agencies used the VSE statistical reports as a benchmark or reference point, such as *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, and *The Non-Profit Times*, as well as many organizations, such as the AFP, CASE, and the National Philanthropic Trust. This information helped to inform administrators, trustees, state systems of higher education, the press, and those who craft public policy. While accuracy was likely reported in the VSE, the data reflected dynamic information representing complex factors at each reporting institution: the importance and effort placed on fundraising, economic climate, and availability of philanthropic dollars. In this study, this quantitative data was used for descriptive analysis in the university participant selection.

The case study method provided thick description of data needed to understand the relationship between the six corporations and the higher education institution specifically in the context of their placement on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. While this instrumental case study provided for only one higher education institution and six corporations, it is likely transferable to general behavior of corporate

motives and ROI expectations in supporting higher education (Creswell, 2007, 2008; Merriam, 1998; Miles et al., 2013; Stake, 2005). This transferability indicated the degree of similarity between the study and the larger context of such other similar inter-organizational relationships (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Bryman, 2004; Flyvberg, 2011; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009).

For this study, the information provided by the higher education institution and the six corporations was confirmed from their behavior as illustrated in document and audio-visual analysis and from field notes yielded from interview observation. Additionally, the interviews of leaders provided original data sourcing. It was noted, however, that all participants were intimately involved in the relationship process and not independent external auditors or observers. Merriam (1998) encouraged acknowledging the researcher and participants' roles for bias transparency and clarity of the process.

Summary

Corporations and higher education have relied on each other for mutual benefit, yet varying views have existed on the purpose(s), merit(s), reality, and consequence(s) that exist in the relationship between corporate America and higher education. This organizational analysis case study discussed the exchange between one higher education institution and six U.S. corporations to focus on understanding motivations, expected ROI, and ethical concerns of their inter-organizational relationships. Multiple methods and multiple data sources were used to address the research questions. Such methods included multiple types of document review, audio-visual materials, interviews, and observation field notes. Through triangulation, the researcher confirmed the data that

emerged from the interviews, observations, and document and audio-visual analyses.

While “...existing research offers some guidance for practitioners, the implications are limited by the failure to ground the research in theoretical or conceptual frameworks” (Drezner, 2011, p. 2). This study explored Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, which added to the body of knowledge as a conceptual framework. The spectrum provided a continuum of four categories identifying key corporate citizenship functions based on motivations and ROI expectations, including philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos. Each of the six corporations in this study was placed on the spectrum based on their reasons for engagement with the higher education institution.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

“Do what you can, with what you have, where you are.”

~ Theodore Roosevelt (Middleton, 2008, p. 413)

Introduction

This organizational analysis allowed the researcher “to look for relationships regarding the structure, occurrence, and distribution of events over time” (Janesick, 2000, p. 387). A single-embedded case study format of one university and six corporate participants allowed for consideration of each organization’s perspective in the engaged inter-organizational relationships, which included intended behaviors and actual behaviors as well as “other contexts, such as economic, political, legal, and aesthetic” (Stake, 2005, p. 447). The ethnographic study illustrated complexities that likely included many factors contributing to the dynamics and situations within inter-organizational relationships.

The inter-organizational relationships between an American higher education institution and six U.S. corporations were viewed and analyzed to uncover and describe “beliefs, values, and attitudes that structure behavior” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). The sociocultural analysis of this unit created the ethnographic viewpoint; “the cultural context is what sets this type of study apart from other types of qualitative research” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). Creswell (2007), Emerson et al. (1995), and Tedlock (2000) detailed the focus of an ethnographic case study to describe and interpret a culture-sharing group. In this study, that culture or environment is that of the inter-organizational relationships. Corporate engagement with higher education is unique from alumni,

foundations, and other organizations. Corporations and higher education rely on each other in inter-organizational relationships for mutual benefit (Brennan, 2000; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Gould, 2003; Liebman, 1984).

Documents and audio-visual materials were reviewed for the framed time period of 2006 to 2010 as well as more recent materials as available. Face-to-face interviews allowed for inquiry as to the motives and ROI expectations for the University to engage with each of the six corporations. Finally, the campus observation provided forensic evidence of the manifestation of corporate presence on the University's campus.

Chapter Four explains the recruitment of the participant University and the six corporate participants as well as describing organizational participants' settings. This chapter describes the data collection and management process, the analysis of the data, and the findings of the research questions. Chapter Four also plots the six corporations on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum and analysis across embedded units. Finally, Chapter Four highlights serendipitous findings.

Organizational Participant Recruitment

All organizational participants in this dissertation research opted for confidentiality. The following sections explain the organizational participant recruitment process and descriptive essence of the institutions, however, the researcher could not use organizational participants' names, geographical locations, institutional history or age, specific identifications, nor any information that may hint at organizational or individual participants' names or identities. With that limitation in mind, information gleaned from the research data and text from a relevant literature review were used in order to shape an image of each participant organization, their scope, and their settings.

University Participant Recruitment

The first step in the data collection process was to recruit a university participant. Utilizing the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) annual survey data (see Appendix D), the goal was to contact each of the 33 eligible universities on the purposeful sample list from the 5-year composite corporate data for 2006-2010. Initial brainstorming was conducted to determine known individuals in the researcher's network to become a *champion* inside any of the institutions to navigate organizational commitment (Bryman, 2004; Saul, 2011; Yin, 2009). A dozen contacts were made by telephone and email. The individuals were unable to determine the appropriate person, or *decision-maker*, to assist in committing any of the universities to the study (Moeran, 2009).

The next action was to send formal printed proposals on high-quality stationery in catalog envelopes mailed first class to the president of each of the of 33 universities including a cover letter explaining the project, a proposal outlining the research project, and the researcher's vita. The universities were given 3 weeks to respond. Four presidents wrote to indicate that a chancellor was head of a local university in a state system, so those inquiry packets were redirected. Initially, eight universities responded by the deadline with negative responses. On the day of the deadline, the researcher began calling each president's office to track down the proposal and its status in their system. Twelve presidents' assistants indicated the information was under review by the president or senior management, four indicated that the request had been sent to the head of academics, and eight said someone in fundraising was reviewing the project proposal. One university was unreachable after multiple calls.

During the following month, the researcher had conference calls with various

university leaders in more than a dozen of the eligible participant universities to explain the project and answer any questions; the goal was to build a relationship to recruit a university participant. Thirty of the universities ultimately responded in some way: three said *yes*, 27 said *no*, one was unreachable and never responded in any way, and two never gave a final answer. The first to say *yes* was formally committed to the project. The other two positive response universities became back-up options if there were difficulties with the first university committing or in the event of participant withdrawal, and both other universities are interested in post-doc research on the topic. Half of those universities initially responding ‘no’ expressed curiosity as to where the project will lead and want to watch the research topic of inter-organizational relationships between American higher education and U.S. corporations unfold to potentially participate in future research.

A major issue was experienced in recruiting a university participant. The researcher discussed the issue with academic colleagues and learned that *organizational resistance* was a theory as to the perceived lack of an organization (e.g., a university or a corporation) agreeing to participate in a study (C. Loes, personal communication, February 7, 2012; B. Opall, personal communication, February 6, 2012). Additionally, spontaneous responses from universities seemed flippant. Responses received differed based on who the individual was who created the communication. Other organizations having protocols in place provided planned canned responses or required review time. For instance, the initial ‘rejection’ responses to not participate in this study came quickly and felt pre-planned. A few responses were spontaneous ‘no’s’ through telephone follow-up from initial non-respondents. Those taking time to understand the scope and importance of the project injected time as an element of potential organizational

resistance. A variety of reasons were given for universities to not want to participate in dissertation research. Examples of reasons included: no time, lack of staff availability, timing of other priorities, and policies about third-party activities.

University Participant and Setting

The participant University in this dissertation research opted to remain confidential and unnamed in the study. Because a specific university is indicated, the remaining dissertation will reference the participant University as *the University*. In order to describe the essence of the University, data elements and relevant text from a literature review have been used and are cited appropriately to help picture the scale, scope, and complexities of the University. From the higher education institution selection process using the VSE data, all 33 eligible university participants were classified as Carnegie doctoral/research universities. Therefore, the University is a doctoral/research university.

Universities are of a special type of educational institution. The following description by Rhodes (2001) characterizes a general definition of a university and exemplifies the University participant in this dissertation:

The university is the most significant creation of the second millennium. From modest beginnings over nine hundred years ago, it has become the quiet but decisive catalyst in modern society, the factor essential to its effective functioning and well-being. The university promotes neither political action nor government policy, but it provides the knowledge and data on which both are developed. It manufactures no products, but it creates the science and technology on which those products depend. It produces no mass circulation newspapers, magazines, or television programs, but it trains their publishers, writers, and producers. It informs public understanding, cultivates public taste, and contributes to the nation's well-being as it nurtures and trains each new generation of architects, artists, authors, business leaders, engineers, farmers, lawyers, physicians, poets, scientists, social workers, and teachers—as well as a steady succession of advocates, dreamers, doers, dropouts, parents, politicians, preachers, prophets, social reformers, visionaries, and volunteers—who leaven, nudge, and shape the course of public life. (p. xi)

“The American research university is a significant departure from training centers for the religious and civil elite” at the beginning of the United States (DAV-40). Rhodes claimed,

There is nothing that can be identified as ‘The American University.’ Nevertheless, most people think of the American university as a substantial institution, with an established campus, a large enrollment, a significant residential component, a comprehensive scope, graduate programs, professional schools, and a commitment both to undergraduate education and significant research. (p. 19)

The University in this study maintains all of those attributes.

The University is a large, public research university with multiple campuses and “world-class” facilities (DAV-1, DAV-13; DAV-20; DAV-24; DAV-94). As a “top tier” university of the “150 public and private research universities” in the United States, this University is “one of the top-rated institutions in the country” (CFAI-1; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-24; DAV-26; DAV-47; DAV-273). Additionally, the University is one of the most “well-established and influential universities in the world” (DAV-17). The University is a “leader in research” and “sustainability” (DAV-22; DAV-23). Educational units at the University includes more than a dozen colleges and schools across a range of programs and centers in many “disciplines” including law, health sciences, business, education, liberal arts, and social sciences as well as the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) (DAV-1; DAV-16; DAV-21; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-115; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-271). The University is concerned with both humanities and professional studies—“the disciplines of which universities are made” (DAV-271). As a mission-driven organization, the University strives for “academic excellence” and supports “research” (DAV-14; DAV-23; DAV-48; DAV-421).

The University is particularly keen on providing “access” to a high-quality educational experience to a wide range of diverse students (DAV-1; DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-22; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-41). Programs at the University serve a “broad demographic” (DAV-15). The educational environment provides for success both “academic and personal” as well as “collaborative” (DAV-13; DAV-20). The University has renowned, “top-notch,” “outstanding,” “highly credentialed” faculty and leadership as well as some of the United States’ brightest and “stellar” students; both have received “prestigious national and international honors” (DAV-13; DAV-15; DAV-19; DAV-22; DAV-24; DAV-89; DAV-96; DAV-273). Examples include “National Merit Scholars,” and “National Achievement Scholars,” as well as “CASE” achievements, “Fulbright Scholars,” and “Nobel Prize” faculty (CFAI-1; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-37; DAV-40; DAV-44; DAV-47; DAV-110; DAV-113; DAV-129; DAV-130). Many faculty have received competitive funding and/or national organization awards in their respective disciplines (DAV-21). Faculty have a “commitment to teaching” (DAV-23).

The University is “widely recognized” nationally and internationally for its successful track record academically by a host of sources such as *Forbes*, *Fortune*, *Newsweek*, *Princeton Review*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *The Economist*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Time*, *U.S. News & World Report*, *USA Today*, and several other publications (DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-26; DAV-35; DAV-42; DAV-94; DAV-103; DAV-113; DAV-117; DAV-129; DAV-130). Student retention is high, which adds to the depth of students’ experiences (DAV-19; DAV-24; DAV-115). “Multicultural” demographics add to the “culture and experiences

[to] enrich the university” (DAV-20). The University also has outstanding athletics programs and has won national titles in many sports (DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-26; DAV-129; DAV-130). Leaders at the University are concerned with providing superior “facilities” (e.g., “classrooms,” “laboratories,” “libraries”) and educational resources for its students and faculty as well as support for “research infrastructure” (DAV-13; DAV-21; DAV-24; DAV-35).

An “institutional culture” promotes strong teaching and learning for applicable, “real-world” issues (DAV-19; DAV-24). The University’s goal is to provide a “highly skilled” and “educated” workforce to society (DAV-20; DAV-22; DAV-100). Graduates’ education is “immediately relevant to the modern corporate landscape” (DAV-21).

While emphasizing quality educational opportunities and citizenship aligned with the University’s core values, the University measures its success by student achievement, faculty research and scholarship, alumni accomplishments, and contributions to society (DAV-1). The University is a “public asset” and serves “many constituencies” (DAV-13). The University believes it has a “responsibility to serve all citizens” and “be a resource” (DAV-21). Additionally, the University strives for “excellence” in its “impact” and “engagement” of its students, service to the community and state, and to the contributions to the world (DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-41; DAV-48; DAV-89). To those ends, the University is “committed” (DAV-21).

University Foundation and Participant Setting

The University’s foundation also opted to remain confidential and unnamed in the study. Because a specific university is indicated, the remaining dissertation will reference the University’s as *the University foundation*. In order to describe the essence of the

University's foundation, data elements were used and are cited appropriately to help picture the scale, scope, and complexities of the University's foundation.

The University foundation exists to “support” and “advance” the “activities of” the University (DAV-21; DAV-24; DAV-68; DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88; DAV-89; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-271). As a “501(c)(3)” entity, the University foundation is “an organization operated for the “benefit” of the “University” and is a “public charity,” “nonprofit corporation,” or “non-profit,” according to the IRS (DAV-39; DAV-81; DAV-83; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-88; DAV-89; DAV-121; DAV-129; DAV-130). The University foundation focuses on “philanthropic investment” to support a vast array of student needs, research, and other needs through “contributions, gifts, and grants” (DAV-21; DAV-24; DAV-50; DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83). The leadership and board of the University foundation provides “fundraising” and “investment and asset management” to support the University through “perpetual and annual gifts” (DAV-87; DAV-88). The fundraisers of the University foundation secures “private gifts from individuals, corporations, and foundations” that are “compatible with the mission of the University” (DAV-68).

The University foundation provides “advocacy” for the University and offers a comprehensive resource development program in annual giving, scholarships, major gifts, planned gifts, corporate and foundation relations, parents and alumni contributions, donations by other individuals and organizations, and investment in capital campaigns and endowments (DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-39; DAV-87). “Philanthropy is a tradition of giving and sharing” (DAV-24). The University foundation receives, receipts, administers,

and applies funds “for the benefit” of the University (DAV-79; DAV-80). The fundraising staff and management of the University foundation actively identifies and secures “new partners” to assist the University in “attaining” its goals (DAV-87). Aside from operational expenses, funds from the University foundation were transferred annually to the University for “education, research, public service, or other activities” to “provide” for “programs, activities, students, and faculty” (DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-87). Accordingly, the University has expended resources on “academics,” “athletics,” “faculty,” “instruction,” “research,” “student services,” “operation,” “construction,” “library books,” and “scholarships and fellowships,” (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-20; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-47; DAV-95).

University Participant Recruitment of Six Corporate Participants

As part of the University and University foundation’s agreement to participate in the study, they were responsible to help recruit corporate participants. Such insider advocacy through established relationships was vital to gaining access to key corporate decision makers to commit to the study. Foundation research staff prepared a list of 20 medium and 13 *Fortune 500* companies to approach. The University foundation corporate relations officer networked with unit development staff in the University’s schools and colleges to identify a handful of potential small companies for the study. An executive summary, researcher vita, and introductory email were used for the University foundation corporate relations officer to introduce the project to potential participant corporations. The first two medium companies approached agreed quickly after introductory emails and a brief researcher presentation. Four introductions and follow-up

presentations to small companies were made before two agreed to participate. Six *Fortune 500* companies were approached to participate before two said ‘yes’ after review of the research requirements and consent agreement, several planning phone calls, and internal management and legal approvals. The six corporations signed consent agreements and desired confidentiality, so they are unnamed in this study. All companies were helpful in assisting the researcher in gathering needed documents or audio-visual materials and in coordinating interviews with corporate executives and key management.

Corporate Participant Recruitment

Because the University and its related foundation opted to remain confidential and unnamed in the study, the corporate participants also opted to remain confidential and unnamed. To describe the essence of the six corporations, data elements and relevant text from a literature review were used and are cited appropriately regarding the scale, scope, and complexities of each of the six participant corporations. Each corporation will be identified by size and labeled A or B and referenced from this point forward as: *Small Company A*, *Small Company B*, *Medium Company A*, *Medium Company B*, *Fortune 500 Company A*, and *Fortune 500 Company B*.

Using only U.S. companies allowed the study to concentrate on a discrete corporate population. Businesses in the U.S. are classified on a number of factors including type of legal registration, gross annual revenues, number of employees, and industry classifications (Carty & Blank, 2003; Ringleb et al., 1997; U.S. Census, 2008; U.S. Small Business Administration, 2011). Currently there are more than six million companies operating in the United States (Clifton, 2011). However, there are three types of categories considered in this study for participants of U.S. corporations: small,

medium, and large (i.e., *Fortune 500*) (Levy, 2001).

The six corporations involved in the study represented a variety of industries and ranged in age from less than a decade old to more than a century. All companies operate in multiple states, and some operate in multiple countries. Some companies are family-owned; some, privately held; and some, publicly traded. Four of the companies have corporate foundations. All six corporations have been actively engaged with the University in varying capacities for the framed time period of 2006-2010.

Background on Types of Corporations

Fortune 500 companies are the largest U.S. companies and listed annually “from the latest reported financial data as of January 31 through the efforts of teams of reporters, accountants and analysts gathering data, organizing and analyzing the information, and then releasing a list in April” (Carty & Blank, 2003, ¶ 5) in *Fortune Magazine*. Carty and Blank (2003) defined the *Fortune 500 Index* as:

The list consists of the 500 largest domestic U.S. companies [publicly held] ranked by total operating revenues, as reported in their latest fiscal year, including revenues from discontinued operations. ... Components for the *Fortune 500* are ... based on four eligibility criteria: 1) A stock must be publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange or the NASDAQ National Market. 2) It must have a minimum average daily trading volume of 100,000 shares during the 25 consecutive trading days preceding initial inclusion. 3) It must have a minimum reported price equal to or in excess of \$5 per share during that period. 4) The company must have a minimum market capitalization equal to or in excess of \$100-million during that period. The criteria used in compiling the *Fortune 500* are rigorously followed by the Fortune Index Committee, resulting in the index being objectively derived and completely transparent with respect to its constituents. (¶ 5-11)

Medium and small companies vary in size and may be publicly or closely/private held (Cheeseman, 2012). Closely/publicly held companies have shareholders. Privately held corporations are owned by only a few shareholders, such as a

specific family, an extended family, or friends. Classification as medium or small is determined by both the number of employees and annual corporate revenues (Burlingame & Frishkoff, 1996; Levy, 2001). Medium companies typically have 101-500 employees although some have more in a few industries where revenue constitutes classification as medium. Medium companies typically have between \$10- and \$100-million in revenues. Small companies typically have fewer than 100 employees and gross under \$10-million in revenue (Levy, 2001). Some industry definitions record employee numbers as high as 1,500 but are typically under \$7-million annually in revenue (U.S. Small Business Administration, 2011).

Since the 1930s businesses in the United States were classified under the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system, which was most recently revised in 1987 and allows for 1,004 industry codes. The SIC had been criticized as lacking modern codification in industries such as technology, so the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) was devised in 1997 with 1,170 industry code categories (Boeninger, 2010; U.S. Department of Labor, 2012). NAICS codes are six digits providing thousands of specific business types. For the purposes of this study, the 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index (CSRI) with only 20 industry codes is more simplistic than the SIC or NAICS and further provides confidentiality to participant companies. Additionally the CSRI industry codes provide framing of companies specifically for corporate citizenship. The CSRI key industry classifications in the United States include: airlines and aerospace, automotive, beverage, computers, consumer products, electrical and electronics, energy, financial—banking, financial—diversified, financial—insurance, food manufacturing, industrial products, information and media,

pharmaceuticals, retail—food, retail—general, services, telecommunications, transport and logistics, and utilities (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010).

Table 1 exhibits classification of the six participant corporations.

Table 1

Classification of Corporate Participants

	Industry (Based on CSRI Codes)	Ownership
Small Company A	Computers Electrical and electronics	Privately held
Small Company B	Services Transport and logistics	Privately held Limited Liability Company
Medium Company A	Services	Closely held Family-owned business
Medium Company B	Utilities	Publicly traded
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company A	Industrial products	Publicly traded
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company B	Consumer products	Publicly traded

Note. Exhibited are the six corporate participants' industry classifications based on The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index and type of corporate ownership interest.

Small Company A

Small Company A identified as both categories of “electrical and electronics” and “computers” within the CSRI. Small Company A is a “privately held” corporation that is “independently” owned (DAV-141; DAV-142). The Company has a multi-state presence (DAV-138). This Company works on a variety of technological systems, devices, and

protocols for both “government and commercial sectors” (DAV-138; DAV-143; DAV-144; DAV-145; DAV-146). Small Company A does not have a corporate foundation and has no University alumni ties. Table 2 illustrates corporate participants’ alumni connectivity with the University and number of foundations.

Table 2

Corporate Participants’ Alumni Connections and Existence of Corporate Foundation(s)

	Alumni Connections	Corporate Foundation(s)
Small Company A	None	None
Small Company B	None	None
Medium Company A	Some including executives and management	Two
Medium Company B	Several	One
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company A	Active group of University alumni engaged in various projects; includes some executives and management	Several
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company B	Active group of University alumni engaged in various projects	Three

Note. Exhibited are the six corporate participants’ level of alumni connectivity with the University and number of corporate foundations.

Small Company B

Small Company B identified as both categories of “services” and “transport and

logistics” in the CSRI. Small Company B is a privately owned LLC and operates in multiple states (CSBI-1; CSBI-2; DAV-170). Small Company B provides a variety of “technology” services, communications, and logistics for a variety of companies (DAV-148; DAV-149; DAV-169; DAV-170). The Company’s goal is “to work together” with customers “to develop relationships to promote success” (DAV-172).

The leadership of the Company is well respected and has received accolades and awards for ethics, excellent customer service, leadership, and superior sustainability practices (DAV-149; DAV-150; DAV-168; DAV-173; DAV-181; DAV-228). Small Company B does not have a corporate foundation and has no University alumni ties. Small Company B is a local company but has provided services regionally, statewide, and nationally (CSBI-1; CSBI-2).

Medium Company A

Medium Company A identified as a “services” company within the CSRI. This corporation is in the industrial goods and services industry and is a closely held, “family-owned company” that is part of a group of companies (CMAI-1; DAV-157). Examples of services include trades such as masonry, steel work, and glazier (DAV-153; DAV-160). Original “family” descendents are still involved with each of the companies along “with local shareholders” (DAV-153; DAV-157). The company operates on “Christian principles and family values” (DAV-153). A main business philosophy is to “build strong, long-lasting relationships” with clients (DAV-160).

Concerning “the environment,” Medium Company A emphasizes an “obligation to be good stewards” of “precious resources” (DAV-164). The company has received “awards” for “excellence” (DAV-270). This company operates in several states (DAV-

157). Medium Company A has two corporate foundations (DAV-157; DAV-182; DAV-183; DAV-184; DAV-185; DAV-186; DAV-187; DAV-188; DAV-189; DAV-190; DAV-191; DAV-192; DAV-193; DAV-194; DAV-195; DAV-196; DAV-197; DAV-236; DAV-237; DAV-238; DAV-239). Additionally, two affiliated divisions of Medium Company A operate family foundations (DAV-240; DAV-241). Medium Company A has a few executives and management as well as employees who are alumni of the University (DAV-157).

Medium Company B

Medium Company B identified as “utilities” in the CSRI. This mature, publicly-traded company provides a range of “energy” products and services in a multi-state region (DAV-178; DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-209; DAV-212; DAV-220; DAV-226; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-231; DAV-248; DAV-303; DAV-305; DAV-314). This industry is highly “regulated” and monitored (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-209; DAV-220; DAV-226). The company emphasizes “customer value,” “dedication to shareholders,” “growth,” “improving” communities, and minimizing “impact on the environment” (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-207; DAV-226).

Medium Company B has received numerous awards and high rankings for customer satisfaction, “leadership,” “environmental” efficiency, “sustainability,” “community” commitment, and “social performance” (DAV-204; DAV-207; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-305; DAV-307; DAV-308; DAV-311; DAV-313). Likewise, the company serves as “a strong community partner” (DAV-225). The company highly values employees’ efforts (DAV-205; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-

226; DAV-228). This stellar corporation’s “company, communities, customers, regulators, and shareholders exist symbiotically” (DAV-207). The company “has built strong relationships with diverse businesses” (DAV-208). Medium Company B has a corporate foundation (DAV-201; DAV-198; DAV-199; DAV-200; DAV-201; DAV-202; DAV-203; DAV-205; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230). Several Medium Company B employees are University alumni.

Fortune 500 Company A

Fortune 500 Company A identified as “industrial products” under the CSRI. This multinational, publicly-traded company operates in many states and many countries (DAV-260; DAV-326; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-337; DAV-339; DAV-377; DAV-485; DAV-486). The division participating in this study began as an American corporation and was acquired as a subsidiary division of a corporation in another country through various mergers and acquisitions during several decades of growth (DAV-326; DAV-374; DAV-375).

The corporation manages a diverse “portfolio” of “products and services” including communications, “telecommunications,” “energy,” “engineering,” “health,” “financial services,” “technology,” “manufacturing,” logistics, and a myriad of other areas (DAV-251; DAV-326; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-337). *Fortune 500* Company A focuses on “long-term” products and services creating “sustainability” and “value” for “stakeholders” (DAV-252; DAV-255; DAV-258; DAV-261; DAV-262; DAV-264; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-338). These determinations emphasize a “culture” of stewardship

behavior for the company (DAV-252; DAV-268; DAV-327; DAV-329; DAV-332).

Fortune 500 Company A provides “value” to “shareholders” (DAV-251). One report provided illustration of the company’s focus on people (DAV-339). The company has also received awards and high rankings for “sustainability,” “environmental” advocacy, “compliance,” and “risk management” (DAV-327; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339). The company praises “employees” for on-going success (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334).

The company claims it is “a good corporate citizen” (DAV-331). *Fortune 500* Company A has several corporate foundations (DAV-DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-321; DAV-322; DAV-323; DAV-324; DAV-325; DAV-326; DAV-336; DAV-339; DAV-343; DAV-344; DAV-350; DAV-351; DAV-366; DAV-367; DAV-368; DAV-369; DAV-370). *Fortune 500* Company A has an active group of University alumni engaged in various projects. *Fortune 500 Company A* has some executives, key employees, and recruiters who are alumni of the University (DAV-326).

Fortune 500 Company B

Fortune 500 Company B identified as “consumer products” in the CSRI. This multinational, publicly-traded company operates in a few states and several countries (DAV-385; DAV-397; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-448). The division participating in this study began as an American corporation and was acquired as a subsidiary division of a family-based corporation in another country during the past decade (DAV-384; DAV-386; DAV-387; DAV-397; DAV-405; DAV-409; DAV-411; DAV-447; DAV-449; DAV-451). The corporation produces a wide range of “products” and “technologies”

(DAV-385; DAV-387; DAV-389; DAV-397; DAV-398; DAV-400; DAV-437; DAV-448). The company has received a variety of “awards” and excellent “rankings” from numerous third parties for sustainability, financial performance, innovation, ethics, human resources practices, and employee training (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-432; DAV-435; DAV-437; DAV-439; DAV-440; DAV-441; DAV-447; DAV-448; DAV-453; DAV-454; DAV-455; DAV-456; DAV-457; DAV-459; DAV-460; DAV-461; DAV-462; DAV-463; DAV-464; DAV-465; DAV-466; DAV-467; DAV-468; DAV-473; DAV-474; DAV-475; DAV-476; DAV-477; DAV-479; DAV-481; DAV-482).

Fortune 500 Company B is committed to maximizing “shareholder” profits while balancing the other triple bottom line factors of the “environment” and “society” for the “long-term” success of the company (DAV-387; DAV-389; DAV-392; DAV-394; DAV-398; DAV-400; DAV-437; DAV-442). *Fortune 500* Company B is a leader in “sustainability” and “corporate citizenship” (DAV-384; DAV-389; DAV-398; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-403; DAV-412; DAV-417; DAV-425; DAV-435; DAV-437; DAV-438; DAV-440; DAV-441; DAV-442; DAV-448; DAV-450; DAV-471; DAV-478). The company believes strongly in “employees” contributions to corporate success including “teamwork” (DAV-387; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402). *Fortune 500* Company B has three foundations (DAV-394; DAV-395; DAV-397; DAV-398; DAV-401; DAV-438; DAV-441). *Fortune 500* Company B has an active group of University alumni engaged in various projects.

Data Collection

Evidence for the research included information from the University, the

University foundation, six companies and their affiliated corporate foundations, and third-party sources. Three types of data explored were interview transcripts, document and audio-visual materials, and a campus observation. A data accounting log was created to track “when and what types of data have been collected from specific participants and sites” (Miles et al., 2013, p. 122). In a process called *pagination* (Miles & Huberman, 1994), all materials were labeled to be referenced as needed in Chapter Four: Data Collection, Analysis, and Presentation of Findings and in Chapter Five: Discussion. This organization of data facilitates tracing for potential audit and adds to trustworthiness (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002; Seidman, 1991; Stake, 1995).

Data Management and Coding

When possible, materials collected were maintained both electronically and in hard copy. Confidential materials in electronic files were password protected. Additionally, identification of specific entities was hidden in spreadsheet columns and password protected to safeguard confidentiality. Sensitive printed materials were kept in locked cabinets in a locked office.

Document and Audio-visual Collection

To address the three research questions, the researcher began by collecting and reviewing documents and audio-visual materials. To perform, organizations have had to create infrastructures for planning, implementation, and record keeping to summarize their inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact (Katz & Kahn, 2005; Rossi, et al., 2004). Such record keeping included documents and audio-visual materials. Documents are “written to do something” (Hodder, 2000, p. 704). Records “attest to some formal

transaction” (Hodder, 2000, p. 703). Examples of records are financial and accounting documents, filed tax or reporting forms, and legal documents. Organizations prepared other types of documents and audio-visual marketing materials, annual reports, management notes to financial statements, and press releases to convey information about who they are and their intended organizational contributions to society. Such materials may attract students or funding partners, provide stewardship to alumni and donors such as corporations, or provide the public with transparency and accountability.

Today documents and audio-visual materials take on many forms, including traditional printed documents and 21st Century electronic representation of documents as audio-visual texts and videos on websites or as a portable document files (PDFs) or hypertext markup (HTML) files. Miller (1997) indicated,

Texts...are made up of written words, numbers and visual images that objectify the events, objects or issues that they purport to represent. The words, numbers and images ‘freeze’ the ongoing events of life, making it possible for us to return to them from time to time in order to ‘verify’ our remembrances of, and others’ claims about, them. When we treat them in these ways, we transform institutional texts into authoritative and decontextualized institutional realities to which we and/or others might be held accountable. (p. 78)

Merriam (2009) noted that online documents and artifacts must be captured and logged for future reference. Such materials “may be gone tomorrow or the content changed...radically... its stability can no longer be taken for granted” (Merriam, 2009, p. 159). Additionally, “version control...emerges as a critical issue for anyone using the Internet as a reference or a source” (Merriam, 2009, p. 160). For this study documents and audio-visual materials were combined because many traditional documents take the form of “soft copy” in today’s technological world as PDFs or as HTML on websites.

Documents and audio-visual materials for this study were retrieved both manually

and electronically. When possible, both electronic and hard copies were maintained. Materials were labeled DAV-# for cataloging and audit purposes. A total of 486 documents and audio-visual materials were catalogued, reviewed, and coded with their findings summarized.

Interviews

Interview protocols were developed to be consistent with interactions of interviewees. Protocols were followed, and the researcher conducted a total of 36 in-person interviews providing 17.8 hours of recording, which yielded 649 pages of transcripts. Because of the complexities of scheduling busy executives, the interviews took place over 7 months in seven cities in three states; the researcher traveled 18,000 miles. During the process, the researcher “follow[ed] new leads during fieldwork, taking advantage of the [emergent and opportunistic interviewees who were] unexpected” (Patton, 2002, p. 244). Advantages of in-person interviewing included high relating with contextual awareness, more thoughtful self-generated answers, higher interaction of participants with the researcher, undivided attention, and more effectiveness in discussing complex or sensitive issues (Shuy, 2001).

Thirty-two of the 36 face-to-face interview participants included seven senior University executives—including the University president, six University foundation executives and managers, four University foundation board members who are current or retired corporate executives, and 15 corporate executives. Additionally four informational interviews were conducted with University foundation executives and directors. The four informational interviews with University foundation employees were “informal conversational interview[s]” that emerged (Patton, 2002, p. 349). “The informal

conversational interview is the most open-ended approach...[which] offers maximum flexibility to pursue information in whatever direction appears to be appropriate” (Patton, 2002, p. 342). Patton indicated that this interview style specifically deals with the ethnographic perspective to understand the cultural environment and values. One 25-year administrative director discussed ethical obligations and processes, including policies, accounting and finance practices, compliance with state and federal accounting, reporting, and transparency guidelines. The director of donor relations discussed the history of naming and recognition opportunities at the University, including corporations and assisted with information and logistics for the campus observation. A third informational interview assisted with recruiting the four University foundation board of directors and trustee interview participants. The final informational interview was a discussion of the corporate giving culture at the University and included a 3-hour campus tour that would typically be given to prospective corporate executives or to major donors.

After interview transcripts were transcribed, the researcher proofed them against recordings for accuracy. The researcher also distilled the transcripts to ensure confidentiality of participant organizations and individuals. Each interviewee was emailed a PDF of the distilled transcript for member checking (See Appendix T). Line numbers were included for interviewees to reference if needed. Interviewees were permitted to omit or to edit text because of concerns for clarity or confidentiality. The member checking process took about 6 weeks.

University Campus Observation

The University maintains several campuses, which were visited by the researcher. For the purpose of this study’s campus field observation, though, the researcher focused

time to forensically search for corporate presence or artifacts on the University's main campus. To become generally familiar with the main University campus, the researcher participated in two guided tours: a 2-hour admissions tour, guided by a student for new families and a 3-hour major donor tour, guided by a development officer. The researcher then spent 2 days visiting 80% of the main campus buildings where corporate artifacts would potentially be found. The researcher photographed all named spaces such as buildings, administrative spaces, laboratories, classrooms, plaques, statues, and advertisements. Campus observation yielded 407 photographs, which were catalogued by building name in a spreadsheet. Images were stored by building name references in individual electronic folders.

“Ethnographers have to take notes based on their observations” (Bryman, 2004, p. 306). Notation was made regarding photographs, plaques, statues, donor recognition walls, marketing promotions such as billboards and display cases, equipment and books, and any other places where corporate names or logos may have been found. A campus observation matrix form was completed for each building to recall important information and to compare with photographs later.

Data Analysis

Patton (2002) indicated that “qualitative analysis transforms data into findings” (p. 432). A qualitative study provided for five key advantages: the understanding of meaning, the learning of a particular context between American higher education and U.S. corporate interactions, identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences, discovering the process of an organizational analysis of inter-institutional relationships, and developing relational explanations (Maxwell, 2013). Yin's (2009) five types of data

analysis included: pattern matching, explanation building, time-series analysis, logic models, and cross-unit analysis of embedded units. This study allowed for patterns to emerge to identify behavior related to Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum, explanation building regarding each organization's planned and actual behavior, logic models relating to complex "chain[s] of events over an extended period of time" (Yin, p. 149) that is another form of pattern creation, and analysis across the embedded units of the six corporations' behavior.

The goal of data analysis was to answer the three research questions used to explore the inter-organizational relationships:

1. Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?
2. Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?
3. What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationship between corporations and a higher education institution?

Based upon the data analysis, the final goal was to place each corporation on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

Document and audio-visual materials plus interview transcripts were coded based upon Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum (See Figure 9). Each category was subdivided into *a priori* codes. Aside from the four categories and related sub-categories of philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos,

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
P1 Classical (Direct cash or matching gifts)	C1 Cause-related branding: Direct cash or cause with purpose(s)	O1 Organizational culture: care about people (includes diversity)	D1 Corporate social responsibility (i.e., ethics, human rights, financial accountability, consumer product liability, profitability, environment)
P2 Corporate Foundations	C2 Partnerships/ collaborations (includes student projects)	O2 Stakeholder Management: manage primary and secondary stakeholders	D2 Corporate citizenship
P3 Strategic Philanthropy	C3 Sponsorships and grants	O3 Social responsibility (includes giving resources; In-kind if tied to social responsibility; discounting or free services to low-income or unemployed)	D3 Leadership and management modeling
P4 The New Philanthropy	C4 Sponsored research, intellectual property, Technology transfer	O4 Employee volunteerism	D4 Employee engagement (more than volunteerism; includes employees in the decision-making process)
P5 In-kind (Altruistic)	C5 Other: economic development, entrepreneurship, recruitment, executive training, exit strategies for products, affinity programs		D5 Environmentalism
P7 Endowment	C7 Vendor relationship		D7 Sustainability, long-term commitments
	C8 Networking		D8 Triple Bottom Line (people, profit, planet)
	C9 Cheap/free student labor		D9 Corporate governance
			D10 Stakeholder engagement

Figure 9. A priori codes used for coding in data analysis.

additional codes that emerged included ethics, economics impact from 2006-2010 (i.e., good, worse, same), culture, fundraising techniques, government, alumni connections, non-alumni connections, issues, and other (e.g., interesting topics not fitting into any other category). “Coding is analysis” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56). First-order and second-order analysis were required to condense materials to develop patterns and themes (Creswell, 2007, 2008; Miles et al., 2013). “Layering themes builds on the idea of major and minor themes but organizes the themes into layers” (Creswell, 2008, p. 259). “Aggregating information into large clusters of ideas and providing details that support themes” create findings to address the research questions (Creswell, 2007, p. 244).

Document and Audio-visual Materials

The 486 documents and audio-visual materials, totaling 12,906 pages, were initially hand coded and condensed to a 70-page transcript. Of the 486 documents and audio-visual materials, 185 documents and audio-visual materials totaling 4,545 pages and images, as well as dozens of videos relating to the University and University foundation, were analyzed. From the 486 documents and audio-visual materials, 301 documents and audio-visual materials totaling 8,361 pages and images relating to the six participating corporations and respective foundations were analyzed to develop themes.

Both Small Company A and B as well as Medium Company A have limited document and audio-visual materials available because they are privately held corporations and are not required to release financial information; they also have public pressure to publish annual reports. These companies also have limited website information. Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B have much more

information available in print and electronically because of the legal reporting requirements by the IRS and SEC.

After hand coding the 12,906 printed pages of document and audio-visual materials or notes from reviewing videos, data condensation of the materials was typed into a 70-page transcript. The transcript was imported into *Dedoose* (2013) to code electronically. The condensed coding was then used to analyze the data in a similar format with the coded interview transcripts to support or to contrast patterns and themes. These process steps helped to support data trustworthiness (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Mertens, 2005; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995).

Interview Transcripts

A transcriptionist was recruited to transcribe interviews and agreed to confidentiality (See Appendices R and S). The 649 pages of interview transcripts were proofed by the researcher for accuracy and distilled to remove organizational, individual, and geographic references to protect agreed-upon confidentiality of individual participants and participating organizations. After member checking, interview transcripts were imported into *Dedoose* (2013) for coding and analysis. The coded transcripts were then used to analyze the data to determine patterns leading to themes to answer the research questions. Additionally, information was then analyzed across the embedded units among the six companies, according to Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum.

This preliminary information was in a similar format and able to be compared with the coded condensed transcript from document and audio-visual analysis to corroborate patterns and themes. Two peer coders were recruited and signed confidentiality agreements (See Appendices U and V). The two peer coders

independently analyzed the interview transcripts; one reviewed higher education participant transcripts and the other one reviewed corporate participant transcripts. Each peer coder developed themes independently to answer the research questions. Peer coders and the researcher then discussed themes and findings for corroboration. This corroboration adds credibility supports data triangulation (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Janesick, 2000; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; Maxwell, 2013; Mertens, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009; Stake, 1995; Weitzman & Miles, 1995; Yin, 2009).

Campus Observation

While searching for corporate presence, it was noted that many facilities or objects were funded and/or named for previous presidents, deans, alumni, or faculty and many of their spouses as well as organizations and foundations in addition to corporations. Many facilities, laboratories, or resources were unnamed. A total of 407 photographs were taken on the University's main campus and analyzed. Names of corporations appeared 215 times while non-corporations' names appeared 1,357 times for a total of 1,572 recognitions observed. Corporate presence totaled only 14% of all identified named spaces or objects observed as illustrated in Table 3.

Named buildings. Four of the buildings were named for corporations (CO-20-5; CO-35-5; CO-36-5; CO-37-5) Fifty-seven buildings were named honorifically for former University presidents, administrators, or famous leaders or were funded and named for alumni. Two facilities planned for the future will likely be named for corporations. Some facilities named for alumni earned their wherewithal in corporate America; however, the companies did not receive naming rights because the money was given by the alumni.

Table 3

Campus Observation Summary

	Corporate	Non-Corporate
Named Buildings	5	57
Named Rooms	6	52
Named Laboratories	6	7
Photos	1	26
Plaques	2	452
Statues	0	5
Donor Walls	91	754
Marketing and Promotions	49	0
Logos in Academic Areas	9	0
Equipment or Books	0	1
Other	46	3
TOTALS	215	1,357

Note. Corporate and non-corporate named spaces and objects were observed through 407 photographs taken on the main campus of the University. The marketing and promotions category included advertisements in athletic complexes and vendors anywhere on campus. Of those named items found, only 14% had corporate names or logos.

All buildings did include the contractors' and/or construction laboratories) were named for corporations (CO-1-14). The remaining seven were named for alumni or other leaders. The researcher observed no corporate logos relating to laboratory facilities.

Photos. Only one photo illustrated a corporation (CO-35-17). The remaining 26

companies' names on the buildings' founders' plaques. The observation data included only one instance of a corporation's logo relating to the naming of buildings.

Named rooms. Six rooms (e.g., foyers, conference rooms, meeting spaces) were named for corporations (CO-1-11; CO-6-9; CO-31-9; CO-35-9; CO-42-9). The remaining 52 named rooms honor alumni or other leaders. The researcher observed no visual display of corporate logos relating to the naming of rooms.

Named laboratories. Six laboratories (e.g., studios, classrooms, scientific illustrated University administrators, alumni, coaches, friends, or other leaders. The researcher observed no corporate logos in photos.

Plaques. Thirty-one plaques illustrated names of corporations (CO-20-20; CO-35-20). The other 452 were named for University administrators, alumni, coaches, friends, or other leaders. The researcher observed no corporate logos relating to the naming of plaques.

Statues. No statues were named for a corporation. Five statues were commemorative of University administrators, alumni, coaches, or friends. The researcher observed no corporate logos relating to the statues.

Donor walls. Corporations' names or logos appeared 91 times on donor walls or sidewalks highlighting financial support to the University (CO-19-26; CO-20-26; CO-29-26; CO-34-26; CO-AM-38; DAV-235). The remaining 754 names observed were for alumni or friends. A dozen corporate logos were found in one donor recognition area. A brochure regarding the "commemorative" area included allowance for "corporate logo" usage (DAV-235). It was noted by University staff that several existing facilities have donor walls planned but not installed. Additionally, new construction projects have donor

walls planned to be installed in the future.

Marketing and promotions. Forty-nine observations of corporations' names were found in marketing and promotions in campus facilities such as display cases or on program-related posters (CO-14-29; CO-37-29; CO-40-29). The majority of the corporate names were from sponsorships of athletics. A few other corporate names were from sponsorships of academic programs. Logos were found for all 49 companies in the observation. The researcher observed that no individuals' names were associated with marketing and promotions.

Logos. As noted in each previously observed campus building, space, or artifacts, some corporate logos were found—mainly in athletics or sponsored academic programs (CO-G-33; CO-O-33; CO-AF-33; CO-AL-33; CO-AO-33). Routine business logos were also found on the University campus on vending machines, ATMs, restaurants, and industrial products (e.g., cleaning agents) (CO-21-39; CO-38-39). The University and University foundation policy is: “donor recognition signage may not contain corporate logos” (DAV-61).

Equipment or books. No equipment or books were identified as named for a corporation. The one object observed was named for an alumna. The researcher found no corporate logos relating to equipment or books.

Other. Forty-six other corporate names or logos were found in the observation not relating to buildings, classrooms, laboratories, photos, plaques, statues, donor walls, marketing and promotions, or athletics (CO-2-39; CO-6-39). Some objects or spaces related to company affiliation of board or committee volunteers or recognitions by business leaders (CO-6-39). Some names or logos of businesses were relating to routine

business on the University campus included vending machines, ATMs, restaurants, and industrial products (e.g., cleaning agents) (CO-21-39; CO-38-39). Three other objects observed not fitting into the above categories were commemorative of individuals.

The University and University foundation maintain strict guidelines and policies related to naming “physical elements, programs, scholarships, fellowships, or other activities” in support of the University (DAV-61). Specifically relating to “corporate” naming, “a review” is performed to safeguard “any potential conflicts” (DAV-61).

Overall, only 14% of all named spaces or objects found in campus observation represented U.S. corporations; the remaining 86% represented non-corporate entities such as alumni, former administrators, or local leaders and politicians.

Summary of Data Analysis

A total of 486 documents and audio-visual materials totaling 12,906 pages, 36 in-person interviews yielding 649 pages of interview transcripts, and 407 photographs taken on the University’s main campus were collected and analyzed. Themes developed from data analysis were prioritized “in terms of their impact” regarding their relevance to answer the research questions (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). After interconnecting themes, findings were developed to address the research questions (Creswell, 2008).

Findings

Findings include narrative and data visualization to organize and explain salient and elusive descriptions and examples relating to themes found in data analysis (Mertens, 2005; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002). Stake (1995) defined this process as “development of issues” (p. 123). Three themes emerged regarding Research Question One, and four themes emerged regarding Research Question Two. For Research Question

Three, most interviewees could not think of any ethical concerns or provide any specific examples; only five disparate ethical examples were shared. Document and audio-visual materials confirmed why few ethical issues existed given the depth and breadth of ethical policies, expectations, and practices. Five general ethics topics were discussed, and four other themes not directly focused on the research questions emerged relating to culture, economic challenges, alumni connectivity, and geography.

***Research Question One:
Why does a higher education institution
accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?***

The University is committed to “forming partnerships” and “networks” with the business community” as a “key,” “integral component” of fulfilling the University’s mission (DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-129; DAV-130). The University has been “the recipient of extraordinary investments from...business” (DAV-20). “Large gifts have proved to be transformational for the University” (DAV-19).

The goal of engaging corporations is to develop “tailored partnerships” where corporate relations and development officers “work closely with companies to identify value-added opportunities for deep relationship” (DAV-25). “Businesses” are given “access” to the “intellectual assets” in the University that will help to benefit society as a whole (DAV-129; DAV-130). Such University-wide attention “improve[s] the quantity and quality of corporate relationships to benefit the entire University” while “building value for corporations” (DAV-25). Coordination University-wide with a single point of contact for each company helps to create “more informed corporate partnerships” (DAV-25). Engaging corporate partners begins with a “company needs assessment” then internal planning and matching of University priorities (DAV-25).

Three main themes emerged to answer Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? The three major themes included: *viable resources*, *student enrichment*, and *real-world connectivity*. Specifically, such corporate engagement and financial support emphasizes the University's "most important corporate connections" in supporting a wide range of activities and relationships such as "research," "sponsorships," "vendor relationships," and "student employment" (DAV-25; DAV-36; DAV-92; DAV-134). Other important interests included "[student] recruitment, executive education, professional training, philanthropic investments, licensing and commercialization opportunities, [and] demonstration projects" as well as "entrepreneurial" activities (DAV-24; DAV-25; DAV-30; DAV-34; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-84; DAV-89; UFI-1; UFI-8; UNI-1; UNI-3; UNI-4; UNI-5). Many of the inter-organizational relationship activities identified in data were joint ventures while others were partnerships for major initiatives or regular business-vendor and contractor relationships (DAV-13; DAV-37; DAV-41; DAV-112; UNI-2; UNI-6; UNI-7).

Theme One: Viable Resources

Today, universities face the complexity of diminished governmental and public resources continuing to create emphasis on private support for higher education, so partnering with corporations provides a range of *viable resources* to aid in delivering the University's mission. "Corporations and businesses invest generously" in the University (DAV-129; DAV-130). *Theme One: Viable Resources* highlights the significance of corporate citizenship engagement and financial support with the University, illustrates examples of corporate resource contributions, provides examples of corporate

participants' resource support to the University, and summarizes seven major areas of importance for the University to engage with corporations as sub-themes including *funding for students, endowments, sponsorships, sponsored research, in-kind gifts, building funds, and vendor relationships.*

Significance of corporate citizenship engagement and financial support. The University foundation indicated more than 14,000 “corporate donors” have engaged with and financially supported initiatives and programs of the University (DAV-91). From 2006 through 2010, 385 companies were directly named in managerial notes to financial statements, text of University or University foundation annual reports, and related marketing materials. Four companies found in document and audio-visual materials or from campus observation were among those six corporate participants in the study including both Medium Companies A and B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B (CO-31; CO-40; DAV-23; DAV-92; DAV-25; DAV-35; DAV-271).

The University and University foundation's financial statements from 2006-2010 clearly showed alignment of expenditures on major priorities such as “facility construction,” various “research” initiatives, “scholarships and fellowships,” and other “faculty resources” (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-23; DAV-24). The University emphasizes “instruction, research, and public service” (DAV-13; DAV-24) in both their goals as well as their actual behavior exhibited in financial documentation. However, corporations' contributions were not directly identified in financial statements; they were lumped into “voluntary private support from individuals, foundations, and corporations” (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18). It is also noted that “auxiliary enterprises” such as “bookstores” and “intercollegiate

athletics” provided nearly double the revenue that the “voluntary private” funding (including corporations) did (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-24). The majority of athletic revenue came from businesses (UNI-2).

One University executive indicated that the more a company is “involved, the less likely they are to pull out” (UNI-2). The University needs to be sure to engage companies on multiple levels: sponsor for a program or event, “a philanthropy piece tied into the foundation,” and a variety of engagement techniques such as “a suite in the stadium or the theatre” (UNI-2). “Everything is customized based on the company needs” (UNI-2).

One University foundation board member, who is a retired executive of a *Fortune 500* corporation, said that corporations and related corporate foundations may both work with a University. “The synergy of what is going to benefit [a company] is really a focus for their gifts” (UFI-13). Corporations and their respective corporate foundations also like

Being able to then monitor how that money is being spent. ... While their foundation can get involved, sometimes the corporation just does it on its own, and then it is even more focused on goals of the corporation. There is independence, there is a coincidental goal-setting, and usually the corporation has some not insignificant control over the foundation.
(UFI-13)

Corporations are vital to the success of the University both financially as a viable resource and through a wide range of corporate citizenship engagement (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-25; DAV-89).

Examples of corporate resource contributions. A wide range of viable corporate resource examples was found including: direct cash, philanthropic dollars, scholarships, endowments, sponsorships, sponsored research, advertising, corporate training, in-kind contributions, building funds, and vendor resources. “Strategic partnerships” with corporations is identified in that the “relationship is long-term with significant, ongoing,

financial contributions” (DAV-25). For example, several companies were mentioned as major contributors in University and University foundation publications.

One *Fortune 500* company donated \$250,000 in-kind for a “program” to “fully prepare students for success” in the company’s field (DAV-89). The company was lauded for “continued commitment to education” to provide “students with contextual learning” with state-of-the-art technology (DAV-89). Another *Fortune 500* company contributed significantly to a scientific program, and a *Fortune 500* corporate foundation funded an arts program (DAV-89). The scientific gift helps develop “new [scientific] technologies” for efficiency and environmental-friendly products, while the arts program funding assists with the University’s ability to “sustain” engagement in the community (DAV-89). One *Fortune 500* company with a “longstanding relationship” with the University established a major new program (DAV-99). These examples illustrate the capacity of financial resources as well as the long-term commitment to the success of the University by companies.

The University foundation also receives “matching gifts” from nearly 1,000 companies (DAV-70; DAV-98). Companies encourage employees to contribute to an “organization of the employee’s choice, which the company will then match in some manner” (DAV-70). Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Company A offer a matching gift program that matches employees’ gifts to worthwhile community activities including the University (CMBI-1; CMBI-2; DAV-233; DAV-371).

Examples of corporate participants’ resource support to the University. From the six corporate participants, various examples were given to illustrate the commitment to the University in a range of viable resources. For example, Medium Company A has

supported the University in “a broad landscape of things” (CMAI-1). Medium Company A’s name appeared in a “corporate partners” donor honor roll (DAV-32). Medium Company B has financially supported the University and made in-kind contributions for infrastructure, buildings, academic programs, athletics, the arts, and scholarships (DAV-201; DAV-202; DAV-203; DAV-249; DAV-250; CMB-1; CMB-2; CMB-3; CMB-4; CMB-5; UFI-1). The company has also sponsored “events” (DAV-225). Medium Company B was recognized on two donor honor rolls and was also listed as a funding partner in research (DAV-23; DAV-32; DAV-44; DAV-45, DAV-112). Medium Company B’s corporate foundation supports the University (CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-3; CMBI-4; CMBI-5; DAV-198; DAV-199; DAV-200; DAV-201; DAV-202; DAV-203).

Fortune 500 Company A supports higher education significantly including “events,” “sponsorships,” “scholarships,” “awards,” “selected education projects,” “research,” and program dollars, particularly for “STEM” (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-326; DAV-327; DAV-329; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339; DAV-343; DAV-347; DAV-366). The corporation also funds graduate student “stipends” and program “grants” (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; DAV-334). *Fortune 500* Company B and its foundations provide resources for “scholarships,” “research,” “teaching,” “university faculties,” STEM programming, “awards,” and “grants” (CFBI-1; CFBI-2; DAV-394; DAV-403; DAV-410; DAV-437; DAV-458). Overall, the company contributes multiple millions of dollars annually (CFBI-1; DAV-412). The corporation has funded several projects at the University (DAV-397; DAV-421). No foundations from *Fortune 500* Company A or B support the University.

Viable resources is the first theme of three themes found to answer Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? Viable resources included seven sub-themes of importance for the University to engage with corporations. The seven sub-themes include *funding for students, endowments, sponsorships, sponsored research, in-kind gifts, building funds, and vendor relationships*. The sub-themes are ordered based on importance of appearance from data analysis of interviews and document and audio-visual materials. Examples of corporate participants' involvement in sub-themes are included as appropriate.

Funding for students. Experiences for students take on many forms on a university campus both inside and outside the classroom as well as on-campus and off-campus. For example, technology companies may provide access to hardware or software for student use, and students become competent and confident with the technology and desire to recommend it in future situations (UFI-5). Student clubs and organizations “do approach companies” for their events and activities, both academic and co-curricular (UFI-10). Funding for students is dynamic and changes year-to-year based on needs and requests.

Endowments. A variety of endowments are established to fund University opportunities including scholarships, chairs, professorships, programs, physical plant maintenance, and new initiatives. For instance, Medium Company B provides money for “a number of endowed scholarships” (CMBI-1). A University foundation executive also indicated that Medium Company B has “endowed chairs and professorships” as well (UFI-1). As the University grows, it continues expanding resources, so companies often

“build on that endowment” (UFI-1). Endowments are indicative of a long-term relationship and perspective; one executive said, “There’s so many chairs endowed from what we’ve done in the past that our history with [the University] won’t end” (CMBI-3).

Sponsorships. Sponsorships are opportunities for companies to contribute to the financial and conceptual endorsement of an organization, program, or cause (UFI-1; UNI-2; UNI-3; UNI-6). “Everything is customized based on the company needs,” said one University executive (UNI-2). In higher education, sponsorships may include a naming opportunity or more extensive benefits such as logo promotion, exclusive networking opportunities with other companies or potential clients, brand or product promotions, or special access to events (CAIS-1; CSBI-1; CSBI-2; UFI-1; UFI-5; UNI-2; UNI-6). One University foundation board member indicated that there is a “rapid evolution of how corporate America looks at education,” and the University is reflecting how it “thinks about corporate sponsorships” (UFI-11). Good relationships with sponsors also leads to referrals with other businesses to become sponsors, which in turn helps the University even more (UNI-2; UNI-6). Sponsorships tend to be one of the highly visible types of evidence of corporations.

Sponsored research. A significant funding for the University is sponsored research. The University is committed to “a culture” of sponsored research, which is “knowledge transfer” through “research,” “innovation,” “technology transfer,” and “commercialization,” that “fosters” the “development of products and services” to better the world (DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-96; DAV-97; DAV-100; DAV-134; UNI-4). Ideally, the University “aligns connections with leading corporations to areas of [the University’s] research and expertise” (DAV-21). One University vice president said that

research is one of “the most obvious and long-standing ways” the University receives funding from corporations” (UNI-1). The vice president elaborated, as “a large public research institution, you can imagine that the range of opportunities for corporate engagement on the research agenda is clearly mutually beneficial for the industry as well as for the institution” (UNI-1).

“These partnerships range from large to small, short-term to long-term, and local to national to international” (DAV-21). Companies sponsor “research projects” with potential co-ownership of “intellectual property” or invention “patents” between the company and the University’s students and/or faculty (DAV-24; DAV-27; DAV-28; UFI-12; UNI-1; UNI-3; UNI-4). Small Company A, Medium Company B, *Fortune 500* Company A, and *Fortune 500* Company B all work with the University in various capacities and disciplines for research (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; CFBI-1; CFBI-2; CMAI-1; CMAI-2; CMBI-5; CSAI-1; DAV-389; DAV-437; DAV-441; DAV-484; UFI-10; UNI-4). Universities are often required to have corporate matching money for research activities in state or federal grants (CSAI-1; UNI-4). The University “leverages those dollars from corporate partners” to grow their “research endeavors and programs” (UNI-4).

In-kind gifts. In-kind gifts are non-cash support provided by some corporations such as services (e.g., printing, accounting, legal, technology), loaned staff or executives for special purposes, facility usage, equipment, or goods and products. For example, the president of Small Company A said they have “donated in-kind services” (CMAI-1). “We’ve done a lot of in-kind work” explained a vice president from Medium Company A (CMAI-1). Medium Company A contributed “well over \$1.5 million” of in-kind labor

and supplies to refurbish an area of campus (UFI-1). *Fortune 500* Company A donated a major software application in-kind for students in science and technology fields (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; UFI-1; UFI-5). The specific software is used to train students on a particular platform; after graduation those trained students will likely recommend that specific software when they go to work for a company (UFI-1; CFAI-1). Companies will often use their internal resources to design or print materials related to a University event and donate them in-kind (CMBI-1; UFI-5; UNI-6).

Building funds. Companies continue to be “interested” in contributing to building funds to provide the most current facilities and laboratories to support higher education (UFI-10). For example, one industry, including Medium Company A, “mobilized a fund-raising effort” achieving more than \$4-million to help support a major University “academic facility” and specific “program” (DAV-89). This example is cited as “how industry can make a difference in education” (DAV-89). Coordinators of the effort noted “the need for well-educated [industry] managers to lead and direct [that field]” is important because they will “meet the needs” of their industry “in the future” (DAV-89). Providing significant building funds were required to maintain and grow a quality program. Another discipline also had corporations contributing “million” dollar gifts that “have been instrumental in helping us to leverage...six-figure gifts from some of the other companies,” explained one development officer (UFI-10). Medium Company A has also provided funding for building restoration and several structures at the University (CMAI-1; UFI-1; UNI-1).

Vendor relationships. The University is “proactive” to develop on-going relationships with vendors to engage them in a variety of ways to support the University

and are usually rooted to their discipline or industry interests (UFI-1). Small Company B's vice president indicated that the University is "big, and they have a lot of businesses" in their vendor network engaging with the University (CSBI-2). Small Company B provided services to the University and liked several programs; the company was also recognized as an outstanding small business. This vendor relationship expanded into an engaged and contributing business to the University. Similar inter-organizational relationships have been developed with other companies. Our company "has been lucky enough to do a fair amount of work for the University," said Medium Company A's vice president. "We helped [to introduce] other vendors to provide resources to enhance" projects we have funded (CMAI-1).

A University foundation vice president said, "[Medium Company B] invited us to understand how they did business" (UFI-8). The University "took an interest in what they were doing" and realized the company was "a pretty innovative company" (UFI-8). It made it easy for the University foundation vice president to say, "The next time we're building something, it would be good if [Medium Company B] were on a short list of people to be considered" (UFI-8). The vice president explained,

I don't mind saying that to the people who make decisions around here. I like to keep my ears to the ground about those looking for companies doing good work. So [Medium Company B] didn't mind having somebody like me suggesting that they be given an opportunity at some point. They also understand that delivery on time, under budget, and working with a client effectively is good business for them, endears them to [the University]. When the University needs somebody to buy that table or help out with this, that, or the other, they're usually there. They seem to have found a really nice sweet spot between the interests: how can we partner together more effectively to get what the University needs done and what would we like to do as a business that's profitable? I was trying to make sure that everybody was aware of everybody else's needs and interests. I think they found a very good position between those two things. (UFI-8)

Summary of viable resources. Universities face complex challenges to fulfill their missions including securing financial support from private sources. Corporations are a source of viable resources, which is the primary motive for a higher education institution to accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support. *Theme One: Viable Resources* highlighted the significance of corporate citizenship engagement and financial support of the University, illustrated examples of corporate resource contributions, provided examples of the corporate participants' resource support to the University, and summarized the seven sub-themes of importance for the University to engage with corporations including *funding for students, endowments, sponsorships, sponsored research, in-kind gifts, building funds, and vendor relationships*.

Theme Two: Student Enrichment

The University has a student-centered philosophy and desires to provide students with hands-on, real world opportunities in their disciplines (DAV-1; DAV-13; DAV-15; DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-22; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-41; DAV-89; DAV-96; DAV-273). The educational environment provides for success both “academic and personal” as well as “collaborative” (DAV-13; DAV-20). Corporations provide a range of opportunities and resources to support *student enrichment* for the University. *Theme Two: Student Enrichment* highlights the purpose of corporate citizenship engagement and financial support, provides examples of corporate engagement and contributions to student enrichment, and summarizes six major areas of importance for the University's students as sub-themes including *scholarships, programs, in-class projects, idea generation, competitions, and internships*.

Purpose of corporate citizenship engagement and financial support. Businesses

“make a positive contribution to the University’s educational mission” through corporate citizenship engagement and financial support (DAV-13). The University’s partnerships with corporations “maximize[s] available resources and knowledge” to assist students to attend the University and have rich, real-world experiences to learn and apply concepts (DAV-13). One University executive explained that the goal is to

Create authentic experiences for students...students who have those authentic experiences—and the more of them they have, the better—they understand the world they’re going into. Ninety percent of students go out and get a job. They don’t go on to graduate school. So that 90% of students can experience what is so authentic that they know if they continue, that’s what they’re going to do, or they decide that’s not what they want to do. (UNI-3)

Corporations provide a range of financial resources to assist students to attend the University, participate in hands-on experiential learning opportunities both inside and outside the classroom, and potentially work in an organization through an internship or job shadowing. One University executive said,

I think there’s real benefit to looking at your studies...not in terms of how quickly can I turn a profit on ...[their] degree, but is there something that ... exceeds the boundaries of just coming here, completing ... homework assignments, getting a grade, graduating? Why not start thinking about how you’re situated in the world, corporate or otherwise? ... What does that have to do with what you’re doing here as a student right now? (UFI-8)

Corporations can provide students opportunities to take what they are learning in the classroom and apply it to the real world as well as learning how their expertise situates itself in today’s society.

Examples of corporate participants’ engagement and contributions to student enrichment. A University executive said the University actively solicits “industry to engage with us in the learning process” (UNI-3). The University has a wide range of

opportunities for students and requires significant financial support and engagement with corporations to help provide those opportunities. Examples include basic funding for students through scholarships and fellowships, specific programs related to given fields or disciplines, providing real world issues for in-class projects relating to current issues brought into the University, idea generation to create new ways of solving real-world issues allowing students to apply knowledge and skills, various competitions to promote excellence, and career development opportunities such as internships to give students in-depth experiences in a given career with individual performance, team dynamics, and on-the-job training.

Student enrichment is the second theme of three themes found to answer Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? Student enrichment includes six sub-themes of importance for student growth and development including *scholarships*, *programs*, *in-class projects*, *idea generation*, *competitions*, and *internships*. The sub-themes are ordered based on importance of appearance from data analysis of interviews and document and audio-visual materials. Examples of corporate participants' involvement in sub-themes are included as appropriate.

Scholarships. The University is particularly keen on providing “access” to a high-quality educational experience to a wide range of diverse students (DAV-1; DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-22; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-41). One University foundation vice president indicated that companies often see the University as a “pipeline for talent, and so they invest heavily in scholarships” (UFI-1). A development officer said, “We have a lot of named scholarships from corporations” (UFI-10). Corporations “understand the

scholarship cycles” (UFI-1). The University often leverages corporate support by using their funding as a matching contribution to solicit others’ support to scholarships (CMAI-1). An executive of Medium Company A indicated they fund “ongoing scholarship programs” (CMAI-1). Two executives of Medium Company B indicated they support University scholarships heavily (CMBI-3; CMBI-5). Another executive of Medium Company B indicated a history of establishing endowed scholarships when one of their corporate executives retire (CMBI-1). Medium Company B also funds “athletic scholarships” (CMBI-1).

Programs. One University dean said the University desires to provide “problem-based learning...contextualized learning” through “pervasive problem-based pedagogy where we do projects every semester” with companies (UNI-3). These student enrichment programs create opportunities to apply theory to real-world problems in real time. Programs may be academic or co-curricular in nature.

Small Company A has funded and engaged with “student success” programs (DAV-141). Medium Company A funds “a variety of academic programs” (CMAI-1). Medium Company B, *Fortune 500* Company A, and *Fortune 500* Company B all fund STEM programs (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; CFBI-1; CFBI-2; CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-4; CMBI-5; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-231; DAV-244; UFI-1). Medium Company B also funds “athletic programs” (CMBI-1). A representative of Medium Company B said they’re programmatically “building a future workforce for the entire industry, looking at attracting businesses, making this state more economically viable” (CMBI-2).

A University foundation board member said,

One of the programs that they've got is organizations on each of the campuses where a student—if they have an idea, and they want to develop that idea into a company or something—can market. Then they can go into that site and get help to do that. So I think there's probably the synergistic relationship with the larger corporations, and it's probably more of a giving relationship with the smaller, more entrepreneurial organizations that they can benefit from what [the University] is doing more than necessarily [what] they might be able to give back. But in any of those types of relationships, you never know where benefits are going to come from. I think that ultimately you always hope that there will be some benefit back to the University, and it comes in many forms whether it's financial or just experiential or contact. (UFI-13)

In-class projects. “University projects” provide an opportunity to better tomorrow’s world through “university students” (DAV-327). The University partners with corporations to provide quality, real-world projects for student enrichment. “Corporate sponsors have been invited into the classroom in specific settings...to maximize student growth and achievement” (DAV-21). “We have corporations on campus all the time,” expressed one University foundation director (UFI-10).

Companies have “collaborated with courses” by sponsoring “project based experience” for students (CSAI-1; CSAI-2; DAV-21; DAV-27; DAV-28). A managing director of Small Company A said, “students provide inexpensive resources for us” (CSAI-2). *Fortune 500* Companies A and B have worked with students for “product testing” (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; CFBI-1; CFBI-2; UNI-1). Some companies develop new ideas, processes, services, or products and want a 360-degree review to find flaws or deficits. One retired *Fortune 500* corporate executive, who is a University foundation board member said,

Well, we have strategies here; we have business issues. Why don’t we engage some of the business school students and have them see if they can shoot holes in some of this stuff. And if we have an engineering problem, let’s have some of the engineers in the University come and see what they think about this. (UFI-12)

The University president indicated that corporations are “looking for basically help on specific projects where they have almost everything they need, and they just need a slight augmentation” (UNI-5). Additionally, the University president said the students benefit from working on corporate-related projects, and the companies are “getting a lot out of that in return because they’re not paying major firms to develop solutions for their issues” (UFI-5). One University executive said,

Now what I find with many companies...is to do something that they need to get done that they don’t currently have workforce to do. Do this not as a gift, but find something that’s not on the critical path, but the ‘I would like to do’ and ‘I would like to explore this,’ and so [the University is] offering increased capacity. If you look at the price of what is charged for a project and the number of student hours, it’s an inexpensive way for a company to possibly get something done that could generate intellectual property and new employees. (UNI-3)

A vice president from Small Company A said, “The students get a more real project experience for academic credit” (CSIA-1). “Industry is sponsoring students in a class to do classroom projects for them...students own their own intellectual property (IP) done in a class, and they can transfer that IP if they develop it to industry” (UNI-3).

Additionally, in-class projects often lead to larger, “more sophisticated” projects (UNI-3).

Sometimes, in-class projects relate to senior-level “capstones” (CSAI-1). One University executive indicated, “In one unit we have 157 seniors that are looking for industry-sponsored projects” (UNI-3). These projects are “industry-sponsored research and development projects” (CSAI-1). Projects may also provide students with employment when they are graduated. A University vice president explained,

If you’ve got a student team, say you have six students working for you for 9 months on a project, you’ll find out who’s good and not; so we’ll often have a team, and they’ll [companies] come in and cherry-pick one or two people ‘cause they’re the real students who’ve actually run a project,

been a project lead, and, tried to develop something for the company. It's a lot better than looking on a résumé, and it's different than an internship. (UNI-3)

Idea generation. The University president said corporations are “looking for ideas and solutions...new ideas—just completely new concepts” (UNI-5). A University vice president said,

The University's about ideas and exploring possibilities; and the marketplace is ultimately the vehicle for those ideas to become reality in products, in services, in new discoveries. So there's mutual benefit that needs to be nurtured from an idea generation vantage point and to be realized from an implementation perspective. (UNI-1)

One University vice president said,

If you're doing more and more research and collaboration with companies who have real-life objectives in mind when they do something, then you are about the business of making an impact because you're doing something that's going to be applied or at least advancing the state of knowledge about what's needed in the world to solve some real-world problems. In doing so there's a real benefit to the University in working with companies in addition to simply having the dollars come in to grow the endeavor or the enterprise in making sure that you're focused in an area that's meaningful to real life because you're involved in stuff that's being translated into the marketplace by definition. If it doesn't make the marketplace, at least the knowledge base about what's useful in the world is advanced—even if we make mistakes in doing so. Apart from just the subjects of that research and collaboration, engaging our students with companies is equally important for that very reason, too. Our students are engaged in the business of advancing the state-of-the-art in an applied sense. Some of our students only work in that area... I think that they benefit dramatically as a result of those combinations and collaborations with companies as a result. (UNI-4)

A University foundation director said, “We get invaluable information from our students because it's a different perspective whether it's an MBA class or an under-graduate class. It's just a different idea, a different spin on things” (UFI-10). Examples ranged from customer service practices to utilization of texting to reach audiences.

Competitions. Competitions are offered at both high school and university levels

with various goals and objectives related to higher education. For example, *Fortune 500* Company A provides prize money for high school students for various competitions related to science, technology, engineering, and math disciplines; the goal is for the students to use the money to continue their education at a university (CFAI-2). A different example is one where the University has a program funded by corporations where students compete “on an annual basis...if they win, they will have space...[and] a certain amount of money to seed their operations...mentoring services and connections to those in the community who can help their businesses grow” (UNI-4).

Internships. “Internships” were noted as an important facet of a University education (DAV-23; DAV-117; UFI-4; UFI-5; UFI-10). A managing director indicated that internships are flexible and may be paid or unpaid. Sometimes internships are “based on the course requirement” (CSAI-2). Small Company A has “done a number of internships” (CSAI-1). Medium Company B has “increased the number of interns” (CMBI-1). A vice president of Medium Company B said, “We usually have at least three or four summer interns from [the University]” (CMBI-5). *Fortune 500* Company B has an “intern program every summer” and has “20-30 interns” from the University (CFBI-1; CFBI-2). Internships provide students the opportunity to apply classroom knowledge and to explore career options.

Summary of student enrichment. A main emphasis of the University is to provide real world experiences for students to apply what they are learning in the classroom and to understand how their discipline or field of study fits into today’s complex society. Corporate can provide a range of opportunities for student enrichment, which is the secondary motive for a higher education institution to accept corporate

citizenship engagement and financial support. *Theme Two: Student Enrichment* highlighted the purpose of the University working with corporations to provide opportunities to students, provided examples of corporate engagement and contributions to student enrichment, and summarized six sub-themes of student enrichment including *scholarships, programs, in-class projects, idea generation, competitions, and internships*.

Theme Three: Real-world Connectivity

Today, “universities are no longer self-contained” (DAV-48; DAV-49). The University is greatly aware of its role in society as well as determining “how to marshal the power” of the business community (DAV-271). University educational include more than a dozen colleges and schools across a range of programs and centers in many “disciplines” including law, health sciences, business, education, liberal arts, and social sciences as well as the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) (DAV-1; DAV-16; DAV-21; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-115; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-271). As a member of a pluralistic society, the University collaborates with governments and corporations to foster economic growth; to create solutions for real-world problems nationally and globally; to enhance humanity, culture, and diversity; and to strengthen commitment to research and knowledge for practical purposes. *Theme Three: Real-world Connectivity* highlights the University’s role, provides real-world issues to be addressed, explains the value of corporate citizenship engagement to support real-world connectivity, and summarizes five major areas of importance supported by corporations as sub-themes including *social connectivity, economic connectivity, cultural connectivity, environmental connectivity, and sustainability*. Examples of corporate participants’ involvement in sub-themes are included as appropriate.

The University's role. The University is particularly conscientious to add to the social, economic, educational, artistic, scientific, and cultural vitality and enrichment for the communities, regions, and state it resides in and serves as well as providing regional, national, and international contributions (DAV-1; DAV-13; DAV-20; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-39; DAV-48; DAV-87; DAV-129; DAV-130; UNI-5). In a pluralistic society, the University understands that it “has always been an institution built to serve” (DAV-21).

A University vice president said,

Being of greatest service to our citizens clearly includes our corporate partners, and we know if we do that we'll have more than fewer [partners], and that the synergies will continue to grow as a result of that. Both in terms of its fundamental mission of educating citizens ... as well as its research agenda [the University] benefits directly and indirectly from its corporate partners. Having said that, our orientation to our corporate partners is really more of being of greatest service to them and less about trying to drive benefit to the institution. We know those two things go hand-in-hand.... In the current lexicon of higher education, everyone likes to use phrases in this context like ‘use-inspired research.’ How would you know that if you saw that? What makes that real? ... Those are things that we take to heart; I mean the idea that whatever we do needs to be applicable to our local community first and foremost and then beyond that, certainly to the region, to the nation, and the global citizens around the world where applicable. (UNI-1)

Real-world issues. The University is concerned with modern issues of “technology,” “energy,” “agriculture,” “sustainability,” “health care,” “diseases,” “economic development,” “human rights,” and “improving” the “environment” (DAV-1; DAV-15; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-96; DAV-112; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-273). All such endeavors are approached with an “entrepreneurial” perspective to see challenges and ways to solve issues through “collaborations” and “interdisciplinary” methods (DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-32; DAV-103; DAV-134). Additionally, the University is

concerned with the American concepts of “business, industry, and government” (DAV-20).

Value of corporate citizenship engagement to support the University’s real-world connectivity. The University touted its accomplishments because of the “effort and dedication” provided by its many partners such as corporations (DAV-15). “Investors allow” the University to “rise to the challenges” needed to be a “change agent” in society (DAV-23). University-wide, attention is given to develop “broad based engagement” of corporations “with company leadership participation” (DAV-25). Such “collaborations” are able to “impact students, the University, and the community” (DAV-135). “Community engagement” is valued to provide “social, economic, cultural,” and “environmental” success (DAV-19; DAV-87).

Real-world connectivity is the third theme of three themes found to answer Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? Real-world connectivity includes five sub-themes of importance for the University to engage in the community, state, region, country, and world including *social connectivity*, *economic connectivity*, *cultural connectivity*, *environmental connectivity*, and *sustainability*. The sub-themes are equally important and appear in the general order found in the University’s literature and data analysis from document and audio-visual materials and interviews. Examples of corporate participants’ involvement in sub-themes are included as appropriate.

Social connectivity. America’s pluralistic environment requires all parties to take interest, ownership, and responsibility for rational behavior and joint ownership for social values. “Commitments of corporations” greatly affect our pluralistic society and “the

quality” of life in America (DAV-339). Sometimes corporations “just want to be good citizens” (UNI-3).

The social aspect in the United States of America’s pluralistic society allows a multitude of groups and organizations—such as the University and the six corporations—to not only coexist, but to provide wide decentralization and diversity in the American culture. The interplay of organizations helps in shaping the social aspect of society needs. The University provides a venue for real-world connectivity for students, faculty, and alumni to engage in a myriad of societal topics with corporations. The social construct includes maximizing freedom of expression and balance, minimizing the danger of any one leader or organization being in control, and providing built-in checks and balances.

Students may engage socially and professionally with corporations. One University vice president said,

The benefit of our students being employed because of these [corporate] relationships, and readily employed, gainfully employed as a result is a massive benefit to the University. If you come here, and you’re involved in these kinds of projects and connections, your likelihood is you’re going to be gainfully employed as a result of your experience at the University, so those kinds of benefits are replete in our relationships with companies. (UNI-4)

Real-world connectivity in society with corporations creates not only hands-on experiences, but leads to employment and supports contribution to a democratic productive society.

Economic connectivity. One University executive said the University’s economic development office is

...sort of the broker [for] the faculty to make linkages to the public and private sector, to government, to business, to industry in ways that are

meaningful and mutually beneficial. They're a brokerage firm in many respects just within an academic organization, and they're also in a position to—beyond all the work that they do in the kind of the classic sense of facilitating grant proposals and the work that they do in this space has, at this institution and at every other—become increasingly a more dominant part of [the University]. That's really an important role for that office.... They have to be a driver for the greater economic good, not just the greater educational benefit, public or private institutions. (UNI-1)

The University president said, “the value proposition of the institution is to make sure that there is the easiest, fastest access to what we produce as possible—unencumbered by unnecessary cultural barriers” between higher education and corporations (UNI-5).

The University wants to be “an economic driver” by convincing companies about the “benefits of affiliating with the University and its strengths in research [to] cause companies to move their R&D labs or even their manufacturing facilities” to the area (UFI-8). Another vice president said, “We also work with economic development groups here in the marketplace to attract more companies to the market” (UNI-4). The University also has “a program to help entrepreneurs generally to get their businesses off the ground” (UNI-4). The economic development vice president said,

We get some compensation for doing that...if they are successful. The idea is that if we create more and more of these companies in the area, they'll stay here; they'll prosper; they'll create more opportunity for our students to be employed and for the economy to grow, so it's part of the service that we perform for the community. (UNI-4)

The economic impact of the University pervades nearly all industries and engages businesses locally, statewide, regionally, nationally, and internationally.

Cultural connectivity. The University president explained how a major metamorphosis has taken place in the cultural purpose of higher education in society. The president stated,

I think that there's this overly simplistic, almost ideological position that's

held by some academics and is held in the culture of some institutions that somehow the university is to be separate, and I think that that's a function of an historic reaction of the universities to undo an unruly influence by the church, by the crown, by the government, by the dictator, by the local powerful corporation, which had a powerful link to some local lord who was the German university's master in some way. So the universities suffer through many of those pains. None of those things, none of those people... if anything, the power ratio is no longer so imbalanced or unbalanced that we can't say, 'These are our terms, these are our conditions,' and so there's a latent anti-corporation, anti-industrial linkage logic inside many schools. Not inside [major private research university name], not inside [second major private research university name], not inside [the University], but in many, yes. And inside the minds of some faculty who believe that, for various reasons, there's, these other outside entities consuming our knowledge products are somehow incompatible with our value system. Our value system is intact. I believe that it can be maintained intact, and so I find a lot of that logic and a lot of that rhetoric to be outmoded. (UNI-5)

"There is a tradition of change in higher education" (DAV-40). Since the 1970s, universities have engaged corporations in varying degrees to impact the United States. The University is concerned with modern issues of "technology," "energy," "agriculture," "sustainability," "health care," "diseases," "economic development," "human rights," and "improving" the "environment" (DAV-1; DAV-15; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-96; DAV-112; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-273).

A University vice president said there is motive for the University to look for partners "where there's opportunity for mutual benefit" (UNI-1). "Our orientation to our corporate partners is really more of being of greatest service to them and less about trying to drive benefit to the institution." One University foundation board member expressed,

The paradigm is different for each corporation.... There's a lot more connectivity. As it relates to their corporate giving in this day and age than perhaps there might have been in the past—the best way of connecting with corporations is for the universities to be able to offer something that will be of interest to that corporation, to its business, to its employees, to

some aspect of what that corporation's all about. (UFI-13)

Another University Foundation board member said there is a significant difference in how universities and corporations prioritize initiatives. Fundamentally, there is a huge difference between needs and wants. The board member said,

I think with each of these successes at [the University], for example, [there] were a series of individuals or corporate leaders who said, ‘Okay, that’s what I believe in,’ and as if everybody else believed in it, but at least they committed and identified and supported that, and that’s the one thing that happens with any corporation. Somebody comes... [and says], ‘Let’s do this. And let’s tell the school that we’re supporting. We like this.’ Sometimes it’s our own fault. We don’t have enough broad, objective review to know what’s needed versus what’s wanted. And there is a big difference. (UFI-14)

Needs and wants create agendas for both higher education and corporations. These agendas can coordinate or conflict, but either way, the inter-organizational relationships impact the American culture and the United States’ ability to engage on a global level.

Environmental connectivity. The University is concerned about environmental sustainability and maintains several programs for “minimizing waste,” “efficient...water management,” “recycling,” “repurposing,” and “carbon neutrality” (DAV-24). The University works with corporate partners and citizens to develop solutions to real-world environmental issues. One University vice president said,

A concrete example here is population—it’s doubled in the last decade. Transportation in a growth population is of course an issue as is noise pollution and the like; and we take on a project like, ‘how do we make travel on the local highways quieter?’, and so we’ve got materials people who developed a composite asphalt and concrete that reduced the noise of traffic on the local freeways by something like 50%. It improves quality of life for everybody—the people driving and clearly the people who live in proximity to those freeways, and so that’s the kind of work that we like to do. (UNI-1)

Sustainability. The combination of social, economic, cultural, and environmental

concerns is called *sustainability*. “Sustainability” is considered for educational programming, managing resources, and contributing to society (DAV-19; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-40). Holistically, “sustainability” is an American “concept with as much transformative potential as justice, liberty, and equality” (DAV-20; DAV-24). The University is a “leader in sustainability” (DAV-22; DAV-23).

The University is also concerned with and functioning in the framework of the *Brundtland Report* with the emphasis on the triple bottom line of impact—like many corporations today—including attention to *people* (students, faculty, alumni, citizens), *profit* (financial and “economic”), and *planet* (“sustainable environment”) (DAV-20; DAV-24). “Sustainability” encompasses a “host” of issues, “solutions, stakeholders, values, policies, geographies, and people” (DAV-40).

Summary of real-world connectivity. The University is greatly aware of its role in society and exists to serve its students, the local community, the state, the region, the United States, and the world. Educational units at the University includes more than a dozen colleges and schools in a wide range of disciplines including law, health sciences, business, education, liberal arts, and social sciences. As a member of a pluralistic society, the University collaborates with governments and corporations to contribute to the American and global landscapes with solutions to real-world problems through connectivity in various capacities. Particularly, the University partners with corporations to contribute to knowledge and practical solutions, research, sustainability, environmental challenges regarding scarce and finite resources, democracy, and economics. *Theme Three: Real-world Connectivity* highlighted the University’s role to contribute to society, provided examples of real-world issues being addressed, explained the value of corporate

citizenship engagement to support the University's real-world connectivity, and summarized five major areas of University importance supported by corporations as sub-themes including *social connectivity*, *economic connectivity*, *cultural connectivity*, *environmental connectivity*, and *sustainability*.

Summary of Findings to Research Question One

Research Question One asked: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? Three themes emerged to answer Research Question One: *viable resources*, *student enrichment*, and *real-world connectivity*. Private funds—including corporate support—have grown increasingly important as governmental funds have decreased. Corporations are a source of *viable resources*, which is the primary motive for a higher education institution to accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support. A variety of corporate resources was discussed including examples from the six corporate participants. Seven sub-themes of importance relating to viable resources for the University to engage with corporations included *funding for students*, *endowments*, *sponsorships*, *sponsored research*, *in-kind gifts*, *building funds*, and *vendor relationships*.

As a student-centered University, *student enrichment* opportunities and resources are needed to provide students real world, hands-on learning activities to apply classroom knowledge and to situate their given disciplines in society. Corporations provide a wide range of opportunities and support student enrichment priorities such as the six sub-themes regarding *scholarships*, *programs*, *in-class projects*, *idea generation*, *competitions*, and *internships*. Finally, the University strives to serve a multitude of constituents to create an inclusive and accessible education, to serve the personal and

professional development of its students and alumni, to propel the economic and cultural vitality of the local and surrounding communities, and to solve and support broad-based issues impacting the greater society state-wide, regionally, nationally, and globally as related to social, economic, cultural, or environmental issues. The University is a world-renowned research institution and is a leader in sustainability. As a member of a pluralistic society, the University is mission-oriented to create a productive learning environment, to contribute to social and environmental causes, to support multi-cultural appreciation and diversity, and supporting the American frameworks of entrepreneurship, democracy, and capitalism. Through its commitment to improving society, the University emphasizes real-world connectivity—supported by corporations—in the five sub-theme topics of *social connectivity*, *economic connectivity*, *cultural connectivity*, *environmental connectivity*, and *sustainability*.

Figure 10 plots those three themes on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum. Plotting the major themes to Research Question One begins to provide an overview of the motives and related return on investment (ROI) expectations corporations have of engaging as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution. This plotting, however, provides the viewpoint of what mutual interest the University had to offer the corporations. Themes One and Two related to cause-related branding, and Theme Three focused on the DNA citizenship ethos. “Cause-related branding” is defined as “corporate financial support or a partnership” developed with reciprocity expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). This scenario requires a mutual exchange of monetary support or other resources from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the University in a tangible manner. Theme One: Viable Resources

provided nearly a 100% mutual exchange. Only scholarships could sometimes fit under Cone’s category of Philanthropy. However, in speaking with many interviewees, their perspective is that corporations contribute to scholarship programs to earmark students to be tracked through matriculation and then potentially hired; the hiring creates the Cause-related Branding motive. The “DNA citizenship ethos” means that the corporation from the ground up considered the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how they go about doing business. The purpose of profitability only is done while also equally considering the actions of a company upon all stakeholders (Martin, et al., 2012; Saul, 2011). The University’s emphasis is focused on helping society in all three areas.

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
	Theme One: Viable Resources		
	Theme Two: Student Enrichment		
			Theme Three: Real-world Connectivity

Figure 10. Plotting Research Question One’s major themes on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum after analysis of all data—including interviews, document and audio-visual materials, and campus observation.

***Research Question Two:
Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships
with a higher education institution
as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum
as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture,
or DNA citizenship ethos?***

Varying views exist on the purpose, merits, consequences, and realities that exist in the inter-organizational relationship between corporations and higher education relating to the motives and ROI expectations from the corporations. “Any time you have a partnership with a university, there’s some value there,” expressed one corporate executive (CMBI-3). One *Fortune 500* global vice president said,

There has to be a value proposition that [the] University brings to [*Fortune 500* Company B] to allow us to financially support initiatives. Sometimes there are gaps because universities sometimes are driven by different types of key performance indicators (KPIs); companies, of course have a different set of KPIs. When they all lock up, that works; but if not, it doesn’t. Sometimes we are sharing the same philosophy and the same interests, but there’s no business transaction. The future challenge is determining how—in addition to those strategic interest overlaps—can we build a strong engagement through business transaction? (CFBI-1)

A vice president of Medium Company A said,

There’s always a checks and balances because you cannot give to everyone or you’d be out of business. You have to prioritize and evaluate because if you gave to everyone that had their hand out you’d be bankrupt. We have to think strategically long-term. (CMAI-2)

One vice president with the University’s foundation explained,

Corporate philanthropy is a bit of an oxymoron. Corporations tend to give for a variety of reasons. They might be committed to economic development. They might be interested in promoting a community well-being. They might want to get their name out in the public as a marketing tool. They may want access to our students to employ. So it's no different at this University than at anywhere else. Any company is going to give to us because it’s going to serve some corporate goal. (UFI-2)

A Medium Company B representative said, “We want to maximize” our relationships,

“and we want to really know that our resources are being leveraged appropriately. Does [this relationship] make sense for us as a business?” (CMBI-1; CMBI-2). A Medium Company B vice president said, “A lot of the things that we do are relationship based, and then they’re based on our business needs” (CMBI-5).

“Corporations and organizations who invest [in the University] each year see the positive impact” (DAV-21). Companies relate to the University in a variety of ways. Small Company A’s involvement with the University participant is purposeful and strategic to connect to the world of academe (CSA-1; DAV-141). Small Company B emphasized providing “quality service” and engagement in the community (DAV-148). Medium Company A was noted as “deeply committed to education” and has contributed significantly to the University’s “curriculum,” “scholarships,” “capital” construction, and in-kind (DAV-21; DAV-42). Medium Company B “gives back to its communities by partnering with select non-profit and civic organizations” such as the University (DAV-180). *Fortune 500* Company A gives back to “fulfill” its “responsibility to society” (DAV-330). *Fortune 500* Company B was named as a long-time supporter of University research (DAV-25; DAV-421; DAV-422; DAV-478).

Four main themes emerged for Research Question Two: Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos? The four major themes included: *workforce development*, *community enrichment*, *brand development*, and *research*. *Workforce development* included the sourcing of talent at various levels for the corporations as well as providing continuing education, professional development

opportunities for executive leadership, and venues for corporate employees to network in their fields of expertise. *Community enrichment* includes the contribution by corporations to society through *community development*, *economic development*, enhancing and growing the local *employment* base, exhausting collaborative *University resources*, and addressing *environmental protection*. *Brand development* highlights corporations' goal of maintaining a positive public image through *advertising*, *promotions*, and *sponsorships*. Finally, *research* was identified as a significant area of corporate engagement in higher education.

Theme One: Workforce Development

In order to compete in today's economy, "the value of a university education has never been greater" (DAV-21). The University's goal is to provide a "highly skilled" and "educated" workforce to society (DAV-20; DAV-22; DAV-100; UFI-1; UFI-8).

Workforce development emerged as the top reason corporations engage with Universities.

Theme One: Workforce Development highlights the significance of corporations seeking University students or training and summarizes the five major areas of importance for the corporations to engage with the University as sub-themes including *internships*, *graduate recruitment*, *training and development*, *executive leadership*, and *specialist consultation*.

Significance of corporations seeking University students or training. One

University director said, "They're [corporations are] interested in the product, which is the students" (UFI-4). "Corporations mostly are looking for people," said the University president (UNI-5). "They're mostly looking for the best and most able people that they can bring into their enterprise." Corporations want access to the University's current students for *internships* or graduates to hire. Graduates' education is "immediately

relevant to the modern corporate landscape” and is important in *talent recruitment* (DAV-21). Corporations “continue to invest in scholarships and student programs because they want to be the employer of choice” for the University’s “best and brightest students” (UFI-1). The companies also need involvement with *training and development* for employees and executive leadership. Specific attention is given to developing *executive leadership* for both their corporate careers and community engagement. Finally, corporations also seek *specialist consultation* to provide an array of expertise to contribute to disciplines. The following sections highlight the importance of these sub-themes. Relevant illustrations from participant corporations are included as appropriate.

Internships. Internships allow students to have a real world experience to apply classroom knowledge and to confirm interest in a given field. One local business owner invests in the University’s educational programs to “make them [students] more competitive job applicants” (DAV-122). A global vice president of *Fortune 500* Company A said, “Our focus is to work with them [the University] because we have the greatest potential for generating the next generation of engineers, and our customers usually hire from those” students (CFAI-1). One University foundation development director indicated that internships were important because those same students often move “through recruiting and hiring” by companies (UFI-4). Another director said, simply put, “internships lead to jobs” (UFI-5).

Many of the companies recruit interns from the University. Small Company A’s president said, “There’s a certain amount of return in a recruiting sense. We hired one of those interns...full-time, when he graduated, 6 months later or so. And that worked out really, really well for us. So there's a certain recruiting benefit there” (CSAI-1). Medium

Company A's vice president said, "We've hired 20-some interns over the last 10 years or so from the University" (CMAI-1). A vice president of Medium Company B said, "We usually have at least three or four summer interns from [the University], and we've actually hired a couple" (CMBI-5). *Fortune 500* Company B has an "intern program every summer" and has "20-30 [paid] interns" from the University (CFBI-1; CFBI-2). *Fortune 500* Company B's strategy is to have the best students repeat experiences at the sophomore, junior, and senior level and get to "know them as a person," which can lead to full time employment (CFBI-1). Undergraduates can also "continue on like a temporary or contract employee" during the academic year to gain experience (CFBI-2). Internships provide a rich, hands-on experience to supplement students' academic major.

Talent recruitment. Companies realize "they need access to talent" (UFI-1). Corporations see the University as a "pipeline" for talent (CMBI-5; UFI-1). Companies have to determine how to get "access" to the students (UFI-2). "Recruiting opportunities" include "on-campus interview programs," "résumé collection," "employer information files for displaying a firm's...marketing materials to students and alumni," "career fairs," and "educational programs" (DAV-34; CSAI-2; UFI-1). Many businesses hire the University's undergraduates or graduate students because "they fit well into their corporate culture" and have "practical experience" (DAV-105; DAV-117). Small Company A, Medium Companies A and B, and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B have all hired graduates from the University (CFAI-1; CFBI-1; CMAI-1; CMBI-3; CMBI-4; CMBI-5; CSAI-1; UFI-1; UNI-4).

According to one vice president at Medium Company B, they have hired students from a variety of disciplines: "We hire lots of engineers, lots of accountants, lots of

finance, lots of people with environmental science degrees, law degrees” (CMBI-4).

Another vice president gave an example of deciding which programs to fund relating to hiring graduates:

ROI’s always a tough one...I’ve done advertising for years, I’ve done sports marketing. Everybody always wants ROI, and it’s like...you can get some of it, but there aren’t always those specific benefits that you can put dollars towards; so a lot of it may be relationship based, so a lot of the things that we do are relationship based, and then they’re based on our business needs... ‘[If we had to ask], are we going to support the music department or the engineering department?’ If we’re up against the two, it’s going to be the engineering department because that’s where we’re really focused as a company from a recruiting standpoint. (CMBI-5)

The vice president of Medium Company A discussed a similar evaluation and said, “We have a vested interest...making sure there’s strong graduates” (CMAI-1). “We’ve hired...30 or 40 graduates that work for us in various roles” (CMAI-1). *Fortune 500* Company A specifically recruits “University graduates” for management training programs, operations, and research positions (DAV-328). Such “bright,” “well-educated” and “highly motivated” people engage to be highly successful in today’s corporations (DAV-329; DAV-334).

Training and development. Companies often fund their own employees for continuing education, or training and development. Educational opportunities provide credentialing and allow for an individual’s growth and development. Training and development may be required to learn new procedures or technologies or to maintain certification credentials in given fields. The University offers “seminars and workshops” (CFAI-1). These types of trainings often provide “revenue streams” to the University while providing necessary “professional training” to companies (UNI-3). The University worked with companies for “executive and professional development” and “leadership”

programming (DAV-92; DAV-129; DAV-130).

The University devised “company-specific education programs” (DAV-92). A University foundation vice president said if corporations want specific training, the University can “build a curriculum” and make it “very precisely tailored to the needs of that corporation” (UFI-8). An executive of Medium Company B gave an example and said they are:

Training a lot of the executive teams at [Medium Company B] to make sure that our business model was getting turned upside-down, and so we needed to raise our business acumen, so we used [the University’s] business school...to provide that training for a fee. (CMBI-1)

Fortune 500 Company A has also required executive training, which has been delivered through the University (DAV-23; DAV-92; DAV-355).

The University may host a training yet bring in experts from corporations to help deliver key content. “There’s a lot of elements in [services] theory and so on that are taught there” explained the vice president of Medium Company A. “We have put on our own seminars a few times a year and have some of our people teach classes at the University or guest speak” (CMAI-1). The president of Small Company A believes “there’s a benefit” of “morale” within the company by allowing employees to engage in activities with the University (CSAI-1). The University also has various training and development programs including a “world-renowned” customer service center training program (UFI-10). One University foundation director said, “We train companies on how to best service their customer” (UFI-10).

Executive leadership. “Business” leaders “align” to support the University

(DAV-21). Today, hundreds of “business and civic leaders” provide advice, “ideas,” “critique, analysis, and connections” as well as “discretionary funding” to the University president “to support important programs, innovative research...ground-breaking initiatives...[and] urgent needs” (DAV-21; DAV-32). These business professionals and local leaders help to “build vital relationships” for the University “to move forward” (DAV-21; DAV-32). These “influential” people are “closely aligned and interact regularly” with the president (DAV-21). Such “leaders are “vital to the advancement of the University’s mission and vision” (DAV-22).

Companies continue to groom their own management for leadership roles internally as well as provide talent or expertise to relate to the University on various committees and boards. The president of Small Company A serves on an advisory board (CSAI-1). The president weighs such opportunities: “Do I have opportunities to grow in some way? Am I gaining some expertise that I wouldn’t have otherwise had? Am I expanding my network that would be useful?” (CSAI-1). An executive with Medium Company B said, “Through serving on committees or councils, ...[staff] have met people or embarked on relationships that probably indirectly benefit them personally as well as the company” (CMBI-2). “Employees...serve on the boards of non-profit organizations,” such as the University’s foundation (DAV-225). Admittedly, Medium Company B allows “company representatives” to serve on boards to “work to strengthen business alliances” (DAV-225). The University also includes “prominent community and corporate members” to their on-campus dining and athletic clubs, which are premier networking venues (DAV-93). A University foundation vice president explained how much volunteers from businesses contribute to the academic community:

It's fantastic to have their support, and we love the fact that they donate all this time; but they have really good feedback, they have really good information to share with us about what's going on with our students, or what we should be doing...the changes that are happening in the workplace, in the workforce...it's immeasurably helpful. (UFI-10)

While many University foundation board of directors and trustees are currently or formerly associated with businesses and American corporations as named in the University foundation *Form 990s*, board membership list, and the University foundation's website, none received "compensation" for their services as volunteer leaders (DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-119; DAV-120; DAV-121). One board member indicated that being a "leader" and setting an "example" was important to the "change-making power of philanthropy" (DAV-31).

Corporations sometimes "put some students through the University's MBA program" (UFI-10). Such additional education often allows an employee to be promoted to a management or leadership role at a company. Many companies offer tuition assistance. For instance, Medium Company B offers employees with a tuition reimbursement program to pursue a degree (DAV-228). Additional educational opportunities at any level are often considered an employee benefit (CMBI-1). *Fortune 500 Company A* supports "continuing education" as well as "lifelong learning" for employees (DAV-338; DAV-339).

Specialist consultation. University faculty are often looked to as experts in their field or discipline. In a given industry, it is important to collaborate (CSAI-1). A director at Small Company A said, "Both the University and we have opinions. We agreed that independent of this [sponsored] research that we—either independently or together—we will continue the research effort" with or without funding (CSAI-2). Faculty and

corporate representatives both value contributions to a specialty discipline and consider working together important.

Summary of workforce development. Human capital for workforce development is the number one motive for corporations to engage as corporate citizenships in relationships with a higher education institution. *Theme One: Workforce Development* highlighted the significance of corporations seeking University students or graduates to hire or training for employees and summarized the five sub-themes including *internships*, *graduate recruitment*, *training and development*, *executive leadership*, and *specialist consultation*. Of the five sub-themes, the most significant were employee recruitment through internship programs or hiring of undergraduate or graduate students. These students provide the most up-to-date skill set and knowledge base to add to the workforce. Training and development of current employees, rising management, or current management was the next grouping of human capital investment for corporations to desire involvement with a University. Finally, specialist consultation was the least discussed sub-theme under Theme One.

Theme Two: Community Enrichment

“The development of communities is one of the cornerstones of civilization” (DAV-225). *Theme Two: Community Enrichment* highlights community commitment and motives for inter-organizational engagement as well as summarizes five major areas of importance for corporations to engage with the University as sub-themes including *community development*, *economic development*, *employment*, *University resources*, and *environmental protection*.

Community commitment. Historic behavior of the community illustrated that it

cared little whether the University “prospered or failed was not a matter that affected” them (DAV-271). In the University’s early years, the president at the time gathered “65 top people” from the business community. That president indicated the local community should support the University because of their “own self interest” as an economic development perspective (DAV-271). The business leaders embraced the University and its educational endeavors and supported a variety of initiatives from arts and culture to athletics as well as the range of academic disciplines. The president’s “outreach efforts brought harvests of many kinds, quite often in unexpected ways” (DAV-271). However, the president conceded that “cultivating the good will of those in power was sometimes difficult” (DAV-271).

Motives for inter-organizational engagement. Inter-organizational behavior is “not possible in isolation” (DAV-264). Rather, only “joint initiatives” including governments, “the business world,” and society (e.g., universities) materialize (DAV-264). Today, the University believes it has “a significant role” in society and has much to offer corporate partners (DAV-24). “The University offer[s] its partners talent, expertise, and knowledge capital, in addition to a population of students, faculty, and staff” (DAV-24). “Being engaged with” the University “means being directly involved in the University’s mission and vision” (DAV-89). The University economic development vice president said,

Companies can grow their base here physically in this locale creating higher-paying jobs instead of being simply a widget manufacturing facility. They can be the place where—if they locate their R&D centers here or their activities here—they can not only grow but create high-paying jobs here, so I think the more the economy can grow for our region and our state, the better off we are. I see it as intersecting circles of various kinds all the way from measurable dollars in the door to just general growth of the community. (UNI-4)

Community enrichment opportunities included *community development, economic development, employment, University resources, and environmental protection*. Relevant examples from corporate participants providing community enrichment are included as appropriate.

Community development. The vice president of Small Company B explained the value of working with the University in community development:

We see the value in the relationship, and I want to bring other people to them [the University] and build those relationships.... They're instrumental in the community here as a very active University, so... it's pretty important to me to help bring people to the [University] because they're giving back to the community, and it's building a strong net community. (CSBI-2)

A vice president of Medium Company A said the University "becomes kind of a neutral ground for business[es] to get together with peers and learn and be in an environment that can be cohesive and positive for the local economy" (CMAI-1).

The University vice president for economic development discussed Medium Company B's support of the University's commitment to the state: "[Medium Company B] is one of the principal leaders in funding and helping figure out how we advance our city in productive, smart, development ways. It's just another example of how we work together to do things that help our community" (UNI-4). An executive at Medium Company B said the goal of the inter-organizational relationship with the University is, "bringing resources to the table that leverage what they can do and then vice versa, so it's just so multi-faceted" (CMBI-1).

Medium Company B's community development practices have permitted it to become a "leader" in "improving economic, environmental, and social business

practices” locally, state-wide, regionally, and nationally (DAV-225; DAV-226). *Fortune 500* Company B has a corporate “culture” that includes concern for society as part of “corporate citizenship” (DAV-385; DAV-389; DAV-390). The corporation believes that strong, healthy communities provide “economic success,” so giving back is a core “commitment” and “expected” (DAV-398). To be a “responsible corporate citizen,” *Fortune 500* Company B makes “donations” to a variety of organizations and initiatives as direct corporate support or via its foundations including “education” through “schools and universities” (DAV-390; DAV-397; DAV-418; DAV-437). Selection for funding includes creating a lasting “effect” on recipient organizations or their programs (DAV-390).

Economic development. “American research universities” have played a vital role” in the United States’ “economic and social security” (DAV-40). The University is involved with a wide range of economic development activities locally, state-wide, regionally, nationally, and globally (CMBI-3; CMBI-5; UNI-1; UNI-4; UNI-5). The University helps companies in a wide range of situations. For example, the University has assisted small businesses and “farmers” to solve “defaults and violations...forestalling bankruptcy and other dire consequences” (DAV-22). In contrast, the vice president of Small Company B indicated that engaging in the University network helped their business in “partnering with other companies” and growing their business (CSBI-2). Medium Company B, *Fortune 500* Company A, and *Fortune 500* Company B all promote and fund STEM programming (CFAI-1; CFAI-2; CFBI-1; CFBI-2; CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-4; UFI-1).

An executive of Medium Company B explained that their ultimate goal is

“building a future workforce for the entire industry, looking at attracting businesses, and making the state more economically viable” (CMBI-2). Medium Company B’s engagement with the University contributes to “economic development” (CMBI-3; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-229; DAV-245). One vice president said, “We give to things that will make this a better place to live and place making is one of the key elements of having a great economy” (CMBI-3). A publication from Medium Company B said, “to be honest, this support isn’t completely selfless. The way we figure it, healthy communities and strong local economies are...good for business” (DAV-231). “Economic development” is also an important function for *Fortune 500* Company B by contributing new ideas and products to society as a whole (CFBI-1; DAV-437). In a pluralistic society, the University and corporations of various sizes work together to develop the economic development capacity of communities.

Employment. Companies in the local area, state, and region “understand how critically important the University is to workforce development, creating a pipeline of talent” to enter the workforce (UFI-1). For instance, Medium Company B makes “programmatic investments looking at building a future workforce for the[ir] entire industry, looking at attracting businesses, and making th[e] state more economically viable” (CMBI-2). *Fortune 500* Company A recruits from the University, but also has relationships with many other business customers who also need highly educated and trained workers. An executive of *Fortune 500* Company A said, “We want to work with the University to help them be successful” (CFAI-1). The University provides a trained workforce to foster the development of the individual mind and to prepare individuals for careers and life work.

University resources. One corporate executive said, “When we’re piggybacking with the University, the sum is greater than the sum of its parts in this particular case” (CMBI-1). The University provides a wide and an extremely diverse range of resources that are of interest to corporations. A University foundation board member who is a retired *Fortune 500* corporate executive said,

I think the more the community knows and understands the resources, the talent, the intellect, the solutions that can exist in a university, then I think that becomes a place where they can go to learn, either to use it as a university, to use it as a sounding board, to use it with their company as a partner in finding solutions. (UFI-12)

The University has a group that serves as a “link between” faculty and the service businesses (CMAI-1). For example, the University’s economic development vice president said the University works with companies and:

Community leaders getting together to figure out how to grow the city and the greater area. [Medium Company B] is one of the principal leaders in funding and helping figure out how we advance our city in productive, smart, development ways. It’s just another example of how we work together to do things that help our community. (UNI-4)

The University also serves as a “convener of companies around” issues, and companies have the resources to help fund the efforts (UNI-4). Additionally, the University has also provided business incubator space “targeted to partner companies” (DAV-21).

One vice president from Medium Company B said, “The University is one of our largest customers, and so first and foremost” is that relationship between the organizations (CMBI-3). Another Medium Company B vice president said the University is “a huge account for us.” The vice president explained,

There’s a lot of things that you have to do to have relationships with your cities and towns.... You may need to build something. You may have [to deal with issues] in that area, so there’s a lot of relationships that are important there.... We’re supporting the University from a corporate

standpoint, but they're also a huge account for us. They're our customer, and so if they're having problems or they want to put in a big system, we put a team together and work with the University to get that done.
(CMBI-5)

The University has many resources to offer that are of special interest to corporations.

Environmental protection. The environment has been a major U.S. agenda item since the release of the 1987 *Brundtland Report*, which established the emphasis of the triple bottom line on sustainability for corporations including attention to people, profit, and planet. Corporations focus on all three areas simultaneously. Environmental issues take on a wide range of programming such as carbon footprint management, eliminating pollution in air and sea, reducing production of packaging, minimizing waste, recycling,

“Environmental stewardship is a critical element” of Medium Company B’s corporate strategy (DAV-180). The company has also complied with increasingly strict regulations and “environmental” policies (DAV-205; DAV-208; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230). The company has extensive internal environmental “assessments,” “audits,” and “compliance reviews” (DAV-225). Medium Company B is concerned about environmental sustainability and maintains several programs for “minimizing waste,” “efficient...water management,” “recycling,” “repurposing,” “air quality,” and “carbon neutrality” (DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230). The company participates in the Superfund, which “establishes liability for the cleanup of hazardous substances found contaminating the soil, water or air” (DAV-204; DAV-205).

“Environment” concerns are a major emphasis for *Fortune 500* Company A and cover a wide range of activities (DAV-265; DAV-326; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-334). An executive at *Fortune 500* Company B indicated,

Partners are important. Working with [the University], government agencies such as the EPA, and trade organizations not only provide new technologies, but they also give us life cycle analysis and measurement tools. They're also providing consumer habits and practice, the legislation to regulate public policies, and public opinions. Relationships are embedded in our overarching strategy. (CFBI-1)

To safeguard the environment, *Fortune 500* Company B works with its competitors, the University, and several other universities collaboratively to develop products that are “less toxic” and more “environmentally friendly” (CFBI-1). The goal is to “speed up the process” by engaging all stakeholders (CFBI-1). To improve products and change harmful practices, *Fortune 500* Company B releases its patents so others can duplicate successes for the overall betterment in a given product's production line.

“Sustainability” includes the triple bottom line concerns for the “economic” success of the corporation as well as “social” responsibility and the environment (DAV-392; DAV-399; DAV-437). Medium Company B promotes “sustainability,” (DAV-180; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230). “Sustainability” is *Fortune 500* Company A's long-term emphasis in operations, business success, and corporate responsibility (DAV-338). For *Fortune 500* Company B “environment(al)” concerns are a major priority relating to nearly all product produced concerning chemicals, production, product packaging, and logistics (DAV-402; DAV-420; DAV-437; DAV-439; DAV-440; DAV-441). “Product” safety and taking “responsibility” for problems is *Fortune 500* Company B's number one priority (DAV-392; DAV-437).

Summary of community enrichment. Corporations contribute to community enrichment by establishing various relationships including many with the University and its initiatives. *Theme Two: Community Enrichment* highlighted the business community's commitment to society and working with the University, provided motives for

corporations to foster inter-organizational engagement, and summarized the five sub-themes of community enrichment including *community development*, *economic development*, *employment*, *University resources*, and *environmental protection*.

Theme Three: Brand Development

Brand development includes a range of marketing mediums. The goal of brand recognition is to associate a company with a positive public image. Brand recognition is done in name or logo repetition. *Theme Three: Brand Development* defines and summarizes the three sub-themes including *advertising*, *promotions*, and *sponsorships* with relevant examples from corporate participants. *Theme Three* also identifies locations of corporate logos, corporate namings, and corporate presence found on the University's main campus.

Advertising. Advertising is straight forward contracting and purchasing of rights to include a company's name, logo, or advertisement in a publication, program, athletic space, or event media. Many companies' names and/or logos were found on advertisements in alumni magazines, athletic facilities and competition spaces, program sponsor posters, or athletic trophies, (CMBI-1; CO-2; CO-14; CO-15; CO-20; CO-31; CO-42; DAV-35; DAV-36; DAV-37; DAV-274, DAV-275, DAV-276, DAV-277, DAV-278, DAV-279, DAV-280, DAV-281, DAV-282, DAV-283, DAV-286, DAV-287, DAV-288, DAV-289, DAV-290, DAV-291, DAV-292, DAV-293, DAV-294, DAV-295, DAV-296, DAV-297, DAV-298, DAV-299, DAV-300). Of the six companies in this study, three were located in advertisements including Medium Companies B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B. Because of the protection of organizational identities in this study, the researcher is unable to provide illustrative examples.

Promotions. Through various relationships, corporations are often offered networking and promotions options (CMAI-1; CMAI-2; CSAI-1; CSBI-1; CSBI-2; UNI-6; UNI-7). For instance, through the alumni association, companies may promote events, products, or services to the University network (UNI-6). As part of a sponsorship activity, companies may also be able to give away prizes, samples, or information relating to the company through drawings, newsletters, or events (UNI-2; UNI-6). One University director said,

I ask them, ‘what are your objectives?’ ‘What are you trying to do?’ I say, ‘Are you trying to reach students? Are you trying to reach alumni over 35? Under 65? What are you looking for?’ After they share with me what their objectives are, then I tailor a campaign for them. (UNI-6)

Another corporate executive said, “We buy a box every year at the football games” (CMBI-3). The box is used to promote the company while creating a space for networking, thanking current or potential clients, or as a reward for employees. One University executive said, the goal is “to build affinity with our fan base” (UNI-2). Promotional events also serve as an entry point for new people to integrate into the network of people in the University and the community (UNI-2). Because of the protection of organizational identities in this study, the researcher is unable to provide illustrative examples.

Sponsorships. One company defined “sponsoring” as any activity where a “third party” provides promotion of the company by name or logo recognition in return (DAV-258; DAV-269). Sponsorships may be program focused in a specific University school, college, industry, or discipline; be involved in recognition activities or special events for

students, faculty, administrators, or alumni; or be related to performance areas such as athletics, the arts, or student organizations. The University can provide “market research” to help companies reach target audiences (UNI-6). Contracts are typically developed and signed by both parties relating to benefits offered by the University and received by a company and generally include branding (UFI-3; UNI-2; UNI-5; UNI-6). Such expectations are described in rate cards, media kits, or sponsorship plans (UFI-1; UNI-2; UNI-6). Event sponsorships are often “set and prescribed” to define known benefits to companies (UFI-1; UNI-2). Such benefits may be name recognition or marketing opportunities to speak at events, promote the company, sponsor tables with event tickets, or network with other sponsors or potential clients (CMAI-2; UFI-5; UNI-2; UNI-6; UNI-7). A company may say, “Hey, I just want my name everywhere” (UNI-2).

Small Company A’s president said they “have supported workshops here and there, deans’ breakfasts, [discipline] workshops, and industry outreach” activities (CSAI-1). An executive of Medium Company A said, “We’ve done matches for sponsored events or programs so the University can go out and raise additional funds” (CMAI-1). Medium Company B sponsors several types of events including athletics and alumni events (CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-3; CMBI-5; UFI-10; UNI-6). An executive of Medium Company B also indicated that sponsoring events or programs “gives us a great community forum” (CMBI-3). “Community leaders go and listen” at programs and learn about issues or platforms in which the company is engaged (CMBI-3). Some other companies also sponsor a variety of “events” (DAV-129; DAV-130). Because of the protection of organizational identities in this study, the researcher is unable to provide illustrative examples.

Corporate logos. No images of corporations' logos were found in any University, University foundation, or University alumni documents or audio-visual materials other than advertisements or athletic sponsorships (DAV-23; DAV-41). The majority of corporate logos found were associated with athletics programming (CO-2; CO-14; CO-14; CO-20; CO31; CO-42). As with most major universities, athletics' success, or "spirit of confidence," engaged a plethora of companies (DAV-271). The University is among "the top collegiate athletic programs in the country," so corporations desire to support the programming with brand initiatives and utilize audiences for networking (DAV-20; DAV-23; DAV-24).

Corporate namings. Names of corporations observed in documents and audio-visual materials included recognition of corporate individuals for awards, volunteers and service on boards, mentors, professors of practice who came from business or industry, employment of alumni or students, corporate donations, program sponsors, vendors, contractors, or professional services (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-23; DAV-32; DAV-43; DAV-44; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88; DAV-89; DAV-112). These namings highlighted positive inter-organizational relationships by associating a given corporate name or logo with the University's initiatives. For example, the University foundation corporate relations officer said,

Over the years [Medium Company A has] been just very, very good to us. They recognize the value of the relationship on the business side, but they are also very sophisticated in their understanding of how they can use the philanthropic and charitable contribution not only to grow the business relationship but to grow their reputation in the state and to build the value of their brand, and to build on their core, or their niche in the market, which is [services] for education. (UFI-1)

One University executive indicated that the University environment is a "siloe

place.” “If you can offer a seamless marketing program or a seamless visibility for Company X, the greater the value, the greater the revenue, the greater the exposure for all parties involved” (UNI-2). However, not all companies are motivated by the need for brand development. The president of Small Company A said, “We don’t actively promote the company” (CSAI-1).

Corporate presence on University campus. To be consistent with labeling of participant corporations by key industry codes, the same 20 were used for the forensic investigation of corporate manifestation on the campus. The key industry classifications in the United States included: airlines and aerospace, automotive, beverage, computers, consumer products, electrical and electronics, energy, financial—banking, financial—diversified, financial—insurance, food manufacturing, industrial products, information and media, pharmaceuticals, retail—food, retail—general, services, telecommunications, transport and logistics, and utilities (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010). This list allowed for simplicity and continued confidentiality of the University and corporations. Of the 407 photographs were taken and analyzed, 215 companies’ names or logos appeared. Overall, only 14% of all named spaces or objects found in campus observation represented U.S. corporations with the remaining 86% of named spaces or objects representing non-corporate entities such as alumni, former University administrators, local leaders and politicians, organizations, or friends of the University.

Table 4 illustrates the summary of corporate presence found on the main campus at the University as analyzed by size of company as well as the purpose of the recognition according to Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Of the six participant corporations in this study, only Medium Company B’s and *Fortune 500* Company B’s

names or logos were observed on the University's main campus.

The most significant business and industry presence of corporate recognition and naming through campus observation of those buildings and objects observed was services. Other significant business and industry presence of corporate recognition and naming observed included retail—general, electrical and electronics, industrial products, computers, financial—banking, financial—insurance, and energy. Minor recognition and naming of business and industry observed included telecommunications, airlines and aerospace, financial—diversified, retail—food, information and media, automotive, beverage, food manufacturing, and transport and logistics.

Table 4

Campus Observation of Corporate Presence

Size of Company	Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)	Total
Small	9	42	13	0	64
Medium	4	32	3	18	57
<i>Fortune 500</i>	0	59	5	30	94
Total	13	133	21	48	215

Note. This table summarizes the number of times companies were identified on campus by size of company as well as plotting of the purpose of the corporate engagement on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

The University and University foundation maintain strict guidelines and policies related to naming “physical elements, programs, scholarships, fellowships, or other activities” in support of the University (DAV-61). Specifically relating to “corporate” naming, “a review” is performed to safeguard “any potential conflicts” (DAV-61). These policies assist the University with managing corporate expectations relating to naming or logo opportunities desired for brand development and longevity of their inter-organizational relationships with the University.

Summary of brand development. Brand development is important to corporations. The University is a vehicle for corporations to receive recognition from *advertising, promotions, and sponsorships*. The University and University foundation maintain strict guidelines and policies related to naming spaces or programs in support of the University. From campus observation of the main campus, only 14% of all named spaces or objects found represented U.S. corporations while the remaining 86% of named spaces or objects represented non-corporate entities such as alumni, former University administrators, local leaders and politicians, organizations, or friends of the University.

Theme Four: Research

“The American research university is a significant departure from training centers for the religious and civil elite” at the beginnings of higher education’s roots in the United States (DAV-40). A main emphasis for major universities is research. The University is a “leader in research” (DAV-22; DAV-23). Additionally, research is one of the metrics used to measure the University’s success (DAV-1). *Theme Four: Research* highlights the significance of research to corporations, illustrates research partnerships, reviews types of research resources, and provides examples of corporate participants’

research activities with the University.

Research significance. Research is a major area of common interest between the University and corporations. Research can enhance student experience but also provides needed funding to the University. For corporations, the content of the research is most important and needed. The inter-organizational relationship dynamics in research can be win-win. One University vice president explained that the research partnerships between the University and corporations is a

Big tech transfer enterprise where it's about bringing ideas into products and bringing products to a marketplace, start-up companies, spin-offs. A professor has an idea about a device, a cure, an invention, or a service, and we have a vehicle through which we can engage the private sector to make those things happen. Clearly we [the University] don't have the financial capital to do that on our own, nor do we want to try to replicate that. I think that provides the incentive for both sides, probably more than and in a broader way than in any other time before in modern history. (UNI-1)

Research partnerships. Research arrangements between the University and corporations may take on various forms. Collaborative partnerships, sponsored research, or industry sustainability research solutions. Collaborations include various partners such as multiple universities, corporations, and governments. Examples might include medical research or scientific discovery. Sponsored research entails companies sponsoring “research projects” with potential co-ownership of “intellectual property” or invention “patents” between the company and the University’s students and/or faculty (DAV-24; DAV-27; DAV-28). Industry sustainability research solutions may enable an entire industry to improve for better efficiencies to maximize scarce resources, increase longevity of product usefulness, or create improved processes or operations such as technology-related equipment. To promote sustainability, the University is committed to “a culture” of sponsored research, which is “knowledge transfer” through “research,”

“innovation,” “technology transfer,” and “commercialization,” that “fosters” the “development of products and services” to better our world (DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-96; DAV-97; DAV-100; DAV-134). One executive from Medium Company B explained that the University is a “community steward” and does “some terrific research,” which makes partnering important and valuable (CMBI-3).

One retired *Fortune 500* corporate executive who is a University foundation board member explained how the University and corporations can partner with research:

I was also involved in a technology partnership, and it was the University that said, ‘Look, we have a bunch of technical confidences. There are companies that have technology that can be commercialized. Can we put those together? Can we connect ideas in the University to ideas in companies?’ I think the only thing that we had to get better at was how to work out the intellectual property and then the royalties. So what was the win-win relationship? I think it might be natural for companies to say, ‘Look, I’ll work with you on this, but I want all the money, I want all the gain, and you can’t use this right now.’ Well, of course the University needs funds, and so that’s an opportunity to raise some funds and capital. I think rather than working on that individually and making that kind of each one-off, early in that process, we said, ‘Well, look, here’s a boilerplate.’ We looked around and found some best practices, and so we started from a place that wasn’t a bare field and said, ‘Here. Here’s some forms that have worked for other people,’ and so I think we put those in place, so we made it a partnership and a relationship rather than, ‘Let’s have all the energy go into who gets the benefit here.’ If we win, then I think we come up with a product that has more length, has more revenue, and has more income, so there’s more to share. So I think we got over some of that initial, ‘University doesn’t want money, do they? The company wants the money.’ Well, I think both want money. They both want to win. (UFI-12)

University research agreements and academic sponsorship guidelines outline roles and responsibilities of the company and the University regarding “financial obligations” as well as joint ownership of “intellectual property” (DAV-27; DAV-28). Additional provisions are disclosed for University ownership for “publishable” rights (DAV-27; DAV-28). The University is concerned with “ethical outcomes” of research (DAV-24).

Additionally, the University considers “ethics in relation to the economy, environment, and prevalent social and cultural issues” in research and programming (DAV-24).

Types of research resources. To conduct state-of-the-art research, corporations and other funding partners work with the University. To that effect, the University needs extensive research resources including equipment and laboratories as well as talented faculty and researchers. The University is concerned with providing superior “facilities” (e.g., “classrooms,” “laboratories,” “libraries”) and educational resources for its students and faculty for research initiatives, or support for “research infrastructure” (DAV-13; DAV-21; DAV-24; DAV-35). Employing top-notch faculty and researchers is also important to the University, which is of keen interest to corporations’ engagement in research. The University has renowned, “outstanding,” “highly credentialed” faculty and leadership who have received “prestigious national and international honors” (DAV-13; DAV-15; DAV-19; DAV-22; DAV-24; DAV-89; DAV-96; DAV-273). Examples include “CASE,” “Fulbright Scholars,” and “Nobel Prize” faculty (DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-37; DAV-40; DAV-44; DAV-47; DAV-110; DAV-113; DAV-129; DAV-130). Many faculty have received competitive funding and/or national organization awards in their respective disciplines (DAV-21).

Today, hundreds of “business and civic leaders” provide advice, “ideas,” “critique, analysis, and connections” as well as “discretionary funding” to the University president “to support important programs, innovative research...ground-breaking initiatives...[and] urgent needs” (DAV-21; DAV-32). For example a medium-sized, privately held company has provided multiple million-dollar contributions to the

University foundation earmarked for University presidential initiatives (DAV-13; DAV-16; DAV-17). The University president provides start-up funding to catapult urgent research opportunities and partnerships.

Examples of corporate participants' research with the University. Several companies in the study participated in research with the University. For example, the University has “a nice, rich relationship” in sponsored research with Medium Company B in science and technology (CMBI-3; UNI-4). One Medium Company B executive said “relevant research” should be funded to find viable solutions to today’s problems (CMBI-3). The goal is “tangible benefit” that “can be replicable” (CMBI-3). A vice president at Medium Company B explained that “applied research” allows for an idea or technology to be developed and subsequently relayed into production because the University and companies have worked together (CMBI-4). Otherwise—working in a vacuum—the University may develop a technology and then have to “figure out how to actually produce it in some commercial scale” (CMBI-4). *Fortune 500* Company A has done a great deal of research with the University as well in technology innovation and engineering (UNI-3). *Fortune 500* Company B is actively engaged in “technology and knowledge transfer” through research and partnerships with other companies, governments, and higher education partners (CFBI-1; DAV-389; DAV-437; DAV-441; DAV-484; UNI-3). *Fortune 500* Company B has also worked with the University on industry related issues to solve environmental sustainability challenges (CFBI-1). Working together on the research can create a win-win scenario for corporations and the University.

Summary of research. The University is a world-renowned research institution.

Corporations seeking research engage as corporate citizens and provide collaborative discussions and needed resources with a potential motive of owning intellectual property to profit from or to solve industry-specific sustainability issues. *Theme Four: Research* highlighted the significance of research to corporations, illustrated various research partnerships, reviewed types of research resources, and provided examples of corporate participants' research activities with the University.

Summary of Findings to Research Question Two

The four major themes that emerged to answer Research Question Two regarding why corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution included: *workforce development*, *community enrichment*, *brand development*, and *research*. *Workforce development* included *internships*, *graduate recruitment*, *training and development*, *executive leadership*, and *specialist consultation*. *Community enrichment* included *community development*, *economic development*, enhancing and growing the local *employment* base, *University resources*, and *environmental protection*. *Brand development* serves to maintain a corporation's positive public image through *advertising*, *promotions*, or *sponsorships*. *Research* was identified as a significant area of corporate engagement in higher education.

Figure 11 plots those four themes on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum. Plotting the major themes to Research Question Two begins to provide an overview of the motives and related ROI expectations corporations have of engaging as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution. Themes One, Three, and Four related to cause-related branding, and Theme Two focused on the DNA citizenship ethos. "Cause-related branding" is defined as "corporate financial support or a partnership"

developed with reciprocity expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). This scenario requires a mutual exchange of monetary support or other resources from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the University in a tangible manner. The “DNA citizenship ethos” means that the corporation from the ground up considered the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how they go about doing business. The purpose of profitability only is done while also equally considering the actions of a company upon all stakeholders (Martin, et al., 2012; Saul, 2011).

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
	Theme One: Workforce Development		
			Theme Two: Community Enrichment
	Theme Three: Brand Development		
	Theme Four: Research		

Figure 11. Plotting Research Question Two’s major themes on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum. After analysis of all data—including interviews, document and audio-visual materials, and campus observation—the major themes are plotted on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum according to their predominant category.

***Research Question Three:
What ethical concerns arise in the engaged relationships
between corporations and a higher education institution?***

Organizations are registered as legal separate entities in the United States. These organizations function in and contribute to the pluralistic society. Yet organizations themselves do not act. Organizational actors are comprised of the collective decisions from individual leaders who were decision makers and individual ethical actors representing the University, the University foundation, and the six participant corporations. One participant corporation leader indicated that “image and reputation” of organizations is “inseparable from the conduct” of employees (DAV-390).

Three main themes emerged for Research Question Three: What ethical concerns arise in the engaged relationship between corporations and a higher education institution? The three themes included: *generally no ethical concerns*, *general ethical discussion* grouped in five categories, and *five disparate ethical dilemmas*. Document and audio-visual materials confirmed why few ethical concerns were found given the culture and expectations of each organization for employees to comply with appropriate ethical conduct.

While ethical issues do occur and many topics of ethical concerns or dilemmas were discussed when asked about ethical concerns, there were generally no ethical concerns and no single overshadowing ethical problem cited. All interviewees generally understood what ethics are in an organizational context and many discussed protocols and ethical frameworks to safeguard ethical behaviors through codes of ethics, policies, training, expectation management, and consequences. Extensive evidence supported the protocols and ethical frameworks as found in document and audio-visual materials for the

University and University foundation as well as Small Company B, Medium Company A, Medium Company B, *Fortune 500* Company A, and *Fortune 500* Company B. All interviewees perceived positive credibility of fundraising and resource management ethics by the University and University foundation and were complimentary of the executive leadership of both entities.

General ethical discussion relating to inter-organizational behavior between the University and corporations emerged when asked about ethical concerns. Dozens of ideas and concerns were analyzed and clustered. Clustering the topics created broad five general categories including: *public relations, solicitation, policies and stewardship, accountability and transparency, and leadership behavior*.

Five University or University foundation interviewees indicated specific yet *five disparate ethical dilemmas* involving corporations. All other higher education interviewees indicated that they had not experienced any issues between higher education and corporations during their careers. No corporate interviewees experienced any uncomfortable or unethical situations. The five stories of specific ethical concerns that were experienced included: (1) faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research, (2) a company wanting to use the University as a venue for a hot political panel debate, (3) requesting the University to submit a proposal and include a position that would inherit a specific corporate employee, (4) having student projects fail to deliver results, and (5) a corporate sponsor wanting free tuition or earmarked scholarship for their child.

Theme One: Generally No Ethical Concerns

There were *generally no ethical concerns* found from the face-to-face interviews, organizational documents and audio-visual materials, campus observation, or third-party

sources. The University, University foundation, and six corporate participants all strive to promote inter-organizational relationships based on sound business practices including legal compliance and ethical behavior. *Theme One: Generally No Ethical Concerns* defines the participant organizations' culture of ethics; the participant organizations' commitment to ethics; divulges legal and ethical violations occurring from 2006-2010; elaborates each participant organizations' ethics policies, guidelines, and trainings; and reviews ethical behavior from financial documentation.

Culture of ethics. Organizations are able to create a “culture” of the environment they desire from leaders' examples and management's expectations guiding the way because “values define [organizational behavior] to the world” (DAV-390). “Personal integrity” and “responsibility” are the beacons for “behavior and action” related to ethics (DAV-390). One University foundation director said, “We follow all rules” (UFI-3). Most interviewees could not think of any specific ethics violations or give an example of any infractions with corporations. One University foundation vice president said,

Can I imagine along the way at any university with a host of corporations something might have happened and could we give you anecdotal things that could happen? Maybe you could, but I don't have anything to report from this seat that would really be illustrative of a bad situation. (UFI-8)

A retired corporate executive who is a University foundation board member said,

I think as a general comment without identifying anything that's peculiar to [the University] ... accepting donor money and making sure that the money is well taken care of and is being put to use in a manner that is consistent with the donor's expectation—I think that's something that all foundations have as an issue. I think [the University] probably does as well if not better than most in terms of having steps and procedures in place to ensure that that happens. (UFI-13)

Another University foundation board member said, “There has been sort of a protected direction always given forth from the [University] foundation or from the University that made everybody understand no games get played here” (UFI-14). A University executive said, “I just have not even heard of anything on an ethical level in dealing with companies here at [the University]” (UNI-4). The vice president of Medium Company A said the University does “a really exceptionally good job” in appropriate and ethical business practices (CMAI-1).

Small Company A had no evidence regarding its culture for ethical behavior. Small Company B provided a presentation outlining the company’s “core values,” which included “ethical principals” (DAV-148). Additionally, Small Company B received an “ethical” stamp of approval for small business in its state (DAV-168). Medium Company A operates under “Christian principles and family values” (DAV-153).

Medium Company B is a “values-based company” and operates with guiding principles to include “integrity,” “trust,” “respect,” “safety,” and “accountability” (DAV-178; DAV-223; DAV-226; DAV-228; DAV-230). Such concerns include “employees,” the “environment,” and “shareholders” (DAV-177; DAV-225; DAV-228; DAV-231). Leadership encourages dialogue and active consideration, enforcement, and reporting of concerns relating to legal and regulatory compliance, “company-wide business practices” with policies and procedures, and sound “ethical principles” (DAV-180; DAV-246; DAV-248). “The code is not a substitute for good judgment” (DAV-180). Medium Company B provides “a culture that supports and empowers employees to make decisions” (DAV-225). Concerns are reported to “an outside third party” (DAV-225). The company also “randomly test[s] for drugs or alcohol” (DAV-180). Leaders are held

highly accountable for “a manner reflecting their position of trust and influence” (DAV-180). Corporate governance includes a broad range of external corporate board members (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-209; DAV-215; DAV-226).

Fortune 500 Company A is “committed to ethical and responsible actions” because “business is built on trust” (DAV-252; DAV-332). The company’s goal is to “meet” and ideally “exceed” all legal requirements (DAV-252; DAV-265). Such “ethical” behavior includes “being responsible,” “compliance,” “fair practices within and outside” the company, and adhering to strict “standards,” (DAV-254; DAV-255; DAV-327; DAV-331; DAV-334; DAV-337; DAV-372). Leadership and management at *Fortune 500 Company A* are expected to make “ethical conduct” a “regular” agenda item in “everyday business” and to set exemplary behavior by “personal leadership” (DAV-258). Leaders need to be “accessible” to address concerns and provide guidance (DAV-258). Multiple third-party options are available for “concerns,” “complaints,” or “whistle blowing,” and are managed “confidentially” (DAV-258).

Fortune 500 Company B’s “culture” includes obeying all “laws and regulations” through strict “compliance” (DAV-390; DAV-391; DAV-401; DAV-425; DAV-439). Many of the products and services produced by the company have strict industry and government “regulations” (DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-414). “Responsible action begins with each and every individual” (DAV-440).

Commitment to ethics. The University and University foundation are both highly committed to ethics. This commitment was noted by all higher education interviewees as well as tracked behavioral performance found in several areas of records, documents, and

audio-visual materials including guidelines, policies, and training materials; disclosure of fiduciary operations and financial management; relationships with other organizations; auditors' comments; and the transparency of financial reporting (DAV-3, DAV-4, DAV-5, DAV-6, DAV-7, DAV-8, DAV-9, DAV-10, DAV-11, DAV-12, DAV-13, DAV-14, DAV-15, DAV-16, DAV-17, DAV-18, DAV-19, DAV-20, DAV-21, DAV-22, DAV-23, DAV-24; DAV-52, DAV-53, DAV-54, DAV-55, DAV-56, DAV-57, DAV-58, DAV-59, DAV-60, DAV-61, DAV-62, DAV-63, DAV-64, DAV-65, DAV-66, DAV-67, DAV-68, DAV-69, DAV-70, DAV-71, DAV-72, DAV-73, DAV-74, DAV-75; DAV-76, DAV-77, DAV-78, DAV-79, DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88; DAV-89; DAV-90).

Forensic evidence of five of the six corporations' commitment to ethics was noted by corporate participant interviewees as well as tracked behavioral performance was found in several areas of records, documents, and audio-visual materials including guidelines, policies, and training materials; disclosure of fiduciary operations and financial management; relationships with other organizations; auditors' comments; and the transparency of financial reporting and providing annual reports, corporate social responsibility reports, or community investment reports (DAV-148; DAV-151; DAV-152; DAV-153; DAV-156; DAV-158; DAV-159; DAV-160; DAV-161; DAV-162; DAV-163; DAV-164; DAV-168; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-231; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339; DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-436; DAV-437; DAV-438; DAV-439; DAV-440; DAV-441; DAV-442; DAV-448). Those companies with corporate

foundations also complied with state and federal reporting requirements (DAV-182; DAV-183; DAV-184; DAV-185; DAV-186; DAV-187; DAV-188; DAV-189; DAV-190; DAV-191; DAV-192; DAV-193; DAV-198; DAV-199; DAV-200; DAV-201; DAV-202; DAV-203; DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-321; DAV-322; DAV-323; DAV-324; DAV-325).

Violations. Legal and ethical issues were found in the University’s documents and audio-visual materials; however, no issues related to inter-organizational behavior with corporations (DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24). No violations regarding legal or ethical issues were found relating to Small Companies A or B nor Medium Companies A or B.

Fortune 500 Company A has had allegations and “investigations” in divisions in other countries, but not specifically related to this U.S. division, regarding a variety of financial misdeeds such as “tax evasion” and governmental “bribery” on the part of individuals (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333). Such challenges required stricter guidelines for managerial behavior as well as reorganization with the resignation of some offenders (DAV-328; DAV-329). Because the company is publicly traded and had corrupt employees with dishonest corporate practices, the organization was penalized and paid significant fines (DAV-329; DAV-331; DAV-332). The company also experienced “anti-trust” litigation in several non-U.S. countries (DAV-329; DAV-331; DAV-332). No issues related to higher education.

Unfortunately, *Fortune 500* Company B experienced unethical behavior because of “fraudulent” activities and “antitrust” corruption (DAV-440; DAV-442; DAV-480). Because “only honest business is good business,” *Fortune 500* Company B released

several employees and was transparent in addressing the matter and reporting it publicly (DAV-440; DAV-441). These issues took place outside the United States in other parts of the corporation, not the division involved in this study. No issues related to higher education in any way.

Ethics policies, guidelines, and trainings. Policies “provide clarity, consistency, and transparency” (DAV-61; DAV-68). Table 5 illustrates the participant organizations’ capacities of identifying and defining ethics. All entities had some amount of forensic evidence regarding ethical guidelines and behavioral expectations. This evidence verifies the existence of codes of ethics, ethics policies and manuals, availability of ethics training, and professional, organizational, and governmental accountability standards that are expected to be followed.

Multiple ethics codes, guidelines, and detailed policies are promoted by the University for research: faculty research, sponsored research assurance, and integrity; student conduct: student behavior, academic integrity, and social media guidelines; and employee conduct: management of University finances and resources, professional conduct for faculty and staff, and interaction with non-university vendors, contractors, and organizations (DAV-2; DAV-3; DAV-4; DAV-5; DAV-6; DAV-7; DAV-8; DAV-9; DAV-10; DAV-11; DAV-12). The University foundation promotes the *Donor Bill of Rights* (DAV-51) (see Appendix C). The bill promotes transparency and integrity.

Ethics guidelines or policies were not found for Small Company A. Small Company B provided a presentation outlining the company’s “core values” as well as its vision and mission (DAV-148). Ethical vocabulary included “respect,” “moral

Table 5

Evidence of Ethics Expectations and Guidelines Within Each Participant Organization

	Code of Ethics	Ethics Policies and Manuals	Trainings	Professional, Organizational, and Governmental Accountability Standards
University	Research, Student conduct, Employee conduct	Research, Student conduct, Employee conduct	Various; Required per role	AAUP, GAAP, GASB, IRS
University foundation	Guiding principles, <i>Donor Bill of Rights</i>	Extensive policies	Various; Required per role	AFP, CASE, CFRE, GAAP, IRS, NACRO
Small Company A	N/A	N/A	N/A	FASB, GAAP, IRS
Small Company B	Core values	Power Point presentation	Power Point presentation	FASB, GAAP, IRS, OSHA, State Ethical Approval
Medium Company A	Christian principles and family values	3-page document	Informal	FASB, GAAP, IRS, Industry regulations, OSHA
Medium Company B	Values-based, Employee conduct, Financial Executives	40-page manual	Required annually	FASB, GAAP, IRS, Industry regulations, NYSE, OSHA, SEC
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company A	Ethical and responsible actions, Business conduct, Financial matters, Code of conduct for external entities, Collaboration	38-page handbook, Dictionary of vocabulary, Sponsor guidelines, Sustainability, Corporate citizenship, Compliance	Extensive training	EPA, FASB, GAAP, IRS, Industry regulations, OSHA, SEC, United Nations, Various stock exchanges
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company B	Employee conduct, Safety and health, Social, Teamwork, Leadership	Several handbooks	Required annually	EPA, FASB, GAAP, IRS, Industry regulations, OSHA, SEC, United Nations, Various stock exchanges

Note. This table exhibits the varying capacities of ethical frameworks and expectations.

principles,” “honesty,” “trust,” and concern for employees to do “the right thing” (DAV-148).

Medium Company A provided a three-page “Code of Ethics” addressing “corporate compliance” and “ethics” (DAV-156). Ethical vocabulary found included “honesty,” “integrity,” “fairness,” “respect,” “trust,” (DAV-151; DAV-152). The Code of Ethics was comprehensive to explain “standards of conduct,” behaviors to avoid, and “discipline” for violations (DAV-156).

Medium Company B ensures “a high level of corporate conduct and ethics” by providing employees with a 40-page manual addressing “Code of Ethics” and business practices to inform and “to hold each other to the highest ethical standards” (DAV-180; DAV-216; DAV-217; DAV-225; DAV-228; DAV-230). Additionally, the company provides a required annual “training” (DAV-216; DAV-217; DAV-225). “Corporate officers, board members, and employees” are required to “pass an online test” from the training (DAV-225). The company also includes a “Code of Ethics for Financial Executives” as required by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (DAV-247). Finally, the company complies with all state and federal human resource regulations and supports “diversity” (DAV-180; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230).

Fortune 500 Company A does not have optional policies but rather “explicit directives” to employees (DAV-256). *Fortune 500* Company A provides a 38-page handbook of “guidelines and regulations” for “business conduct” in several major categories including: employee conduct, anti-corruption, external relations, and financial management (DAV-256; DAV-258; DAV-266; DAV-327; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-336). The “Code of Ethics for Financial Matters” is adopted and followed as a

result of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (DAV-256; DAV-257; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332). From the employee materials and policies, ethical vocabulary included “honest,” “fair,” “values,” “principles,” disallowing “unscrupulous behavior,” “corruption-free business environment,” “responsible actions,” “responsibility,” “integrity,” “disclosure,” “reliability,” “appropriate considerations,” “transparent,” “transparency,” “financial integrity,” “against corruption,” “compliance,” “personal responsibility,” “highest ethical standards,” “quality,” “trust,” and “openness” (DAV-253, DAV-254; DAV-255; DAV-257; DAV-258; DAV-261; DAV-264; DAV-265; DAV-268; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-373). The policies also include “prohibition” of “insider trading” (DAV-256). Employees are required to also “protect company assets,” provide “timely and accurate” reporting, “share appropriate knowledge,” ensure “confidentiality,” follow “safety,” enforce “data protection,” and properly perform accounting and finance functions (DAV-256; DAV-257; DAV-258; DAV-337).

Fortune 500 Company A offers extensive “training” for employees both online and in person relating to conduct (DAV-254; DAV-334; DAV-336). Finally, a list of definitions is provided to employees aside from case scenarios to assist with conduct compliance (DAV-258). *Fortune 500* Company A also provides “product” liability and strives for “customer satisfaction” (DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339). This company abides by initiatives set forth by the United Nations such as “human rights,” “environmental protection,” and “against corruption” (DAV-258; DAV-261; DAV-265; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-338; DAV-339). The company also promotes “diversity” relating to gender, age, nationality, “educational” level, “cultural”

backgrounds, and skill set (DAV-266; DAV-267; DAV-332; DAV-333; DAV-334; DAV-338).

Fortune 500 Company B's has several handbooks dealing with various constituents relating to "conduct" expectations and making "sound business decisions" by providing specific guidelines and punishment for non-compliance (DAV-387; DAV-388; DAV-389; DAV-390; DAV-391; DAV-392; DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-402; DAV-425; DAV-438; DAV-439; DAV-441; DAV-446). Employees complete annual "training(s)" related to an ongoing commitment to ethical behavior (DAV-389). From the standards, materials, and policies, ethical vocabulary included "value," "quality," "respect," "dignity," "personal responsibility," "safety," "honest," "financial integrity," "fairness," "trust," "act responsibly," and "transparency" (DAV-385; DAV-387; DAV-388; DAV-390; DAV-391; DAV-392; DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-401; DAV-437; DAV-438; DAV-441). Policies require employees to protect company "assets" and "intangible assets," protect "confidential internal information," and maintain accurate "reporting" (DAV-390; DAV-398). The policies also include the ability for employees to report suspected misconduct or "reporting violations" for behavior or non-compliance (DAV-390; DAV-391; DAV-392; DAV-441). "Values-based" leadership sets the "example" by modeling appropriate behavior and ensuring "compliance" by all (DAV-391; DAV-392; DAV-399; DAV-401; DAV-437; DAV-448). Leaders also create a positive work environment for addressing issues with "open and constructive" dialogue (DAV-392).

Inter-organizational ethical expectations. Small Companies A and B did not elaborate on expectations regarding inter-organizational ethical behavior. Medium

Company A's policies relating to inter-organizational behavior included avoiding "bribes," not accepting "gifts," maintaining record "confidentiality," and maintaining "accurate and truthful" documentation, "communications," and "representations" of information (DAV-156).

The policies relating to inter-organizational behavior for Medium Company B included not accepting "gifts" or "bribes," maintaining "confidential" records, and maintaining "anti-corruption laws" (DAV-180). Such emphasis on responsibilities guide job performance and how employees "interact with others and represent" the company (DAV-180). Employees at all levels are required to "protect" the company's "reputation" and maintain "one company voice" in all "business objectives" (DAV-180). The company aims "to maintain relationships of mutual trust and respect with all...business partners" and also maintains "contracting guidelines" for "honesty and integrity" (DAV-180). Additionally, the company provides training and requires audits of vendors and contractors (DAV-228; DAV-229). The company provides reporting of "violations" relating to business practices and makes appropriate corrections (DAV-228).

In inter-organizational relationships, *Fortune 500* Company A encourages "business partners, suppliers, and stakeholders" to adopt and abide by "ethical behavior" and provides a "Code of Conduct" for external entities (DAV-256; DAV-258; DAV-327; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-335). The company employs the same "rules" of "conduct" expected internally "in relation to" all "external partners" and "third parties" (DAV-258). Employees, management, and board members must "avoid conflicts of interest," avoid "espionage" seeking advantages for the company, and not "improperly influence government officials" through "bribery" or other inappropriate means (DAV-252; DAV-

256; DAV-258). The company desires to be “a responsible partner” (DAV-257). The company provides reporting of “violations” relating to business practices and makes appropriate corrections (DAV-228).

In inter-organizational relationships, *Fortune 500* Company B admonishes employees, board members, and vendors to avoid espionage, “conflicts of interest,” “improper” behavior of any kind, “bribery” to government officials or other leaders, “money laundering,” “anti-trust” corruption, and not accepting or giving “gifts” to alter or influence anyone’s behavior (DAV-388; DAV-390). All parties are expected to have “fair dealing” (DAV-388). The company also supports initiatives by the United Nations such as “human rights” (DAV-389; DAV-392; DAV-401; DAV-399; DAV-420; DAV-441). Valuing “diversity” of employees is also important as a factor of success (DAV-390; DAV-416; DAV-437; DAV-439; DAV-440; DAV-442; DAV-445; DAV-448).

Financial documentation. Table 6 illustrates available information highlighting actual behaviors by the University, the University foundation, the six corporations, related corporate foundations, and their employees as viewed through document and audio-visual materials, such as financial statements, annual reports, and third-party reviews. These materials served as forensic evidence of actual behavior in contrast to ideal intended behavior by the participant organizations illustrated through their visions, missions, and marketing materials.

The University and University foundation financial statements and filed *Form 990s* were straight forward and well organized. The University foundation follows “generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP)” (DAV-87; DAV-88). Since the University is public, it uses the Governmental Accounting Standards Board’s (GASB)

Table 6

Ethics Documentation for Participant Organizations 2006-2010

	Audited Financials	Annual Reports	Third-Party Reviews
University	2006-2010	2006-2010	<i>CBS, College Navigator, Forbes, Fortune, Newsweek, Princeton Review, The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Economist, The Top American Research Universities Annual Report, The Wall Street Journal, Time, U.S. News & World Report, USA Today</i>
University foundation	2006-2010	2006-2010	<i>Charity Navigator, GuideStar</i>
Small Company A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Small Company B	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medium Company A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2 Medium Company A Foundations	2006-2010 <i>Form 990s</i> for 2	N/A	<i>GuideStar</i>
Medium Company B	2006-2010	2006-2010	Press releases, SEC filings
2 Medium Company B Foundations	2006-2010	2006-2010	<i>GuideStar</i>
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company A	2006-2010	2006-2010	SEC filings
3 <i>Fortune 500</i> Company A Foundations	2006-2010 <i>Form 990s</i> for 2	N/A	(2) on <i>GuideStar</i> with basic information
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company B	2006-2010	2006-2010	Press releases, SEC filings
<i>Fortune 500</i> Company B foundation	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note. Accountability and transparency to evaluate ethics was found in document and audio-visual materials and interviews. This table illustrates available reporting items indicating transparency of financial management and ethics.

reporting requirements (DAV-13). GASB requires disclosure of affiliated “organizations” that financially impact the University because of their “significant assets and revenues” that impact the University and its students (DAV-14; DAV-13).

The University’s audited financial statements included information regarding nearly 10 entities with significant financial relationships, including the University foundation. All of the entities maintain separate boards of directors, and all but two are 501(c) (3) organizations under the IRS tax code. The University provides information regarding resources and support by “individuals, foundations, corporations, and governments” (DAV-13). The other entities used standard “Financial Accounting Standard’s Board’s (FASB) reporting requirements (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88). GAAP, FASB, and GASB aid in the transparency and accountability for organizations.

The researcher observed that the financial statements of both the University and University foundation were consistent and comprehensive from year-to-year with an impression of maturity. The University and University foundations’ audited financial statements included auditors’ endorsement that “the financial statements have been prepared in accordance with” correspondingly appropriate GASB and FASB standards (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88). Additionally, all federal grants were “subject to review and audit” with no material issues resulting (DAV-14). The University foundation manages “endowments” to “create reliable, virtually perpetual income streams” to support University initiatives (DAV-24). The University foundation also follows strict “record retention” policies for accountability and transparency per applicable state and federal

regulations, CASE, and professional business practice guidelines (DAV-74).

Small Companies A and B, and Medium Company A did not provide financial records and are not required to publicly report such information. Medium Company A's two corporate foundations only had basic IRS registration information and *Form 990s* available on *GuideStar*, but no other details (DAV-194; DAV-195; DAV-196; DAV-197). They were not found on *Charity Navigator*.

Medium Company B's financial statements and Medium Company B's corporate foundations filed *Form 990s* were straight forward and well organized. The company follows "accounting principles generally accepted in the United States" under GAAP and FASB (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-208; DAV-248). The researcher observed that the financial statements were consistent and comprehensive from year-to-year with an impression of maturity including auditors' endorsement that "internal control over financial reporting was effective" and there were no "misstatements" (DAV-204). Financial documents and reports as well as company operations reports gave the impression of transparency and disclosure (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-248). "Our company publishes [reports] each year with the intent of providing comprehensive and transparent information to our stakeholders" (DAV-228).

Medium Company B provided more than a decade of financial reports, SEC filings, annual reports, and news releases on their website for transparency (DAV-219). Information not appearing may be requested (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-206; DAV-207; DAV-208; DAV-209; DAV-222; DAV-231). Additionally, the "New York Stock Exchange" is "not aware of any violations" by the company (DAV-204). The company

also complies with all disclosures required by the SEC (DAV-205; DAV-248). Medium Company B is “party” to various “litigation...arising in the ordinary course of business” (DAV-204; DAV-208). No issues related to higher education in any way.

Fortune 500 Company A’s financial statements were extensive, straight forward, and well organized (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331).

Additionally, two corporate foundations’ *Form 990s* that were available were detailed and transparent (DAV-DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-321; DAV-322; DAV-323; DAV-324; DAV-325). Three corporate foundations’ boards only included employees (DAV-DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-321; DAV-322; DAV-323; DAV-324; DAV-325; DAV-380; DAV-381).

The company follows “accounting principles generally accepted in the United States” under GAAP and FASB (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331). This company provides “extensive internal controls” and “company-wide” reporting requirements (DAV-327). The researcher observed that the corporate financial statements and various reports were consistent and comprehensive from year-to-year with an impression of maturity including independent external auditors’ endorsement “without qualification” or “any reservations” and “no major weaknesses” in systems (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339). Financial documents and reports as well as company operations reports gave the impression of transparency and disclosure (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331). The company maintains active “finance and investment,” internal “audit,” and “compliance” committees (DAV-330; DAV-333). The company’s documents provided details about “risk management” of resources and finances (DAV-327; DAV-329; DAV-

331; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-337). The company also complies with all disclosures required by the SEC including “the Sarbanes-Oxley Act” (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331). Maintaining non-financial assets of a strong, positive “reputation,” “trust,” and “goodwill” are key for long-term corporate success (DAV-329; DAV-331; DAV-333; DAV-336). Corporate governance includes a narrow range of corporate board members with little diversity (DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333). Foundation governance provide some diversity among board members (DAV-348; DAV-349; DAV-380; DAV-381)

Fortune 500 Company B’s financial statements were extensive, straight forward, and well organized with the appearance of consistency, stability, and maturity (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-443; DAV-448). No *Form 990s* for the foundations were available. The company carefully monitors “risk management” and has an active “audit” function (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-448). External auditors further endorsed the company’s financial statements and analysis with no “reservation or objection” (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402). “Corporate governance” provides oversight and guidance for all operations and decision making in the company (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-437; DAV-441; DAV-442; DAV-448). It was observed that there is little diversity among the board (DAV-398; DAV-399; DAV-401; DAV-402; DAV-439).

Summary of ethical concerns. Generally no ethical concerns were yielded from the face-to-face interviews. Careful review of the University’s, University foundation’s, and the six corporate participants’ organizational documents and audio-visual materials

supported this finding. The University, University foundation, and six corporate participants all promote and exhibit extensive policies, trainings, and attention to safeguard ethical practices. Likewise, the entities' inter-organizational relationships are based on sound business practices and ethical behavior. *Theme One: Generally No Ethical Concerns* defined the participant organizations' cultures supporting ethics; reviewed the participant organizations' commitment to ethical behavior; divulged legal and ethical violations occurring from 2006-2010 for *Fortune 500* Companies A and B; elaborated on each participant organizations' ethics policies, guidelines, and trainings; highlighted each entity's inter-organizational practices; and reviewed ethical behavior from financial documentation.

Theme Two: General Ethical Discussion

From research interviews many different scenarios and broad-based ideas relating to ethics in general were discussed; five clusters of topics resulted: *public relations, solicitation, policies and stewardship, accountability and transparency, and leadership behavior*. Although no specific examples or dilemmas were given, several interviewees addressed attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and protocols when asked if any ethical issues or situations creating discomfort occurred in the inter-organizational relationships between the University and respective corporations. Table 7 delineates the five clusters of categories and general types of concerns shared by higher education or corporate individuals. The categories are arranged from most predominate cluster to least predominate.

Public relations. Public relations is a visible means to see inter-organizational relationships. Examples of marketing and public relations mediums include

Table 7

General Ethical Discussion Topics

Category	Higher Education Concerns	Corporate Concerns
Public Relations	Forced public relations by companies regarding donations (UFI-1)	Concern for reputation connectivity (CMAI-2)
	Consistency of recognition (UFI-6)	Concern about politics, protocols, and expectation management (CMBI-5)
	Detailed reporting of accountability and transparency with money management (UFI-13)	
	Better communicate uses of donations to donors (UFI-13)	
Solicitation	Pressure of volunteers to fundraise (UFI-11)	Getting nickled and dimed to death (CMBI-1)
	Peer-pressuring gifts from company to company or within industry (UFI-4)	Renegotiation of pledge terms on a large donation because of challenging economy (CMAI-1)
	Renegotiation of pledge terms on a large donation because of challenging economy (UFI-4)	
	Dealing with rival companies' competing with each other for sponsorships or ads (UNI-6)	
Policies and Stewardship	Clarity on who benefits from royalty with intellectual property (UFI-12)	Concern of no set corporate donation policies (CSAI-1)

(Table 7 continues)

Table 7 (continued)

General Ethical Discussion Topics

Category	Higher Education Concerns	Corporate Concerns
Policies and Stewardship (continued)	Clear rules and regulations for in-kind giving (UFI-11) How to deal with current projects or facilities needing attention or new funding but unable to do so because of exhausted funds before adoption of sunset clause policies (UFI-3; UNI-2) Expectations management with sponsored research: student access, timing, clear goals up front (UNI-5)	
Accountability and Transparency	Inflation of in-kind gifts (UFI-1) Cognizant of being circumspect of endowment use (UFI-13) Scrutiny by students regarding companies with which the university is engaged (UNI-1)	Students receiving scholarships have a duty to at least talk to corporate recruiters from the company that sponsored the scholarship (CFAI-2) Concern about overhead administrative fees for grants or research (CMBI-4)
Leadership behavior		Entitlement attitude from University administration (CSAI-2) Concern of culture change when top management changes (CMBI-1) Personality-driven organizational relationship (CMBI-3)

Note. This table highlights other ethical discussion yielded from face-to-face interviews.

advertisements, publications, billboards, print media, broadcast media, social media, reports, and correspondence. Universities often have standard procedures for recognition and promotion regarding inter-organizational relationships. Sometimes corporate partners request or require specific public relations mediums to promote their engagement. One public relations concern was corporations' requiring major publicity about a gift. The University foundation does accept "gifts-in-kind," which are "non-monetary items," if they "represent value" to the University (DAV-69). Such gifts are evaluated to "consider if the gift is needed, wanted, and/or has use within the institution or if it should be sold to benefit the University" (DAV-69). One University foundation executive explained that in-kind gifts are valued at fair market value, and some companies want publicity for those gifts. Many, many companies donate products, equipment, supplies, or software. With the gift, they often want splashy media attention, which becomes a pseudo-media campaign that's essentially free (UFI-1).

Another public relations concern was highlighted by the donor recognition director. While the University does have a naming policy in place, the director explained that named spaces have been applied inconsistently from college to college, school to school, program to program, and building to building. The director said,

We're trying to create a University-wide standard. The University is so enormous, and there's been so much history of people doing their own thing. It's kind of like herding chickens! I hate to say that, but it's a challenge because many people out there in the campus world don't know that they're supposed to go through us although we have directors of development in most of the colleges that all of these requests flow through. I think they're starting to get the message, but over the years, it just hasn't been there. We're trying to actually even develop a plan so that everything looks the same across campus so this person isn't doing glass, this person isn't doing metal. (UFI-6)

With inconsistent recognition—of both organizations and individuals—there are different

expectations and lack of parity donor-to-donor. This inconsistency can cause tension between entities—particularly corporations.

Communication is also a public relations opportunity or concern. A University foundation board member said donors often share “concerns about how their money’s being spent,” which “was more a question of communication than anything else” (UFI-13). The board member also explained, “you have to ensure that you’re fully communicating with those people that have an investment in the foundation and that they know what’s going on and—even though they may not be paying attention—you’re pushing information out to them” as a matter of accountability and transparency (UFI-13). Businesses “are much more interested in how that money’s going to be used and what is going to be the return on that investment” (UFI-13).

Today another public relations concern is having inter-organizational associations and being sure both entities have good reputations. A University foundation vice president said even students “were giving...some arguments about why the engagement of the University with a corporate side is fraught with peril and ‘those two things really ought to be kept separate in a church and state kind of way;’ their missions are different” (UFI-8). A vice president with Medium Company A said, “You have to be careful,” or “your reputation is done” (CMAI-2). A communications executive of Medium Company B explained that inter-organizational dynamics have a lot of push-pull, depending upon politics, protocols, and expectation management. “It’s an agenda of what is [the company] trying to get out of this; what’s [the University] trying to get out of it?” (CMBI-5). Medium Company B has a corporate foundation and a corporate giving department, but many relationship activities are organic and “one-off” (CMBI-5).

Solicitation. The process of asking for a gift is solicitation. Depending on the purpose or amount of an opportunity, different individuals on either side of the inter-organizational relationship may be involved with various touch points between different people. One Medium Company B executive said, “The worst of it is that we were all getting nickel and dimed because there were so many relationships all over” (CMBI-1). Ideally, the goal of the University and University foundation is to coordinate solicitation on behalf of the University through a central point, but one development officer said,

Telling people that we manage corporate relationships is pretty much lying [because] some of [the relationships] are so big ... we would probably have to spend a week focused with the research team and [the University corporate relations officer], and myself to give you a substantive list of relationships between the college and [a company] because nobody manages it. (UFI-4)

The lack of centralization adds to the complexity of various individuals representing the University independently approaching companies. The former president and CEO of Medium Company B is a University alumnus and was significantly engaged with the University. One vice president of Medium Company B explained:

Although there was not absence of conflict,... I saw it because [former Medium Company B president] had me front and center trying to smooth out some of the wrinkles that were happening. And here’s the guy [who] bled [University colors]. [Current president of Medium Company B] would be glad never to get another call again from [University president]. Let’s do what we’re gonna do. Stop bothering me. I don’t have the money you want. I don’t have \$10 million a year to give you [University president’s name]. So I know [the corporate president] gets frustrated by the continuous ask and the continuous ask and the continuous ask. (CMBI-4)

One Foundation board member who is a retired *Fortune 500* CEO lamented:

The only thing that you get from giving is the chance to give again, and that's it.

You don't get anything else. You don't get applause; you don't get tickets; you don't get anything. You just get a chance to write another check. (UFI-11)

The board member further explained that volunteering and giving then leads to fundraising from others. Peer pressuring gifts from company-to-company or within an industry is a challenging solicitation tactic. One development officer explained:

There were some very interesting conversations with the [discipline] folks because it's a very tight-knit group. Getting them bought into this campaign was a multi-year effort, and it was very volunteer-driven. So there were a number of times that I was aware of conversations going on where companies were being strongly encouraged to make gifts—whether or not they wanted to—so that makes things uncomfortable because I'm not in these meetings so I'm only hearing that they might be going on and then I have to follow up and visit with these people who really have no interest in making a gift, and they're signing a pledge form and making gifts for a campaign that they don't care about. So that was an uncomfortable situation sometimes. (UFI-4)

Another solicitation challenge is selling rights to a company to essentially own a space on campus—especially with rival companies in a given industry. For instance, one alumni relations executive said,

The funniest thing that we had to work it out was having both Coke and Pepsi, so they both want to be the official soft drink of [the University] (laughing). They both place ads in the [alumni] magazine, and they both say 'We're the official soft drink of [the University]' (laughing). How do you work that out? I gave some recommendations to [alumni president], and then we also called the business services guy that does contracts, and so we just changed the wording a little bit. One of them said, 'We're the official soft drink of athletics', and the other one said 'campus' or something like that. So in other words, they both were official soft drinks. (UNI-6)

A University foundation vice president said,

Nothing's casual anymore. It's not casual with individual investors; it's not casual with foundations, not casual with corporations. There's a significant contractual dance that's done to make sure everybody's on the

same page.... And corporations probably uniformly will tell you universities are hard to deal with—their interests are all over the place; whereas the corporate side, pretty clear what it's doing. We have a multi-faceted agenda here at the University, so working with us can be tedious to get to the contract. (UFI-8)

The last example discussed of solicitation concerns was a positive one. The University foundation maintains a “write-off and cancellation” policy (DAV-73). If non-payment of a pledge extends over a year, the obligation will be reviewed and potentially written off. During the challenging economic times, many individuals and organizations faced tough financial decisions. Some corporations were in such ethical dilemmas (UFI-1). Medium Company A had a multi-year commitment to the University during the recession (UFI-1; CMAI-1; UFI-4). The company had to renegotiate terms or lay off people. The vice president of Medium Company A said,

Obviously, we'd all want to be as generous as we can and fulfill our obligations that we've pledged, but we also have an obligation to our employees, and so there's definitely a balance there that you have to work through. Any time you sign those 3- or 5-year gifts you truly don't know where you're going to be in 3 or 5 years; none of us do. Economically, that's a long time. (CMAI-1)

Policies and stewardship. Attention to policies and stewardship is very important to the University and University foundation in maintaining strong inter-organizational relationships (UFI-3; UFI-6; UFI-8; UFI-11; UFI-12; UFI-13; UFI-14). The University foundation promotes the *Donor Bill of Rights*, which commits to best practices and policies in fundraising and engagement (DAV-51) (see Appendix C). The director of gift processing provided 27 fiscal guidelines, policies, and operational schematics aiding in the stewardship, transparency, and accountability related to contributions and management of donations (DAV-13; DAV-52, DAV-53; DAV-54; DAV-55; DAV-56; DAV-57; DAV-58; DAV-59; DAV-60; DAV-61; DAV-62; DAV-63; DAV-64; DAV-65;

DAV-66; DAV-67; DAV-68; DAV-69; DAV-70; DAV-71; DAV-72; DAV-73; DAV-74; DAV-75; DAV-76; DAV-77; DAV-78). The University foundation also complies with the IRS by filing timely and detailed *Form 990s* (DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83). The University foundation manages donations, “which are accounted for and monitored through the use of accounts and account purposes” (DAV-83). The fundraising staff adhere to a variety of ethics practices promoted by professional organizations such as AFP, CASE, and NACRO (UFI-1; UFI-2). NACRO “enables its members to advance comprehensive, mutually beneficial relationships with industry and establish common language and metrics for peer comparison” (DAV-133).

University and University foundation employees are to follow appropriate resource acquisition and management including: “procurement rules,” “compliance with University policies,” “licensing requirements,” “conflicts of interest,” “reporting of concerns,” avoiding “misuse...fraud... misrepresentation,” enforcing “contractor codes of business ethics and conduct,” “compliance,” “timely disclosure,” avoiding “acceptance of [personal] gifts and gratuities” (DAV-7; DAV-8; DAV-12). The University and University foundation provide “training” to assist all representatives to understand responsibilities and reporting requirements (DAV-8). University foundation officers, directors, and trustees “are required to disclose any conflicts or potential conflicts” on an annual basis (DAV-82).

With the depth and breadth of attention to policies and stewardship management, a few individuals still discussed issues. The vice president of Small Company A said they don’t have corporate policies governing ethics or policies to interact with companies. “We don't write down as much as we should. I could say with some confidence that we're

known for integrity and fairness. We're not big enough that we have to hold classes and distribute memos" (CSAI-1). Not having policies or expectations is often more difficult to manage than companies with high expectations. The University president said, "there can be conflicts about unmet expectations" (UNI-5). A foundation board member indicated that being clear on roles, responsibilities, and expectations is important (UFI-12).

One gray area in policies is in-kind giving. Most in-kind gifts require external third-party valuations. A foundation board member said, "I think if there's ever a place for a potential—if not right outright conflicts or kind of related-party transactions or whatever—they're magnified by in-kind kind of things" (UFI-11). The University foundation maintains in-kind gift policies, but the onus of valuations is on the donor, not the University.

Relating to policies with research, a retired corporate CEO said, "the only thing that we had to get better at was how to work out the intellectual property and then the royalties" (UFI-12). The University has various policies relating to research contracts, sponsored research, class projects, and quasi-research. The University president said, "We're very upfront about the fact that we're a university. We can't do work that our students can't have in their dissertations. If everyone understands that at the beginning," there are no problems (UNI-5).

Another issue in higher education today is the time limitation of naming rights for physical properties because of the perpetual upkeep and relationships maintained in the longevity of facilities (R. L. Weiner, personal communication, December 13, 2012; DAV-61; UFI-1). Such a policy is called a *sunset policy*. Sometimes renovations or

programs residing in buildings are named (DAV-61). Currently, the University negotiates “an agreed-upon period of time,” subject to reasonable long-term maintenance of facilities and/or usefulness of the purpose of the space for a school or program. The University does have buildings and programs that were funded and named by corporations before the current sunset clause was instituted (UFI-3; UNI-2). Those existing facilities are a challenge to consider renaming. All named “physical elements” and “all academic programs” have a “gift agreement” signed by the funding party and University to clarify terms (DAV-61; UNI-6). The University may also in “an extremely rare occurrence,” remove the name of a funding partner should there be concern of compromising “the public trust or image of the University” because of its association with an individual or organization (DAV-61).

Accountability and transparency. As a public institution, the University and its related University foundation are open to report all resource streams, funding partners, management practices, and allocation of funds. Usages of financial resources related to “instruction,” “research,” “student services,” “operation,” “construction,” “library books,” and “scholarships and fellowships,” which is part of accountability and transparency (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-24). External watchdog organizations *Charity Navigator*, *College Navigator*, and *GuideStar* endorse the University’s and University foundation’s compliance, “accountability and transparency” (DAV-114; DAV-115; DAV-116). *Charity Navigator* rated the University foundation as four star (DAV-114). *GuideStar* labeled the University foundation with an “Exchange Seal” as a “Partners In Trust” organization, “demonstrating its commitment to transparency” (DAV-116). Such recognitions are endorsed because of timely and

accurate releasing of financial information, clarity of mission, filing *Form 990s*, and complying with IRS regulations. The financial statements also discussed investment and financing activities, which were rated well by such organizations as *Fitch*, *Moody's Investor Services*, and *Standard & Poor's* (DAV-14; DAV-24). Finally, the University disclosed law suits relating to "risk management," and no issues with corporations or businesses were mentioned among the grievances (DAV-13; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18).

University research agreements and academic sponsorship guidelines outline roles and responsibilities of the company and the University regarding "financial obligations" as well as joint ownership of "intellectual property" (DAV-27; DAV-28). Additional provisions are disclosed for University ownership for "publishable" rights as well as human concerns of "nondiscrimination" as well as recourse of "non appropriations" or "conflict of interest" (DAV-27; DAV-28). The University is concerned with "ethical outcomes" of research (DAV-24). Additionally, the University considers "ethics in relation to the economy, environment, and prevalent social and cultural issues" in today's society (DAV-24).

Forensic evidence of the University and University foundation's commitment to ethics as well as tracked behavioral performance was found in several areas of records, documents, and audio-visual materials including University guidelines and policies, disclosure of fiduciary operations and financial management, relationships with supporting organizations, the University foundation's commitment to the *Donor Bill of Rights*, and extensive fiscal guidelines and policies, auditors' comments, and the transparency of financial reporting (DAV-2; DAV-3; DAV-4; DAV-5; DAV-6; DAV-7;

DAV-8; DAV-9; DAV-10; DAV-11; DAV-12; DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-17; DAV-18; DAV-51, DAV-52, DAV-53; DAV-54; DAV-55; DAV-56; DAV-57; DAV-58; DAV-59; DAV-60; DAV-61; DAV-62; DAV-63; DAV-64; DAV-65; DAV-66; DAV-67; DAV-68; DAV-69; DAV-70; DAV-71; DAV-72; DAV-73; DAV-74; DAV-75; DAV-76; DAV-77; DAV-78; DAV-79; DAV-80; DAV-81; DAV-82; DAV-83; DAV-84; DAV-85; DAV-86; DAV-87; DAV-88; DAV-121; DAV-134).

One accountability issue was scrutiny by students regarding companies the University is engaged with (UNI-1). Students—as well as executives of the University—desire to maintain a strong University name and image, so only associating with responsible businesses of any size is highly valued. It seems the sentiment is a two-way street as the vice president of Medium Company A said they “didn’t want someone at some level in some inappropriate way to tarnish our name” (CMAI-2).

One concern for corporations’ engagement with the University was the topic of “fees” (DAV-90; UFI-1; CMBI-4). Strictly philanthropic money is managed at the University foundation for managed accounts and is under 5%, but not permitted for non-charitable purposes. The University foundation “will charge a fee” to help with “such expenses as legal, financial, administrative, reporting, and development activities” (DAV-62). Contracts are typically paid directly to the University’s financial office for advertisements or direct sponsorships. Non-philanthropic grants, sponsored research, and outcomes-based projects typically are managed in sponsored research where more than 50% is charged to overhead by the University.

One other accountability issue dealt with students receiving scholarships considering employment with the company that funded the scholarship post graduation.

A global vice president of *Fortune 500* Company A said,

There was no requirement to join [*Fortune 500* Company A] whatsoever. You can do whatever you want, there is no connection of the scholarship with an obligation to work for [*Fortune 500* Company A]. However, there was a moral obligation, and they made this clear from the onset—which I thought was fair—there was a moral obligation at least to talk to [*Fortune 500* Company A], give them a chance. (CFAI-2)

Leadership behavior. An executive of *Fortune 500* Company A said, “The tone from the top matters a lot. You can destroy many things with little words, and you can only build with many deeds. That’s the challenge there.” (CFAI-2). One former corporate CEO indicated “immense respect for the leadership” at the University and University foundation, which is vital to working relationships (DAV-22). Leadership habits were discussed positively overall, but a few individuals expressed concern of an entitlement attitude (CSAI-2). An executive of Small Company A said,

I’m talking not about the professor but mostly from the management and administration—they think they’re entitled to money from us as if we are like, you know a state government to give them money. Sometimes the relationship is like they’re the state, and we are their subject instead of we are the customers and they’re the provider. I don’t understand why they think that way. When we do a contract, for example, then they will say, instead of us the customer and they’re a subcontractor, the way they view it, we are the one who is being hired by them and the language of the contract and all that is kind of one-sided. They don’t have the mindset where it makes it easy to work with small businesses, that their mentality is more like a big institution, and they’re entitled. It makes it hard because we need to be nimble and be open to be able to exchange ideas. They’re just not thinking the way small businesses think. (CSAI-2)

Likewise, a vice president of Medium Company B agreed and said,

I’ll give you a little anecdote. So I’m over at [the University] meeting with our CEO and [the University president], and [the University president]’s lamenting why we don’t do more together. That’s what [the University president] does. The president’s a fundraiser...always lamenting why we don’t do more together. (laughing) Oh, goodness. It’s okay. It comes with the territory. [The president is] brilliant, but it comes with the territory. Being a president of a big university, you have to ask for money.... It’s

like this broken record. (CMBI-4)

Nearly every individual interviewed discussed the charisma and energy of the University president. One University foundation executive observed,

The president of the University is critically important, and we're fortunate enough to have someone who is incredibly visible, incredibly smart, very dynamic. The president is on the national and international stage all the time talking about education and how critically important higher education and postsecondary education is to the future and the fate of this country. The president is always talking to CEOs and presidents and highly placed executives within the corporate and industry sectors. (UFI-1)

Another University foundation executive said the University president's

Vision would be 'resources follow ideas.' And so given that [the president] is an idea-driven [person] and believes—like nobody else I know—in the role of universities to make a difference in the world, [the president] wants to lead ... [and] demonstrate excellence (UFI-8)

On the corporate side, many C-suite individuals expressed how difficult it is on inter-organizational relationships when corporate executives change (CMBI-1). Such changes occur much more frequently on the corporate side of the inter-organizational relationships than on the University side (UFI-8; UNI-5). The “corporate culture has changed dramatically” explained one University foundation executive (UFI-8). One executive of Medium Company B said, “We’ve had far more interface [in the past] at the executive level, and that is less, though, because the faces have changed in our executive ranks.” Since that executive is “not there anymore...the interest might be different” with the degree and magnitude of interest in engagement with the University (CMBI-1). Changes in executive leadership alter dynamics in the inter-organizational relationships because the organizational relationships tend to be “personality driven” (CMBI-3). One

vice president of Medium Company B said the [University president] is a strong personality; so's our CEO" (CMBI-3). Another executive said, "Depending on who's in the CEO spot here, who's in the president role there—the relationship is back and forth" (CMBI-5). Regarding Medium Company B, one University executive said, "That's one company who has had such a change in its own leadership that it has changed the way they see the community and the University" (UNI-7).

Summary of other ethical discussion. Both higher education and corporate interviews discussed various topics when asked if they had experienced any ethical concerns or uncomfortable circumstances. While few specific examples or dilemmas were given, most interviewees provided ideas relating to attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and protocols regarding the inter-organizational relationships between the University and corporations. Of the broad-based thoughts and opinions shared relating to ethics created five clusters of topics (in order of predominance and reoccurring mention): *public relations, solicitation, policies and stewardship, accountability and transparency, and leadership behavior*. Corporate citizenship engagement and financial contributions to the University may receive *public relations* attention. While general protocols are in place, corporations may ask for additional or unique publicity. *Solicitation* for corporate participate or financial support may come from various people within the University to respective counterparts in corporations. Depending on the size and purpose of the gift, multiple individuals representing either party may be involved. While the University and University foundation strive to have central coordination of corporate relations, the sheer volume of organic connections is dynamic and complex. Occasionally, lack of coordination or centralization creates unintended challenges or unmet expectations. All

participant organizations have extensive *policies and stewardship* practices as well as *accountability and transparency* protocols to communicate intentions, reporting, and feedback regarding inter-organizational relationship expectations and deliverables.

Occasionally, individuals not involved with the process day-to-day misstep or have a gap that creates tension. Finally, leaders are esteemed and generally well received, however, individuals' approaches or lack of sensitivity to corporate expectations or needs creates questionable acceptance of *leadership behavior*.

Theme Three: Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas

The University ideally partners with “companies that demonstrate ethics...and excellence” (DAV-22). However, five disparate ethical concerns were highlighted during face-to-face interviews. “Universities and the corporate world have to figure out how to work better together” (CMBI-4). The five stories of specific ethical concerns that were experienced included: (1) faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research, (2) a company wanting to use the University as a venue for a hot political panel debate, (3) requesting the University to submit a proposal and include a position that would inherit a specific corporate employee, (4) having student projects fail to deliver results, and (5) a corporate sponsor wanting free tuition or earmarked scholarship for their child. Table 8 highlights ethical dilemmas (in no particular order); all were discussed by higher education interviewees. None of the dilemmas related to the six corporations in the study.

Dilemma One: Faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research. Depending upon where funds are managed, different overhead fees are associated with resource management. One concern for corporations' engagement with the University is the topic of “fees” (DAV-90; UFI-1; CMBI-4). Strictly philanthropic money is managed at the

University foundation. The University foundation fee for managed accounts is under 5%, but not permitted for non-charitable purposes. The University foundation “will charge a fee” to help with “such expenses as legal, financial, administrative, reporting, and development activities” (DAV-62).

Table 8

Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas (in no particular order)

Category	Higher Education Concerns	Corporate Concerns
Ethical Dilemmas	Faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research (UFI-4)	
	Company wanting to use University venue on a hot topic for a panel as a political agenda (UFI-5)	
	Requested to submit a proposal and had to include a stipend for a position, but an actual corporate employee was being provided (UFI-10)	
	What if student-funded projects fulfill no deliverables? (UNI-3)	
	Self benefit: one sponsor wanted free tuition and another wanted to earmark a scholarship (UNI-3)	

Contracts are typically paid directly to the University's financial office for advertisements or direct sponsorships. Non-philanthropic grants, sponsored research, and outcomes-based projects typically are managed in sponsored research where more than 50% is charged to overhead by the University. One development director said in historical years under prior regulations:

Faculty will sometimes try and pump research dollars to the foundation because it's only a [single digit]% deposit fee and then transferring it over is some other very small percentage. They save a ton of money, but you know, [financial management]'s area and also the foundation don't want to get in the middle of it, so they've really clamped down on that. It used to happen a lot more probably 6, 7 years ago (UFI-4).

This topic was also a sticking point with a vice president of Medium Company B regarding the rate charged to manage project funds by sponsored research:

Whatever [the fee] is, I know it's a big chunk of change that comes out and for people who want to give their money to do some specific work, that's a lot of money to go off into some black hole, right? I know that having the discussion with some engaged philanthropists, they're engaged at [the University] too, they sort of resent it, and there's a lot of discussion all the time about how to get around that. Right? So we talk about creating a friends of [program] and people will give to that 501(c)(3), and then we'll find some way for that to pay for the research without it going [into management with fees]. That is totally an ethical issue. I know that people haven't given to the University because they don't want that large a percentage of the money coming out. ... We'd have to spend some more time sort of parsing out what the actual issues are for me to identify whether I think it's a real problem or not, except that contributors who want to give money to a project don't want 50% of it siphoned off into some black hole. I'm giving you \$50,000 to pay for the project. I don't want to give you \$50,000 and have you have to go out and raise another... however much to pay for the \$50,000 project 'cause you only got 25 from me.... Somebody needs to manage the money. The question is, how much does that really cost? (CMBI-4)

Faculty also would rather see money directly put to work instead of going into overhead, but must follow fiscal management protocols and policies and cannot misdirect or mismanage funds. University administrators justified the fees and indicated that they are

industry standard and pay for facility usage, equipment, utilities, general program support, liability insurance, and other such resources needed to operate.

Dilemma Two: Company wanting to use a University venue on a hot topic for a panel as a political agenda. Universities often serve as a venue for intellectual debate and support of social issues and causes. One development director explained,

Right after [legislation] had been enacted, we were approached by [company and related corporate foundation] that was interested in [coming to the state] as opposed to people who were boycotting. They wanted to sponsor a debate. They were doing kind of a series of whitepapers and community conversations around the issue, and they wanted to do one at [the University] and in particular the [school]. So they contacted us, and they were going to give us \$10,000 or they basically said, 'We're gonna pay for this event, and we just want you to be a partner by hosting by having it in your space, and you can tell us whom to invite or you can help us maybe get some of the speakers and the panelists.' We kind of tried to kick it to some of our University partners in particular...some of the other units across campus that we knew had programs that really targeted this. They were still interested in having a component to it, and we did wind up doing a panel as part of the day-long event. I think our part of it was actually the weakest when you look at the different panels, but it's a long story of how that all came about. But it brought up some, not so much ethical issues, but the dean tries really hard to make sure that...we're happy to lend our space to, and to be a partner with people, but we don't want to be part of one side or another of a political agenda, and that was clearly coming down on one side of a political issue or a hot topic issue, and it created some uncomfortableness regardless of the fact that most of us who were working on the project agreed with the side it was coming down on—that didn't matter. So there was not necessarily an ethical issue, but it made us a little uncomfortable to have that partnership. (UFI-5)

In order to keep the event balanced, the University invited another organization to participate from the opposing viewpoint.

Dilemma Three: Requested to submit a proposal and had to include a stipend for a position, but an actual corporate employee was being provided. A fundraiser said,

Just recently we were approached to put together a last-minute proposal for an organization who was looking to dole out some money. So, in 6 hours, we threw something together. We were then called the next day and

told that we ‘needed to include a \$10,000 stipend for an individual who was going to oversee our efforts.’ Meanwhile, we had been doing what we said we were going to do for the past 5 or 10 years, so this was just supposed to help us leverage, and we said, ‘No, we’re not, we’re not going to do that.’ They had a very specific person in mind. I wasn’t comfortable with that, neither was the rest of my team that was working on this proposal,’ and we said, ‘No, that’s not how we work. We don’t know this person. Just because they’ve done this program at another university doesn’t mean they know our area.’ We responded with a, ‘If that’s the way you want to play this game please don’t include us.’ (UFI-10)

Dilemma Four: What if student-funded projects fulfill no deliverables? One dean said,

We solicit just research, we solicit just student projects, and we solicit these partnerships that evolve that are in-between. ... When industry engages and actually does something where they’re going to get the intellectual property [IP] out of it, there was a good question—is this foundational or is this sponsored research? It’s neither. ... The foundation is for gifts, and gifts there’s no deliverable. Sponsored research is for deliverables. We’re kind of not there either, and so this is for the [program name] piece which is our big engagements. So what are we, and why is this different? Well, when students work in a class—and this is formal class, not just a project that’s extra-curricular—when students work in class they own their intellectual property; they own what they develop. Industry is sponsoring students in a class to do classroom projects for them. It’s neither foundation nor sponsored research. Because students own their own IP done in a class, they can transfer that IP if they develop it to industry. If a faculty did it, it would be different because they’re employees of [the University], and [the University] would own part of that intellectual property. So we took over and moved out of the foundation all of these [programs], and companies sent money directly to us. ... We have an agreement they sign. An agreement in a class is a little bit looser than a formal agreement where if we ... don’t have a deliverable that if we don’t deliver ... they’re going to come back and ask for their money back. So that’s different, and that’s what happens under a deliverable research sort of contract. We promise to do this and there are legal ramifications if we don’t do this. What we promise is students will work on a team for you on your project for a year. That’s all we promise.... Now, we have a pretty good track record of delivering some interesting things, and many companies have ended up generating an IP out of this and getting some pretty big payoffs and some don’t work quite so well.... So it’s kind of a nebulous area for us, and I think as it’s been growing, maybe somebody’s going to eventually want to take it. It’s always about the money, you know. You generate too much money and people want the money. So right now, the foundation doesn’t get any part of this and sponsored research doesn’t get any part of this, though general counsel works with sponsored

research on our agreements, and we have a standard template and have agreed not to take money providing that these companies will sign a standard agreement. There's a risk mitigation piece because even though the contract says that we're just giving you a team, there still is liability—what happens if the contract goes bad? What happens if somebody gets mad at us? It could happen. So they do look at the contracts. ...Any change in the agreements we sign with the companies, they want to look at, so there is a touch by sponsored research in terms of what's happening. Could it change someday? Sure. But right now, we're outside of the purview of the foundation and sponsored research. (UNI-3)

Dilemma Five: Self benefit. One dean said a corporate sponsor asked the question, “Can my son have free tuition now that we’re sponsoring this [project]?” (UNI-3). The dean responded that free tuition was not a benefit of sponsoring a program. Likewise, another corporate person asked “if they gave scholarship money if they could use it for their son” (UNI-3). The dean indicated the University must follow IRS regulations, and earmarked scholarship funds for self benefit are not allowed.

Summary of five disparate ethical dilemmas. Only five interviewees—all higher education participants—shared specific ethical dilemmas they faced regarding the University’s engagement with corporations. No overarching issue emerged, but five disparate ethical concerns were highlighted during face-to-face interviews. None of the dilemmas related to the six corporations involved the study. The five situations experienced included: (1) faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research, (2) a company wanting to use the University as a venue for a hot political panel debate, (3) a company requesting the University submit a proposal and include a position—in which the University would inherit a specific corporate employee, (4) concern if student projects failed to deliver results, and (5) a corporate sponsor wanting free tuition or earmarked scholarship for their child. Each situation was diffused and ended above reproach.

Summary of Findings to Research Question Three

For Research Question Three, three themes emerged. First, most interviewees could not think of any ethical concerns or dilemmas or provide any specific examples, so *generally no ethical dilemmas*. While ethical issues do occur and many topics of ethical concerns or dilemmas were discussed when asked about ethical concerns, there was no single overshadowing ethical problem cited. Second, several *general ethics discussion topics* relating to ethical behaviors created five clusters of other topics: *public relations, solicitation, policies and stewardship, accountability and transparency, and leadership behavior*. While no specific examples or dilemmas were cited, several interviewees addressed attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and protocols when asked if any ethical issues existed in the inter-organizational relationships between the University and corporations. Third, *five disparate ethical concerns* were shared by higher education interviewees. None of the dilemmas involved any of the corporate participants. Each of the situations was one-offs and handled professionally.

Figure 12 plots those three themes on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum considering the importance or focus of ethics in each category. Plotting the major themes to Research Question Three adds to the overview of the ethical behavior stemming from motives and related ROI expectations corporations have of engaging as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution.

Themes One and Two related to the DNA citizenship ethos, and Theme Three focused on cause-related branding. The "DNA citizenship ethos" means that the corporation—or any organization such as the University—from the ground up considered the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how they go about

doing business. All of the behaviors in this ethos emphasize ethical stewardship of resources and behavior creating transparency and accountability. The University and six corporations overall emphasize strong ethical guidelines and exhibited actions.

Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
			Theme One: Generally None
			Theme Two: General Ethical Discussion Leading to Five Clusters of Topics
	Theme Three: Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas		

Figure 12. Plotting Research Question Three’s major themes on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum. After analysis of all data—including interviews, document and audio-visual materials, and campus observation—the major themes are plotted on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum according to their predominant category.

“Cause-related branding” is defined as “corporate financial support or a partnership” developed with reciprocity expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). This scenario requires a mutual exchange of monetary support or other resources from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the University in a tangible manner. Theme Three yielded five specific examples of ethical issues. These are

categorized as Cause-related Branding because quid pro quo behaviors were emphasized, which created the problems experienced that had to be managed.

Other Themes

Aside from answering the three research questions, four other themes emerged from the data and dealt with *culture*, *economic challenges*, *alumni connectivity*, and *geography*. The culture of the University and University foundation, as well as each of the cultures of the six corporate participants, affects the inter-organizational relationships. Particularly as corporate cultures change, the inter-organizational interface with the University changes dynamically. Inter-organizational engagement may “reflect the corporate values” (COP, 2007, p. 12). One corporate executive declared, “Our commitment to corporate citizenship and sustainability is based in our values” (DAV-223). The economic challenges of the United States from 2006 through 2010 were discussed. “Governments, societies, and companies faced major challenges” because of the economic crises (DAV-339). Tough economic times caused all organizations to focus upon the most important projects and relationships. The two final categories—alumni connectivity and geography—likely are important overall factors related to the University’s ability to attract and to interact with corporations.

Culture

Various types of culture were highlighted in documents and audio-visual materials and interviews; they included “academic culture”; “multicultural” demographics that add to the “culture and experiences [to] enrich the University”; “institutional culture” that promotes strong teaching and learning for applicable, “real-world” issues; “a culture of philanthropy”; and “a culture” of knowledge transfer (DAV-

19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-24; DAV-487). The word cloud in Figure 13 illustrates the most important concepts found in the 12,906 pages of document and audio-visual materials. “Culture” was one of the main topics found in materials of the participant organizations for both intended and actual behaviors. Leaders set the institutions’ values and personify organizational culture (CFAI-2; DAV-487). “Sustainability” is “a culture” (DAV-225). “Responsible and sustainable business practices translate into strong financial performance” (DAV 225).

Figure 13. This word cloud was generated in TagCrowd from the most important contextual concepts found in the 12,906 pages of document and audio-visual materials. “Culture” was one of the main topics found in materials of the participant organizations for both intended and actual behaviors.

Culture of the University. An “institutional culture” promotes strong teaching and learning for applicable, “real-world” issues (DAV-19; DAV-24). The University “has

always been an institution built to serve” (DAV-21). The University is particularly conscientious about adding to the social, economic, educational, artistic, scientific, and cultural vitality and enrichment of the communities, regions, and state in which it resides and serves as well as for which it provides regional, national, and international contributions (DAV-1; DAV-13; DAV-20; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-39; DAV-48; DAV-87; DAV-129; DAV-130).

The University is also concerned with modern issues of “technology,” “energy,” “agriculture,” “sustainability,” “health care,” “diseases,” “economic development,” “human rights,” “transportation,” and “improving” the “environment” (DAV-1; DAV-15; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-40; DAV-96; DAV-112; DAV-129; DAV-130; DAV-273; UFI-8). All such endeavors are approached with an “entrepreneurial” perspective to see challenges and ways to solve them through “collaborations” and “interdisciplinary” methods (DAV-19; DAV-20; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; DAV-24; DAV-32; DAV-103; DAV-134; UFI-8; UNI-1; UNI-4). The University also strives to be dynamic to meet needs of business and industry (DAV-105; UFI-1; UFI-4; UFI-8; UNI-5). Such “organizational evolution” best serves the public and constituents such as corporations (CFBI-1; DAV-105).

The University is focused on long-term initiatives and has been “redefining the relationships” among its programs and leadership (DAV-15). The goal is to be an “effective institution” (UFI-8). “The relationships [the University and University foundation] have fostered with...businesses... [have] become a major force” contributing to the University’s success (DAV-22). The University foundation also “ensures longevity” through long-term “investment” and “endowment” strategies (DAV-19; DAV-

24; DAV-87). The University is always in “motion” to provide “growth and improvement” (DAV-20). The University does not rest on its laurels, but is dynamic and maintains growth and expansion in “enrollment” and “new academic buildings,” which include “classrooms... laboratories... and departmental offices” (DAV-15).

To succeed, “the University would expand and nurture its relationships with new and existing partners” (DAV-24). “Creating extensive partnerships” with corporations “who share the vision” of the University allows continued success and growth (DAV-24). In the process the University “serves the needs of businesses” (DAV-132). The University’s culture was summarized by a University foundation vice president:

We’re thinking about projects proactively or areas of engagement proactively, and then we want to find those people who believe in the outcomes. And if [businesses] are giving for expressive reasons as well, that’s fine. But that’s the way we’re thinking about it, and that would be the front door strategy—talking to corporations about what the future looks like for them, for us, where’s the point of mutual concern, as opposed to just hoping for some largesse coming out the back door. (UFI-8)

The word cloud shown in Figure 14 was created from interviews with University executives. The most important concepts from the dialogue created the content that was discussed in the themes answering Research Question One. The culture of the University and University foundation is manifested in the word cloud.

Culture of Small Company A. Small Company A’s website promoted support to several youth and faith-based “charitable organizations” (DAV-139). The president, however, indicated that the website was out-of-date and was changing the company’s initial response strategy away from generally helping the community, which focused on a variety of organizations that did not serve the business’s interest but, rather, served the interest of employees. The president indicated that more strategic partnerships that are

business related are now the company’s priority for company engagement—such as the involvement and resource allocations to the University. As a privately owned corporation, Small Company A does not prepare annual reports about funding. The president of Small Company A said the business relates well to higher education because “we have an academic culture” (CSAI-1). Small Company A takes an informal approach to its internal values as well as to its style to engage in inter-organizational relationships. One executive of Small Company A said, “I cannot say there is a strategy that we actually sit down and talk about it” (CSAI-2).

Figure 14. This word cloud was generated in TagCrowd from the most important words generated from interviews with 21 University executives.

Culture of Small Company B. The Company’s goal is “to work together” with customers “to develop relationships to promote success” (DAV-172). Small Company B is very strategic in creating a dynamic and flexible vision for the company. Both the

president and vice president—who are a husband and wife team—have vision boards to inspire the company’s direction, employees, community engagement, business goals, and personal life priorities (CSBI-1; CSBI-2; DAV-489; DAV-490). Small Company B received an award for sound business practices (DAV-149). Small Company B is very engaged in the community, including being a vendor at the University. Because the University recognized the company, Small Company A has become engaged in mentoring other businesses for best practices (CSBI-1). Because the Company desired confidentiality, the vision boards are unable to be illustrated.

Culture of Medium Company A. The company operates on “Christian principles and family values” (DAV-153). A main business philosophy is to “build strong, long-lasting relationships” with clients (DAV-160). The vice president of Medium Company A indicated in recent years the company “changed the philosophy of the company to be a community-friendly, get work based on our relationships, based on our reputation, based on being involved in the community, and doing the right things” (CMAI-2). Among those “right things,” Medium Company A was noted as being “deeply committed to education” (DAV-21). Medium Company A “is committed to building” strong “communities” and “improving the quality of life,” including “education” (DAV-158; DAV-163). Medium Company A and Medium Company A’s foundation have been engaged with the University in a variety of ways and believe that “powerful relationships are built upon” (CMAI-1; DAV-157; DAV-176; DAV-207). The culture of the company is focused on engaging in the community and on being a good corporate citizen.

Culture of Medium Company B. Medium Company B is highly aware of developing a culture to interact outside the organization. “Our actions, decisions, and

words all create the culture of the company” (DAV-180). “Community involvement” is part of our company “culture” (DAV-225; DAV-228). “Sustainable business concepts” are part of that culture (DAV-226). The culture of the Company emphasizes “customer value,” “dedication to shareholders,” “growth,” “improving” communities, and minimizing “impact on the environment” (DAV-204; DAV-205; DAV-207; DAV-226). Three reports provided illustrations of Medium Company B’s focus on people (DAV-205; DAV-229; DAV-230). The company has “worked to build lasting relationships” with its customers and its communities through a “long-term perspective” and measurement of “impact” (DAV-207; DAV-226; DAV-228; DAV-230).

One of Medium Company B’s five main corporate and corporate foundation interests is “education” and, specifically, “STEM education” (CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-3; CMBI-4; CMBI-5; DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-227; DAV-228; DAV-229; DAV-230; DAV-231; DAV-244). Medium Company B is “active” in its communities of operation “through volunteerism, charitable donations, and community and business leadership” (DAV-225). “Giving back to the community means more than simply writing checks” (DAV-225). The “company supports volunteering and community involvement” for “community organizations and programs” of interest as determined by employees through a “formal corporate volunteer program,” which includes funding and engagement with the University (DAV-180; DAV-225; DAV-229; DAV-231; DAV-245).

The culture of Medium Company B is also concerned with “economic development” (DAV-225; DAV-226; DAV-229; DAV-245). A company brochure indicated, “To be honest, this support isn’t completely selfless. The way we figure it, healthy communities and strong local economies are...good for business” (DAV-231).

Medium Company B included specific determination to focus on the “triple bottom line” of “people, planet, performance” (DAV-208; DAV-226; DAV-229). In summary, Medium Company B believes in “building sustainable relationships” (DAV-228).

Culture of Fortune 500 Company A. The essence of the culture of *Fortune 500* Company A stems from its original founders and the many generations of family members who have continued to be involved (CFAI-2). “The culture of the company goes in many elements, be it innovation, be it corporate responsibility” (CFAI-2). One of the main corporate cultural behaviors and interests of *Fortune 500* Company A is “citizenship” (DAV-261; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-333). “A corporate culture” including “social responsibility” is vital to long-term business decisions (DAV-334).

Fortune 500 Company A included specific determination to focus on the triple bottom line of “business” profitability, “society,” and the “environment” (DAV-258; DAV-260; DAV-261; DAV-327; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337). Society includes higher education. The company “makes monetary or product donations” for “education and science” and the “environment” among several areas of interest to “colleges and universities” and several national educational programs (DAV-258; DAV-269; DAV-334; DAV-344; DAV-347; DAV-383). Such “donations” must be “transparent” (DAV-258).

Fortune 500 Company A said “the culture” in an organization “starts at the top” (DAV-258). “Culture” of “behavior” modeled by “managers” includes all facets of business behavior such as “ethical conduct,” “compliance,” “corporate responsibility,” and motivating “employees” (DAV-328; DAV-336; DAV-439). Additionally, the

company provides awards for “individuals” and “teams” carrying out corporate culture values such as “ethical” actions, “protecting the environment,” and helping “society” (DAV-321; DAV-322; DAV-323; DAV-324; DAV-325; DAV-328). “A corporate culture that empowers” employees increases performance (DAV-329).

Fortune 500 Company A and at least one corporate foundation “provides funding to universities,” including the University, as a “major commitment” (DAV-269; DAV-316; DAV-317; DAV-318; DAV-319; DAV-320; DAV-327). Various reports highlighted significant multi-millions of corporate direct dollars and foundation funds contributed for “educational programs” (DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-344). Additionally, the corporation’s partner “network” includes “universities” for the expedient “transfer of ideas from theory to practice” (DAV-331; DAV-334). The University’s foundation indicated that *Fortune 500* Company A has given to a range of campus interests (DAV-326; DAV-355; DAV-356; DAV-357). ***Culture of Fortune 500 Company B.*** *Fortune 500* Company B’s culture values inter-organizational relationships including “partners,” “partnership(s),” “interface,” “business relationship(s),” engage “stakeholders at the local, regional, and corporate level,” and “working together” (DAV-385; DAV-387; DAV-389; DAV-390; DAV-398; DAV-401; DAV-419; DAV-421; DAV-435; DAV-437; DAV-438; DAV-441). Specifically, “universities” and “government” were mentioned as partners (DAV-435). The company also supports “volunteer work” by “employees” in their “communities” (DAV-389; DAV-405; DAV-417; DAV-418; DAV-437; DAV-441).

Fortune 500 Company B said “culture” provided the environment for “innovation” as well as ethical “conduct” (DAV-390; DAV-391; DAV-398). “Employees

expect a corporate culture with which they can identify and which they can help to shape” (DAV-441). Additionally, “sustainability is a corporate value” (DAV-440).

Summary of culture. The word cloud shown in Figure 15 was created from interviews with the corporate executives at the six participant corporations. The most important concepts from the dialogue created the content that was discussed in the themes answering Research Question Two. The culture of the corporations is manifested in the summary content illustrated by the word cloud.

Figure 15. This word cloud was generated in TagCrowd from the most important words generated from interviews with 15 corporate executives. The culture of the corporations is manifested in the summary content illustrated by the word cloud.

Economic Challenges

The timeframe explored in this study was 2006 through 2010. The period marked “the most significant recession since the Great Depression” (DAV-16). Businesses

showed “loyalty and conviction” to their commitments to the University and University foundation during “one of the toughest economic downturns in our nation’s history” (DAV-22). Two sub-themes emerged relating to economic challenges: *the recession* and the domino effect because of *inter-organizational dependency*.

The recession. This recession created “lots of challenges” for the University particularly relating to inter-organizational relationships with corporations (CMAI-1; DAV-23). Both the University and University foundation addressed challenging budgetary, endowment management, and financial management issues related to the turbulent economic times—including “unprecedented reductions” in governmental funding, significant endowment losses, and a “near meltdown of global economic markets” (DAV-14; DAV-15; DAV-16; DAV-21; DAV-22; DAV-23; UNI-1). “The recession has slowed” Medium Company A’s business, yet it has maintained growth, profitability, and customer satisfaction (DAV-206; DAV-208; DAV-227). While the recession—nationally and globally—was “a difficult business environment,” *Fortune 500* Company A remained “positive” to manage resources and business for profitability and successful corporate citizenship activities (DAV-327; DAV-329; DAV-332). The company noted that “the financial and real estate crisis in the U.S.” and the “global financial crisis” were challenging for business, but the company was “successful” in spite of the circumstances (DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331). The corporate foundation *Form 990s* for 2010 indicated a dip in available distributions in 2007 with increases in 2008 and 2009 (DAV-320). *Fortune 500* Company A admitted that “commitment” to “society and the environment” ultimately increases “long-term value (i.e., profitability)” for the company (DAV-328). The company assisted with “employment” of dislocated workers

from one vendor that went bankrupt (DAV-327). The company also acknowledged “governments” assisting to help the economic “situation,” which was “the most serious economic downturn since the end of the Second World War” (DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-337).

The “difficult environment” of the “recession” created a number of challenges for *Fortune 500* Company B (DAV-399; DAV-400; DAV-448). Decline in market demand and “overall economic performance” in the U.S. required a decrease in production (DAV-400). Additionally, “to ensure the company’s long-term” existence, they had to release several employees (DAV-440). Only by being “economically successful” is the company able to address other matters such as the economy and society (DAV-440).

Not all individuals believed the recession negatively affected corporate support and engagement. One University foundation executive said, “Interestingly enough I think corporate giving has remained fairly steady or flat” (UFI-1). One University manager said, “The ironic thing ... we've been successful the last couple of years really with the economy not being very great; I think it's been more of building great relationships and over-delivering on service and value. I think that's where we've been successful” (UNI-2). The University president said, “I would say our relationships are broader and more intense than they were at the beginning of the recession” (UNI-5). One vice president of Medium Company B said, “I don’t think that our economy has driven any differences” (CMBI-3). Several executives of Medium Company B indicated that they followed focused, strategic actions and continued with funding and programming with the University (CMBI-1; CMBI-2; CMBI-3; CMBI-4; CMBI-5). A vice president of *Fortune 500* Company B summarized the difficult recession:

It's part of the capitalism in society, right? When you encourage competition, you encourage a lot of those IP rights, you encourage a lot of those protective measures from our current social legal system. Working with the partners like [the University] during difficult times gave us the way to design the new way of working together. That's one thing which is really important—you've got to find the people who matter...the stakeholders that may change the behavior, may change the policies, but this is a long period of evolution. (CFBI-1)

Inter-organizational dependency. Reflecting on the challenging economy, one

University foundation board member said,

I think it's created a scenario where most corporations are holding their money and sort of waiting to see what's going to happen before they start to invest it again. It's created a much more focused and analytical effort in terms of deciding that this is actually going to give us a return on our investment. It's not something where giving for giving's sake is what's going on today. It's a far more analytical effort and one that is even more tied now than it was before to how that synergy is going to benefit our shareholders and this company. So I think it's slowed things down significantly, and I think that the ones that are participating and are giving are much more interested in how that money's going to be used and what is going to be the return on that investment, rather than just saying, 'Here, take this. Go do good.' (UFI-13)

A University vice president said,

The economy didn't discriminate. I think everyone is impacted. Certain business sectors were arguably more impacted than others, but overall—because it all works together—there's a clear degree of interdependency that we come to realize quickly in an economic downturn of the size and proportion that we just experienced nationally. What's the ancillary impact of corporations on their support for the institution? They've got less discretionary funds to support ideas and new initiatives at an institution. Our investment portfolio overall gets constrained during periods like that. We were pretty careful to make decisions that didn't materially weaken the fundamental mission of the institution. We worked hard to prioritize and made difficult choices. At the same time I think we had corporate partners who were maybe more stable than some other sectors and who came to our support. I can't say 'rescue,' but who came to our support as a result of the circumstance and have stood by us. Now that we're coming out of the trough I think that everyone feels pretty good about the kinds of relationships that we were able to maintain in a material way as well as in kind of a symbolic way. (UNI-1)

One University foundation executive said, “We don't look towards company sponsorship as much as we once did for events; that's where they pulled most of their money when the downturn in the economy started. We're finding that they're more interested in student support and building support” (UFI-10). The economic development vice president said,

I think with the marketplace that most companies are faced with, they're not as able as they'd like to be to spend money on research and development—let alone research done outside their walls. So dollars spent by companies on research done by universities are cherished. They're harder to come by than they had been. I think we've seen a steady flow of money, and even statistically I suppose there's been some modest growth in the, nationwide numbers, but still it's not where it should be, and I think not where they'd like it to be. It's not where we'd like it to be. We'd like it to be much larger than it is for us, and we have challenges in how to get to the number that we aspire to. (UNI-4)

One University foundation director indicated that corporations had to cut funding for employees' continuing education:

What has been interesting on the corporate side is not necessarily the philanthropic part of it, but the fact that they've changed their educational reimbursement policies and that's been a big issue for us. The fact that corporations are now no longer sending students to MBA programs or are no longer willing to pay for the full boat, we're not seeing the numbers that we once saw. That's been a huge impact. (UFI-10)

The University Foundation corporate relations officer said,

We haven't had any kind of growth, but I think that the companies' bottom line is needing access to talent. They see what they call 'the silver tsunami,' and even though the economy's bad, and the unemployment rate is climbing, or was climbing, they understand that the baby boomers are still aging—no one can stop that. I've read and been told that over 54% of those in management positions are due to retire in the next 5 years, and they don't have the talent pool to backfill those positions, so it is a concern. The concerns were put on the back burner when the economy was really suffering at the height of the collapse, but when I sit down and talk to companies about 'what can we do for you? What can this University do to better serve the needs of this partnership?' I still get, 'We need more talented students.' And so I think that they continue to invest in

those scholarships and those student programs because they want to be the employer of choice for our best and brightest students. Most companies didn't take that off the table.” (UFI-1)

Summary of economic challenges. All organizational participants faced challenging economic times some time between 2006 to 2010, which was the time frame for this study. Each organization had to deal with *the recession* in terms of sustaining itself and determining needs and priorities to ensue. Inter-organizational dependencies caused prioritization of inter-organizational relationships and related financial commitments.

Alumni Connectivity

Graduates of the University often maintain lifelong connectivity. The University alumni office and University foundation creates special events, invitations to return to campus, and ongoing communications to engage alumni. Likewise, corporations often harness alumni to invest time in the inter-organizational relationship with the University on behalf of the company’s agendas. Two sub-themes of alumni connectivity are addressed including alumni engagement and quasi-corporate giving.

Alumni engagement. One University foundation board member said, “I don’t think you have to be an alumni to be supportive of the University. I’m not, and other members of the board aren’t. Why not be involved?” (UFI-12). However, “alumni engagement” has been significant, and University alumni have strong ties to businesses and corporations (DAV-24; UNI-6; UNI-7). The University engages alumni from companies in a myriad of ways such as “inviting alums to come and serve” on committees and boards, “speak on panels,” speak at “events,” “working with alums in regional areas” (CFAI-1; CFBI-1; UFI-1; UFI-5; UFI-8; UFI-10; UFI-13; UFI-14). One

University alumni executive said,

So they graduate from here and then what? How do you develop a person? How do you develop their loyalty? How do you develop them being a possible donor, send their kids here, send their grandkids here, that sort of thing? We don't want them to just leave and then never hear from us again or never be touched. We have so many things to offer—career services, for one thing. Even if, when you graduate, you obviously want a job, but what if you're 40 and you want to re-career, or what if you're thinking of coming back to school? All those things. We want to be all those things to the alums...so touch points...different things for everybody, and we want to be involved in our alums' lives. (UNI-6)

Corporations often engage with the University because of the University's alumni who are employees desiring to stay engaged with the University for volunteerism or who want to contribute financially. Medium Company A has a few executives and management as well as employees who are alumni of the University (DAV-157). Several executive staff, senior management, and other employees of Medium Company B are alumni of the University (DAV-249). An executive with Medium Company B explained their depth of involvement with the University is "because we've had a number of graduates from [the University]," (CMBI-1). The relationship with the University is "dependent on alumni" (CMBI-5). "The former chair and CEO" of Medium Company B graduated from the University and maintained a strong relationship with the University by serving on the University foundation's board (CMBI-3; CMBI-4; UFI-1). One vice president said the entire inter-organizational relationship between Medium Company B and the University "has been driven substantially by our former chairman" (CMBI-3). Medium Company B has "several alumni" of the University and the University's alumni is the largest institution Medium Company B hires from (UFI-10; UFI-11; UFI-12). The company supports "the alumni association" (CMBI-1). Several *Fortune 500* Company A and B leaders, managers, and employees are alumni of the University (CFAI-1; DAV-

326; DAV-397). An executive of *Fortune 500* Company A explained that “people who have a vested interest in [the University]—the alumni” maintain relationships with others inside the University and want the company to be involved in any ways possible.

Quasi-corporate giving. Many alumni receive naming or gift credit, however, their influence and earning capacity came from their roles in corporate America (UFI-1; UFI-14). One University foundation board member said, “Well, I think it, for example, [local philanthropist’s name] who is a very close personal friend of mine combines his business success locally with his direct involvement being an alum of the University” (UFI-14). Quasi-corporate contributions are typically those items (e.g., scholarships, named programs or buildings, etc.) funded by alumni who either own(ed) their own company or earned their wherewithal through a major company and/or corporate investments. University annual reports and press releases highlighted significant contributions (e.g., one report totaled \$260-million) from alumni or community citizens who own(ed) companies, corporate investments, corporate foundations, or corporate trusts (DAV-20; DAV-122; DAV-131; DAV-234; DAV-276). Some facilities or programs were named for alumni or citizens who earned their wherewithal in corporate America, however, the companies did not receive naming rights because the money was given by the individual(s) (CO-3-5; CO-13-5; DAV-131; DAV-234; DAV-276). There is a difference of opinion whether such naming is considered corporate or not (UFI-1; UFI-2; UFI-11).

Summary of alumni connectivity. Alumni involvement is mutually beneficial to the individuals participating, the University, and corporations who emphasize such commitment. *Alumni engagement* includes volunteering for co-curricular or classroom

opportunities, providing leadership or other expertise, attending various campus events such as sports or arts, or contributing financially. One major area of complexity is *quasi-corporate giving*. Some alumni own a company or profit from corporate careers. While the gift is from the individual, some people believe the relationship with corporate America was influential in the process.

Geography

The University's mission is to serve the interest of communities locally, state-wide, regionally, nationally, and internationally. One vice president said, "leveraging place" is important "...to be an effective player in the region—economically and otherwise" (UFI-8). One University foundation board member said,

Sitting back and waiting for people to come and do good things...might've worked a long time ago, but I think that now, in this day and age, it's just, it's not going to work because there are so many opportunities for people to do good things, not just in your city, not in your state, not in your country, but internationally. Unless your corporation is actively developing and trying to figure out what those inter-relationships could be and then marketing them, you're going to be behind in a significant way. (UFI-13)

According to one retired corporate executive, being "geographically close to the University...made a big difference" in opportunities to engage (UFI-14). One University alumni executive agreed and said "geographic location of the University might make a difference" (UNI-6). One Small Company B executive said that being located near the University made it "very easy for us to be around" and be involved (CSBI-2). A vice president of Medium Company A said, "Because we're a little bit closer to [the University] just from a geographical standpoint and from a recruiting standpoint we have a closer link" (CMAI-1). An executive from *Fortune 500* Company B said "the University is very close to us."

Summary of Other Themes

Separate from the research questions, four other themes emerged from the data dealing with *culture*, *economic challenges*, *alumni connectivity*, and *geography*. *Culture* and related behaviors of each of the institutions affected the inter-organizational relationships. “Culture” was one of the main topics found in materials of the participant organizations for both intended and actual behaviors. Leaders set the institution’s values and personify organizational culture. The *economic challenges* from 2006 through 2010 created both trials and opportunities for the University and the corporations. *Alumni connectivity* and engagement created an in-roads for the University to create inter-organizational relationships with companies who employ alumni. Finally, *geography* can create an ease as well as responsibility for the University’s ability to attract funding and engagement with corporations.

Analysis Across Embedded Units

After analyzing the data it was possible to analyze across the six companies to compare and contrast their behavior, motives, and ROI expectations for inter-organizational interactions with the University. Areas of comparison and contrast included: complexity of engaging the corporations, availability of information and other resources, functionality of corporate citizenship in each company, and capacity strengths of each type of corporation. Highlights of each corporations’ emphasis to engage in inter-organizational relationships is discussed and includes plotting of each company on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

Complexity of Engaging Corporations

The complexity of recruitment and engagement of corporations varied based on

size of the organizations. Medium corporations had full-time staff dedicated to the interface of their companies with external institutions such as the University. The medium companies were the first to commit to the study and quickly organized accessibility to information and coordinating the face-to-face interviews. Medium companies became the “poster child” or “gold standard” for ideal research engagement. Small companies took more consideration of participating, and some small companies opted to not participate because they believed they had little to contribute to the conversation on the topic of corporate engagement in higher education. Small company executives were very busy, hard to contact, and difficult to focus and convince to participate in the research. While the *Fortune 500* companies had full-time staff and/or departments committed to interface with external organizations, the businesses sought senior management and legal counsel before committing and engaging in the dissertation research. *Fortune 500* Companies A and B committed; the other five companies are still reviewing the opportunity and have never formally responded positively or negatively.

Access to Information

Publicly-traded companies have strict guidelines on transparency and reporting information to the public. Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B are publicly traded, so they had a wealth of information available directly from the companies, related corporate foundations where applicable, and third-party sources as required by law such as the IRS and SEC. Publicly-traded companies are legally required to divulge board rosters, financial statements, and activities of the company. Small Companies A and B and Medium Company A are privately-held companies, so they are not required legally to make information available, and therefore had limited data

available. Corporate interviewees at the privately-held companies answered some questions generally relating to inter-organizational relationships.

Corporate Citizenship Functionality

Functionality of corporate citizenship varied from business-to-business. Small Company A had not been strategic in their relationship with the University. Over time, they decided to be strategic with both volunteerism and financial commitments with the University. Small Company B was a vendor of the University and received a special award. Small Company B strategically networked with the University to expand their own business and assist the University in various ways in the process. Medium Company A had the highest overall commitment to higher education as a platform for corporate citizenship. Specifically with the University, Medium Company A connected with some of the colleges within the University for projects and commitment to their industry. Medium Company A, however, looked at corporate citizenship more as a pluralistic society duty of philanthropy. Medium Company B had the deepest connection with the University on many, many levels. Interviewees and campus observation also illustrated that Medium Company B was the most engaged corporation and corporate foundation in this dissertation research. Medium Company B has been piece meal in their inter-organizational touch points with the University and is currently striving to be more strategic. Specifically, Medium Company B's foundation is focused on STEM. Both *Fortune 500* Company A and B relate most to large research universities. The two main emphases of *Fortune 500* Company A and B's relationships with the University revolve around research and student recruitment.

Capacity of Corporations

Fortune 500 companies had the largest budgets to participate with the University's programming. These companies also had international programming relating to the University's mission. The *Fortune 500* companies also were the most strategic in working with the University.

Overall, the capacities of medium-sized corporation—as exhibited with Medium Company B's prevalent relationship in all data form—encompassed both community corporate citizenship as well as high engagement on multiple levels with the University. Medium companies seemed the most efficient in regular, on-going management and connection in inter-organizational relationships with the University.

Small companies' commitment to community was the strongest of all companies. This commitment capacity created a heavy bond with the University and support of the University's mission. Small companies' corporate citizenship was a balance between volunteerism and limited available resources.

Plotting on Cone's Corporate Citizenship Spectrum

Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum was used as the framework for this study. Cone's spectrum is comprised of four key concepts: philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos. Figure 16 illustrates placement of each of the participant corporations on Cone's spectrum based on the holistic review of data including interviews, campus observation, and document and audio-visual materials. Additionally, the two peer coders corroborated plotting of the corporations on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum based on their analysis of the data.

	Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
Small Company A		●		
Small Company B	●			
Medium Company A	●			
Medium Company B			●	
Fortune 500 Company A				●
Fortune 500 Company B				●

Figure 16. Plotting the six companies on Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum. After analysis of all data—including interviews, document and audio-visual materials, and campus observation—the six companies are plotted on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum according to their predominant category(ies).

Small Company A is placed under *Cause-related Branding*. The president of Small Company A said, “With [the University], it’s a balance of a desire to have community outreach and have a relationship with the academic community locally and [the University] as an organization, but it has to be balanced with a business rationale somewhere” (CSAI-1). Small Company A is calculated in its interactions with the University. Emphasis included research and occasionally hiring interns or employees.

Small Company B is placed on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum under *Philanthropy*. While the company is strategic in trying to gain additional vendor opportunities with the University and other network partners, the company engages in mainly community-based capacities and offers volunteerism and in-kind contributions. Both the president and vice president maintain vision boards, which includes corporate citizenship in general to the community (CSBI-1; CSBI-2; DAV-489; DAV-490).

Medium Company A is humble. While the Company has done a great deal of in-kind giving in the multi-million-dollar range, it seeks no recognition. This organizational attitude places Medium Company A under *Philanthropy*. Medium Company A is a vendor with the University and also hires interns and full-time employees. The Company also wants to support its own industry, so engages with the University with a few colleges and programs, but desires to maintain a low profile. The vice president of Medium Company A said, "We've been privileged to support [the University] in a variety of ways" (CMAI-1). While many of these behaviors seem ROI driven, they are more *Strategic Philanthropy*.

Medium Company B exhibited a range of corporate citizenship behaviors. The company's vision is to absolutely function in the *DNA Citizenship Ethos*. Yet, the company clearly has embedded activities in *Stakeholder Management of Operational Culture*. "To flourish, a sustainable company must understand and engage in symbiotic relationships with its stakeholders including customers, employees, neighbors, other businesses, and government officials" (DAV-228). "Engaging...stakeholders is vital to the long-term success" (DAV-226). "Stakeholder engagement is in our DNA and is a major component of our business model" (DAV-228). Medium Company B "actively

engage[s] employees” (DAV-229). This company emphasizes “social engagement” more than financial contributions, so places itself under “corporate citizenship” (DAV-228).

The company believes that “sustainability isn’t a destination; it’s an on-going way of life which we all share ownership” (DAV-228). One publication claimed: “We realize there is a positive correlation between shareholder value and social and environmental performance” (DAV-228). Leaders of Medium Company B gather on a continuous basis “to receive updates on company initiatives, objectives, and metrics” (DAV-228). “The real test of sustainability lies in the measurement of our performance and being committed to continuous improvement” (DAV-229). These behaviors all emphasize an Operational Culture.

Medium Company B has also seen a nearly 100% turnover in senior management—none with a history with the University. The 30-year most recently retired president and CEO was a graduate of the University and is chair of the University’s foundation board (CMBI-4). The new senior management of Medium Company B is currently reviewing its organizational relationships with all partners and aiming to be more strategic (CMBI-1; CMBI-2).

Fortune 500 Company A had extensive evidence of *DNA Citizenship Ethos*, such as “sustainability,” “employee engagement,” “leadership engagement,” “citizenship,” “stakeholder engagement,” “corporate governance,” “corporate responsibility,” “engaged people,” “technology leadership,” “market leadership,” “environment,” “social engagement,” “community engagement” (DAV-262; DAV-327; DAV-328; DAV-329; DAV-330; DAV-331; DAV-332; DAV-334; DAV-335; DAV-336; DAV-337; DAV-338; DAV-339). The Company is also a leader in reporting and “transparency” (DAV-334).

One document explained that: “Corporate responsibility” is a “commitment” to society and is a “non-financial” success metric (DAV-329; DAV-383). Clearly the corporation supports the triple bottom line via “environmental, economic, and social” actions (DAV-331; DAV-338). The Company’s long-term sustainability programming requires “continuous improvement” (DAV-331). Such improvement requires working with governments and “public policy” to improve inter-organizational relationships working toward common goals (DAV-339).

Fortune 500 Company B had significant evidence of *DNA Citizenship Ethos* as touted in publications as “corporate DNA” with emphasis on: “sustainability,” “leadership,” “stakeholder” engagement, “employee engagement,” “social engagement,” “transparency,” industry “leader” in operations and manufacturing, (DAV-387; DAV-389; DAV-400; DAV-402; DAV-402; DAV-437; DAV-439; DAV-440; DAV-444). Part of the Company’s success is open “dialogue” with “relevant stakeholders” to have a 360-degree view of the company (DAV-440; DAV-441; DAV-442). As part of corporations’ pluralistic role in society, sometimes “politicians and regulators” will “seek the expertise of companies” (DAV-441).

Summary of Analysis Across Embedded Units

Having six corporate participants allowed for analysis across embedded units to compare and contrast behavior, motives, and ROI expectations for inter-organizational interactions with the University. Four key areas of comparison and contrast included: complexity of engaging the corporations, availability of information and other resources, functionality of corporate citizenship in each company, and capacity strengths of each type of corporation. Additionally, each corporation was plotted on Cone’s (2010)

corporate citizenship spectrum based from data analysis and findings.

The larger the size of the company, the more complex it was to locate an internal champion to navigate the approval process. Medium companies were the most efficient to work with while *Fortune 500* companies were bureaucratic. Gaining access to information was much easier for public-traded companies because they have multiple requirements by state and federal governments for transparency and reporting. Private corporations often had little to no information available and were not legally required to share information. Small companies were found to be the most committed to their communities while *Fortune 500* companies have the largest budgets for corporate citizenship activities. Medium companies seemed the most efficient in regular, on-going management and connection in inter-organizational relationships with the University.

Plotting the six corporations' overall behavior onto Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum was readily apparent from analysis of interviews, document and audio-visual materials, campus observation, and corroboration with peer coders. Small Company A focused mainly on ROI and was categorized as "Cause-related Branding." Small Company B and Medium Company A are primarily altruistic and focus on community service, so they were plotted under "Philanthropy." Medium Company B was identified as "Operational Culture" while their organizational culture is aiming to catapult them eventually into "DNA Citizenship Ethos." Finally, both *Fortune 500* Companies A and B clearly have deep and wide corporate citizenship practices focused on the triple bottom line of sustainability, hence they are assigned in the "DNA Citizenship Ethos" category.

Serendipitous Findings

Aside from the findings that developed into themes to answer the research

questions and the emergences of four other findings, this study also yielded three serendipitous or emergent findings unrelated to the research. The first such finding was that during the corporate participant recruitment, it was learned that several companies were upset with the University. These issues related to general contracting or business relationships through the University, not any part of the corporate citizenship or University foundation fundraising activities. The University was pleased to learn of the problems so that they might be addressed for better future relationships.

The second finding related to the University's engagement beyond local or state boards. While several interviewees debated the requirement and limitation of geography as a restriction for corporate citizenship engagement, most learned through their own analysis that geography was not as important as they thought. When discussing the array and scope of companies and several of their locations or international connectivity, it was agreed that the University is truly a global-minded institution with deep, broad, and wide corporate connectivity.

Third, this research allowed the senior management of the companies to reflect on their inter-organizational relationships with the University. While many of the leaders and their employees tasked with external affairs and corporate citizenship responsibilities may have expectations but all agreed they did not have strategic plans or goals in place. It would be illogical and impossible to meet undefined expectations. Some of the corporate interviewees expressed opportunities for improved relations, but all of the executives admitted to not having a formal strategy or plan in place to interface with the University.

Journey

The past 5 years of working on a doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy

Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia and cohort activities at Missouri State University have been extremely rewarding. Aside from learning a plethora of information, research techniques, philosophies of leadership, and fundamentals of education, it was a blessing to gain a surrogate family in Missouri. Faculty and colleagues have truly enriched the journey.

At the onset, it was surmised that the greatest challenge of this dissertation research would be participant recruitment. That gut feeling became reality. It took 10 months to fully recruit a participant University. However, the entire project has unfolded richly, and a better University arguably could not have existed. A deep gratitude of thanks is extended to the University and to the University foundation lead contacts for their tireless efforts, support, and networking to provide participants.

Likewise, recruiting corporations took some time. Thanks to the University foundation's lead contact, the process took only 3 months. Because of the complexities of scheduling busy executives, the interviews took place over 7 months in seven cities in three states; the sessions involved 18,000 miles of travel by plane and car. The hospitality and cooperation by the University, University foundation, and six corporate participants were superb.

The greatest regret in this study was the determination of the organizational participants to desire confidentiality. However, the guarantee of confidentiality was necessary to fully engage the corporations. It was both humbling and exciting to sit in the same room with big-name individuals from the University, from its University foundation—including four board members who are retired CEOs of major U.S. corporations—and from the six corporations. These entities and many executives' names

would likely have household recognition. Protecting data confidentiality required conducting an extensive Internet search for hundreds of expressions, quotes, and buzzwords before incorporating them into this manuscript. The process was very time-consuming. However, it was important, and many phrases cannot be included because of their potential link to the participant organizations' identities.

Aside from participant recruitment, the second-greatest hurdle in this dissertation research was interview transcription. While an experienced transcriptionist was hired, the individual completed the project as a moonlighting activity—not with a full-time emphasis. The interviews were, however, superbly transcribed. The process was estimated to take under 3 months and took 11 months.

During the 5 years of doctoral work, several personal challenges and life changes caused a great deal of stress and concern. Included were job loss, relocation to another part of the country, and open heart surgery related to a previously undiagnosed condition until the relocation. This chain of events was heaven sent. It was possible to leave a very stressful job. The 14 months of unemployment provided time to complete written and oral comps, dissertation proposal research and defense, the recruitment of organizational participants, and the completion of two field research trips. The discovery of the bicuspid aortic valve, dilated aorta and un-descended aneurism, and enlarged heart—and the subsequent open heart surgery and recovery—entailed 6 months.

The last mile of this journey provided the opportunity to learn *Dedoose* (2013) software for qualitative data analysis, to explore various forms of qualitative data visualization, to review many dissertations for ideas, and to learn the use and creation of word clouds.

It was possible during this 5-year journey to remain steadfast. The spirit never faltered. The road was paved with rigorous discussions, countless hours of research and reading, thousands of hours of writing and editing, and many precautions to back up work. The road was also paved with encouragement, love, and support from family, friends, colleagues near and far, pastors, and the world's best dissertation advisor ever.

Summary

Table 9 overviews the major themes discovered through coding, data analysis, and findings to address the three research questions for this organizational analysis case study, which explored the relationships between an American higher education institution and six U.S. corporations to uncover and to describe “beliefs, values, and attitudes that structure behavior” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). The socio-cultural analysis of this unit created this ethnographic viewpoint; “the cultural context is what sets this type of study apart from other types of qualitative research” (Merriam, 1998, p. 12). Creswell (2007), Emerson et al. (1995), and Tedlock (2000) detailed the focus of an ethnographic case study to describe and to interpret a culture-sharing group. In this study that culture or environment was one of inter-organizational relationships. Corporate engagement with higher education is uniquely different from alumni, foundations, and other organizations’ relationships to universities. Corporations and higher education rely on each other in an inter-organizational relationship for mutual benefit (Brennan, 2000; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Gould, 2003; Haley, 1991; Liebman, 1984; Ma & Parish, 2006; Ostrander & Schervish, 2002).

Table 9

Summary of Themes Answering the Research Questions

Research Questions	Themes
1. Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?	Viable resources Student enrichment Real-world connectivity
2. Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?	Workforce development Community enrichment Brand development Research
3. What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationship between corporations and a higher education institution?	Generally none General ethical discussion topics Five disparate ethical dilemmas
Other Themes	
	Culture Economic Challenges Alumni Connectivity Geography

Note. After analysis of all data, themes emerged to answer the research questions.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

“The best philanthropy is constantly in search of the finalities—a search for a cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source.”

~ John D. Rockefeller (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 1)

Introduction

This dissertation is situated in the field of organizational theory. In the pluralistic society of the United States, a multitude of groups and organizations coexist (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Eisenstadt, 1981; Jacoby, 1973; Morgan, 2006). Both higher education and corporations constitute large constituencies in the landscape of organizations. Corporations and higher education rely upon each other in an inter-organizational relationship for mutual benefit (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Gould, 2003; Liebman, 1984; Norris, 1984; Ostrander & Schervish, 2002; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Tromble, 1998). This instrumental, ethnographic case study provided the lens to explore and to examine the inter-organizational relationships with one major American public higher education institution and six of its U.S.-based corporate partners. The higher education institution was labeled by the Carnegie Classification™ system as a doctoral/research university.

Saul (2011) argued: “Education, both as an issue and as an opportunity, is economically significant” (p. 14). Diminished governmental and public resources continued to create emphasis on private support for higher education (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Drezner, 2011; Gould, 2003; Johnson, 2006a; Levy, 1999; Rhodes, 2001; Shannon, 1991). Wilson (2011b) said “a confluence of economic

and demographic trends makes it more critical for companies to step up and play an active role in collaborative efforts” (p. 25). A main area of interest to corporations is higher education. Universities have had to explore all avenues for revenue to operate state-of-the art programs including facilities and highly qualified faculty. Corporations have been a viable and valuable partner for resources as well as corporate citizenship engagement. Rhodes (2001) explained,

The sponsorship of American research universities is distinctive. There is no one sponsor, no overseeing ministry, no national plan or government regulation. Decentralized, feistily independent, uncoordinated, pluralistic, American universities have been opportunistic, adaptive, creative, and responsive to new opportunities. ...The American university remains an organizational enigma, whose loosely coupled structure and collegially based organization defy the established canons of management. ...If university-industry-government partnerships are to prosper, they must operate within guidelines that respect the integrity and interests of all the institutional partners (university, government, corporations, foundations, and so on) and serve the legitimate needs of all the participants (faculty, corporate management, industrial scientists, students, and others). (pp. 13-14, 245)

One highly visible aspect of interaction between higher education institutions and corporations is financial (Eddy, 2010; Fischer, 2000; Gould, 2003; Rhodes, 2001; Rose, 2011). Inter-organizational relationships can yield clear wins for each partner when they have compatible agendas (Andresen, 2006; Crutchfield & Grant, 2008). As discussed by Pollack (1998), Sanzone (2000), Saul (2011), and Siegel (2007, 2008, 2012), corporations and universities strive to work together. These win-win relationships evidenced in this study—while complex and dynamic—do not support Giroux and Giroux’s (2004) nor Sommerville’s (2009) argument that corporations are taking over higher education. When partnerships involve resources, a *power dynamic* is created between the organizations that should be explored, defined, negotiated, and monitored

(COP, 2007). Funding and engagement from corporations often comes with clearly defined expectations and limitations (Fischer, 2000; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Molnar, 2002). Likewise, this dissertation research supports that higher education institutions have defined expectations and limitations when creating mutually beneficial relationships (Bright et al., 2006; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010; Daw & Cone, 2011; Elliott, 2006; Gould, 2003; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Pollack, 1998; Samans, 2005; Sanzone, 2000; Saul, 2011; Siegel, 2007, 2008, 2012).

Chapter Five summarizes the findings of the three research questions, discusses the findings in relation to contextual relevance from the literature review and in relationship to the larger conversation of corporate citizenship engagement in American higher education, reviews limitations of the study, shares implications of the research for practice, and recommends future research. Discussion includes consideration of the recession from 2006 through 2010 framing the study as well as inter-organizational relationship behavior between organizations in the American culture. Implications for practice include observations for inter-organizational relationships, University corporate relations practitioners and senior leaders, and corporate executives and managers organizing the engaged inter-organizational relationships function collectively as corporate citizens.

Summary of Findings

Practically speaking, this dissertation explored the purpose(s), merit(s), reality, and consequence(s) that exist in the inter-organizational relationship between higher education and corporate America's behavior as defined through Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Three key research questions were used to explore this relationship:

1. Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support?
2. Why do U.S. corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a higher education institution as identified on Cone's corporate citizenship spectrum as philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, or DNA citizenship ethos?
3. What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationships between corporations and a higher education institution?

Chapter Four provides great detail of the rich narrative and elaborates on the findings to the three research questions. The following section provides a high-level summary of those findings.

Themes for Research Question One

Three themes emerged from this study to answer Research Question One: Why does a higher education institution accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support? The three themes were *viable resources*, *student enrichment*, and *real-world connectivity*. Private funds—including corporate support—have grown increasingly important as governmental funds have decreased. Corporations are a source of *viable resources*, which is the primary motive for a higher education institution to accept corporate citizenship engagement and financial support. A variety of corporate resources were discussed including examples from the six corporate participants. Seven sub-themes of importance relating to *viable resources* for the University to engage with corporations included *funding for students*, *endowments*, *sponsorships*, *sponsored research*, *in-kind gifts*, *building funds*, and *vendor relationships*.

As a student-centered University, *student enrichment* opportunities and resources are needed to provide students with real world, hands-on learning activities to apply classroom knowledge and to situate their given disciplines in society. Corporations provide a wide range of opportunities and support *student enrichment* priorities described in the six sub-themes regarding *scholarships, programs, in-class projects, idea generation, competitions, and internships*.

Finally, through its commitment to improving society, the University emphasizes *real-world connectivity*—supported by corporations—in the five sub-theme topics of *social connectivity, economic connectivity, cultural connectivity, environmental connectivity, and sustainability*. The University strives to serve a multitude of constituents to create an inclusive and accessible education, to serve the personal and professional development of its students and alumni, to propel the economic and cultural vitality of the local and surrounding communities, and to solve and support broad-based issues impacting the greater society state-wide, regionally, nationally, and globally as related to social, economic, cultural, and environmental issues. The University is a world-renowned research institution and is a leader in sustainability. As a member of a pluralistic society, the University is mission-oriented to create a productive learning environment, to contribute to social and environmental causes, to support multi-cultural appreciation and diversity, and to uphold the American frameworks of entrepreneurship, democracy, and capitalism.

Themes for Research Question Two

The four major themes that emerged from this study to answer Research Question Two regarding why corporations engage as corporate citizens in relationships with a

higher education institution included: *workforce development*, *community enrichment*, *brand development*, and *research*. *Workforce development* includes the sourcing of talent at various levels for the corporations as well as providing continuing education, professional development opportunities for executive leadership, and venues for corporate employees to network in their fields of expertise. *Community enrichment* includes the contribution by corporations to society through *community development*, *economic development*, enhancing and growing the local *employment* base, exhausting collaborative *University resources*, and addressing *environmental protection*. *Brand development* highlights corporations' goal of maintaining a positive public image through *advertising*, *promotions*, and *sponsorships*. Finally, *research* was identified as a significant area of corporate engagement in higher education.

Themes for Research Question Three

Three themes emerged to answer Research Question Three: What ethical concerns arise in the engaged inter-organizational relationships between corporations and a higher education institution? First, most interviewees could not think of any ethical concerns or dilemmas or provide any specific examples, so *generally no ethical dilemmas* were found. While ethical issues do occur and many topics of ethical concerns or dilemmas were discussed when asked about ethical concerns, there was no single overshadowing ethical problem cited. Second, several *general ethics discussion topics* relating to ethical behaviors created five clusters of other topics: *public relations*, *solicitation*, *policies and stewardship*, *accountability and transparency*, and *leadership behavior*. While no specific examples or dilemmas were cited, several interviewees addressed attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and protocols when asked if any ethical issues existed in the inter-

organizational relationships between the University and corporations. Those statements were clustered to become those five topics and are collated in Table 7. Third, *five disparate ethical concerns* were shared by higher education interviewees. In no particular order, those specific dilemmas faced included: (1) faculty trying to bypass fees in sponsored research; (2) dealing with a company that wanted to use a University venue on a hot topic for a panel discussion as a political agenda with only one side of the debate invited; (3) a company requesting the University to submit a proposal that included a position, but an actual corporate employee was being provided; (4) student-funded projects failing to deliver results; and (5) corporate executives wanting free tuition or a scholarship for their child because their company was supporting the University. None of the dilemmas involved any of the six corporate participants in the study. Each of the situations was one-offs and was handled professionally by University personnel involved.

Separate from the research questions, four other themes emerged from the data dealing with *culture, economic challenges, alumni connectivity, and geography*. *Culture* and related behaviors of each of the institutions affected the inter-organizational relationships. All organizational participants faced *economic challenges* between 2006 to 2010, which was the time frame for this study. Each organization had to deal with *the recession* in terms of sustaining itself and determining needs and priorities to ensue. Inter-organizational dependencies caused prioritization of inter-organizational relationships and related financial commitments. *Alumni connectivity* is mutually beneficial to the individuals participating, the University, and corporations who emphasize such commitment. *Alumni engagement* includes volunteering for co-curricular or classroom opportunities, providing leadership or other expertise, attending various

campus events such as sports or arts, or contributing financially. One major area of complexity is *quasi-corporate giving*. Some alumni own a company or profit from corporate careers. While the gift is from the individual, some people believe the relationship with corporate America was influential in the process. Finally, *geography* can create an ease as well as responsibility for the University's ability to attract funding and engagement with corporations.

Discussion

As with any type of relationship, organizations, too, are unique. The inter-organizational relationships between higher education and corporations should be dealt with from each organization's perspective. This organizational analysis is situated in open systems of organizations (Aldrich, 1979; Cropper et al., 2008; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005; Thompson, 2005). The concept of inter-organizational relationship "is concerned with understanding the character, pattern, origins, rationale, and consequences of such relationships" (Cropper et al., p. 4). These inter-organizational relationships are multi-faceted and complex. Analysis of the data supports Eber's (1999) indication that "The nature of inter-organizational relationships is inherently dynamic, rather than static" (p. 38).

This discussion stems from an ethnographic interpretation of inter-organizational relationships (Creswell, 2007; Rosen, 1991). Discussion includes consideration of how inter-organizational relationships work and the perspective from both universities and corporations. Organizational environmental factors are explored. Carroll and Hannan (2004) defined the environment for organizations to include other organizations, natural actors, political structures, technologies, and physical environments. Organizational

behavior considers organizations' decision making based on collective actions and decisions of organizational actors on behalf of the organization. Those decisions are also governed by organizational ethics through a variety of means. Additionally, consideration of ethnography and the culture of organizations is addressed. Finally, this discussion section will summarize key experiences and observations from qualitative research methods utilized in the study.

Inter-organizational Relationships

Organizations function within the pluralistic society, not just within an organization (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Eisenstadt, 1981; Jacoby, 1973; Morgan, 2006). Inter-organizational behavior occurs external to each organization in the open systems concept (Cropper et al., 2008; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005; Thompson, 2005). However, organizations' internal systems influence the essence and being of organizations and how they interact with other organizations and their environments (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Shafritz et al., 2005). Such internal systems include: structure, which may vary depending on size of the institution and type of industry for businesses, and includes policies; human resources roles of leadership, management, and employee volunteerism or engagement; politics and networks of individuals, subgroups, and relations outside the organization supported by internal networks and coalitions; and organizational culture—specifically as mission, vision, and values (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Herman, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Saiia, 2001). For this study, it was an assumption that those internal dynamics were organized and functioning in order for the organizations to interact with other organizations.

“Inter-organizational relationships are subject to inherent development dynamics”

(Ebers, 1999, p. 31). Four dynamics include “the parties’ motives...the pre-conditions and contingencies of forming inter-organizational relationships...the content and...the outcomes” (Ebers, 1999, p. 31). Beyond these dynamics, organizations constantly learn how to act and react to other organizations (Ebers, 1999; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Morgan, 2006; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Morgan (2006) said, “organizations must develop cultures that support change and risk taking” (p. 91). The three processes for organizational learning and respective inter-organizational engagement include understanding, revaluation, and adjustment (Ebers, 1999; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). Ebers indicated,

In the course of an ongoing inter-organizational relationship, the parties may for instance learn more about the environmental challenges and opportunities that affect the contents and outcomes of their relationship; they may learn more about one another, for example, about their goals, capabilities, or trustworthiness; and they may learn how they could perhaps better design their relationship in order to achieve desired outcomes. (p. 38)

Ebers said these dynamics and processes push inter-organizational relationships “to evolve over time” (p. 38).

Organizational participants in this research have built rapport and trust over a time period. While no company was able to provide a holistic strategic plan for inter-organizational engagement, activities and goals for individual projects and programs have been administered. As those projects or programs perform, they are analyzed and adjusted. The University and each of the six corporations learned from each experience and adapted behaviors and related resources to maintain, build, or truncate activities.

Higher Education's Perspective of Inter-organizational Relationships with Businesses

Higher education is funded by tuition, government aid, and private support, which includes individuals, foundations, and corporations. As governments cut funding, more of a burden falls on the private sector to help fund higher education purposes and goals (Arulampalam & Stoneman, 1995; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cicone & Jacob, 2009; Curti & Nash, 1965; DeAngelo & Cohen, 2000; Drezner, 2011; Gould, 2003; Johnson, 2006a; Levy, 1999; Rhodes, 2001; Shannon, 1991). Both analyses of document and audio-visual materials and University interviews confirmed the experience of complex finances in higher education, including the reduction of state and federal funding and the need for high-quality corporate partnerships. Findings supporting the emphasis of financial motives included *viable resources* and *student enrichment* in RQ1. University interviewees expressed significant need for various corporate funding.

The findings in this study were consistent with both Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory and the resource dependence theory by Aldrich (1979) and Pfeffer and Salancik (2003); they defined how higher education looks outside itself for resources—including corporate support. Rhodes (2001) identified several factors in the rising cost of higher education thus creating financial challenges for universities: technology expense and implementation; the processing of labor-intensity to educate students holistically, which comes with a price tag of professionals' costs; new programs to meet current world demands; and the opportunity costs of inclusivity for all people to have access. Today, just as promoted by Fischer (2000) and Pollard (1958), higher education—as evidenced from the participant University in this study—seeks to deliver high quality education as well as partner with appropriate other organizations providing

mutually beneficial ventures and funding and impact into the community—locally, statewide, regionally, nationally, and internationally—and serve the greater public.

Operating an educational organization is expensive. The education industry is broad. “According to the Education Industry Association, education is rapidly becoming a \$1 trillion industry, representing 10 percent of America’s GNP and second only in size to the health care industry. Education companies alone generate more than \$80 billion in annual revenues” (Saul, 2011, p. 14). Resource challenges continue to force higher education—including the University in this study—to diversify funding as explained by Hearn (2003) and to partner with corporations as researched, discussed, and written about by Carroll and Buchholtz (2008), Elliott (2006), Gould (2003), Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), Pollack (1998), Sanzone (2000), and Saul (2011). The findings in this study of the University and its engagement with corporations support Brock (2007), Fulton and Blau (2005), and Saul’s (2011) recommendations to navigate these resources: higher education institutions would do well to embrace the new ecology of the 21st Century requiring the University administrators and fundraisers to not only create a case for support and engagement, but to rethink the value propositions for corporations and other partners.

Brock (2007), Sanzone (2000), and Saul (2011) all indicated that understanding corporations’ values and needs; speaking their language; creating solutions for business problems, opportunities, and needs; and assuring efficiency and effectiveness catapult relationship success. Specifically, the University foundation corporate relations officer and most of the interviewees in this study discussed those dynamics.

Brock said those needing resources should “Understand important trends and directions driving the industry. Understand their key measures of success. Try to anticipate the problems, challenges, and opportunities they face” (p. 2). Corporations and other partners are operating in a more and more complex environment with multiple needs and goals. All six corporations and the University representatives in this study expressed the challenge of a wide range of needs and goals. Additionally, both the University and the six corporations’ executives concur that quantifying impact is the key for organizations such as higher education to engage in today’s complex resource environment (Brock, 2007; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). On the higher education side, while many variables may be tracked, dollars are the primary monitoring measurement for corporate engagement (Hartford, 2000). Overall, the University measures its success by student achievement, faculty research and scholarship, alumni accomplishments, and contributions to society. Hartford (2000) indicated that corporations are reasonable and typically give 2-3 years for academic institutions to show results. Those results are benchmarked with similar programs at other higher education institutions to gauge success. Some interviewees expressed the need for reasonable time to launch a successful relationship to yield tangible results.

As admonished by Pollack (1998) and Sanzone (2000), higher education needs to create a friendly system to assist corporations in navigating working relationships with universities. University interviewees expressed how higher education and corporations have differing goals and objectives and different approaches to inter-organizational relationships relating to all three RQ1 findings of *viable resources*, *student enrichment*, and *real-world connectivity*. Particularly in *real-world connectivity*, interviewees

discussed improvements in working relationship steps, adjustments in behavior over time, and emphasis on long-term objectives.

This study also supports Saul's (2011) framework for higher education institutions to: think like corporations think, understand their own depth of resource capacities to define their value propositions, to seek appropriate partners, to create common dialogue, and to embrace an accountability mind-set to measure and report activities and outcomes. Pollack (1998) said, "campuses that take a corporate partnership approach seek some degree of coordination among them in order to present a unified face to the company" (p. 16). Several of the University executives formerly worked in corporations and have a good understanding of corporate processes between organizations. Additionally, many University interviewees discussed creating win-win objectives required each party to understand the other's.

The findings in RQ2 illustrate that the six companies engage with the University because of the University's high quality opportunities, array of academic resources and human capital, amiable mindset toward community, forward thinking culture, and attention to inter-organizational relationships with corporations. For example, University educational units includes more than a dozen colleges and schools across a range of programs and centers in many *disciplines* including law, health sciences, business, education, liberal arts, and social sciences as well as the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math. Having so many opportunities creates a greater likelihood for corporations to find multiple areas of mutual interest.

Finally, the University's goal is to provide a centralized system of corporate relations including better internal communications and coordination to maximize

engagement with corporations. Individuals from across the University meet on a regular basis to strategize relationships with corporations, develop proposals and relationship plans, and communicate regarding multiple sub-relationships that occur between the University and any given company. Improved processes aim at developing and growing strong inter-organizational relationships with businesses of any size.

Corporations' Perspective of Inter-organizational Relationships with Higher Education

As defined by the World Economic Forum (2002), *corporate citizenship* is universally defined as:

The contribution a company makes to society through its core business activities, its social investment and philanthropy programmes, and its engagement in public policy. The manner in which a company manages its economic, social and environmental relationships, as well as those with different stakeholders, in particular shareholders, employees, customers, business partners, governments and communities determines its impact.
(p. 1)

Today, companies want to function as partners, be more transparent, engage employees at all levels, communicate their giving, and measure the impact of their activities (COP, 2007). Findings in RQ2 support that statement regardless of size of the corporation, its longevity with the University, or its degree of financial contribution or engagement. Additionally, the six companies were found to want to “strengthen connections” locally, but also enlarge “building perceptions” with broader audiences (COP, p. 6).

This study reiterated Philip’s (2012) work that determination of which higher education institutions to partner with include such factors as competency, success track record, potential to improve ROI, and intangibles such as good relationship management. Companies engage as corporate citizens for a wide range of reasons, motives, and desired benefits. This study supports Gardberg and Fombrun’s (2006) statement that “citizenship

activities therefore encompass corporate investments of time and money in pro bono work, philanthropy, support for community education and health, and protection of the environment” (p. 329). As discussed in the themes from the findings in this study, corporations of all sizes generally have the same goals of fulfilling their duties in a pluralistic society, helping communities, recruiting students, networking with faculty, leveraging resources, developing new technologies, continuing education, leadership development, and building brand reputation as previously reported by BBIC (2002), Carey (2012), Hoerr et al. (2012), Philip (2012), and Rubenstein (2004). Specific emphasis of each of the six participant companies is discussed in the analysis across embedded units and the placement of the companies on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum in Chapter Four.

The approach to the inter-organizational relationship with the University varied by the size of the six corporations in this study; this dynamic was previously discussed by BBIC (2002), Burlingame and Frishkoff (1996), Frishkoff and Kostecka (1991), Krieg (1991), Pinney (2009), and Rubenstein (2004). Small Companies A and B had direct oversight of engagement by the organizations’ presidents. Medium Company A’s senior leadership directed the relationship with the University. Medium Company B had designated managers to interface with the University. Both *Fortune 500* Companies A and B had a lead liaison to navigate the University relationship as well as served as a central point of contact internally. While Philip (2012) advocated a decentralized approach and said that companies often want a “decentralized approach” because “every business and division manages its own relationships” (p. 6), the corporate executives interviewed explained that centralized coordination both internally and in cooperation

with the University were desired to better allocate resources, focus on the inter-organizational relationship even with a myriad of complex relationships at various levels, and to centralize reporting and accountability. Those sentiments resounded Carey (2012) and McGowan's (2012) advocacy of a centralized approach. McGowan indicated that a "holistic model" emphasizes a relationship's focus and institutional coordination in a "strategic relationship" (p. 5). McGowan also advocated that "one model does not fit all" (p. 7). Each relationship depends on what type of focus, the institution's staff size, dependence on a centralized or decentralized approach, and availability of resources corporations are interested in tapping. Carey (2012) said having a single "point of contact in corporate relations can be [a] very helpful shortcut to contacting the right person in the right department at the university" (p. 7). Hartford (2000) also promoted on-campus coordination. Brennan (2000) promoted "cross-education" among schools, colleges, and resource departments on campus. Basically, all individuals within a university with information or a need to engage with a corporation meet to strategize and build a comprehensive picture and relationship regarding that company.

While all of the corporation leaders in this study want to be goal-oriented in their engagement with the University, none of the six companies in this study had a centralized strategic plan overseeing the inter-organizational relationship. Philip (2012) admonished that corporations, like universities, should create an "engagement plan" to "build and maintain relationships," create "tools" such as timelines and agreements, and build an "awareness of opportunities" for optimal inter-organizational relationship success (p. 10). To that effect, most of the executives interviewed in this study indicated a desire to better interface with the University. For example, at the time of this study, Medium Company

B's leadership was in the process of addressing a holistic strategic plan including both the company and its related foundation to better maximize its relationship with the University.

Data gathered from the companies in this study supports Saul's (2011) observation:

Over the last five years, something extraordinary has taken place: the market has begun to place an economic value on social outcomes [including education]. Indeed, social impact has become a valuable economic commodity: people are willing to pay for it, sacrifice for it, invest in it, and work for it. This phenomenon extends well beyond do-gooders and environmentalists to include mainstream consumers, investors, corporations, employees, and governments. Corporations alone are spending billions on environmental sustainability, social responsibility, and philanthropy. Consumers are spending more for goods and services related to health, the environment, social justice, and sustainable living. Governments are spending more than ever on education and health care. (p. 5)

The Environment of Inter-organizational Relationships

Aldrich (1979) said, "Organizations are not able to generate internally all the resources and functions required to sustain themselves, and thus...enter into transactions with environmental elements supplying such requirements" (p. 266). Likewise, Meyer and Rowan's (1977) institutional theory manifested in the findings of this study promoted that three types of pressures exist in institutions, including higher education: (a) influence from organizations upon whom they are dependent, (b) mimetic pressures to copy successful models during high uncertainty, and (c) normative pressures to create homogeneity (i.e., centralization). All three of those pressures were found in the University's inter-organizational behavior found in this study. Evan (1965) highlighted that:

All formal organizations are embedded in an environment of other

organizations as well as a complex of norms, values, and collectiveness of the society at large. Inherent in the relationship between any formal organization and its environment is the fact that it is to some degree dependent upon its environment. (p. B218)

Ebers (1999) indicated that a wide range of variables as well as any changes in the environment of organizations effects how organizations interact with one another. These factors include political, economic, social, and organizational dynamics. Aldrich (1979) indicated three sources of an organization's ability to interact with other organizations including leadership, other organizations' behavior, and social and cultural forces. The latter two are external while most scholars contend that leadership is internal (Aldrich, 1979; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Three specific areas of concern from this study include each *organization's culture*, *the challenging economic condition* during time frame of this study from 2006 to 2010 that included a recession, and *organizations' learning process* to improve inter-organizational relationships.

Organizational culture. Organizations are defined as social units created with some particular purpose (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). To understand organizational culture, it is important to understand each individual organization and its essence. This essence includes the organization's purpose(s) typically communicated in vision and mission statements, values that are enacted in organizational behaviors through individual action, and relevant artifacts that create and celebrate how the organization functions (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Spradley, 1980). In this study, the University, University foundation, and the six corporations maintained and promoted vision and mission statements to create a backdrop of organizational identity and culture.

"Culture can be defined as a shared set of values that influence societal perceptions, attitude, preferences, and responses" (Robbins & Stylianou, 2003, p. 206).

Manifestation of culture exhibits itself as actionable behaviors, norms, values, corporate philosophy, written and unwritten rules, and overall climate in an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Liggett, 2000; Morgan, 2006; Schein, 1985). The essence of culture is often intangible and is deeper; culture operates unconsciously in “an environment’s view of itself and its environment” (Schein, 1985, p. 6). Such invisible factors in this study included the organizations’ environments, their nature of time and space, the nature of their people, the nature of both the organizations’ and the employees’ relationships internally and externally, and the activities and behaviors of both the organizations and their agents. The organizations in this study exhibited the desire and actions to interact with other organizations in their environment. Document and audio-visual materials and interviews evidenced a wide range of examples of inter-organizational behavior around shared goals and programs.

Morgan (2006) explained, “The visions, values, and sense of purpose that bind an organization together can be used as a way of helping every individual understand and absorb the mission and challenge of the whole enterprise” (p. 99). Members, therefore, act collectively to make decisions. Leadership of the University, University foundation, Medium Company B, and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B expressed that process. Small Companies A and B and Medium Company A primarily had unilateral decision making from individuals. This study confirmed Brief and Motowidlo (1986), Herman (2008), and Sirsly’s (2009) observation that senior leadership can create a culture of corporate citizenship, including ethics. Schein (1985) said leaders create culture and reinforcement of cultural behavior based on what they “pay attention to, measure, and control” (p. 224); how they react “to critical incidents and organizational crises” (pp. 224-225); how they

role model, teach, and coach others; how they allocate “rewards and status” (p. 225); and their “criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement, and excommunication” (p. 225) of employees. Each of the organizations in the study provided evidence of such processes and operations management internally that likely aid in external interactions with other organizations in inter-organizational relationships.

Garvin (1975) said the responsibility of social responsibility “demands the active participation of top management” (p. 7). Such a hands-on approach sends “a clear signal from the top” (p. 7) to the organization. CEOs learn about key issues and should be personally involved, involve others internally and externally, be innovative, be strategic, set objectives and expect results, and recognize and reward good work (MacAllister, 1991). “The onus is clearly on the executive to not only to establish the corporate values, but to ensure these values form the foundation of corporate actions throughout the organization” (Sirsly, 2009, p. 80). Several interviewees in this study confirmed Garvin (1975), MacAllister (1991), and Sirsly’s (2009) concerns with organizational leadership creating and enforcing organizational culture and behavior in relation to inter-organizational behavior for corporate citizenship engagement. Leadership, however, was not the focus of this study. Additionally, scholars debate whether leadership is an internal (closed system) factor or external (open systems) factor (Aldrich, 1979; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Many scholars believe leaders and even management function as organizational actors in both internal and external spaces at the apex of organizational culture and behavior as organizations interact in their environments.

Several areas of organizational culture were found in this study relating to the American culture; each organizations’ essence and operational policies relating to inter-

organizational behavior; the actors in each organization such as leaders, managers, boards of directors, and individual employees acting as volunteers or who were alumni engaged with the University; and the environmental landscape for inter-organizational stage including the economy and other organizations' interest in interacting. Many of these activities create two-way opportunities. For example, boards of directors gain intel for their organization while working in their board capacity to obtain legal, financial, strategic information, or other expertise to serve the organization as a board member (Aldrich, 1979). Organizational culture promoted "appropriate attitudes, values, and norms" (Morgan, 2006, p. 145). Such organizational culture is manifested in the organization's operational culture and practices. "When we observe a culture, whether in an organization or in society at large, we are observing an evolved form of social practice that has been influenced by many complex interactions between people, events, situations, actions, and general circumstances" (Morgan, 2006, p. 146). The inter-organizational activities found in this research constitute an overlap in participating organizations that found mutually common areas of interest.

America's pluralistic environment requires all parties to take interest, ownership, and responsibility for rational behavior and joint ownership for social values (Jacoby, 1973; Saul, 2011). The organizations in this study exhibited Bar-Tal's (1976) pro-social behavior through resources and engagement in of the American culture by all entities helping one another. With such a vital role in society, corporations have a vested interest in the success of American higher education. Jacoby (1973) said, "The corporation has long played a stellar role on the American social stage" (p. 249). "Corporations have contributed in many ways to enhancing the quality of life in our communities" (Fischer,

2000, p. 184). Inter-organizational engagement may often “reflect the corporate values” (COP, 2007, p. 12). Liggett (2000) said, “organizational cultures influence how people make decisions and set expectations” (p. 6). Rosen (1991) said, “culture emerges from action” (p. 6). Thus the inter-organizational behavior becomes a cycle. The University’s marketing materials, third party analysis and discussion of the University, and the University’s interviewees confirmed the University’s mission to contribute to society. The University engages appropriate corporations as part of that process. Thus the corporations ultimately help the University fulfill its mission while the companies are also contributing to the pluralistic society.

Managing different cultures in the University and corporations was a key issue (Miller & Le Boeuf, 2009; Steele, 2009). Bolman and Deal (2008) explained, “culture forms the superglue that bonds an organization, unites its people, and helps an enterprise accomplish desired ends” (p. 253). The University culture required academic freedom for teaching, research, publishing, and service. The University also functions as an organizational citizen in a pluralistic society. The major duty was to students. Morgan (2006) said, “Corporate culture rests in distinctive capacities and incapacities that are built into the attitudes and approaches of organizational members. Culture is not something that can be measured on a scale because it is a form of lived experience” (p. 147). The six corporations’ cultures required economic production in the free market and additionally illustrated responsibilities and actions as organizational citizens in a pluralistic society. Thus, both types of organizations “play an important part in the construction of their realities” (Morgan, p. 147).

Major processes for both the University and six corporations were navigating

common language, goals, and operations. A vital process was developing trust given the multi-layered goals and competing priorities. Trust was developed through practice—one project at a time. Trust required transparency, frequent communication, honor guidelines, respect, shared vision, shared governance, and vetted ideas to keep everyone focused (Anderson, 2009). Each participating organization in this study exhibited actions to varying degrees through shared initiatives such as volunteerism of corporate personnel on advisory boards and classroom project partners, surrounding issues of societal importance such as the environment and various industries, and open communications regarding activities through reporting to provide accountability and transparency.

Yin (2009) said that organizational culture may also be manifested in relevant physical artifacts. The campus observation component in this study provided an opportunity to forensically look for corporate names or logos on the University's main campus. A total of 407 photographs were taken on the University's main campus and analyzed. Names of corporations or their logos appeared 215 times while non-corporations' names appeared 1,357 times for a total of 1,572 recognitions observed. Hence, corporate presence totaled only 14% of all identified named spaces or objects observed as was illustrated in Table 3. The University's culture was conservative for corporations' name recognition and in alignment with general partner or donor recognition. The largest observation of corporations' presence was found to be logos or names related to athletic complexes and practice facilities. The six corporations' culture did not recognize the University's relationship in any way—no presence, visualization, name recognition, or artifacts of the University—in their offices or work spaces as observed through visiting their offices during the corporate interview process.

Penurious economic times. Aldrich (1979) said, “Organizations are shaped, pushed, and pulled in directions unintended and unforeseen” (p. 22). Fulton and Blau (2005) indicated that building and maintaining close inter-organizational relationships is the key to successful inter-organizational relations in any timeframe, yet even more so in economically challenging times where prioritization of resources creates greater focus. The 5-year period framing this study from 2006 to 2010 included the most recent challenging economic recession (Cohen, 2010; Drezner, 2011; Goldberg, 2010; Kaplan, 2011; Lawrence, 2009; Mayer, 2010; Nonprofit Research Collaborative, 2010; Pinney, 2009; Rose, 2011; The State of Corporate Citizenship, 2012). Many believed the recession was the greatest “economic and financial turbulence unequalled [in the United States] since the Great Depression” (Pinney, 2009, p. 9).

While the companies varied on their perspective of whether the economy was a positive or negative force, all agreed that inter-organizational relationships of any kind were strategic and focused as discussed by Lawrence (2009). Thompson (2005) indicated that such an external dynamic forces an organization to attune to “a problem-facing and problem-solving phenomenon” (p. 494). All of the organizations maintained relationships with the University during the challenging economic times but focused on enhancing existing initiatives rather than establishing new ones. For example, Medium Company A had to renegotiate a very large pledge because of the challenging economy. The University agreed to a longer fulfillment of the commitment. Medium Company A indicated the change of terms was required in order to not have to lay off employees in order to maintain the original payment terms.

This study confirmed Aiken and Hage’s (1968) contention that “as the need for

resources intensifies, organizations are more likely to develop greater interdependencies with other organizations, joint programs, in order to gain resources” (p. 915). This intensity demands clarity of goals, a certain degree of centralization, increased communications, and a degree of formality—all of these qualities were attested to from interview data. However, Touraine (1977) observed that each organization “is autonomous in that it is a decision center that can establish exchanges with the outside as well as internal norms of functioning” (p. 242). Each corporations’ leadership as well as that of the University and University foundation determined priorities of need and opportunities as well as key relationships and inter-organizational relationships to emphasize or de-emphasize.

Organizational learning. Bolman and Deal (2008) said, “Over time, an organization develops distinctive beliefs, values, and customs” (p. 269). These cultural elements are affected by each organization’s learning processes (Schein, 1985). The three processes for organizational learning and respective inter-organizational engagement include understanding, reevaluation, and adjustment (Ebers, 1999; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). Bolman and Deal (2008) said, “Culture is both a product and a process. As a product, it embodies wisdom accumulated from experience. As a process, it is renewed and re-created as newcomers learn the old ways and eventually become teachers themselves” (p. 269). Ebers (1999) indicated,

In the course of an ongoing inter-organizational relationship, the parties may for instance learn more about the environmental challenges and opportunities that affect the contents and outcomes of their relationship; they may learn more about one another, for example, about their goals, capabilities, or trustworthiness; and they may learn how they could perhaps better design their relationship in order to achieve desired outcomes. (p. 38)

The organizational participants in this study have evolved in understanding how their organizations can collaborate. That understanding has grown and matured over time—it is not instantaneous. Each participating organization said that on-going inter-organizational relationships are reviewed at least annually to evaluate outcomes, strengths, and weaknesses and then to re-evaluate next steps or growth. Finally, as needed, adjustments are made. Adjustments range from policies to processes, leadership to employee engagement, organizational strategies to surveying community needs, and availability of resources to match priorities.

As organizations adapt, cope, manage, and survive in their environment, consideration of interrelated cultural concepts may be adjusted to ensure survival, such as mission, vision, and values; short- and long-term strategies; resources of people, time, technology, and capital. Interaction with other organizations required conceptual understandings, common language, organizational learning, definition of roles and boundaries, establishment of power and status, intimacy, rewards and punishments, and ideologies (Schein, 1985).

Ethical Behavior

Ethics in the Western world, and specifically the United States, evolved from an amalgamation of numerous roots including Socratic concerns of long-term principles for sound decision making; Aristotelian personal virtues of temperance, honesty, openness, truth, pride, and humility; and Judeo-Christian values of compassion and kindness (Hosmer, 2008). Because all individuals do not practice personal ethics, governments are formed to provide a central authority and social contracts for citizen and organizational conduct. A “capitalistic market morality presupposes a rule utilitarian world-view that

fosters trust, fairness, loyalty, respect for the well-being of community members, and generally minimizes harm in the process of promoting the public good” (Shaw & Post, 1993, p. 746). Malloy and Agarwal (2003) said, “Benevolence forms the underlying dimension of trust in a relationship which implies that one partner is genuinely interested in the other partner’s welfare and motivated to seek joint gain rather than an egocentric motive” (p. 228). As evidenced in this study, both higher education and corporations have developed meaningful codes of ethical standards to help organizational actors interact (Boyd & Halfond, 1990; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Kidder, 2006; The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics, 1999). In general, however, to mitigate ethics and accountability, emphasis is placed on obeying laws, avoiding excessive and egregious behavior, sound decision making, standard operating procedures and controls for regular routines, and strategies for handling unusual circumstances (Dunn & Babbitts, 1991; Evans, 2000).

Ethical organizational behavior considers various dimensions. Beiser (2005) said, “Ethical behavior means an organization must consistently act in a manner that would allow auditors, and even to some extent the general public, to examine the details of an organization at any time without fear they will find any ‘questionable’ behavior” (pp. 18-19). The following sections address: *organizational ethics, expectations for ethical behavior, observation of ethical behavior, leadership behavior and ethics, organizations’ orientation toward their employees, reactions to social demands, reactions to the environment, and culture.*

Organizational ethics. The ethical findings in this study support Dion’s (1996) assertion that organizational culture creates the basis for organizational ethics and decision making. All of the participant organizations except Small Company A provided

a wide range of considerations, policies, and trainings regarding ethical values, practices, and goals. This attention to values and ethics support the organizations' due diligence of formulating employees' potential behaviors as supported by several pro-social organizational theories by Ashforth and Mael (1989), Bar-Tal (1976), Brief and Motowidlo (1986), and Saul (2011). These organizational practices support Jacoby's (1973) social environment model and Fischer's (2000) theories of the underlying "mutuality" needed for inter-organizational behavior (p. 189).

Organizations do not act; rather individuals within an organization act collectively to consummately make decisions and act as agents for an organization. Therefore, actions of individuals become synonymous with the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hall et al., 1970; Organ et al., 2006; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). For example, *Fortune 500* Company B indicated that "image and reputation" of companies is "inseparable from the conduct" of employees, which supports Albert and Whetten's (1985) organizational identity theory (DAV-390).

Both social identity theory and organizational identity theory claim that distinctiveness of organizations promote certain values and practices that relate best to those of comparable groups with similar values, practices, prestige, and goals (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Katz & Kahn, 2005; Organ et al., 2006). Organizations affiliate and partner with other institutions that embody their salient identities. Such affinity for one another's organizations promotes inter-organizational cohesion, cooperation, and positive interactions. Such reinforcement creates longevous relationships.

Expectations for ethical behavior. Cloniger (1985) and Carroll (1991) explained multiple concerns for business. Three perspectives in corporate ethics included classical,

legal, and constituency. The classical perspective was that the corporation exists in society to produce profits. Businesses need to be profitable and maintain existence in order to be able to interact with their environment and act ethically. The legal perspective indicated that the corporate organization is responsible for its actions via its managerial decision making, products and services, and be held accountable for its involvement in society. The constituency perspective supported the corporate social responsibility of corporate interactions with all stakeholders and society (Cloniger, 1985; Saia, 2001; Waddock, 2004). The University and the six corporations all noted that their purposes for existence had to be upheld in order to act inter-organizationally. As evidenced from document and audio-visual materials—both internal to the organizations and external third-party sources—no corporate issues with higher education were indicated. In this study, the senior leadership was the constituency as decision makers.

Acar et al. (2001) said, “The ethical responsibilities of a business firm are those societally defined expectations of business behavior that are not part of formal law” (p.30). DeGeorge (2009) said “ethics and morality have an important role to play in business” (p. 614). With today’s expectations of transparency and accountability, many audiences watchdog actions of organizations including competitors, governments, employees of the organizations, and the general public. As indicated by Hosmer (2008) and Schein (1985) organizational ethical expectations should be defined and enacted under standard practices, which was the case with all organizational participants. Organizations had codes of conduct that served as the ethics benchmarks for the organizations which were holistic and encompassed: economic viability, sociopolitical realities, substantive issues, performance standards, and proper implementation, which

support ethical issues and practices discussed by Carroll and Buchholtz (2008), Kidder (2006), and The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics (1999). Such codes included values, virtues, and standards for appropriate behavior and cognizant recognition of ethical issues noted by Kidder (2006). Boyd and Halfond (1990) stated that “meaningful codes of ethical standards and vigilant enforcement of those ideals” protects inter-organizational relationships for both parties (p. A44). Ethical behavior and trust created the foundation for organizations to cooperate and seek one another’s “welfare” and “joint gain” (Malloy & Agarwal, 2003, p. 228). From the findings in this study, it is apparent that the leaders from the University, the University foundation, and the six corporations were motivated to act ethically for mutual benefit and hence are dedicated to on-going interactions as evidenced with few examples of ethical dilemmas in RQ3.

Observation of ethical behavior. In today’s society, wide-spread news and social media create instantaneous knowledge of ethical infractions or misconduct. However, in the broad spectrum of all transactions and relationships, those inappropriate incidents often create fear and promote distrust. The findings in RQ3 support that reality is different from perception. Overall, the University and these particular six companies yielded positive interactions rooted in high expectations stemming from in-depth protocols for individuals’ behavior as well as inter-organizational behavior.

For example, evidence of ethical behavior was found in documents and audio-visual materials and discussed in both corporate and higher education interviews. Creswell (2008) labeled these types of materials as *emic data*, which is “information supplied by participants in a study” (p. 482). As indicated by Beiser (2005), good ethical behavior includes accountability as exhibited by “consistency, clarity, and transparency”

(p. 18). All organizations in the study were able to explain and/or provide documentation of intended behavior as defined in the organizations' missions, visions, and values. Likewise, the University, University foundation, Medium Company B, and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B all had a great deal of documented information available to guide and show actual actions with consistency, clarity, and transparency. Financial and reporting documentation in document and audio-visual data were extensive for the University, University foundation, Medium Companies A and B, and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B. Jacobson (1978) claimed that "financial statements have not been used as extensively as they might be [in scholarly research] because they are difficult to understand and interpret" (p. 53). This study provided an opportunity to use financial statements and related annual reports extensively.

Interviews relating to ethics in RQ3 brought to life cognizant recognition for proper ethical behavior and decision making to promote inter-organizational behavior. Interviews also provided an opportunity to hear more about Bright et al.'s (2006) five dimensions of organizations' ethical conduct—which is beyond just moral decision making—and included leadership behavior and ethics, organizations' orientation toward their employees, reactions to societal demands, reactions to the environment, and culture. These five dimensions are considered as normal, negative deviance, or positive deviance. Normal forces created ethical decision making, support and retention of employees, mutual benefit to society, maintenance and renewal of the environment, and compromise or tolerance for cultural differences. Negative deviance is considered weakness, and must be corrected. Examples of negative deviance might include unethical leadership behavior, exploiting or abusing employees, being defensive to society, exploiting and destroying

the environment, and fostering conflict. Positive deviance, on the other hand, is extraordinary above normative expectations.

It is presumed by the researcher that interviewees were trustworthy, open, and honest in their responses regarding ethical behavior. Such positive actions included discussion relating to virtuous leaders, engaged and respected employees, mutuality to society, fostering environmentalism, and collaborating toward acceptance. From overall data analysis, the researcher believes Small Companies A and B as well as Medium Company A had normal behavior. Medium Company B and both *Fortune 500* Companies A and B evidenced positive deviance. These five dimensions are discussed in the following sub-sections: *leadership behavior and ethics*, *organizations' orientation toward their employees*, *reactions to societal demands*, *reactions to the environment*, and *culture*.

Leadership behavior and ethics. Participating organizations emphasized employees' expectations, however, little was discussed relating to specific disciplines' codes of conduct or ethics such as ACFREs, CFREs, or CPAs or organizations such as AFP, AAUP, CASE, or NACRO. All of the participant organizations seemed in practice to uphold Carroll and Buchholtz (2008) and Reichart's (1999) goals that organizations are expected to avoid questionable practices, to respond to the spirit and letter of the law, and to protect employees and the environment. Those organizations in this study also embrace the concept of minimizing harm to society and maximizing benefit through shared value with all stakeholders as promoted by Googins et al. (2007) and Waddock (2004).

Caboni (2010) researched six concerns in fundraising ethics. Three of the six

concerns were ethical issues relevant to relationships with corporations: dishonest solicitation, donor manipulation, and institutional mission abandonment. From the interview data and analysis of document and audio-visual materials, none of the organizations in this study exhibited mission abandonment in order to solicit or negotiate resources or engagement. Additionally, no dishonest solicitation was discussed. Regarding donor manipulation, while no specific ethical situations were discussed, one corporate executive was concerned about the University's leadership behavior having an "entitlement attitude" (CSAI-2). As discussed in RQ3 findings, this concern could constitute an inappropriate perspective of taking a corporation's involvement or funding for granted or neglecting appropriate stewardship and attention to the inter-organizational relationship. However, to balance that concern, another former corporate CEO indicated ze has "immense respect for the leadership" at the University and University foundation, which is vital to working relationships (DAV-22). Two companies had documentation regarding their leaders. First, leadership of Small Company B is well respected and has received accolades and awards for ethics and leadership. Second, Medium Company B has received numerous awards and high rankings for leadership.

Organizations' orientation toward their employees. All of the interviewees indicated support and attention to fostering positive work environments for employees. Most of the organizations in this study provided extensive ethical guidelines and trainings. Several companies had University alumni employees actively engaged with their respective companies' inter-organizational relationships with the University. For example, Medium Company A has a few executives and management as well as employees who are alumni of the University (DAV-157). Several Medium Company B

employees are University alumni. *Fortune 500* Company A has a focus on its people and praises “employees” for the company’s on-going success. *Fortune 500* Company A has an active group of University alumni engaged in various projects. *Fortune 500 Company A* has some executives, key employees, and recruiters who are alumni of the University. This company believes strongly in employees’ contributions to corporate success including teamwork. *Fortune 500* Company B has an active group of University alumni engaged in various projects.

Reactions to societal demands. Compliance with governmental regulations is part of societal demands. Since the University is public, it follows all state and federal regulations including appropriate reporting. As a 501(c)(3), the University foundation follows all state and federal regulations including appropriate reporting. Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B are publicly traded, so they are required to follow appropriate IRS and SEC regulations as well as state and federal requirements; all provide extensive transparency and reporting.

Likely emphasis to societal demands is manifested most in Cone’s (2010) third and fourth categories of *Organizational Culture* with a Stakeholder Management perspective and the *DNA Citizenship Ethos* of the Triple Bottom Line of people, profit, and planet. Of the six corporations in the study, Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B paid the most attention to societal demands as opposed to only focusing on the companies’ goals. For example, Medium Company B serves as “a strong community partner” (DAV-225). *Fortune 500* Company B is a leader in corporate citizenship and is committed to maximizing shareholder profits while balancing the other triple bottom line factors of the environment and society for long-term success.

Reactions to the environment. Likely emphasis to the environment is manifested most in Cone's (2010) third and fourth categories of *Organizational Culture* with a Stakeholder Management perspective and the *DNA Citizenship Ethos* of the Triple Bottom Line. Of the six corporations in the study, Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B paid the most attention to environmental issues. For example, Medium Company A emphasizes an "obligation to be good stewards" of "precious resources" in the environment (DAV-164), and has received awards for excellence. Medium Company B has received numerous awards and high rankings for environmental efficiency, sustainability, community commitment, and social performance. *Fortune 500* Company A has received awards and high rankings for sustainability, environmental advocacy, compliance, and risk management. *Fortune 500* Company B has received a variety of awards and excellent rankings from numerous third parties for sustainability, financial performance, and ethics.

Culture. Robbins and Stylianou (2003) said that "culture can be defined as a shared set of values that influence societal perceptions, attitude, preferences, and responses" (p. 206). Hall (1991) indicated that key areas of concern in developing organizational culture include philosophy, values, mission, strategy, structure, resource commitment, and style. Organizational attention to those key areas helps to develop a culture of ethics. Such cultures were exhibited in all participant organizations through document and audio-visual materials and interviews. The culture provides internal and external stakeholders with clarity on who the organization is and how it will act. Additionally, these concepts provide certain overlap with other organizations with similar interests, programs, goals, or initiatives. Having clear expectations for the individual

actors that act collectively on the organization provide the ethical framework for decision-making.

Dion (1996) said that organizational culture creates the basis for decision making. Each organization illustrated cultures that promoted pro-social organizational theories by Ashforth and Mael (1989), Bar-Tal (1976), Brief and Motowidlo (1986), and Saul (2011). These organizational practices support Jacoby's (1973) social environment model and Fischer's (2000) theories of the underlying "mutuality" needed for inter-organizational behavior (p. 189).

Cropper et al. (2008) said the culture of organizations in inter-organizational relationships is "concerned with understanding the character, pattern, origins, rationale, and consequences of such relationships" (p. 4). These inter-organizational relationships are multi-faceted and complex. Analysis of the data supports Eber's (1999) indication that "The nature of inter-organizational relationships is inherently dynamic, rather than static" (p. 38). Carroll and Hannan (2004) defined the environment to include other organizations, natural actors, political structures, technologies, and physical environments. All of these factors contribute to the cultural dynamic studied in this dissertation research.

Summary of ethical behavior. Business is created as the economic cornerstone of the capitalistic democratic society. Corporations need to have acquired resources for them to be available to exist, to contribute, and to engage with other institutions such as higher education organizations. Navigating ethical behavior is an ongoing process among all organizational actors and their respective agents thus establishing organizational behavior and ethics. Each organization's culture has created the organizational ethics (Dion, 1996).

Higher education is concerned that corporations behave appropriately. Higher education is prudent and transparent about relationships, and is cautious about reputational concerns. Likewise, corporations desire to partner with colleges and universities with sound ethical practices. Areas of importance included: *organizational ethics, expectations for ethical behavior, observation of ethical behavior, leadership behavior and ethics, organizations' orientation toward their employees, reactions to social demands, reactions to the environment, and culture.*

Reflection on Qualitative Methodologies

Conducting an embedded, single-case study with the University and six corporations took time to plan and to organize. As elaborated by Merriam (2009) and Srivastava and Hopwood (2009), the research process was iterative in nature and was adjusted as needed. For example, after the first interview, interview questions were edited, condensed, and re-ordered. Additionally, new introductions to additional interviewees materialized. Several noteworthy issues, dynamics, experiences, and reflections resulted from this study; included are experiencing *organizational resistance, interviewing elites, triangulating data, reflecting on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum as a framework, considering transferability, and examining ethnography.*

After the literature review was completed, proposal defense passed, and IRB approval secured, the greatest challenge was organizational recruitment. The researcher experienced *organizational resistance*. Once organizations committed to the study, it took some time to navigate gathering information and *interviewing elites* because of challenging schedules. Using data and audio-visual materials, interviews, and campus observation provided for *triangulating data*. After completion of the data analysis and

theme development, *reflecting on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum* provided a comprehensive framework for gathering, sorting, and analyzing data in relation to the inter-organizational relationships between the University and six corporations. This dissertation adds to the landscape of organizational analysis and may provide *transferability* and further insights regarding inter-organizational relationships.

Organizational Resistance

A major resistance was experienced in the University participant recruitment. The researcher networked with academic colleagues and learned that *organizational resistance* was a theory regarding the perceived lack of an organization (e.g., a university or a corporation) agreeing to participate in a study (C. Loes, personal communication, February 7, 2012; B. Opall, personal communication, February 6, 2012). Additionally, an insider-outsider tension was experienced, which took careful maneuvering (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008).

Putnam, Grant, Michelson, and Cutcher (2005) indicated that the phenomenon of *organizational resistance* is a “complex, dynamic, and interconnected nature of resistance practices” and is common in organizations (p. 5). Just as pro-social behavior equals those actions that promote assisting others in both non-emergency and emergency situations, organizational resistance equals unwilling or stonewalling actions to deny assistance.

Organizational resistance originates internally in an organization. As noted in Chapter Three's assumptions, closed systems of internal dynamics would not be addressed in this study—only those organizations ready for external interaction in open systems. However, this internal dynamic of stonewalling or denying assistance can be exhibited externally. Putnam et al. (2005) discussed three areas of organizational

resistance: *targets of resistance, practices and forms, and consequences.*

Targets of resistance. “Resistance is shaped by the oppressive nature of capitalistic modes of production that lead to alienation” (Putnam et al., 2005, p. 6). Resistance is often not aimed at the appropriate actors causing the behavior. “Resistance may assume a theatre-like quality in that it aims to attract the attention of, and appeal to, an audience of interested third parties, such as the media, public, or customers” (Putnam et al., p. 7). In this instance, the researcher was the audience.

Practices and forms. Practices of organizational resistance may have included covert or overt actions, collective or individualistic behavior, and planned or spontaneous responses. Behavior scholars generally believe conventional resistance is “overt, collective, and planned whereas routine resistance is covert, individualistic, and spontaneous” (Putnam et al., 2005, p. 8). Discourse of organizational resistance is grounded in people’s lives, their working conditions, and organizational policies. *Overt* referred to publicly visible actions while *covert* actions are often indirect or hidden. Individuals’ decision-making ability is contrasted with collective actions, which are agreed upon by a group in a planned, organized manner. Spontaneous responses seemed flippant and differing based on the individual communicating, whereas other organizations having protocols in place provide planned canned responses or required review time. For instance, the initial *rejection* responses to not participate in this study came quickly and felt pre-planned. A few responses were spontaneous *nos* through telephone follow-up with initial non-respondents. Those taking time to understand the depth of the project injected time as an element of potential organizational resistance.

Consequences. Unfortunately, “resistance is rooted in a discursive cycle of a

volatile marketplace” (Putnam et al., 2005, p. 10). Highly demanding environments such as university presidents’ offices, with stretched staff time and limited resources, volatility creates agenda-driven decisions that may delay or deny perceived non-priority requests such as a dissertation study. Organizational resistance can provide intended or unintended consequences. In this instance, intended negative responses seemed to be routine, yet polite to actually respond and curtail follow-up. Unintended consequences may have included the perception of disorganization or lack of protocols on behalf of major research universities’ presidents’ staffs appearing to be unfamiliar with research processes.

It was difficult to determine the appropriate *decision-maker* to grant access to each prospective university (Bryman, 2004; Moeran, 2009). Brewer (2000) defined *gatekeepers* as “individuals that have the power to grant access” (p. 189). Creswell (2013) indicated that “gatekeepers...can facilitate or interfere with your study” (p. 90). It took time and persistence to interface with each prospective university to navigate their organizations to locate the right decision-maker to approve entrance. Additionally, each participant organization in the study had numerous gatekeepers for each individual recruited to be interviewed.

A variety of reasons were given for universities’ not wanting to participate in this research study for a dissertation (e.g., no time, lack of staff availability, timing of other priorities, and policies about third-party activities). Bolman and Deal (2008) and Morgan (2006) offer structure (e.g., power, bureaucracy, hierarchy, decision-making authority) and culture (i.e., job focus and lack of research process knowledge by administrative staff) as organizational frames that can create barriers to productivity. Staff at other

universities—even though they are some of the nation’s top research institutions (see Appendix D)—had no idea about the research process or whom to engage and were unwilling to explore the process to assist in providing access for the researcher.

Once the participant University committed to the study, four other universities agreed to participate. Many universities were interested in the topic but did not believe the timing and internal utilization of resources for the study was available. Additionally, many of the original 33 prospective participant universities expressed interest in learning the outcome of this study and are eager to see the findings in this dissertation to potentially participate in further research on the subject for post-doctoral research.

The University and the University foundation lead contacts were positive, seasoned professionals and became champions in support of this research. The corporate relations officer at the University foundation was the gatekeeper to qualify and to network with the prospective corporations for the study. Once the six corporations committed, each company provided a lead contact, or gatekeeper, for documents and audio-visual materials and access to recruit interviewees. Each interviewee’s assistant, or gatekeeper, was contacted to set up the interview appointment.

Interviewing Elites

All interviews were conducted face-to-face. As indicated by Gubrium and Holstein (2001) and Seidman (1991), the process of setting up interviews, researching the individual and the respective organization participating, and executing the interviews was complex. Individuals in the study were C-suite or senior-level managers at the University, University foundation, and six corporations. Odendahl and Shaw (2001) labeled these type of individuals as *elites*—people with status, power, decision-making roles, and/or

higher levels of education. Dealing with such individuals for this study required sensitivity and finesse. Odendahl and Shaw encouraged a high sensitivity to meet elites in their environments on their schedules, which was adhered to strictly for the success of this research.

Medium Companies A and B were easiest to work with because once they committed, individuals agreed quickly to interview times. Only one executive with Medium Company B had to be rescheduled once. Both Small Company A and B's executives were very busy. Once recruited, it took a few weeks to schedule interviews after rescheduling a time or two. The University president and two of the *Fortune 500* Company A executives were very busy; it took more than 5 months to secure appointments on their schedules. Additionally, the other University contacts and many University foundation staff took time to coordinate interviews because of individuals' having very full calendars; nearly half were scheduled and rescheduled at least once. Organizing the interviews with the four University foundation board members took extra time because of the need for official introductions through a senior University foundation executive and then scheduling interviews at the wrap-up time frame after a quarterly board meeting.

Shuy (2001) summarized face-to-face interviewing advantages, which held true for this study. Such advantages included high relationship with contextual awareness interviewing each individual in his office, more focused interaction with the researcher, thoughtful self-generated answers, more effectiveness on complex or sensitive issues by the researcher probing or seeking elaboration on answers, and ideal communication clarity. The researcher confirmed parking and meeting space arrangements with each

interviewee or zir assistant. The researcher arrived with ample time to be early to appointments with flexibility for schedule changes. Nearly all interviewees had assistants or receptionists who greeted and announced the researcher. All interviewees were focused, professional, thoughtful, and exhaustive in their answers. Executives' offices ranged from small to very large, but all had nice dark wood furniture, personal and professional photographs, plaques, awards, trophies, and comfortable seating. Three individuals opted to conduct interviews in a conference room in lieu of their personal offices.

Odendahl and Shaw (2001) encouraged mirroring appropriate personal demeanor and inter-personal skills to best relate to interactions with elites. To that effect, the researcher wore professional attire of a suit and tie and carried a briefcase. The University, University foundation, and corporate interviewees were all professionally dressed. However, interviews conducted on Fridays found business professionals in business casual attire. The University president's interview was on a Friday; ze asked the interviewer to remove the tie, and the researcher respectfully complied.

While interviewing took some time to recruit the right individuals and to establish schedules, the quality of the face-to-face interviews was focused and in-depth. Many interviewees allotted additional time to provide thoughtful and robust answers. Some asked for further discussion regarding Cone's framework and importance of the study as well as the researcher's background and career trajectory.

Triangulating Data

Triangulation is analytic induction using different independent sources and research methods to show agreement or repeated verification in findings (Bloomberg &

Volpe, 2012; Bryman, 2004; Janesick, 2000; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Patton, 2002; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). Miles and Huberman (1994) said,

The aim is to pick triangulation sources that have different biases, different strengths, so they can compliment each other.... In effect, triangulation is a way to get to the finding in the first place—by seeing or hearing multiple *instances* of it from different *sources* by using different *methods*.... (p. 267)

For this study, triangulation of data was provided by 36 face-to-face interviews, more than 12,609 pages of documents and audio-visual materials, and a campus observation of 407 photographs.

Because the transcriptionist took 11 months to complete interview transcription, the researcher spent ample time analyzing document and audio-visual materials and campus observation data first. Spending time on those types of data provided richer consideration of multiple data sources for triangulation. Once the primary data of interviews was coded, analyzed, and yielded preliminary findings, the supporting concepts from document and audio-visual analysis and campus observation triangulated findings that developed into themes. These multiple sources aided in convergence and corroboration of data (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009).

For this study, the researcher completed several data management processes planned in Chapter Three that supported triangulation. “Cross-checking information and conclusions through the use of multiple procedures” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 276) included creating an audit trail, member checking, participant feedback, peer coding, and peer review (Creswell, 2008; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Maxwell, 2013;

Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles et al., 2013; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). An extensive Excel file with spreadsheets on each participant organization's document and audio-visual materials cataloging, campus observation organized by building, interviewees' details and member checking responses, and separate data analysis summaries of interviews with corporate and higher education participants. It took 5 weeks to complete 100% of member checking. Several interviewees opted to omit some interview responses and provide any feedback. Two colleagues assisted with peer coding and analysis of interview transcripts to aid in corroboration of findings. Finally, four peer reviews were performed including three from doctoral-level faculty at two public and one private university and a corporate relations officer from a major public university. The external peer reviews allowed for objective feedback regarding the findings as well as guarding against researcher bias.

Reflecting on Cone's (2010) Corporate Citizenship Spectrum as a Framework

Gardbery and Fombrun (2006) said, "An individual company may be engaged in multiple citizenship activities simultaneously" (p. 336). Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum considered many facets of corporate citizenship categorized as Philanthropy, Cause-related Branding, Operational Culture (i.e., Stakeholder Management), and DNA Citizenship Ethos (i.e., the Triple Bottom Line of people, profit, and planet). Cone's spectrum is more comprehensive than any other continuum or axes relating to business and society. The framework has strong functionality and also allows for analysis across embedded units of the six companies in relation to their engagement with the University.

Utilizing Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship framework for this study helped to

identify categories of motives and interest for both the University and six corporations. Figure 17 combines themes from the three research questions and develops a pattern regarding overall mutual interactions. This plotting provides a summary of the motives and related ROI expectations both the University and corporations have of engaging in inter-organizational behavior. All motives fall into two main categories: Cause-related Branding or DNA Citizenship Ethos. “Cause-related branding” is defined as engagement developed with reciprocity expected in the long-term (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008). This scenario requires a mutual exchange of monetary support or other resources from a corporation for an intended purpose or outcome from the University—and vice versa—in a tangible manner. The “DNA citizenship ethos” means that the organization from the ground up considered the triple bottom line of sustainability as strategically integral into how they go about doing business while equally considering the actions of an organization upon all stakeholders (Martin, et al., 2012; Saul, 2011). As evidenced in this study, the University operates in the DNA Citizenship Ethos space, so it would be reasonable for it to attract similar-minded companies with mutual interests.

The categories of Philanthropy and Operational Culture were not predominant categories for the inter-organizational relationship between the University and the overall relationships with these six particular companies. Philanthropy requires financial or other resource support to be given to the University to manage as needed to further a cause to enhance the well being of humanity (Ciconte & Jacob, 2009; Drezner, 2011; Levy & Cherry, 1996). Typically, corporations give money or in-kind resources or services for organizations to manage on their own. No expectations of tangible returns typically exist, although intangible rewards may be provided. “The amount and nature of these activities

	Philanthropy (Altruism)	Cause-related Branding (ROI Expectation)	Operational Culture (Stakeholder Management)	DNA Citizenship Ethos (Triple Bottom Line)
RQ1 Higher Education Motive One		Viable Resources		
RQ1 Higher Education Motive Two		Student Enrichment		
RQ1 Higher Education Motive Three				Real-world Connectivity
RQ2 Corporate Motive One		Workforce Development		
RQ2 Corporate Motive Two				Community Enrichment
RQ2 Corporate Motive Three		Brand Development		
RQ2 Corporate Motive Four		Research		
RQ3 Ethics Issue One				Generally None
RQ3 Ethics Issue Two				General Ethical Discussion Leading to Five Topic Clusters
RQ3 Ethics Issue Three		Five Disparate Ethical Dilemmas		

Figure 17. Plotting the Themes from Research. The major themes from the three research questions are combined and plotted onto Cone’s corporate citizenship spectrum. The overarching inter-organizational relationships and behavior are mainly categorized as *Cause-related Branding* and *DNA Citizenship Ethos*—both carry high business performance motives.

are voluntary, guided only by business's desire to engage in social activities that are not mandated, not required by law, and not generally expected" (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008, p. 43). While some in-kind activities and scholarships were found, there was no overarching *Philanthropy* motive or strategy. Corporations today do have altruistic behavior; it was just not exhibited with this University.

Operational Culture refers to companies that view nonprofits as a strategic key in their corporate identity and behavior so charitable contributions are given with high expectation of assisting with, or engaging in, implementation. A stakeholder view of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is optimized (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010). The stakeholder view is a corporation's consideration of all people involved in their business, including not only shareholders, but also employees, employees' families, customers, vendors, suppliers, and their communities. Intertwined with CSR is the concept of strategic philanthropy whereas there is "an approach to giving that links a company's business strengths with community needs" (Brown, 2004, p. 151). This stakeholder management approach is often reactionary instead of planned. While Medium Company B operates in this space, it has a philosophy to emphasize goals in a pro-active manner and is migrating toward DNA Citizenship Ethos behavior.

What works. Aldrich (1979) said, "Relations between organizations are not as easy to classify as those between biological organisms, as multiple purposes and multiple consequences of organizational actions defy straightforward categorization as leading to symbiotic or commensalistic relations" (p. 266). Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum provided a comprehensive framework with a wide range of categories. These categories were exhaustive (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Merriam, 2009). Many other

authors have offered various parts of the context woven into Cone's spectrum as discussed in Chapter Two, but none are as comprehensive. Cone's spectrum included consideration of all angles of corporate citizenship, including what Gardberg and Fombrun (2006) included as "activities [that] have been categorized in terms of financial commitment, beneficiary, target audience, form, duration, and scope" (p. 335).

The framework has what Guba (1978) and Patton (2002) consider *good convergence* to identify distinct categories. Content in each category of Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum is meaningful, and content categories have internal homogeneity. The concepts represent over a century of behaviors and concerns relating to corporations' behavior in society. These agendas and motives provided an ideal framework to study the inter-organizational relationships with the University and six corporate partners.

What does not work. Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum is challenging to understand nuance differences in the Operational Culture and DNA Citizenship Ethos categories. Ideally, categories' content must be mutually exclusive with no overlap (Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Merriam, 2009); this concern is labeled *external heterogeneity* by Guba (1978) and Patton (2002). Three specific areas of concern included management behavior toward constituents, employees' actions in volunteerism versus engagement, and how deep environmental issues are addressed. All three are discussed in the Operational Culture and DNA Citizenship Ethos categories. Cone said, "If a company has purpose in its DNA, that will direct how it engages with stakeholders—internally and externally" (C. Cone, personal communication, November 8, 2012). An average citizen may not understand the differences in the categories.

Practitioners working in the corporate relations arena can likely distinguish the nuances and depth between the two categories. However, deeper elaboration could help in clarifying significant differences. Likely a main difference stems from the origins of the two concepts. The Operational Culture was a reactionary effort with Stakeholder Management initiated in the 1970s (Brown, 2004; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Cone, 2010; Hall 1991). Today Operational Culture can be both pre-planned or reactionary. The DNA Citizenship Ethos requires a corporation to have considered the Triple Bottom Line concepts of people, profit, and planet at the establishment of the company and programming from the ground up. This concept emerged in 1987 from the United Nations' *Brundtland Report* (Martin, et al., 2012; Reichart, 1999; Saul, 2011; United Nations, 1987). Thus the DNA term is appropriate as values and goals are engrained in the organization's culture and related behaviors.

Analysis across embedded units. Focusing on one University and six corporations provided for what Bernard and Ryan (2010), Johnson and Christensen (2008), and Yin (2008) call *cross-unit analysis*. Cross-unit analysis across embedded units allowed for comparison of similarities and differences in motivations and expected ROI for corporate engagement among the six corporate participants. Having two small, two medium, and two large companies provided enough data to find some similarities and several differences. At the onset, it was noted that less information would be available from Small Companies A and B and Medium Company A because they are private. The public companies—Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B—have to provide greater transparency as required by the government. Six corporations in varying industries and different sizes allowed for full understanding of the functional areas

described in Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. However, ideally having many more companies could provide a deeper comparison.

Other considerations. This study did not yield any negative cases. Future research could examine more corporations that may include failed or difficult experiences of inter-organizational relationships between the University and a company. Involving other colleges or university may also lead to negative cases.

During the interview process two executives asked if Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum were a continuum or perhaps a maturation process. Cone indicated that a company "can start anywhere and then utilize cause marketing, cause branding, shared value, [and/or] strategic philanthropy to support stakeholder programs" (C. Cone, personal communication, November 8, 2012). Cone maintains that the four functional areas in the spectrum are related yet separate. Additionally, any given company can exhibit behavior in multiple categories to achieve different types of goals.

Considering Transferability

The case study method provided thick description of data needed to understand the relationship between the six corporations and the higher education institution specifically in the context of their placement on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. While this instrumental case study provided for only one higher education institution and six corporations, its intent was not prescriptive for the participant University studied nor specific industries or companies. Rather, the findings in this dissertation are likely transferable to general behavior of inter-organizational relationships between higher education and corporations. Specifically, transferability could be for higher education institutions to understand and to engage with corporations,

for corporate relations officers working with higher education to define what corporate motives and ROI expectations are desired in supporting higher education, and for both types of organizations to approach inter-organizational relationships with ethical frameworks and processes (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Miles et al., 2013; Stake, 2005). This transferability indicated the degree of similarity between the study and the larger context of such other similar inter-organizational relationships as supported by Auerbach and Silverstein (2003), Bloomberg and Volpe (2012), Flyvbjerg (2011), Mertens (2005), Patton (2002), Stake, (2005), and Yin (2009).

Examining Ethnography of Inter-organizational Relationships

“The study of inter-organizational relations has been quite limited in terms of its depth of analysis” (Siegel, 2008, p. 221). Young and Burlingame (1996) said, “Although thoughtful practitioners and scholars have made important headway, we still have trouble answering the question—‘Why do businesses engage in giving and volunteering?’” (p. 158). Jacoby (1973) alleged, “Only with an understanding of its dynamic social context can the true strengths and weaknesses of corporate business be appraised” (p. xvii). This dissertation provided an important study into these inter-organizational behaviors and dealt with several ethnographic perspectives. This study provided a deep analysis of the University and six corporate partners to help address the inter-organizational behaviors promoting corporate citizenship engagement.

Croppers et al. (2008) explained that *inter-organizational relationship* is concerned with “understanding the character, pattern, origins, rationale, and consequences of such relationships” (p. 4). The study of behavior within and between

organizations (i.e., inter-organizational relations) is ethnographic and supported by Erikson (2011), Moeran (2009), Neyland (2008), Rosen (1991), and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow's (2009). Erickson (2011) indicated that qualitative educational studies with a realist, ethnographic viewpoint have gained importance and value to contribute to both education and business in today's research. The backdrop of the ethnographic perspective in this study is that of American higher education and U.S.-based corporations. This framing focused on the pluralistic interactions in the United States between higher education and corporate America. Stake (1995) indicated that such a focus viewed the sociological perspective of inter-organizational relationships. The relationship between higher education and corporate America was viewed and analyzed to uncover and to describe what Merriam (1998) identified as "beliefs, values, and attitudes that structure behavior" (p. 12).

This study is bound as a single University's engagement with six specific corporations. The sociocultural analysis of this unit created this organizational ethnographic viewpoint. Merriam said, "The cultural context is what sets this type of study apart from other types of qualitative research" (p. 12). Creswell (2007), Emerson et al. (1995), Spradley (1980), Tedlock (2000), and Ybema et al. (2009) detailed the focus of an ethnographic case study to describe and to interpret a culture-sharing group, which can be an organization. In this study that culture or environment is that of the individual organizations and their actions with inter-organizational relationships. Corporate engagement with higher education is unique in contrast to universities' relationships with alumni, foundations, and other organizations. Spradley (1980) suggested the need for ethnographic research to study "socially responsible corporations that operate in the

public interest as well as in the private interest” (p. 18). This dissertation provided analysis and interpretation of the viewpoint of both the University and its relationship with each of six corporations as well as considered any ethical concerns surrounding the inter-organizational exchanges.

Specific ethnographic considerations occurred in this constructionist paradigm. Each organization—the University, the University foundation, and the six corporations—defined their values, visions, and missions. Ethnographic culture was personified in each organization through Albert and Whetten (1985) and Daw and Cone’s (2011) organizational identity theory as well as through Ashforth and Mael’s (1989) social identity theory. Additionally, Organ et al.’s (2006) organizational citizenship behavior was exhibited by University alumni engaging on behalf of their respective companies. The individual actors collectively make decisions on behalf of each company or the University, and then those decisions are carried out by individual actors. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) argued that organizations tend to hire like-minded individuals that promulgate each institution’s behavior. Specifically, Bar-Tal’s (1976) and Brief and Motowidlo’s (1986) pro-social behavior is manifested in the organizations’ inter-organizational behavior. All of these concepts were paramount in weaving the fabric and culture of the University, University foundation, and the six companies.

Individual actors acting collectively then created socially constructed realities between organizations through policies, actions, and reporting on those activities. The culture and essence of each organization provided the basis for ethnographic context. Specifically relating to interactions of higher education with corporations, both Meyer and Rowan’s (1977) institutional theory and Pfeffer and Salancik’s (2003) resource

dependence theory for organizational behavior motives were found in the inter-organizational relationships between the University and the six corporations mainly in RQ1's findings of *viable resources* and *student enrichment*.

Forensic evidence of the culture of each participating organization was found through the University campus observation and during interviews when visiting each corporation. Ultimately, evidence of corporate presence—or lack thereof—was examined on the main campus of the University. Corporate presence totaled only 14% of all identified named spaces or objects observed and related to RQ2's *brand development* finding. No forensic evidence of the University's presence was found in the corporations' offices.

Is corporate America taking over higher education? This ethnographic study did not support Gould's (2003) concern that corporations wield power over higher education. While win-win relationships between the University and corporations were found with Small Company A, Medium Company B, and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B relating to intellectual property or entrepreneurial activities, Giroux and Giroux (2004) nor Slaughter and Rhoads's (2004) negative observations of such partnerships were found. However, Cohen (2010) and Rhodes's (2001) positive attributes of the six inter-organizational relationships between higher education and corporations—especially supporting current world concerns and efforts to improve humanity and community—were observed. Given there were only six participant companies in the study, perhaps having more companies would unearth negative cases of failed inter-organizational relationships between the University and a corporation or other challenging dynamics. In reflection, it took some time to recruit the participant University; there may have been

challenging situations in existence with those other universities that did not opt to participate in the study. During the recruitment of corporate participants, two Small Companies refused to participate. One Small Company's president believed they had nothing to contribute and the other Small Company's president did not believe ze had time to participate. Both Medium Companies A and B agreed to participate quickly, so no other Medium Companies were approached. A total of seven *Fortune 500* Companies were invited to participate; the first two accepting became participant *Fortune 500* Companies A and B in the study. The other five *Fortune 500* Companies never said *no*; to this date their senior management and legal teams are reviewing the opportunity. One of those five *Fortune 500* Companies was a potential negative case as the University champions learned that the senior management was upset with the University regarding contracting issues.

Limitations

Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) and Mertens (2005) indicated that any study is limited by the perspective of the researcher as well as the formulation of the study, the specific participants involved, and the approach to analyzing the data and reporting the findings. This dissertation research was limited to consideration of inter-organizational behavior between organizations—not their internal systems. Additionally, the study was limited by the types of organizational participants as well as the type of specific individual participants representing each organization. Another limitation relating to the organizational participants was their desire to be unnamed in the study. Finally, the boundaries of this study were limited to American higher education and U.S. corporations.

Open Systems

A limitation of this study was the assumption explained by Cropper et al. (2008), Katz and Kahn (2005), Morgan (2006), Shafritz et al. (2005), and Thompson (2005) that organizations may only participate in *open systems* in inter-organizational relationships if they are stable enough to do so based on their internal or *closed systems*. This study did not explore internal systems of participating organizations such as management and leadership structure, styles of leadership, internal operations in general, nor financial strategies. This study was concerned with external interactions with other organizations and their environment. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) and Shafritz et al. labeled those considerations *externalities*, and Carroll and Hannan (2004) defined the environment to include other organizations, natural actors, political structures, technologies, and physical environments.

Types of Participants

Through the process of selecting a higher education institution, a public doctoral research university became the University of study. There was no intent to select any type of institution over another. Other doctoral research universities are private. Likewise, other types of higher education institutions include comprehensive master's, baccalaureate, and community colleges as classified by the Carnegie Classification™ (Carnegie Foundation, 2011; Kaplan, 2010). In the selection process for a higher education institution, the doctoral, research-based category emerged from the Voluntary Support of Education data, which yielded 33 universities as a prime potential for selection. Both public and private institutions were on the list. (See Appendix D). The first university to agree to participate was selected. For the purpose of this study, any type

of higher education institution exhibiting strong, consistent corporate engagement would have sufficed.

The recruitment of the six corporations for this study was limited to those companies who financially contributed to and engaged with the University between 2006 and 2010. The corporate participant list was limited by the relationships the University maintained as well as the six corporations' willingness to participate. The six companies participating in this study represented the following industries: computers and electrical electronics, services and transport and logistics, services, utilities, industrial products, and consumer products. For the purposes of this study, the 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index (CSRI) with only 20 industry codes was used as it (a) is more simplistic than the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) or North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes, (b) provided confidentiality to participant companies, and (c) provided framing of companies specifically for corporate citizenship, which was the focus of this dissertation. The CSRI key industry classifications in the United States include: airlines and aerospace, automotive, beverage, computers, consumer products, electrical and electronics, energy, financial—banking, financial—diversified, financial—insurance, food manufacturing, industrial products, information and media, pharmaceuticals, retail—food, retail—general, services, telecommunications, transport and logistics, and utilities (The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index, 2010).

Only the executives or decision makers of the participant organizations were interviewed. This limitation provided only one type of perspective regarding corporate support and engagement with higher education. For the University, no faculty, students,

alumni, nor general employees were interviewed. For the six corporations, no employees below the C-suite were interviewed. The researcher believed the key individuals engaged in inter-organizational relationships would be those decision makers or those knowledgeable about such situations. These decision makers are considered elites (Odendahl & Shaw, 2001).

Organizations willing to engage in inter-organizational relationships were studied. Therefore, this study did not inquire with other corporations approached by the University or University foundation who rejected interactions. These audiences may have offered a different view of strengths or weaknesses of such partnering with an academic institution. This void is a gap in this study.

Finally, the limitation of the time period from 2006 through 2010 included a major recession. Consideration of each of the participants' abilities to engage in inter-organizational relationships with other organizations may have been altered, hindered, adapted, or changed during this penurious time period. Studying the same organizations during a different economic climate, studying other organizations in other industries during this same time period, or studying different organizations at a different time period may have yielded different themes. Therefore, the economic climate may have constrained the inter-organizational relationships.

Confidentiality of Participant Organizations

The researcher initially wanted to conduct a meta-analysis of previous studies between corporations and higher education. Because of the lack of named companies in other studies, conducting a meta-analysis was abandoned. The next research option was to focus on one university and some of its corporate partners.

Because of the guarantee of confidentiality of the University, the University foundation, and the six corporate participants, extra care and due diligence were required. For example, nearly every quote used in the dissertation drawn from the data had to be searched on the Internet as to ensure the participants were likely not findable based on key terms, phrases, or direct quotes. This task was significantly time consuming. Had the participants agreed to being named, additional rich, thick description and more specific examples could have been used.

Because of the guarantee of confidentiality for the University and University foundation, this dissertation was unable to share specific graphics, photographs from campus observation, and specific numbers or actual dollars for corporate contributions and engagement, or named program examples. Likewise, because of the guarantee of confidentiality for corporate participants, this dissertation was unable to share specific internal models, graphics, photographs, and matrices for corporate citizenship; reporting tools and systems; actual dollars; or named program examples. Additionally, the confidentiality of the corporations does not calibrate the prominence of the six corporations and many of their household brand recognition. Protection of the individual participants eliminated the opportunity to recognize or name people. Readers would be familiar with many of the companies and specific executives who participated.

Scope

To frame this study, only U.S.-based corporations and American higher education institutions were considered. Specifically using American organizations emphasized Western world political, social, economic, and cultural considerations of organizational behavior; American democracy, capitalism, and laws; and established American

behavioral practices in organizations. Higher educational institutions or corporations based in other countries may have exhibited or expressed different experiences.

The emphasis of this study was American higher education, not American nonprofits in general. Attention was focused on American higher education, not K-12 levels of engagement with corporations. Because a public doctoral research university emerged to become the subject organization, private institutions and higher education institutions of other size or scope were not researched.

Data analysis of the participant organizations focused on inter-organizational relationships, not problems or issues. Likewise, an assessment of third-party engagement with other educational institutions, state and federal governments, or other corporations in associations or coalitions was not researched. While Medium Companies A and B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B have corporate foundations, those foundations were not the focus of this study. While University alumni are actively engaged from Medium Companies A and B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B, alumni connectivity between organizations was not the focus of this study. Finally, the scope of this study was not a financial analysis, development audit, nor process analysis of any participant organizations.

Implications for Practice

Organizations do not operate in a vacuum but interact with their external environment through other organizations in inter-organizational relationships and contend with other environmental factors such as politics, social constraints, the economy, and the American culture (DeMillo, 2011; Rhodes, 2011). Ebers (1999) said, “Inter-organizational relationships are subject to inherent development dynamics” (p. 31). Many

dynamics may be planned, negotiated, and controlled. It is an assumption that an organization is internally stable enough to interact with other organizations. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) and Shafritz et al. (2005) promoted organizations interacting with one another. Touraine (1977) explained that an organization “is dependent upon both technical constraints and social objectives, but it is autonomous in that it is a decision center that can establish exchanges with the outside as well as internal norms of functioning” (p. 242). This autonomous power provokes organizations to seek best practices to create win-win inter-organizational relationships. This study provides several implications for *inter-organizational relationships* in general; *implications for higher education* leaders, corporate relations officers, and individuals needing corporate engagement; and *implications for corporations* partnering with higher education with a wide range of motives. Specifically, transferability could be for higher education institutions to understand and engage with corporations, for corporate relations officers working with higher education to define what corporate motives and ROI expectations are desired in supporting higher education, and for both types of organizations to approach inter-organizational relationships with ethical frameworks and processes (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Miles et al., 2013; Stake, 2005).

Inter-organizational Relationships

Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) said, “To acquire resources, organizations must inevitably interact with their social environments” (p. 19). Sanzone (2000) promoted that partnerships with organizations “are interactive, ongoing, dynamic relationships that evolve and change over time” (p. 322). Inter-organizational relationships are vital to build

successful partnerships. Saul (2011) said, “The point is to establish some rapport and use that rapport to build trust and have the partner learn more” (p. 171). The organizations in this study experienced those dynamics. To be successful with inter-organizational relationships, Fulton and Blau (2005) said there are four main concerns: organizations have had to develop strategic advantages, cooperative advantages, ability to respond to complexity, and to navigate scrutiny to build success. The findings in this dissertation divulge sentiments and illustrations touching on all of those concerns.

Aldrich (1979) and Pfeffer and Salancik’s (2003) resource dependence consideration is not one-sided. Rather, organizations today are interdependent: both higher education and corporations need the other. Meyer and Rowan’s (1977) institutional theory continues to be true today. Institutional theory connotes that three types of pressures exist in institutions: (a) coercive pressures from legal mandates or influence from organizations upon whom they are dependent, (b) mimetic pressures to copy successful models during high uncertainty, and (c) normative pressures to create homogeneity, which stems from the similar attitudes and approaches of professional groups and associations brought into the organization through hiring practices. This study between the University and six corporate partners highlights all three of those pressures. As governments have cut funding, higher education looks outside itself for resources. Those available organizations—such as corporations—have their own agendas and mutual interests that should be prioritized and negotiated. Efficiency is important in any organization, but it is also important between organizations. This mimetic pressure to find and copy successful models is heavily experienced in companies and is also found in higher education. These pressures are even greater during high uncertainty, such as the

recession experienced during the time frame of this study from 2006 to 2010. Finally, homogeneity is sought because organizations seek similar-minded organizations to partner with to champion goals. Additionally, those same companies become homogenous as they seek more individuals to hire who relate with the values, mission, and vision of the organizations.

Fischer (2000) indicated assessing organizational compatibility is an important first step to inter-organizational partnerships. After determining the common agenda, organizations need to weigh the pros and cons of being associated. Organizational leaders in this study confirmed those steps. Inter-organizational relationships require “mutual understanding and shared values” (Fischer, 2000, p. 190). Once mutually compatible goals are established, the relationship works through a plan to help stay on track. Ring and Van de Ven (1994) identified three key processes for successful inter-organizational relationships: negotiations to identify needs and expectations, commitments to solidify and formalize intentions, and execution of commitments. Saul (2011) said organizations seek reciprocity and return on investment (ROI) that includes performance as well as transparency and reporting. These processes were elaborated on by each participant organization’s leaders.

Jacoby’s (1973) social environment model holds true for corporations today, and higher education institutions need to understand that economic arena. The social environment model is complex and dynamic, multi-vectored, involves a wide range of shareholders and stakeholders, focuses on long-run profit maximization and strategy, emphasizes long-run social investment, and is subject to political pressures, public opinion through multiple modes of communication and social networking, and market

volatility. All of these concerns were discussed by the six corporate participants' leaders.

Higher Education Implications

Cohen (2010) argued that higher education continues to face resource challenges, and this study's participant University leaders expressed that view. Rhodes (2001) reminded higher education that it does not exist in a vacuum but, rather, as part of the wider community. The University in this study sees itself as a vital contributor to its various communities. Corporations are also part of that wider community. Statistics provided by Rose (2011) illustrated that corporate support for higher education is important and constitutes 11% of all corporate resources given. Issues important to higher education also receive significant corporate support: health, 30%; community and economic development, 14%; and environmental issues, 4%.

Saul (2011) admonished higher education to capture, market, and sell their value and impact to funding stakeholders—including individuals, foundations, the government, and corporations. However, higher education institutions need to help to create a framework of how to work with their organizations as “companies are not experts in working with educational institutions” (Sanzone, 2000, p. 323). This study provided insight for leaders of higher education institutions to need to *develop key strategies for fundraising techniques, provide multiple opportunities* with several areas of the institution, *create clear value propositions, invest in stewardship of relationships, prioritize key people, and always act ethically*; the following sub-sections elaborate.

Develop key strategies for fundraising techniques. While modern fundraising and resource strategies may include value-driven ROI propositions for corporations, there is not a total erosion of philanthropic efforts. Rather, as Saul (2011) admonished, a

“renaissance” (p. 177) of thinking and processes are being used to navigate the complexities of many funders’ goals, including corporations. Higher education should offer a cafeteria plan of opportunities. Pollack (1998) said, “the more areas of involvement, the stronger the partnership” (p. 16). The leaders of the University in this study value inter-organizational relationships and offer multiple opportunities for constituents such as corporations to have a wide range of engagement and funding options.

Sanzone (2000) cautioned that “support for higher education is a strategic investment” by corporations (p. 321). Higher education fundraising professionals and management typically follow the AFP’s formula for building justification for causes and include items such as “mission, vision, history, statement of community problem, goals of the campaign, objectives to meet these goals, programs and services, staffing, governance, facility needs, endowment, budget for the campaign, statement of needs, gift range chart, and named-giving opportunities” (Saul, 2011, p. 167). However, leaders of corporations and corporate foundations also want to understand the intended impact a higher education institution and/or its programs and services make, the strategies to support those programmatic intents, and a detailed explanation of all metrics for performance, which may need to include proof of a successful track record (Saul, 2011). Sanzone (2000) said, “The institution must work hard and creatively to seek out new and appropriate opportunities for corporate support; the institution must demonstrate how a relationship with its institution will benefit the company” (p. 324). These sentiments were expressed by interviewees in all participating organizations.

To be successful in engaging today’s corporations and corporate foundations,

Saul (2011) said higher education institutions need to be able to speak their language, be attuned to the corporations' values and needs, justify the institution's abilities and resources to be successful in partnering, and differentiating their potential collaborative abilities against competitors. Professional fundraising staff and higher education leaders would benefit to be able to define and articulate the organization's ability to create impact, ability to provide efficiencies, and clearly manage expectations. Higher education needs to directly address corporations' motives for engagement, present value-based propositions—not cost-plus, understand the culture and dialogue of industries, sell solutions, sell outcomes—not programs, create mutually beneficial partnerships, and engage with like-minded organizations. Martin et al. (2012) said today's higher education institutions also embrace the triple bottom line concept for success; the participant University is committed to the triple bottom line philosophy.

Provide multiple opportunities. Burson (2009) said collaborations on higher education campuses have been encouraged in recent years. The integrated approach for collaboration has created coordination, central relationship contact for a designated corporation, communication, concerted institutional representation, shared learning, and increased performance. As evidence in this study, relationships with corporations are complex. Sanzone (2000) observed,

There are multiple sources of support from companies [so higher education institutions must] widen the focus of attention...to the entire corporate relationship. [Higher education must] be able to facilitate relationships between admissions, career services, sponsored research, technology transfer, and development offices. Providing corporations ways to increase their visibility, become involved with key programs, influence curriculum development, and find well-trained students will enhance the ability of an institution to compete for corporate support. ... Corporate support inevitably will be stronger for an institution whose research strengths match corporate priorities than for those whose research

strengths do not. This kind of support is less unrestricted, more targeted, more aligned to strategic business objectives, and more likely to be viewed as an investment rather than an outright gift (even if it is a gift). (pp. 322-323)

The University in this study provides a wide range of multiple opportunities for corporations and other constituents.

Saul (2011) indicated that outcomes for nonprofits, including higher education institutions, are measured in any or all of three categories: change in status, change in condition, and/or systemic change. Such educational outcomes may include higher social and economic status, ROI of individual and collective contributions to society, and broad implications and foundational changes including quality and quantity of education's contribution to society, addressing social and environmental issues, and creating efficiencies and innovations based on technologies and accessibility. The corporations and the University in this study measure their contributions in the three categories. Major successes include contributions to society including educated individuals, solutions for social and environmental issues, and discoveries and applications in a wide range of disciplines and professions.

Create clear value propositions. Higher education would do well to create solutions for corporations' biggest challenges, opportunities, and needs while fulfilling their own mission (Brock, 2007; Rhodes, 2011; Saul, 2011). Saul (2012) said higher education must prove impact and value to corporations. Brock (2007) and Saul (2012) both indicated that understanding corporations' values and needs; speaking their language; creating solutions for business problems, opportunities, and needs; and assuring efficiency and effectiveness catapult relationship success. Brock said those needing resources need to be relevant and "Understand important trends and directions

driving the industry. Understand their key measures of success. Try to anticipate the problems, challenges, and opportunities they face” (p. 2). Corporations and other partners are operating in a more and more complex environment with multiple needs and goals. Quantifying impact is the key for organizations such as higher education to engage in today’s complex resource environment (Brock, 2007; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). The University and corporations continue to refine their measurement and reporting activities as evidenced in their annual reports.

Invest in stewardship of relationships. “Stewardship activities supporting existing relationships” are “important” (Cleland et al., 2012, p. 6). “Outcomes of effective stewardship are signs of evolving growth and strengthening of the relationship with [a] company” (Cleland et al., 2012, p. 6). Sanzone (2000) said, “the institution must prove its ability to consistently use and manage gifts and other corporate revenue responsibly” (p. 324). To that effect, the University and University foundation staffs provide written and verbal feedback to report on uses of funds and their impact. Additionally, key constituents of organizations are invited to visit campus to participate in programs or ceremonies as appropriate stewardship.

Prioritize key people. Sanzone (2000) observed that successful inter-organizational relationships are built through individuals such as executive leadership, management, researchers with faculty contacts, and alumni of educational institutions. The centralized, industrial-focused model coordinates campus efforts and maximizes interface with corporations. However, Pollack (1998) cautioned that “it’s labor intensive” (p. 17). Jacobson (1978) indicated a centralized corporate relations program:

Establishes working relationships with business in interests and university activities; solicits gift support from business and industry in a systematic

manner; [and] provides a centralized office for assistance, guidance, and coordination of all matters as needed involving contact between corporations and university programs. (p. 22)

The University prioritizes key corporate relationships and strives to coordinate university-wide to streamline communications and to maximize opportunities for engagement. This process is complex and time consuming given the size of the University and number of potential key interest areas for each company involved.

In addition to coordinating efforts on campus, higher education needs to engage individual constituents located in corporations where appropriate (Pollack, 1998). Higher education can “invite institutional CEOs and corporate executives to serve as advisers to key academic areas and...cultivate alumni networks within companies” (Sanzone, 2000, p. 324). Leveraging individual relationships will strengthen the fabric of the inter-organizational relationship. Interviewees at the University support the centralized approach for corporate relations, however, they are sensitive to organic and developing relationships at all levels within the University community as needed and as appropriate. This multi-prong approach keeps the central University leaders abreast of activities yet fosters an open communication system to best serve corporations.

These champions will corroborate internally to maintain strong support for the higher education institution. Having multiple champions within a company builds bench strength in case any one champion moves to another company or retires. The relationships are built inter-organizationally and are not reliant on individual actors.

Always act ethically. Higher education—like all organizations in the 21st Century—are pressured to provide accountability, transparency, and open reporting as part of the requirement for credibility to promote ethical behavior. Evans (2000) said,

It is always valuable to try to determine the conventions and standards that have been followed in the profession over the years. ...By raising ethical questions and by dealing with ethical matters in conferences and in literature, the development profession can help to sensitize individual practitioners. (pp. 365-366)

The University and the University foundation maintain high ethical standards. Multiple ethics codes, guidelines, and detailed policies are promoted by the University for research: faculty research, sponsored research assurance, and integrity; student conduct: student behavior, academic integrity, and social media guidelines; and employee conduct: management of University finances and resources, professional conduct for faculty and staff, and interaction with non-university vendors, contractors, and organizations. The University foundation promotes the *Donor Bill of Rights* (see Appendix C) and has extensive policies and procedures.

Summary of higher education implications. This study support's Sanzone's (2000) observation that a higher education "corporate relations office needs strong and effective links with all areas in the institution that directly interact with companies" (p. 323). Saul (2011) indicated that higher education leaders need to view their inter-organizational relationships from the corporations' eyes and provide clear value propositions. Examples include offices dealing with research, grants, student placement, vendors, and academic programs. This study found that to be successful, higher education institutions should *develop key strategies for fundraising techniques, provide multiple opportunities with several areas of the institution, create clear value propositions, invest in stewardship of relationships, prioritize key people, and always act ethically.*

Corporate Implications

Companies want to enter into "relatively long-term (three years or more)

partnerships” (COP, 2007, p. 31). Most higher education institutions are willing to agree to multi-year commitments, but for mutual benefit. McGoldrich (1989) said corporations approach inter-organizational relationship activities “from a position of enlightened self-interest” (p. 166). However, this self-interest often involves a long-term perspective. Corporations look to higher education to work together to develop long-term social, economic, and environmental plans—together. Litan and Mitchell (2011) indicated that “the qualities of a university’s ideas, faculty, and programs are what matter. In the end, all schools are chasing the same dollars,” (p. 142). The corporations in this study supported the notion that high-quality relationships with the University perpetuate ongoing growth and desire to engage. Success begets success.

Corporations, therefore, are selective in which higher education institutions to associate with and for what programs. Benioff and Adler (2007) said, “The good news for corporations is that giving back, when conceived and executed thoughtfully, creates a win-win scenario for businesses and the public” (p. xii). “Best practices in corporate giving programs are tied to a number of elements within the company and the company’s operating environment” (COP, 2007, p. 23). The corporations in this study consider a wide range of criteria to partner with higher education such as: *benefits*, *risk analysis*, *strategic emphasis*, *long-term emphasis*, and *motives*.

Benefits. Liggett (2000), Pollack (1998), and Sanzone (2000) said a main goal of corporations’ relationships with educational institutions is *workforce recruitment*. This motive was the top finding in RQ2. “Recruitment of students is certainly a central reason why companies want to connect with educational institutions. Companies use their resources to gain access to top students pursuing studies in areas of strategic importance

to them” (Sanzone, 2000, pp. 321-322). As confirmed by this study, corporations also enrich their human capital by partnering with higher education for tailored continuing education and training programs. Additionally, corporations access higher education to receive low-cost, affordable consulting.

A main resource of universities is research collaborations and joint ventures resulting in intellectual property or technology transfer. Corporations ought to be fair in offering win-win scenarios for the University’s engagement. The participant University and corporations in this study explained that win-win propositions incentivize students, faculty, the University, and corporations to work together to find new processes, scientific discoveries, or technological advancements to improve society.

Risk analysis. Hoerr et al. (2012) and Robbins, et al. (2007) cautioned that industry risks need to be considered in higher education partnerships. Scarcity of time and resources causes corporations to take careful consideration of inter-organizational relationships, however, higher education institutions take even longer due diligence time to preserve a strong reputation and calculated risks. Those considerations push both corporations and the University to research potential partners, vet individuals involved, create trial periods, monitor activities, and provide appropriate time needed to build inter-organizational relationships.

Another major risk is the concern of ROI. Corporations continue to demand proof on expedient timetables. The University provides needed resources of people or funds appropriate to the challenge in order to ensure success of ventures. The University is cautious yet ambitious to accept challenging projects with corporations.

Finally, higher education protects academic freedom. Corporations need to

appreciate and respect boundaries set by higher education to protect students and faculty while providing valuable opportunities. McGowan (2012) said,

- Corporations have multiple choices to form partnerships with universities to advance common interests, and they prefer academic partners who:
  - See the mutual advantages of working together
  - Appreciate the inherent differences in their cultures
  - Allocate experienced resources to manage the interactions
  - Strive to remove barriers to effective, timely agreements
  - Share in risks as well as benefits (p. 2)

Partnering with other organizations is complex (Aldrich, 1979). Both corporations and higher education institutions need to determine goals and opportunities; these considerations carry a certain degree of risks and rewards that have to be considered (Robbins et al., 2007). Corporate executives in this study shared their ideas and experiences supporting the balance of risk and reward in working with the University.

Strategic emphasis. Sanzone (2000) claimed: “Increasingly, corporate dollars focus on strategic initiatives and comprehensive partnerships” (p. 322). This statement held true for the six corporations in this study. Inter-organizational relationships have shifted in the past 20 years. For example, while leadership relations between higher education and corporate executives are valuable, pet projects of corporate leaders is no longer the norm in corporate strategic planning nor inter-organizational relationships with higher education. Sanzone (2000) said, “The corporate agenda for support of educational institutions has moved away from senior executives’ personal interests and affiliations toward their business interests and objectives” (p. 322). This situation was directly expressed by Medium Company B. The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (2007) reported:

Some companies see their philanthropy as a way to mobilize others as volunteers and/or donors. Some firms deliberately use their giving to build a body of knowledge or expertise in a field, rather than just assist individual organizations. Others give for individual organizations and then use their power of convening or dissemination to increase knowledge or capacity about how to solve specific community problems. Some firms work closely with subject or content experts in a field to administer a program or grants process. Others work closely with other companies as funders and as experts/resources to leverage their impact on achieving a shared objective. (pp. 15-16)

Those types of goals were seen in all six corporations as well as the University. However, as promoted by Bruch and Walter (2005), many of the participant companies' activities continue to "lack a cohesive strategy and are conducted in a piecemeal fashion" (p. 49). While all of the companies in this study have developed success stories, executives interviewed admitted that there was no written, comprehensive strategy. Medium Company B was the only corporation that expressed that it was assessing and strategizing its relationship with the University. While corporations often claim they have ROI expectations, they should take the time to develop plans and communicate those to their higher education counterparts.

Long-term emphasis. "Tapping the extensive resources of the corporate world to strategically match social, community, and public needs can create immense benefits for all parties" (Benioff & Adler, 2007, p. xv). As organizational citizens in a pluralistic society, corporations are willing to engage and support universities. The State of Corporate Citizenship (2012) reported that:

Corporate citizenship has the greatest impact on companies' reputations and corporate cultures and the largest companies benefit the most... Corporate citizenship contributes to...success in fostering public trust. Smaller companies benefit, too, although not as much. (p. 11)

The leaders of the six corporations in this study all expressed that their companies desire

to make a positive impact in society by investing in long-term, inter-organizational relationships with the University and other organizations. These six companies understand their role in the larger society to create win-win opportunities.

Motives. Higher education knows its value and is becoming more astute at communicating and pricing it. Higher education institutions—particularly larger doctoral research universities—are able to offer premier connectivity and resources to corporations for committed reciprocal resources and long-term engagement. While companies have their own strategic initiatives, so do universities.

Concerns regarding corporations taking advantage of and controlling inter-organizational relationships are diminishing (Etzkowitz et al., 1998; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Gould, 2003; Haley, 1991; Molnar, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Stein, 2004; Washburn, 2005; White, 2000). Entrepreneurial activity of corporate America is being kept in check and not unduly influencing higher education in ways such as directing curriculum content, swaying decision-making by faculty and administrators, purchasing research and ideas at low costs, or eroding educational agendas in deference to market demands. Specific intellectual property, technology transfer, or other entrepreneurial ventures are controlled and purposeful for higher education, not loose or dominated by corporations that was of special concern to Etzkowitz et al. (1998), Giroux and Giroux (2004), Haley (1991), Molnar (2002), and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004). The corporations in this study are focused on business enhancement, however, they utilize opportunities with the University to foster win-win successes for themselves while also positively impacting the University, its people, and its programs.

Summary of corporate implications. Businesses have a wide range of interests in partnering with other organizations (Cone, 2010). The six corporations in this study look to higher education to work together to develop long-term social, economic, and environmental plans—together. When corporations evaluate the potentiality to partner with higher education, several key considerations are made relating to: potential benefits, possible risks, strategic priority overlap or growth, long-term investment, and mutually beneficial motives (Benioff & Adler, 2007; Gould, 2003; McGoldrich, 1989; Sanzone, 2000; Saul, 2011). Of the six companies in this study, Medium Company B and *Fortune 500* Companies A and B relate to the University on all three levels of social, economic, and environmental concerns. Small Companies A and B and Medium Company A relate mainly on the economic and social areas but do philosophically support environmental concerns.

Summary of Implications for Practice

This study provided several implications for *inter-organizational relationships* in general; *implications for higher education* leaders, corporate relations officers, and individuals needing corporate engagement; and *implications for corporations* partnering with higher education considers a wide range of issues. Organizations needing resources do not operate in a vacuum and “must inevitably interact with their social environments” (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003, p. 19). This interaction often comes in the form of *inter-organizational relationships*. Such relationships are beneficial when partnering with compatible organizations on common or complementary goals (Brennan, 2000; Bright et al., 2006; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Daw & Cone, 2011; Elliott, 2006; Fischer, 2000; Gould, 2003; Pollack, 1998; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Samans, 2005; Sanzone, 2000).

The six corporations in this study have developed on-going relationships with the University. Each project gives the opportunity to yield successes and increase the depth of comfort and longevity for the inter-organizational relationships.

Ring and Van de Ven (1994) identified three key processes for successful inter-organizational relationships: negotiations to identify needs and expectations, commitments to solidify and formalize intentions, and execution of commitments. Saul (2011) said organizations seek reciprocity and ROI that include performance as well as transparency and reporting. These processes were elaborated on by each participant organization.

Implications for higher education leaders, corporate relations officers, and individuals (e.g., faculty, staff, students) needing corporate engagement included important steps to plan for successful inter-organizational relationships. Higher education leaders need to develop key strategies for fundraising and resource development, provide multiple opportunities for potential collaboration, create clear value propositions of interest to corporations, invest in stewardship of relationships, prioritize key people, and always act ethically, (Burson, 2009; Evans, 2000; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Sanzone, 2000; Saul, 2011). These considerations will aid in the increased success and productivity of higher education engaging with corporations.

Implications for corporations partnering with higher education involve a wide range of considerations. Several key considerations include: potential benefits, possible risks, strategic priority overlap or growth, long-term investment, and mutually beneficial motives (Benioff & Adler, 2007; Gould, 2003; McGoldrich, 1989; Sanzone, 2000; Saul, 2011). All six corporations in this study resound Benioff and Adler's (2007) opinion,

“The good news for corporations is that giving back, when conceived and executed thoughtfully, creates a win-win scenario for businesses and the public” (p. xii). “Best practices in corporate giving programs are tied to a number of elements within the company and the company’s operating environment” (COP, 2007, p. 23). The six corporations in this study participated with the University for different and varying reasons with the University.

Future Research

“Complex organizations...are ubiquitous in modern societies, but our understanding of them is limited and segmented” (Thompson, 2005, p. 491). Rhodes (2001) said,

It is not only the testing of conclusions that requires community. Increasingly, identifying issues of importance, specifying the problem to be addressed, framing the experiment, designing the study, and developing the competence and skill to pursue it also require the teamwork and joint effort of a community. And effective service—the humane application of knowledge—cannot be pursued in isolation; its very nature involves the recognition of *need* in others, and the deliberate application of skills to meet that need. The effective university depends on community, because the interacting community multiplies the power and extends the reach of its members. (p. 45)

This research provided valuable insights into the inter-organizational relationships between the University and six of its corporate partners. Likewise, Cropper et al.’s (2008) *The Handbook of Inter-organizational Relations* provided many insights into inter-organizational relations including various motives as well as processes. However, only one higher education example was used in this study and one in Cropper et al.’s book. Many more studies need to be done between higher education and corporations. Additional research opportunities exist to continue to refine the understanding of these relationships and to deepen the context and motives involved. Future research could

include expanding the participants in this study, researching other audiences, and addressing the inter-organizational relationship topic using other research methodologies.

Expanding Participants in the Current Study

Further exploration from this dissertation could include deeper research on the specific themes and sub-themes (Bernard & Ryan, 2010). The participant University in this study was public. Additional public universities could be studied to gain a more comprehensive view of their inter-organizational behavior. Such a multiple case study would allow for cross-case analysis to include variables such as geography, state or local culture, and size of institution. Likewise, private universities of like framing and size could be included in further research for a cross-case analysis. Additionally, other educational institutions at all levels could be studied and compared: comprehensive masters, baccalaureate, and community colleges.

For this specific study, more corporations and additional types of corporations could be studied. Potentially companies in the same industry would potentially have overlapping goals to understand. Researching more studies could potentially confirm the behavior observed in this study based on size (e.g., small, medium, or large) in this study. Researching companies in many industries would allow for cross-industry analysis for inter-organizational behavior of corporate citizenship with higher education.

Researching Other Audiences

To frame this study, only U.S. higher education or U.S. corporate participants were considered so they operate under the same legal and tax structure. Further research could involve multiple countries for an international perspective. Studying multiple countries would involve other cultural aspects surrounding inter-organizational behavior.

This study only included C-suite and senior level leaders and managers. Further research of types of participants in this study could include deeper analysis of the boards of the organizations and the leadership styles of individual participants. Likewise, other participants could include employees to understand their perspective in pro-social behavior and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Specifically, research could be conducted to only focus on companies whose University alumni were employed in corporations.

While this study focused on corporate support of higher education, it is noted that significant corporate support is also wielded to elementary and secondary levels of education, and higher education institutions should be aware of this competition for funding and corporate citizenship engagement (Meuth, 1991). Studying the range of public and private K-12 institutions and related corporate supports could illuminate similar or contrasting motives to those in higher education. The culture and functionality of schools likely operate under state and federal educational requirements, which would constitute a different type of organizational culture to study.

Another opportunity of research could be exploring organizations fostering corporate-higher education relationships (e.g., BHEF, CECP, GUIRR, NACRO, UIDP). These organizations likely involve specific higher education institutions and businesses with specific needs, motives, and ROI expectations. Leaders of those partnering associations could also be studied.

While governments' roles were mentioned in this dissertation, more specific research could be performed viewing the 50 U.S. states and the federal government regarding their needs and motives for supporting inter-organizational relationships. These

governmental organizations potentially champion overall goals for the United States in a global arena. The governments may also have specific considerations of needs based on geographic opportunities. A cross-unit analysis of multiple states would contribute to the broader understanding of variances among different U.S. states.

Benioff and Adler (2007) said, "...all organizations—whether they be nonprofit, for-profit, or government—are defined by the people who work for them. It is their ideas, their talents, their skill sets, their vision that is any organization's greatest asset and that has the ability to make it great" (p. 107). This study mentioned the importance of leaders in organizations and their influence on organizational culture and inter-organizational behavior. However, research could be conducted to study the specific leaders in participating organizations. Each leader would have a demographic make-up of variables that likely influence their actions and impact on inter-organizational activity. Such leadership variables could include educational background, experience, involvement in other organizations, political view, faith background, or a host of other denominators.

This study experienced only successful, positive inter-organizational relationships between the University and each of the six corporate embedded units. A wider inclusion of other universities and/or more companies could provide negative experiences of failed inter-organizational relationships or controversial ones. Including more corporations could locate and elaborate on negative cases. Additionally, the researcher presumed all interviewees in this study presented the truth. A larger critical mass of participant organizations may provide dissenting views and opinions.

Using Other Research Methodologies

This dissertation utilized multiple types of data to research a single-embedded

case study format. Depending on the number and types of higher education institutions and/or corporations studied, multiple case studies could be conducted for in-depth cross-unit or cross-case analysis or meta-analysis (Patton, 1990). The broader and deeper the number of organizational participants, the more corroboration or availability of contrasting information may be studied and analyzed.

Additionally, empirical data could be collected and analyzed. For example, surveys could be completed with multiple types of individual participants per organization on their opinions regarding the three Research Questions in this study. Additionally, surveying many people regarding the University and six corporations in the study or other studies would yield broader and deeper information as to the motive and ROI expectations for inter-organizational engagement.

Other research methods could include a combination of mixed methods to include maximum corporate and higher education participation. A longitudinal study could broaden perspectives to look for various behaviors during different time periods, different economic conditions, or during different political parties' tenure in governmental offices. Any number of external variables could be studied that influence organizational behavior. An organizational ethnography would allow for more in-depth observation and interactions (Erikson, 2011; Moeran, 2009; Neyland, 2008; Rosen, 1991; Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2009). A more robust number of cases and long-term research may engage negative cases and a broader range of participants.

Other Considerations

Aside from other participants or types of research methods, several other future research projects might include *processes, dissident voices, related topics, or public*

relations areas. Processes might include various policies, models, or unknown situations. Dissident voices may include organizational lessons from failed inter-organizational attempts or rejected offers. Related topics might include other research relating to organizational analysis, inter-organizational relations, leadership, or other components related to Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Public relations may include promotion and sharing of information via traditional print or new social media.

Processes. Processes might include various policies, models, or unknown situations. For example, NACRO has worked recently to develop considerations of how and why corporations engage with higher education. Specifically, NACRO's *Metrics for a Successful Twenty-First Century Academic Corporate Relations Program* (Cleland et al., 2012) begins a framework and dialogue for addressing the "corporate engagement process" (p. 2). The white paper addresses processes and roles very well of academic and corporate partners. The metrics provided, however, are mainly inputs and outputs; additional research needs to be performed to develop outcomes and impacts that are meaningful to both higher education and corporations. Significant research could be conducted with corporations to collate and categorize what metrics they look for; perhaps those same metrics could be used for universities (R. Jones, personal communication, January 2, 2013). It is vital to recognize that "different metrics will be important to different stakeholders" (p. 7). Additionally, while a "corporate relationship gauge" is presented including "philanthropic giving, sponsored programs, recruiting, evaluation from leadership, master research agreement, and national ranking" (p. 12). While these are some touch points of interest, the categories seem arbitrary and incomplete and could be researched and framed best through Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum.

From an inter-organizational relationship perspective, historical record context, and a cultural forensic need, creating a system of managing expectations in the corporate engagement process and the corporate relationship gauge “provides a forum to recap events, collaborations, and accomplishments” (p. 12). Additionally, this white paper addresses more management than inter-organizational relationship issues. Finally, ethics practices are not discussed in the NACRO recommendations.

Dissident voices. Research could be conducted on failed partnerships, rejected organizational partnering, or negative inter-organizational relationships. For example, an external reviewer of this dissertation, said,

As you develop your list of potential informants, you might actively seek out a handful of dissident voices (i.e., individuals who have vocalized serious concerns about academic/corporate relationships or are otherwise not supportive of efforts to strengthen ties between our sectors). Interviews with dissidents often prove very revealing about the topic at hand. (D. Siegel, personal communication, March 16, 2012)

While it may be challenging to recruit dissident organizational participants, studying their concerns could illuminate other perspectives or inter-organizational relationships.

Related topics. New and expanding research provides discussion for overlapping or inter-related topics. The field of organizational analysis encompasses both internal and external considerations. Any number of related topics may create research opportunities related to this study. For example, as the new business accountability of social, environmental, and economic responsibility and sustainability (SEERS) develops and embeds itself, further research and tracking could be researched. This framework was discussed by Greenberg et al. (2011).

Public relations. All current research needs to be catalogued centrally. More scholarly research relating to inter-organizational relationships or relevant other topics

should be published. Such shared information can continue to build overarching themes to further understand inter-organizational relationships. Additionally, new and social media need to be explored. “Companies are paying attention to how these forms of rapid communication shape public opinion and corporate reputation” (COP, 2007, p. 13). Further research might include the impact these expeditious and transparent mediums have on inter-organizational relationships between higher education and corporations.

Summary

Chapter Five discussed the findings of the study as they related to the literature on organizational analysis, inter-organizational relationships, and culture. Specific discussion on inter-organizational relationships included both the higher education perspective working with businesses and the corporations’ perspective of engaging with higher education. The environment of inter-organizational relationships was discussed including organizational culture, the economic recession during the time period of this study from 2006 to 2010, and the process of organizational learning. Ethical behavior in inter-organizational relationships included discussion regarding organizational ethics, expectations for ethical behavior, observation of ethical behavior, leadership behavior and ethics, organizations’ orientation toward their employees, reactions to societal demands, reactions to the environment, and relevant culture impacting ethics. Chapter Five also discussed qualitative research methodologies related to the study and related experiences including organizational resistance, interviewing elites, triangulating data, reflecting on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum used as the framework of the study, transferability, and examining inter-organizational ethnography. Limitations of this study included the lens of open systems, types of organizational participants,

confidentiality, and scope. Implications for practice considered inter-organizational workings in general and specific practices for both higher education and corporations. Finally, Chapter Five discussed future research such as expanding participants in the current study, researching other audiences, using other research methodologies, and other considerations such as processes, dissident voices, and related topics.

Conclusion

Education and knowledge are the most important resources of any culture. Inter-organizational relationships inevitably occur in a pluralistic society. Cohen (2010) argued that higher education continues to face resource challenges. Rhodes (2001) reminded higher education that it does not exist in a vacuum but, rather, as part of the wider community. DeMillo (2011) said, “It is the fate of universities to be shaped by political, economic, and social forces, but each institution remains free to choose the road it wants to travel” (p. 272). Today higher education looks outside itself for resources; corporations are one key area of interest for academic institutions. While corporate funding is highly volatile because of the American economy, corporate funding constitutes 11% of revenue for higher education (Rose, 2011). These inter-organizational relationships between American higher education and U.S. corporations are important.

The World Economic Forum (2002) defined corporate citizenship as:

The contribution a company makes to society through its core business activities, its social investment and philanthropy programmes, and its engagement in public policy. The manner in which a company manages its economic, social and environmental relationships, as well as those with different stakeholders, in particular shareholders, employees, customers, business partners, governments and communities determines its impact.
(p. 1)

Aldrich (1979) said any particular organization may be enmeshed in a web with other

organizations. With such a vital role in society, governments and corporations have a vested interest in the success of American higher education. Jacoby (1973) said, “The corporation has long played a stellar role on the American social stage” (p. 249).

“Corporations have contributed in many ways to enhancing the quality of life in our communities” (Fischer, 2000, p. 184). “Many corporations support social and academic causes without attaching conditions or extracting concessions. Corporate America tends to respect the university’s independence and idealism and to honor its boundaries” (Boyd & Halfond, 1990, p. A44). Likewise, the U.S. and state governments have contributed greatly to societal functioning, including by support for free market enterprise and higher education (Cohen; Jacoby, 1973; Madden, 1977).

The inter-organizational relationships between the University and six corporate partners in this study appear congruent with the American pluralistic society, ideals of democracy, and free enterprise system of capitalism (Eisenstadt, 1981). “Direct relationships exist between business and academic institutions to the benefit of both...[and]...both parties...maintain separate identities...[yet]...often complementary missions” (Elliott, 2006, p. 59). This study highlighted positive inter-organizational relationships with mutual benefit as the outcome.

“Key supports to develop and sustain strategic partnerships include strong relationships nurtured over time, trust, frequent and open communication, shared values and vision, and a common understanding of what it means to be involved in the partnership” (Eddy, 2010, p. xi). Motivations for the relationship between higher education and corporations can be either intrinsic or extrinsic. When both parties have intrinsic motivation, partnerships are likely to develop and be long lasting. Extrinsic

motivation for resources or network are also important, but if either part of the relationship is forced on the other, limited, short-term, or ill-fitting relationships ensue (Eddy, 2010). Although resources may be at stake, the greatest benefit of mutual relationships is the social capital or social benefit to society (Eddy, 2010; Fulton & Blau, 2005; Saul, 2011). A balance of roles and responsibilities lead to successful relationships.

The concept of corporate interaction with society as a spectrum has emerged and evolved in the past several decades. All inter-organizational relationship research includes two key frames: “a set of dimensions describing the organizations and a set of dimensions describing the nature of relationships through which they are linked” (Cropper et al., 2008, p. 9). Several scholars have developed models and theories addressing the relationship between business and society (Carroll & Buchholtz, 2008; Edwards, 2008; Frishkoff & Kostecka, 1991; Garriga and Melé, 2004; Johnson, 2011; Munilla & Miles, 2005; Saiia, 1999; Saul, 2011; Sethi, 1975; Stangis, 2007; Waddock, 2004; Young & Burlingame, 1996). While others have hinted at the existence of a spectrum, Cone (2010) crafted a visual concept. Cone’s (2010) multidimensional corporate citizenship spectrum illustrates a continuum of four categories identifying key corporate citizenship functions, which include philanthropy, cause-related branding, operational culture, and DNA citizenship ethos as a continuum from left to right.

This study illuminated several reasons why higher education engages with corporations as well as some of the motives and ROI expectations corporations have, such as enlightened self interest. Consideration of ethical dilemmas was also addressed. This study confirmed that stringent reporting, accountability, and transparency uphold the *Golden Rule* and utilitarian principles. Additionally, the development of inter-

organizational relationships is an on-going process situated in organizational culture. The process matures and strengthens over time. Positive inter-organizational relationships are yielded by exploring potential opportunities, navigating common interests, defining and negotiating key expectations, and monitoring progress and outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, E.; Borchert, A.; Dwyer, M.; Fuller, C.; Gibbs, G.; Hanifan, M. et al. (2011). *Five elements of a successful twenty-first century university corporate relations program*. White Paper, Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers Benchmarking Committee, August 2, 2011. Retrieved March 17, 2012, from http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Welcome_files/White_Paper_FINAL.pdf
- Acar, W., Aupperle, K. E., & Lowry, R. M. (2001). An empirical exploration of measures of social responsibility across the spectrum of organization types. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(1), 26-57.
- Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1968). Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. *American Sociological Review*, 33(6), 912-930.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Straw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews*. (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Aldrich, H. E. (1979). *Organizations and environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Alexander, L., Coleman, R., Bennett, E., Dam, K. W., Delaney, H. R. J., Dennis, K. O., et al. (1997). *Giving better, getting smarter: The report of the National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Philanthropy and Civil Renewal.
- Altheide, D., Coyle, M., DeVriese, K., & Schneider, C. (2008). Emergent qualitative document analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 127-151). New York: The Guilford Press.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2011). Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.aaup.org>
- Anderson, D. (2009, August 13-14). *The relentless pursuit of collaborative corporate relations*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Andresen, K. (2006). *Robin Hood marketing: Stealing corporate savvy to sell just causes*. San Francisco: Wiley & Sons.
- Angrosino, M. V., & Mays de Perez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 673-702). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Arulampalam, W., & Stoneman, P. (1995). An investigation into the givings by large corporate donors to UK charities, 1979-86. *Applied Economics*, 27, 935-945.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP). (2011). Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.afpnet.org>
- Astley, W. G., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1983, June). Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 245-270.
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1976). *Pro-social behavior: Theory and research*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.
- Barnard, J. W. (1990). Exxon collides with "Valdez Principles." *Business and Society Review*, 74, 32.
- Baruch, J. J. (1984). Structuring markets for public goods and services. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 111-130). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Baumol, W. J. (1984). Matching private incentives to public goals. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 175-194). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Beiser, K. J. (2005). *Fundraising in the nonprofit sector: An analytical look at donor perceptions of how their donations are used to elicit more donations*. Unpublished dissertation, Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.
- Benioff, M., & Adler, C. (2007). *The business of changing the world: Twenty great leaders on strategic corporate philanthropy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Benioff, M., & Southwick, K. (2004). *Compassionate capitalism*. Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.
- Berezin, V. (2010). Social reporting: Getting a clear picture. *The Corporate Citizen*, 4, 11-13.

- Berle, A. A., & Means, G. C. (1968). *The modern corporation and private property*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.
- Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2008). *Philanthrocapitalism: How the rich can save the world*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boccalandro, B. (2009). *Mapping success in employee volunteering: The drivers of effectiveness for employee volunteering and giving programs and Fortune 500 performance*. Boston: Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship.
- Boeninger, C. (2010). *What are NAICS and SIC industry codes and how do I use them?* Retrieved November 27, 2012 from <http://www.library.ohiou.edu/subjects/businessblog/business-topic-guides/what-are-naics-and-sic-industry-codes-and-how-do-i-use-them>
- Bok, D. (2003a). Academic values and the lure of profit. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(30), B7.
- Bok, D. (2003b). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. D. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Boverini, L. (2008). When venture philanthropy rocks the ivory tower. In A. Walton & M. Gasman (Eds.), *Philanthropy, volunteerism, and fundraising* (pp. 876-892). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Boyd, D. P., & Halfond, J. A. (1990). Corporate ties and integrity at U.S. business schools. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36(38), A44.
- Brennan, M. J. (2000). Strategic corporate alliances: The importance of internal institutional collaborations. In M. K. Murphy's (Ed.), *Corporate and foundation support: Strategies for funding education in the 21st century* (pp. 51-54). New York: Case.
- Brewer, J. D. (2000). *Ethnography*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Pro-social organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 710-725.
- Bright, D. S., Fry, R. E., & Cooperrider, D. L. (2006). Transformative innovations for the mutual benefit of business, society, and environment. *BAWB Interactive Working Paper Series*, 1(1), 17-33.
- Brittingham, B. E., & Pezzullo, T. R. (1990). *The campus green: Fund raising in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Brock, D. (2007, July 5). Focus on a customer's need to buy, not on your need to sell. *EyesOnSales*. Retrieved July 14, 2012 from http://www.eyesonsales.com/content/article/focus_on_a_customers_need_to_buy_not_your_need_to_sell
- Brooks, H. (1984). Seeking equity and efficiency: Public and private roles. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 3-29). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Brown, M. C. (2004). Making the case for corporate philanthropy: A key element of success. In H. P. Karoff (Ed.), *Just money: A critique of contemporary American philanthropy* (pp. 151-164). Boston: TPI Editions.
- Bruch, H., & Walter, F. (2005). The keys to rethinking corporate philanthropy. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(1), 48-55.
- Brudney, V., & Ferrell, A. (2002). Corporate charitable giving. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 69(3), 1191-1218.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: University Press.
- Buchanan, P. W. (1991). Variables influencing corporate giving to higher education in Michigan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Building Business Investment in Community (BBIC). (2002). *The business of giving back: 2002 survey of business and community giving*. Retrieved January 25, 2013 from http://www.mnchamber.com/foundation/2002_Summary_Report.pdf
- Burlingame, D. F., & Frishkoff, P. A. (1996). How does firm size affect corporate philanthropy? In D. F. Burlingame and D. R. Young (Eds.) *Corporate philanthropy at the crossroads* (pp. 86-104). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

- Burson, E. N. (2009, August 13-14). *Management of the long-term relationship*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Bush, V. (1945). *Science, the endless frontier: A report to the president*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Business-Higher Education Forum (BHEF). (2011). Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.bhef.com/about/index.asp>
- Byrne, J. A., Cosgrove, J., Hindo, B., & Dayan, A. (2002). The new face of philanthropy: Today's donors are more ambitious, get more involved, and demand results. *Business Week*, 3810, 82-94.
- Caboni, T. C. (2010). The normative structure of college and university fundraising behaviors. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(3), 339-365.
- Caboni, T. C., & Proper, E. (2007). *Dissertations related to fundraising and their implications for higher education research*. Louisville, KY: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Carey, K. (2012, August 1-3). *Partnering with universities NACRO 2012: Managing different drivers of corporate funding – research funding, branding/marketing, and recruiting*. Presentation at the NACRO Conference, Evanston, IL. Retrieved December 28, 2012, from <http://www.nacroonline.org/conference-presentations>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching™. (2011). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education™*. Retrieved October 18, 2011, from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org>
- Carroll, A., B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39-48.
- Carroll, A. B., & Buchholtz, A. K. (2008). *Business & society: Ethics and stakeholder management* (7th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Carroll, G. R. & Hannan, M. T. (2004). *The demography of corporations and industries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Carty, C. M., & Blank, H. D. (2003, January). The Fortune 500 vs. the S&P 500. *Financial Advisor Magazine*. Retrieved November 12, 2011, from <http://www.fa-mag.com/component/content/article/624.html?issue=28&magazineID=1&Itemid=27>
- Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE). (2011). Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.cfre.org>

- Cheeseman, H. (2012). *Business law: Legal environment, online commerce, business ethics, and international issues* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Chernow, R. (1998). *Titan: The life of John D. Rockefeller, Sr.* New York: Random House.
- Christy, R. D., & Williamson, L. (Eds.). (1992). *A century of service: Land grant colleges & universities, 1890-1990*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Ciconte, B. L., & Jacob, J. G. (2009). *Fundraising basics: A complete guide* (3rd ed.). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Clark, R. C. (1984). What is the proper role of the corporation? In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 195-220). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Cleland, T. A., Colledge, B., Ellerbrock, M., Lynch, K., McGowan, D., Patera, S. et al. (2012). *Metrics for a successful twenty-first century academic corporate relations program*. White Paper, Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers Benchmarking Committee, August 2, 2012. Retrieved December 28, 2012 from <http://www.nacroonline.org>
- Clifton, J. (2011). *The coming jobs war: What every leader must know about the future of job creation*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Cloniger, D. S. (1985). *Corporate social responsibility and the business manager: An ethical inquiry*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.
- Cohen, A. M. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergency and growth of the contemporary system* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cohen, D., & Crabtree, B. (2006). *Qualitative research guidelines project*. (July) Retrieved December 13, 2013 from <http://www.qualres.org/HomeDisp-3831.html>
- Collins, M. E. (2011, September/October). Doing business by the book. *Advancing Philanthropy*, 37-38.
- Conley, J. H. (2011). Ethics. *Encyclopedia of business* (2nd ed.). Retrieved November 23, 2011, from <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/management/Em-Exp/Ethics.html>
- Cone, C. (2010). *The new era of global corporate citizenship & compliance*. Presentation at Net Impact Conference, October 27, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

- Connelly, T. (2006). Effective knowledge transfer: From research universities to industry. In L. E. Weber & J. J. Duderstadt (Eds.), *Universities and business: Partnering for the knowledge society* (pp. 223-230). London: Economica Ltd.
- Connolly, P. (2008). Buckle up: Sharp turn ahead for capitalism. *The Corporate Citizen*, 2, 22-26.
- Corporate citizenship: New balancing act for business. (2008). *The Corporate Citizen*, 2, 18-19.
- Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). (2011). Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.case.org>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Cropper, S., Ebers, M., Huxham, C., & Ring, P. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The Oxford handbook of inter-organizational relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crutchfield, L. R., & Grant, H. M. (2008). *Forces for good: The six practices of high-impact nonprofits*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cummings, D. L. (1991). Building relationships with grantseekers. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.). *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 299-309). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). *Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education*. Rahway, NJ: Quinn & Boden Company.
- DaSilva, A., & Kerkian, S. (2008). *Past. Present. Future. The 25th anniversary of cause marketing*. Boston: Cone.
- Daw, J. S., & Cone, C. (2011). *Breakthrough nonprofit branding: Seven principles to power extraordinary results*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- De George, R. T. (2009). *Business ethics* (7th ed.). Upper River Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- DeAngelo, L., & Cohen, A. (2000). *Privatization: The challenge ahead for public higher education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

- DeMasi, E. (2010). *The 2010 corporate social responsibility index: Who made the top 10?* Retrieved February 23, 2012 from <http://inspiredeconomist.com/2010/10/12/the-2010-corporate-social-responsibility-index-who-made-the-top-10/>
- DeMillo, R. A. (2011). *Abelard to Apple: The fate of American colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Dedoose. (2013). Version 4.5, web application for managing, analyzing, and presenting qualitative and mixed method research data. Los Angeles: SocioCultural Research Cosultants, LLC.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dickinson, W. B. (2010). Visual displays for mixed methods findings. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie's (Eds.), *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavior research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 469-504). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dicks, B., & Mason, B. (2008). Hypermedia methods for qualitative research. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 571-600). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1946). *Concept of the corporation*. New York: The John Day Co.
- Drucker, P. F. (1984). Doing good to do well: The new opportunities for business enterprise. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 285-293). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Drezner, N. D. (2011). Philanthropy and fundraising in American higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 37(2). San Francisco: Wiley.

- Dunn, R. H., & Babbitts, J. (1991). Being ethical and accountable in the grantmaking process. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 332-342). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ebers, M. (1999). The dynamics of inter-organizational relationships. *Sociology of Organizations*, 16, 31-56.
- Eddy, P. L. (2010). Partnerships and collaborations in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(2). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Eddie, J. A. (1991). Legal standards for corporate foundations and contributions programs. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 201-212). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Edwards, M. (2008). *Just another emperor? The myths and realities of philanthrocapitalism*. New York: Demos.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1981). Interactions between organizations and societal stratification. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design: Adapting organizations to their environments* (Vol. 1). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elliott, D. (2006). *The kindness of strangers: Philanthropy and higher education*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, F. (2011). A history of qualitative inquiry in social and educational research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 43-59). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Etzkowitz, H., & Dzisah, J. (2008). Rethinking development: Circulation in the triple helix. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 20(6), 653-666.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., & Healey, P. (1998). *Capitalizing knowledge: New intersections of industry and academia*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Evan, W. M. (1965). Toward a theory of inter-organizational relations. *Management Science*, 11(10), B217-B230.
- Evans, G. A. (2000). Ethical issues in fund raising. In P. Buchanan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (3rd ed., pp. 363-366). Washington, DC: CASE.

- Fairweather, J. S. (1988). Entrepreneurship and higher education: Lessons for colleges, universities, and industry. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 14(6). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Ferrell, O.C., Gresham, L. G., & Fraedrich, J. (1989). A synthesis of ethical decision models for marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 9(2), 55-64.
- Finn, W. T. (1990). Training business ethics: How employees behave on company time has become the business of business. *Successful Meetings*, 39(10), 167-168.
- Fischer, M. (2000). *Ethical decision making in fund raising*. New York: Wiley.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 301-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fox, M. A. (2006). Universities, businesses and public authorities—and the inclusive development of society. In L. E. Weber & J. J. Duderstadt (Eds.), *Universities and business: Partnering for the knowledge society* (pp. 187-199). London: Economica Ltd.
- Freeman, H. L. (1991). Corporate strategic philanthropy: A million here, a million there, it can add up to real corporate choices. *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 246-250. Speech given to the Business Leaders of Europe on September 16, Barcelona, Spain.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.
- Friedman, V. (2008). Data visualization and infographics. *Smashing Magazine*, January 14th. Retrieved December 13, 2013 from <http://www.smashing.magazine.com/2008/01/14/monday-inspiration-data-visualization-and-infographics/>
- Frishkoff, P., & Kostecka, A. (1991). *Business contributions to community service*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.
- Fry, L. W., Keim, G. D., & Meiners, R. E. (1982). Corporate contributions: Altruistic or for-profit? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 25(1), 94-106.
- Fulton, K., & Blau, A. (2005). *Looking out for the future: An orientation for twenty-first century philanthropists*. Cambridge, MA: The Monitor Group.
- Gardberg, N. A., & Fombrun, C. J. (2006). Corporate citizenship: Creating intangible assets across institutional environments. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 329-346.
- Gardyn, R. (2003). Generosity and income. *American Demographics*, 24(11), 46.

- Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1), 51-71.
- Garvin, Jr., C. C. (1975). *Corporate philanthropy: The third aspect of social responsibility*. New York: Council for Financial Aid to Education.
- Geisel, T. S. (1971). *The lorax*. New York: Random House.
- Giroud, C. D. (1991). Cause-related marketing: Potential dangers and benefits. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 139-152). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giving USA Foundation. (2011). *Giving USA 2011: The annual report on philanthropy for the year 2010*. Chicago: Giving USA Foundation.
- Goldberg, S. (2010). *Beyond corporate donations*. Presentation at the Association of Fundraising Professionals' 47th AFP International Conference on Fundraising, Baltimore, MD. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://conference.afpnet.org/>
- Googins, B. K., Mirvis, P. H., & Rochlin, S. A. (2007). *Beyond good company*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gould, E. (2003). *The university in a corporate culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grabois, A. N. (Ed.). (2010). *National directory of corporate giving* (16th ed.). New York: Foundation Center.
- Greenberg, D., McKone-Sweet, K., & Wilson, H. J. (2011). *The new entrepreneurial leader: Developing leaders who shape social and economic opportunity*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Greenfield, J. M. (2008). Rights of donors. In J. G. Pettey (Ed.). *Ethical fundraising: A guide for nonprofit boards and fundraisers*. (pp. 19-36). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Gregory, P., Brenton, S., Alexander, D., & Deuser, T. (2012). *Gift or grant? A taxing issue resolved*. Paper presented at the CASE Conference, New York.
- Grimm, R. (2011, August 1-3). *Agilent technologies*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>

- Guba, E. G. (1978). *Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of interview research: Context and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guetzkow, H. (1966). Relations among organizations. In R. V. Bowers (Ed.), *Studies on behavior in organizations: A research symposium* (pp. 13-44). Athens, GA: University of Georgia.
- GuideStar. (2011). Retrieved November 5, 2011, from <http://www2.guidestar.org/rxg/about-us/history.aspx>
- Gurin, M. G. (1991). *Advancing beyond the techniques in fund raising*. Rockville, MD: Fund Raising Institute.
- Guthrie, D. (2012). For the 21st century, a network of beneficial philanthropy and corporate citizenship. *Forbes*, February 26, 2012. Retrieved March 10, 2012, from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/douguguthrie/2012/02/26/for-the-21st-century-a-network-of-beneficial-philanthropy-and-corporate-citizenship/>
- Hale, S. S. (2011, July/August). Our profession, our CFRE. *Advancing Philanthropy*, 32-38.
- Haley, U. C. V. (1991). Corporate contributions as managerial masques: reframing corporate contributions as strategies to influence society. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28(5), 485-509.
- Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176-190.
- Hall, M. S. (1991). Linking corporate culture and corporate philanthropy. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 105-118). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Hartford, G. A. (2000). Corporate fund raising at large research universities. In M. K. Murphy's (Ed.), *Corporate and foundation support: Strategies for funding education in the 21st century* (pp. 71-77). New York: Case.
- Hatakeyama, K., & Ruppel, D. (2004, June 27-30). *Sábato's triangle and international academic cooperation: The importance of extra-relations for the Latin American enhancement*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Engineering Education and Research "Progress through Partnership," Olomouc and Bouzov Castle, Czech Republic. Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.ineer.org/Events/ICEER2004/Proceedings/papers/0535.pdf>

- Hearn, J. C. (2003). *Diversifying campus revenue streams: Opportunities and risks*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Herman, R. D. (2008). Regulation in the nonprofit sector: Symbolic politics and the social construction of accountability. In J. G. Pettey (Ed.), *Ethical fundraising: A guide for nonprofit boards and fundraisers* (pp. 235-245). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2008). *Handbook of emergent methods*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hickman, J. (2011, August 1-3). *Strategic industry university partnerships – John Deere*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Himmelstein, J. L. (1997). *Looking good and doing good: Corporate philanthropy and corporate power*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 703-715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoerr, T., Kucic, B., Wagener, A., & Nolan, M. (2010, August 11). *Small and medium-sized businesses: Finding mutual value*. Presentation at the 2010 NACRO Annual Conference, Urbana-Champaign, IL. Retrieved December 28, 2012, from <http://www.nacroonline.org/conference-presentations>
- Hoffman, W. M., Frederick, R. E., & Schwartz, M. S. (2001). *Business ethics: Readings and cases in corporate morality* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2011). The constructionist analytics of interpretive practice. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 341-357). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hosmer, L. T. (2008). *The ethics of management: A multidisciplinary approach* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holy Bible, New International Version (2013). Biblica, Inc. Retrieved October 27, 2013, from <http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=colossians%203:23>
- Hume, J. (2011, August 1-3). *Demystifying marketing*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Independent Sector. (2011). *Vision*. Retrieved October 9, 2011, from http://www.independentsector.org/mission_and_values

- Jacobs, J. A. (2004). Corporate governance reform: What it means to associations. *Association Management*, 56(1), 17.
- Jacobson, H. K. (Ed.). (1978). *Evaluating advancement programs: New directions for institutional advancement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jacoby, N. H. (1973). *Corporate power and social responsibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, J. (2007a, August 16). *Making the connection: Metrics of success*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Johnson, J. (2007b, August 16). *Making the connection: University-Industry relations and corporate relations models*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Johnson, J. (2008, April 14-15). *Survey tools and implications: Measuring impact*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Johnson, O. (1966). Corporate philanthropy: An analysis of corporate contributions. *The Journal of Business*, 39(4), 489-504.
- Johnson, R. A., Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1964). Systems theory and management. *Management Science*, 10(2), 367-384.
- Johnson, W. C. (2006a). Challenges in university-industry collaborations. In L. E. Weber & J. J. Duderstadt (Eds.), *Universities and business: Partnering for the knowledge society* (pp. 211-222). London: Economica Ltd.
- Johnson, W. C. (2006b). The collaboration imperative. In L. E. Weber & J. J. Duderstadt (Eds.), *Universities and business: Partnering for the knowledge society* (pp. 99-110). London: Economica Ltd.
- Johnson, W. C. (2011). University-industry partnership continuum. Presentation at the APLU CICEP Summer Meeting. Retrieved March 9, 2012, from <http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=3375>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Joseph, J. A. (1991). The corporate stake in community involvement: Has business lost its social conscience? In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 3-19). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Just, R. E., & Huffman, W. E. (2009). The economics of universities in a new age of funding options. *Research Policy*, 38(7), 1102-1116.
- Joyce, C., Neill, A., Watson, V., & Fisher, J. (2008). *Tables and graphs*. Retrieved December 13, 2013 from <http://arb.nzcer.org.nz/supportmaterials/tables.php#1>
- Kaplan, A. E. (2007). *2006 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (2008). *2007 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (2009). *2008 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (2010). *2009 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (2011). *2010 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *Translating strategy into action: The balanced scorecard*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaptein, M. (Autumn 2007). Ethical guidelines for compiling corporate social reports. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 27, 71-91.
- Karoff, H. P. (2004). *Just money: A critique of contemporary American philanthropy*. Boston: TPI Editions.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (2005). Organizations and the system concept. In J. Shafritz, J. Ott, & Y. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 480-490). Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Keller, P. R., & Keller, M. M. (1993). *Visual cues: Practical data visualization*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE Press.
- Kelly, K. S. (1998). *Effective fund raising management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Kelly, K. S. (2002). The state of fund-raising theory and research. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New Strategies for educational fund-raising* (pp. 39-55). Portland, OR: Book News.
- Kidder, R. M. (2001). Ethics is not optional. *Association Management*, 53(13), 30-31.
- Kidder, R. M. (2006). *Moral courage*. New York: Harper.
- Kinnicutt, S., & Pinney, C. (2010). Getting to the roots of success: The leadership competencies that grow corporate citizenship pros. *The Corporate Citizen*, 4, 26-30.
- Kolderie, T. (1984). Business opportunities in the changing conceptions of the public sector role. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 89-110). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Kostelnick, C., & Hassett, M. (2003). *Shaping information: The rhetoric of visual conventions*. Carbondale, IL: University Press.
- Krieg, I. M. (1991). Contributions programs for smaller companies: Why and how. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 249-264). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lacy, P., & Pickard, S. (Summer 2008). Managing risk and opportunity: The people imperative. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 30, 139-147.
- Lauer, L. D. (2000). Branding opportunities for education support. In M. K. Murphy's (Ed.), *Corporate and foundation support: Strategies for funding education in the 21st century* (pp. 55-59). New York: Case.
- Lawrence, S. (2009). *A first look at the foundation and corporate response to the economic crisis*. Retrieved November 15, 2011, from http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/researchadvisory_economy_200901.pdf
- LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing & interpreting ethnographic data*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Letts, C. W., Ryan, W., & Grossman, A. (1997). Virtuous capital: What foundations can learn from venture capitalists. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(2), 36.

- Levy, B. R. (2012). *Defining your leadership role in promoting ethical practice*. Presentation at the Association of Fundraising Professionals' 49th AFP International Conference on Fundraising, Vancouver, BC. Retrieved February 1, 2012, from <http://conference.afpnet.org/>
- Levy, B. R., & Cherry, R. L. (Eds.) (1996). *The NSFRE fund-raising dictionary*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Levy, R. (2001). Corporate philanthropy comes of age: Its size, its import its future. In C. T. Clotfelter & T. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector* (pp. 99-121). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Liebman, L. (1984). Political and economic markets: The public, private, and not-for-profit sectors. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 341-358). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Liggett, G. (2000). Ethics in corporate and foundation fundraising. In M. K. Murphy's (Ed.), *Corporate and foundation support: Strategies for funding education in the 21st century* (pp. 3-13). New York: Case.
- Lim, T. L. (2010). *Measuring the value of corporate philanthropy: Social impact, business benefits, and investor returns*. New York: Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy.
- Lister, D. (2008). The appearance of impropriety. In J. G. Pettey (Ed.), *Ethical fundraising: A guide for nonprofit boards and fundraisers* (pp. 3-18). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Litan, R. E., & Mitchell, L. (2011). Should universities be agents of economic development? In C. J. Schramm (Ed.), *The future of the research university: Meeting the global challenges of the 21st century* (pp. 123-146). Kansas City, MO: The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.
- Locke, E. H. (1996). The foundations of a relationship. *Advancing Philanthropy*, Fall 1996, 20-23.
- Lozovsky, V. (2008). *Table vs. graph*. Information Builders. Retrieved December 13, 2013 from http://www.informationbuilders.com/new/newsletter/9-2/05_lozovsky
- Lydenberg, S., & Wood, D. (2010). *How to read a corporate social responsibility report: A user's guide*. Boston: Center for Corporate Citizenship at Boston College.
- Lyrics Depot. (2012). Friends with you lyrics. Retrieved December 13, 2012, from www.lyricsdepot.com/john-denver/friends-with-you.html

- Ma, D., & Parish, W. L. (2006). Tocquevillian moments: Charitable contributions by Chinese private entrepreneurs. *Social Forces*, 85(2), 943-964.
- MacAllister, J. A. (1991). Why give? Notes to a new CEO. In J. P. Shannon (Ed.), *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs* (pp. 121-125). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Madden, C. (1977). Forces which influence ethical behavior. In C. C. Walton (Ed.), *The ethics of corporate conduct* (pp. 31-78). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Malloy, D. C., & Agarwal, J. (2003). Factors influencing ethical climate in nonprofit organization: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 8(3), 224.
- Marion, B. H., Donahue, J., & Josephson, M. (2012). *Steps in ethical decision making*. Presentation at the Association of Fundraising Professionals' 49th AFP International Conference on Fundraising, Vancouver, BC. Retrieved April 2, 2012, from <http://www.afpsoaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Ethics-Part-2.pdf>
- Martin, J., Samels, E., & Associates. (2012). *The sustainable university: Green goals and new challenges for higher education leaders*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Matthews, J. B., & Norgaard, R. (1984). *Managing the partnership between higher education and industry*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A., & Miller, B. A. (2008). Precision and patience: Categorizing and connecting strategies in qualitative data analysis. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 461-477). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mayer, C. E. (2010). Corporate and foundation relations professionals grapple with the new normal. *CASE Currents*, November/December, 2010. Retrieved February 7, 2011, from http://www.case.org/Publications_and_Products/2010/NovemberDecember_2010/Precision_and_Patience.html
- McCraw, T. K. (1984). The public and private spheres in historical perspectives. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs*, (pp. 31-60). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- McCray, J. (2012). *Is grantmaking getting smarter? A national study of philanthropic practice*. Washington, DC: Grantmakers for Effective Organizations.

- McGoldrick (1989). Details you should know. In J. L. Fisher and G. H. Quehl (Eds.), *The president and fund raising* (pp. 160-169). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- McGowan, D. (2012, August 1). *Academic corporate relations: Contact sport, slow waltz, or both?* Presentation at the NACRO Conference, Evanston, IL. Retrieved December 28, 2012, from <http://www.nacroonline.org/conference-presentations>
- McInay, D. P. (1998). How foundations work: What grantseekers need to know about the many faces of foundations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McIntire, L. (2012). *The reputational threat that just might be under your nose*. Retrieved February 23, 2012, from <http://blogs.bccccc.net/2011/08/the-reputational-threat-that-just-might-be-under-your-nose/>
- McNaught, C., & Lam, P. (2010). Using wordle as a supplementary research tool. *The Qualitative Review*, 15(3), 630-643.
- Merriam-Webster. (2011). Retrieved October 29, 2011, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/engaged>
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meuth, E. F. (1991). Corporate philanthropy in American higher education: An investigation of attitudes towards giving. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Middleton, C. H. (2008). *Great quotations that shaped the Western world*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, G. (1997). Contextualizing texts: Studying organizational texts. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Context & method in qualitative research* (pp. 78-91). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, R. C., & Le Boeuf, B. J. (2009). *Developing university-industry relations: Pathways to innovation from the West Coast*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Mirvis, P. H. (2010). Stakeholder engagement: Local faces and global reputation. *The Corporate Citizen*, 4, 19-22.
- Mirvis, P., & Googins, B. K. (2006). *States of corporate citizenship: A developmental framework*. A Center for Corporate Citizenship at Boston College Monograph. Boston: Boston College.
- Mixer, J. R. (1993). *Principles of professional fundraising: Useful foundations for successful practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moeran, B. (2009). From participant observation to observant participation. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels, & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 139-155). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Molnar, A. (2002). The corporate branding of our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 60(2), 74-78.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morris, L. L., Friz-Gibbon, C. T., & Freeman, M. E. (1987). *How to communicate evaluation findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Munilla, L. S., & Miles, M. P. (2005). The corporate social responsibility continuum as a component of stakeholder theory. *Business and Society Review*, 110(4), 371-387.
- Murphy, M. K. (1989). Corporations and foundations. In J. L. Fisher and G. H. Quehl (Eds.), *The president and fund raising* (pp. 126-139). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- National Philanthropic Trust. (2012). Philanthropy quotes. Retrieved December 9, 2012, from <http://www.nptrust.org/history-of-giving/philanthropic-quotes/>
- Network of Academic Corporate Relations Officers (NACRO), (2011). Retrieved October 4, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO>
- Neyland, D. (2008). *Organizational ethnography*. Los Angeles: Sage.

- Nicol, A. A. M., & Pexman, P. M. (2010). *Presenting your findings: A practical guide for creating tables*. (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Nonprofit Research Collaborative. (2010). The nonprofit research collaborative November 2010 fundraising survey. Retrieved March 26, 2012, from <http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1001467-Nonprofit-Research-Collaborative.pdf>
- Norris, W. C. (1984). A new role for corporations. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 243-262). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Nucifora, A. (1998). Nonprofits must have smart marketing plans. *The Puget Sound Business Journal*, 4, 20.
- Odendahl, T., & Shaw, A. M. (2001). Interviewing elites. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 299-316). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ostrander, S. A., & Schervish, P. G. (2002). Giving and getting: Philanthropy as a social relation. In J. Van Til and Associates, *Critical issues in American philanthropy: Strengthening theory and practice* (pp. 67-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paul, K. (Winter 2008). Corporate sustainability, citizenship, and social responsibility reporting: A website study of 100 model corporations. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 32, 63-79.
- Philip, C. S. (2012, August 1-3). *Corning and university technology collaborations*. Presentation at the NACRO Conference, Evanston, IL. Retrieved December 28, 2012, from <http://www.nacroonline.org/conference-presentations>
- Pinney, C. (2009). *Weathering the storm: The state of corporate citizenship in the United States 2009*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship.
- Pinney, C. (2012). Increasing impact, enhancing value: A practitioner's guide to leading corporate philanthropy. Council on Foundations. Retrieved June 3, 2012, from <http://www.cof.org/files/Bamboo/whoweserve/corporate/documents/CorporateGuide.pdf>

- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pollack, R. H. (1998). Give and take: Create a mutually beneficial relationship to bring corporate support to your campus. *Currents*, 24/2, 16-22.
- Pollard, J. A. (1958). *Fund-raising for higher education*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.
- PollingReport.com. (2011). "As far as people in charge of running are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them?" The Harris Poll, February 16-21. Retrieved October 26, 2011, from <http://www.pollingreport.com/institut.htm>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002). The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(12), 56-69.
- Prior, L. (2008). Researching documents: Emergent methods. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 111-126). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Putnam, L. L., Grant, D., Michelson, G., & Cutcher, L. (2005). Discourse and resistance: Targets, practices and consequences. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1), 5-19.
- Ramlo, S. (2011). Using word clouds to present Q methodology data and findings. *Human Subjectivity*, 9(2), 99-111.
- Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse, and document analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Reed, R. (2007, August 16). *Some thoughts on academic/industry collaboration [or] Attempting survival in the global marketplace of ideas, people, and products*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Reichart, J. (1999). Corporate ethics and environmental values: Issues, perceptions, and the logic of stakeholder action. (Unpublished dissertation, University of Virginia, 1999).
- Rhodes, F. H. T. (2001). *The creation of the future: The role of the American university*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 90-118.

- Ringleb, A. H., Meiners, R. E., & Edwards, F. L. (1997). *Managing in the legal environment* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Robbins, S., & Stylianou, A. C. (2003). Global corporate web sites: An empirical investigation of content and design. *Information & Management*, 40, 205-212.
- Robbins, Z., Cirillo, A., Kaylor, R., Larson, D., & Reed, R. (2007, August 15). *Industry-university relationships*. Panel at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Rose, A. P. (2011). *Giving by the numbers 2011*. New York: Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy.
- Rosen, M. (1991). Coming to terms with the field: Understanding and doing organizational ethnography. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28(1), 1-24.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rubenstein, D. (2004). *The good corporate citizen: A practical guide*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saia, D. H. (1999). Strategic philanthropy: Corporate resources for the public good? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Saia, D. H. (2001). Philanthropy and corporate citizenship: Strategic philanthropy is good corporate citizenship. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 2(2), 57-74.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Samans, R. (2005). *Partnering for success: Business perspectives on multistakeholder partnerships*. Boston: Harvard University.
- Sanchez, C. M. (2000). Motives for corporate philanthropy in El Salvador: Altruism and political legitimacy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(4/2), 363-376.
- Sanzone, C. S. (2000). Securing corporate support: The business of corporate relations. In P. Buchanan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (3rd ed., pp. 321-324). Washington, DC: CASE.

- Sargeant, A., Lee, S., & Jay, E. (2002). *Major gift philanthropy: Individual giving to the arts* (report). Oxfordshire England: Centre for Voluntary Sector Management, Henley Management College.
- Saul, J. (2012, August 2). *The business case for corporate involvement: How to sell your impact*. Presentation at the NACRO Conference, Evanston, IL. Retrieved December 28, 2012, from <http://www.nacroonline.org/conference-presentations>
- Saul, J. (2011). *The end of fundraising: Raise more money selling your impact*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sawyer, T. H., Hypes, M. G., & Hypes, J. A. (2004). *Financing the sport enterprise*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schmidt, K. (2008, April 14-15). *Yahoo! Academic relations*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Schwartz-Shea, P., & Yanow, D. (2009). Reading and writing as method: In search of trustworthy texts. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels, & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 56-82). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Sears, J. B. (1922). *Philanthropy in the history of American higher education*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sethi, S. P. (1973). Genius becomes rare. In D. Votaw and S. P. Sethi (Eds.), *The corporate dilemma: Traditional values versus contemporary problems* (pp. 214-231). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sethi, S. P. (1975). Dimensions of corporate social performance: An analytical framework. *California Management Review*, 17(3), 58-64.
- Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (2005). *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed.). Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Shannon, J. P. (Ed). (1991). *The corporate contributions handbook: Devoting private means to public needs*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Shaw, B., & Post, F. R. (1993). A moral basis for corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12, 745-751.
- Shoemaker, B. (2011, September/October). Assessing your ethical performance. *Advancing Philanthropy*, 14-18.
- Sheldon, K. S. (2000). *Successful corporate fundraising: Effective strategies for today's nonprofits*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Shuy, R. W. (2001). In-person versus telephone interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 537-555). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Siegel, D. (2007). Constructive engagement with the corporation. *Academe*, 93(6), 52-55.
- Siegel, D. (2008). Framing involvement: Rationale construction in an inter-organizational collaboration. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(3), 221-240.
- Siegel, D. (2012). Beyond the academic-corporate divide. *Academe*, 98(1), 29-31.
- Sievers, B. (2004). Philanthropy's blindspots. In H. P. Karoff (Ed.), *Just Money: A Critique of Contemporary American Philanthropy* (pp. 129-149). Boston: TPI Editions.
- Sirsly, C-A. T. (2009). 75 years of lessons learned: Chief executive officer values and corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management*, 15(1), 78-94.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sloan, P. (Winter 2009). Redefining stakeholder engagement: From control to collaboration. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 36, 25-41.
- Solomon, R. C. (1993). *Ethics and excellence: Cooperation and integrity in business*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Sommerville, C. J. (2009). Universities are corporatized because they are secularized. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(39), omm.
- Smith, Jr., L. (1968). Guidelines for efforts of public universities to attract corporate support. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

- Smith, P. R. G. (1968). *The history of corporate financial assistance to member institutions of the associated colleges of Indiana 1948-1967*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Srivastava, P., & Hopwood, N. (2009). A practical iterative framework for qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1), 76-84.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stangis, D. (2007). *Where does philanthropy fit in the CSR spectrum?* Retrieved November 5, 2011, from CSR@Intel Blog at <http://blogs.intel.com/csr/2007/07/>
- Steele, S. (2009, August 12-14). *Research partnerships: Review of the PCAST report: University-private sector research partnerships in the innovation ecosystem*. Presentation at the NACRO 3rd Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Stein, D. G. (2004). *Buying in or selling out? The commercialization of the American research university*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Steinbock, D. (2013). Retrieved December 3, 2013 from www.tagcrowd.com
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sundquist, J. L. (1984). Privatization: No panacea for what ails government. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 303-318). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Swords, P. (2011). How to read the new IRS Form 990. Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.npcny.org/new990/new990-1.htm>
- Symonds, W. C. (2009a). Getting down to business in America's classrooms: Companies seek new collaboration for improving American education. *The Corporate Citizen*, 3, 23-26.

- Symonds, W. C. (2009b). School's out on achievement gap: Educator urges rethinking of student preparation to meet demands of the 21st century global economy. *The Corporate Citizen*, 3, 27-29.
- Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 455-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The 2010 Corporate Social Responsibility Index. (2010). Retrieved February 23, 2012, from <http://www.bcccc.net/pdf/CSRIRReport2010.pdf>
- The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (COP). (2007). *Corporate philanthropy: The age of integration*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University. Retrieved November 11, 2011 from http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/files/research/corporate_giving_-_july_2007.pdf
- The Clarkson Centre for Business Ethics. (1999). *Principles for stakeholder management*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto.
- The State of Corporate Citizenship 2012 – Highlights. (2012). Retrieved December 8, 2012, from <http://www.bcccc.net/pdf/SOCC2012HighlightPresentation.pdf>
- The Williams Institute for ethics and management. (TWI) (2011). *Ethics awareness inventory guidance*. Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www.ethics-twi.org/EducationalResources/TeachersResources/College/TeachingwiththeEthicsAwarenessInventory/GuideforAdministeringtheEAI/tabid/167/Default.aspx>
- Thompson, J. D. (2005). Organizations in action. In J. Shafritz, J. Ott, & Y. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 491-504), Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Torgersen-Paul, D. (2008, April 14-15). *Developing alliances between industry & major academic centers*. Presentation at the NACRO Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved November 1, 2011, from <http://web.mac.com/nacro/NACRO/Toolbox.html>
- Touraine, A. (1977). *The self-production of society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tromble, W. W. (1998). Corporate and foundation relations. In W. W. Tromble (Ed.), *Excellence in advancement: Applications for higher education and nonprofit organizations* (pp. 93-118), Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.
- Tufte, E. R. (1990). *Envisioning information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

- U.S. Census. (2008). Statistics of U.S. businesses: Latest SUSB data. Retrieved November 12, 2011, from <http://www.census.gov/econ/susb/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *The federal role in education: History*. Retrieved November 11, 2011, from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2012). North American industry classification system (NAICS). Retrieved November 27, 2012 from <http://www.osha.gov/oshasstats/naics-manual.html>
- U.S. Senate Finance Committee. (2011). *Charity oversight and reform: Keeping bad things from happening to good charities*. Retrieved October 9, 2011, from <http://finance.senate.gov/hearings/hearing/?id=48ca4cce-afe1-db95-0fcb-8ff9255e780a>
- U.S. Small Business Administration. (2011). *Table of small business size standards matched to North American industry classification system codes*. Retrieved November 11, 2011, from http://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/Size_Standards_Table.pdf
- United Nations. (1987). *Our common future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- University-Industry Demonstration Project (UIDP). (2012). Retrieved March 9, 2012, from <http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/uidp/index.htm>
- Viégas, F. B., & Wattenberg, M. (2008). Tag clouds and the case for vernacular visualiation. *interactions*, July-August, 49-52.
- Vitaliano, D. F. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and labor turnover. *Corporate Governance*, 10(5), 563-573.
- von Stein, W. B. (1975). *A study of corporate attitudes and philosophies in Northeastern Ohio regarding financial support for higher education*. Unpublished thesis, Kent State University, Kent, OH.
- Votaw, D. (1973). Genius becomes rare. In D. Votaw and S. P. Sethi (Eds.), *The corporate dilemma: Traditional values versus contemporary problems* (pp. 11-45). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Waddock, S. (2004). Parallel universes: Companies, academics, and the progress of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review*, 109(1), 5-42.
- Wagner, L. (2002). The 'new' donor: Creation or evolution? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(4), 343-352.

- Walton, A., & Gasman, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Philanthropy, volunteerism, and fundraising*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Washburn, J. (2005). *University, Inc.* New York: Basic Books.
- Weitzman, E. A., & Miles, M. B. (1995). Computer programs for qualitative data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Welytok, J. G. (2006). *Sarbanes-Oxley for dummies®*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.
- White, A. H., & Bartolomeo, J. (1982). Corporate giving: The views of chief executive officers of major American corporations. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.
- White, G. D. (Ed.). (2000). *Campus, Inc. Corporate power in the ivory tower*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Whitehead, P. J. (1976). Some economic aspects of corporate giving. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Wilson, T. (2011a). Cleared for takeoff: Corporate citizenship more than just a blip for UPS CFO Kuehn. *The Corporate Citizen*, 5, 14-16.
- Wilson, T. (2011b). Crisis in U.S. classrooms spells trouble for business. *The Corporate Citizen*, 5, 26-29.
- Wisely, D. S. (2008). A foundation's relationship to its public: Legacies and lessons for the Lilly Endowment. In A. Walton & M. Gasman (Eds.), *Philanthropy, volunteerism, and fundraising* (pp. 26-35). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Withers, D. C. (2002). New patterns of corporate support. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New Strategies for educational fund-raising* (pp. 155-163). Portland, OR: Book News.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wood, D. J., & Jones, R. E. (1995). Stakeholder mismatching: A theoretical problem in empirical research on corporate social performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 3(3), 229-267.
- World Economic Forum. (2002). *Global corporate citizenship initiative*. Retrieved December 11, 2012 from https://members.weforum.org/pdf/GCCI/GCCI_CEO_Questionnaire.pdf

- Worth, M. J. (2000). Educational fund raising: Introduction. In P. Buchanan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (3rd ed., pp. 294-298). Washington, DC: CASE.
- Worth, M. J. (2002). *New strategies for educational fund-raising*. Portland, OR: Book News.
- Worthy, J. C. (1984). Managing the “social markets” business. In B. Harvey, L. Liebman, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Public-private partnership: New opportunities for meeting social needs* (pp. 221-241). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H., & Kamsteeg, F. (2009). *Organizational ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Young, D. R., & Burlingame, D. F. (1996). Paradigm lost: Research toward a new understanding of corporate philanthropy. In D. F. Burlingame and D. R. Young (Eds.), *Corporate philanthropy at the crossroads*. (pp. 158-176). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Appendix A: Field of Organizational Theory Concept Map

Organizational Analysis	
Closed Systems: Internalities	Open Systems: Externalities
System/Structural	Strategic Choice
Rational	Natural Selection
Collective Action	
Natural Systems	
Structural, Human Resources, Political, Cultural	Law, Economics, Politics, Psychology, Sociology, History
Inputs/Outputs Resource Dependence Inter-organizational Relationships	
Efficiency	Effectiveness
Social Identity Theory	Organizational Identity Theory/ Institutional Theory
Pro-Social Behavior: Individuals	Pro-Social Behavior: Organizational
Classical Market Model, Managerial Model, Social Environment Model	
Inter-Organizational Relations	
Cone's Corporate Citizenship Spectrum	

Note. This concept map of the field of organizational theory situates Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum in relation to other major models and theories dealing with organizational and inter-organizational behavior related to this study. These models and theories are expounded in Chapter One.

Appendix B: AFP Code of Ethical Principles and Standards

AFP Code of Ethical Principles and Standards

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES • Adopted 1964; amended Sept. 2007

The Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) exists to foster the development and growth of fundraising professionals and the profession, to promote high ethical behavior in the fundraising profession and to preserve and enhance philanthropy and volunteerism. Members of AFP are motivated by an inner drive to improve the quality of life through the causes they serve. They serve the ideal of philanthropy, are committed to the preservation and enhancement of volunteerism; and hold stewardship of these concepts as the overriding direction of their professional life. They recognize their responsibility to ensure that needed resources are vigorously and ethically sought and that the intent of the donor is honestly fulfilled. To these ends, AFP members, both individual and business, embrace certain values that they strive to uphold in performing their responsibilities for generating philanthropic support. AFP business members strive to promote and protect the work and mission of their client organizations.

AFP members both individual and business aspire to:

- practice their profession with integrity, honesty, truthfulness and adherence to the absolute obligation to safeguard the public trust
- act according to the highest goals and visions of their organizations, professions, clients and consciences
- put philanthropic mission above personal gain;
- inspire others through their own sense of dedication and high purpose
- improve their professional knowledge and skills, so that their performance will better serve others
- demonstrate concern for the interests and well-being of individuals affected by their actions
- value the privacy, freedom of choice and interests of all those affected by their actions
- foster cultural diversity and pluralistic values and treat all people with dignity and respect
- affirm, through personal giving, a commitment to philanthropy and its role in society
- adhere to the spirit as well as the letter of all applicable laws and regulations
- advocate within their organizations adherence to all applicable laws and regulations
- avoid even the appearance of any criminal offense or professional misconduct
- bring credit to the fundraising profession by their public demeanor
- encourage colleagues to embrace and practice these ethical principles and standards
- be aware of the codes of ethics promulgated by other professional organizations that serve philanthropy

ETHICAL STANDARDS

Furthermore, while striving to act according to the above values, AFP members, both individual and business, agree to abide (and to ensure, to the best of their ability, that all members of their staff abide) by the AFP standards. Violation of the standards may subject the member to disciplinary sanctions, including expulsion, as provided in the AFP Ethics Enforcement Procedures.

MEMBER OBLIGATIONS

1. Members shall not engage in activities that harm the members' organizations, clients or profession.
2. Members shall not engage in activities that conflict with their fiduciary, ethical and legal obligations to their organizations, clients or profession.
3. Members shall effectively disclose all potential and actual conflicts of interest; such disclosure does not preclude or imply ethical impropriety.
4. Members shall not exploit any relationship with a donor, prospect, volunteer, client or employee for the benefit of the members or the members' organizations.
5. Members shall comply with all applicable local, state, provincial and federal civil and criminal laws.
6. Members recognize their individual boundaries of competence and are forthcoming and truthful about their professional experience and qualifications and will represent their achievements accurately and without exaggeration.
7. Members shall present and supply products and/or services honestly and without misrepresentation and will clearly identify the details of those products, such as availability of the products and/or services and other factors that may affect the suitability of the products and/or services for donors, clients or nonprofit organizations.
8. Members shall establish the nature and purpose of any contractual relationship at the outset and will be responsive and available to organizations and their employing organizations before, during and after any sale of materials and/or services. Members will comply with all fair and reasonable obligations created by the contract.

9. Members shall refrain from knowingly infringing the intellectual property rights of other parties at all times. Members shall address and rectify any inadvertent infringement that may occur.
10. Members shall protect the confidentiality of all privileged information relating to the provider/client relationships.
11. Members shall refrain from any activity designed to disparage competitors untruthfully.

SOLICITATION AND USE OF PHILANTHROPIC FUNDS

12. Members shall take care to ensure that all solicitation and communication materials are accurate and correctly reflect their organizations' mission and use of solicited funds.
13. Members shall take care to ensure that donors receive informed, accurate and ethical advice about the value and tax implications of contributions.
14. Members shall take care to ensure that contributions are used in accordance with donors' intentions.
15. Members shall take care to ensure proper stewardship of all revenue sources, including timely reports on the use and management of such funds.
16. Members shall obtain explicit consent by donors before altering the conditions of financial transactions.

PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION

17. Members shall not disclose privileged or confidential information to unauthorized parties.
18. Members shall adhere to the principle that all donor and prospect information created by, or on behalf of, an organization or a client is the property of that organization or client and shall not be transferred or utilized except on behalf of that organization or client.
19. Members shall give donors and clients the opportunity to have their names removed from lists that are sold to, rented to or exchanged with other organizations.
20. Members shall, when stating fundraising results, use accurate and consistent accounting methods that conform to the appropriate guidelines adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)* for the type of organization involved. (* In countries outside of the United States, comparable authority should be utilized.)

COMPENSATION AND CONTRACTS

21. Members shall not accept compensation or enter into a contract that is based on a percentage of contributions; nor shall members accept finder's fees or contingent fees. Business members must refrain from receiving compensation from third parties derived from products or services for a client without disclosing that third-party compensation to the client (for example, volume rebates from vendors to business members).
22. Members may accept performance-based compensation, such as bonuses, provided such bonuses are in accord with prevailing practices within the members' own organizations and are not based on a percentage of contributions.
23. Members shall neither offer nor accept payments or special considerations for the purpose of influencing the selection of products or services.
24. Members shall not pay finder's fees, commissions or percentage compensation based on contributions, and shall take care to discourage their organizations from making such payments.
25. Any member receiving funds on behalf of a donor or client must meet the legal requirements for the disbursement of those funds. Any interest or income earned on the funds should be fully disclosed.

Appendix C: A Donor Bill of Rights

A Donor Bill of Rights

PHILANTHROPY is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To ensure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

I.

To be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes.

II.

To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization's governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgement in its stewardship responsibilities.

III.

To have access to the organization's most recent financial statements.

IV.

To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.

V.

To receive appropriate acknowledgement and recognition.

VI.

To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.

VII.

To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.

VIII.

To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors.

IX.

To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.

X.

To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers.

DEVELOPED BY

Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)
Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP)
Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)
Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Non-Profits

ENDORSED BY

(in formation)
Independent Sector
National Catholic Development Conference (NCDC)
National Committee on Planned Giving (NCPG)
Council for Resource Development (CRD)
United Way of America

Appendix D: Alphabetical U.S. Higher Education List of Schools Receiving the Most Corporate Financial Support (2006-2010)

This composite list of 33 American higher education institutions reflects the schools that ranked in the top 20 at least once by receiving the most corporate resources, according to Kaplan's Voluntary Support of Education annual reports between 2006 and 2010.

Institution (Alphabetical)	State	2006 Rank	2007 Rank	2008 Rank	2009 Rank	2010 Rank
Arizona State University Foundation	AZ	16			6	
Clemson University	SC		10			
Columbia University	NY				18	
Duke University	NC	12	17	14	13	14
Georgia Institute of Technology	GA		14		20	19
Harvard University	MA	17	6	15	11	10
Indiana University	IN	7	3	3	4	2
Johns Hopkins University	MD				16	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	MA	18		18	10	
New Mexico State University	NM	2				
New York University	NY			20		
North Carolina State University at Raleigh	NC	11	15	2		
Northwestern University	IL		13	10		
Ohio State University	OH	6	2	4	3	1
Pennsylvania State University	PA	19	7		14	9
Purdue University	IN	8	4	13	8	5
Stanford University	CA	3	11	6	5	6
SUNY-Albany	NY	4				
Texas A&M University	TX		18	8	17	12
Texas Tech University	TX		19			3
University of Arizona	AZ				19	20
University of Arkansas	AR	15	9	17		16
University of California, Berkeley	CA	20		19	15	13
University of California, Los Angeles	CA	14				
University of Cincinnati	OH			5		17
University of Florida	FL			16		
University of Houston	TX					11
University of Minnesota	MN	5	16	7	7	8
University of Pennsylvania	PA	10	8	12	9	18
University of Southern California	CA	1	1	1	1	7
University of Texas at Austin	TX	13	12	11	12	4
University of Washington	WA	9	5	9	2	15
West Virginia University Foundation	WV		20			

Note. Kaplan, A. E. (2007). *2006 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education
Kaplan, A. E. (2008). *2007 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education
Kaplan, A. E. (2009). *2008 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education
Kaplan, A. E. (2010). *2009 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education
Kaplan, A. E. (2011). *2010 Voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education

Appendix E: University Participant Recruitment Letter

MORGAN R. CLEVINGER, MBA, CFRE
2348 East Cambridge St., Springfield, MO 65804
417.569.6474 ~ clevenger.morgan@gmail.com

January 10, 2012

President
University ~ Office of the President
Address
City, State Zip

RE: Dissertation Research Inquiry (Confidential)

Dear Dr. _____:

This letter comes to ask your consideration for [University] to work with me on a dissertation research project for my doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia; the project has received IRB approval. It is my intention that information gleaned from the study will be useful for the field of higher education, fundraising professionals, and corporate America to better understand the relationship between higher education and corporations engaging with them. Enclosed is a brief Research Abstract Proposal. My background is in fundraising, and I am very passionate about the field. I am certified in fundraising and very familiar with higher education and corporate support. (See Clevenger Vita.)

For the purpose of this study, your University's engagement with six corporations will be studied using qualitative methodology. Two main methods will be used to collect data for the study: interviews and document analysis. (See Research Abstract Proposal). Additionally, I would need to be introduced to six corporations (i.e., 2 *Fortune 500*, 2 mid-size, 2 small) on which we agree to have a similar document analysis and set of interviews.

Participation by the University in the study is voluntary. The identity of the University could be labeled as such should you find benefit with identification OR, if preferred, the identity of the University will not be disclosed. Information gathered from participants' involvement in the study will remain confidential. Informed Consent Forms will be provided for the University and the Corporations as well as individual participants.

Please review the proposal and respond as to your willingness to work with me on my project by January 31, 2012. I am flexible to work with you on a timeline. My dissertation advisor is Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Missouri State University, (417) 836-6046, CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu. Please feel free to contact me with questions at (417) 569-6474 or by email at clevenger.morgan@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger, MBA, CFRE
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix F: University Document and Audio-visual Analysis Protocols Matrix

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the question?	Where can I find the data?	Whom do I contact for access?	Look for:
Mission	To understand what the university claims is a focus	Mission statement of institution	Website or printed materials	Public access	Organizational identity and similarities to corporations' missions
Values	Organizational identity	Organizational identity	Website or printed materials	Public access	Organizational identity and beliefs
Ethical Codes	To see if the organization has ethical codes or behavioral expectations	Ethical code document	Human resources area of website or printed from human resources unit	Public access online; if not, ask organization representative	Organizational and individual accountability and ethical expectations and/or policies
990s	Disclosure of gross amount of dollars received	<i>Form 990s</i>	2006, 2007 request; 2008, 2009, 2010 on <i>GuideStar</i>	Organization representative; <i>GuideStar</i>	Programs, initiatives, amounts, key actors (leaders, directors, board members)
Audited Financial Statements	Disclosure of gross amount of dollars received and how used	Organization's audited financial statements	From organization's accounting or finance department	Request from organization representative	Programs, initiatives, amounts, auditor concerns
Annual Reports	Self-promotion of key initiatives and programs supported by corporations	Annual reports	Website or printed materials	Public access online; if not, ask organization representative	Program or initiative features, photos, emphasis of relationship, corporate recognition
Press Releases	Self-promotion of key initiatives and programs supported by corporations	Press releases	Website, news media, or public relations office	Public access online; if not, ask organization representative	Highlights of relationship, corporate acknowledgment
Web marketing news	Self-promotion of key initiatives and programs supported by corporations	University's website	Online	Public access	Highlights of relationship with the corporations, photos
Third-party news coverage	Good or bad public image of organization and key initiatives	News media, social media, new media	Online	Google	Good or bad highlights of relationship with corporations

Appendix G: Corporate Document and Audio-visual Analysis Protocols Matrix

What do I need to know?	Why do I need to know this?	What kind of data will answer the question?	Where can I find the data?	Whom do I contact for access?	Look for:
Mission	To understand the organization's focus	Mission statement of institution	Website or printed materials	Public access	Organizational identity and similarities to university
Values	Organizational identity	Organizational identity	Website or printed	Public access	Organizational identity and beliefs
Ethical Codes	To see if the organization has ethical codes or behavioral expectations	Ethical code document	Human resources area of website or printed from human resources unit	Public access online; if not, ask organization representative	Organizational and individual accountability and ethical expectations and/or policies
Type of corporation	Delineate Fortune 500, medium, or small	Delineate Fortune 500, medium, or small	990s or online	Public access	Identity of type of corporation
990s	Disclosure of gross amount of dollars contributed and to whom	<i>Form 990s</i>	2006, 2007 request; 2008, 2009, 2010 on <i>GuideStar</i>	Organization representative; <i>GuideStar</i>	Programs, initiatives, amounts, key actors (leaders, board members)
Audited Financial Statements	Disclosure of gross amount of dollars contributed	Organization's audited financial statements	From organization's accounting or finance department	Request from organization representative	Programs, initiatives, amounts, auditor concerns
Annual Reports	Promotion of key initiatives or programs with university	Annual reports	Website or printed materials	Public access online; if not, ask organization representative	Program or initiative features, photos, emphasis of relationship
Press Releases	Self-promotion of key initiatives or programs with university	Press releases	Website, news media, or from public relations office	Public access or ask organization representative	Highlights of relationship with university
Web marketing news	Self-promotion of key initiatives	Corporation's website or national websites	Online	Public access	Highlights of relationship with university, photos
Third-party news coverage	Good or bad public image of organization and key initiatives	News media, social media, new media	Online	<i>Google</i>	Good or bad highlights of relationship with university

Appendix H: University Consent Letter

Date

Contact

Address

City, State Zip

Dear [president]:

Thank you for considering participation in the research study titled “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-organizational Relationship Between a Public American Higher Education University and Six United States Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.” This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia. It is the researcher’s intention that information gleaned from the study will be useful for the field of higher education, fundraising professionals, and corporate America to better understand the relationship between higher education and corporations engaging with them.

Researcher: Morgan Clevenger, University of Missouri-Columbia Doctoral Candidate, Clevenger.morgan@gmail.com, (417) 569-6474.

Advisor: Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Missouri State University, CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu, (417) 836-6046.

Procedures: For the purpose of this study, your university’s leadership team involved in engagement with corporations will be studied using qualitative methodology. Two methods will be used to collect data for the study: interviews and document analysis. Individual interviews will be conducted with the head of fundraising/foundation, director of corporate relations, and three other appropriate individuals identified by you. Interviews will take approximately 45 minutes and will be recorded. The researcher will collect two types of documents for review: mission and intent documents and actual behavior documents. Mission and intent documents would be statements from your website or written materials indicating potential need for corporate financial support or engagement. Actual behavior documents would include *Form 990s*, audited financial statements, annual reports, and any press releases or promotions highlighting corporate engagement or support. These documents will provide further insight into the relationship of the university with corporations.

University Participation: Participation by the university in the study is voluntary.

Individual Participants: Participation by individuals in the study is voluntary. Participants may choose to withdraw their participation at any time without penalty. Participants may decline to answer any question about which they feel a level of discomfort. The researcher will be available to answer any questions or to address any

concerns about participation. In addition, participants may contact the dissertation advisor with any questions or concerns. Each participant will be asked to sign a consent form.

Confidentiality: Information gathered from participants' involvement in the study will remain confidential. Data collected for the purposes of the study will be kept secure and ultimately destroyed seven years after the completion of the study. Participants' identity will be made confidential with use of other names in the reporting content. The research will not disclose any names of participants or relative information within the dissertation material or in any future publications of the study. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri-Columbia has preauthorized content of the research. Questions regarding participants' rights may be directed to the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585 or by visiting <https://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm>.

Injuries: The University of Missouri does not compensate human subjects if discomfort eventually results from the research. Nonetheless, the university holds medical, professional, and general liability insurance coverage and provides its own medical attention and facilities if participants suffer as a direct result of negligence or fault from faculty or a student associated with the research. In such an unlikely event, the Risk Management Officer should be contacted immediately at (573) 882-3735 to obtain a review of the matter and to receive specific information. Related ethical guidelines about Protection of Human Subjects set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations "45 CFR 46" will be upheld. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

Risks and Benefits: Participation risk is minimal. Research gathered through the course of the study should be assistive to higher education administrators, fundraisers, and corporations to understand the relationship between higher education and corporate citizenship. Participants concerned with level of risk or potential benefits may contact the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585.

To participate in the study, please sign the attached consent form on behalf of the university. Please keep a copy of this letter and the signed consent form for your future reference. Thank you for your time and consideration for participation in this study.

Please feel free to contact me with additional questions, ideas, or concerns by phone at (417) 569-6474 or by email at clevenger.morgan@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger, MBA, CFRE
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix I: University Informed Consent Form

[University Name] agrees to participate in the research study titled “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-organizational Relationships Between an American Higher Education University and Six U.S. Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum,” being conducted by Morgan R. Clevenger. This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark true philanthropic motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today’s fundraisers and higher education institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject’s identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your institution’s participation in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB by writing Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211; by calling (573) 882-9585; or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

The act of signing this consent form acknowledges that the institution is aware of and understands:

- Information found during the study will be used for the dissertation and will be printed for future general reference and potential future publications.
- Participants in the interviews do so voluntarily and may withdraw at any time.
- Identification of individuals will be protected in all aspects and reports of the research.
- University representatives will help to secure six corporations to participate in this study and introduce the researcher.

We have read the information above, and any questions have been answered to our satisfaction. On behalf of [University Name], we voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Check ONE box:

- ☐ It is OK to use the name of the university when presenting any of the data or information in the dissertation, presentations, or any subsequent publications.
- ☐ The identification of the university is to remain confidential and CANNOT be used when presenting specific data or information in the dissertation, presentations, or any subsequent publications.

_____
University Representative Name

_____
Date

_____
University Representative Signature

*Please keep a copy of the consent letter and signed consent form for your records, and mail original to: Morgan Clevenger, 2348 E. Cambridge St., Springfield, MO 65804 or PDF and email to clevenger.morgan@gmail.com

Appendix J: Corporation Consent Letter to Participate in Study

Date

Contact

Address

Address

Dear [corporate representative]:

Thank you for your time today to discuss my research project. This email comes to outline the project and officially to seek approval for [corporation] to participate. Attached is a consent agreement.

Overview: Thank you for considering participation in the research study titled “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-organizational Relationships Between an American Higher Education University and Six U.S. Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum.” This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia. It is the researcher’s intention that information gleaned from the study will be useful for the field of higher education, fundraising professionals, and corporate America to better understand the relationship between higher education and corporations engaging with them.

Researcher: Morgan Clevenger, University of Missouri-Columbia Doctoral Candidate, Clevenger.morgan@gmail.com, (417) 569-6474.

Advisor: Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Missouri State University, CMacgregor@MissouriState.edu, (417) 836-6046.

University and University Foundation Champions: Name, Title, Email, Phone. Name, Title, Email, Phone.

Procedures: For the purpose of this study, your corporation’s leaders involved in engagement with [University] and [University Foundation] will be studied using qualitative methodology. Two methods will be used to collect data for the study: interviews and document analysis. Individual interviews will be conducted with appropriate individuals identified by you. Interviews will take approximately 45 minutes and will be recorded. The researcher will collect two types of documents for review: mission and intent documents and actual behavior documents. Mission and intent documents would be statements from your website or written materials indicating potential reasons for engaging with or supporting nonprofit organizations and/or higher education. Actual behavior documents would include publicly available documents such as audited financial statements, annual reports, and any press releases or promotions highlighting corporate engagement or support. These documents will provide further insight into the relationship of the university with your corporation.

Corporate Participation: Participation by the corporation in the study is voluntary.

Individual Participants: Participation by individuals in the study is voluntary. Participants may choose to withdraw their participation at any time without penalty. Participants may decline to answer any question about which they feel a level of discomfort. The researcher will be available to answer any questions or to address any concerns about participation. In addition,

participants may contact the dissertation advisor with any questions or concerns.

Confidentiality: [University] has opted to remain unnamed in the study to provide confidentiality. Information gathered from participants' involvement in the study will remain confidential. Data collected for the purposes of the study will be kept secure and ultimately destroyed seven years after the completion of the study. Participants' identity will be made confidential with use of other names in the reporting content. The research will not disclose any names of participants, or relative information, within the dissertation material or in any future publications of the study. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri-Columbia has preauthorized content of the research, Case #1200341. Questions regarding participants' rights may be directed to the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585 or by visiting <https://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm>.

Injuries: The University of Missouri does not compensate human subjects if discomfort eventually results from the research. Nonetheless, the university holds medical, professional, and general liability insurance coverage and provides its own medical attention and facilities if participants suffer as a direct result of negligence or fault from faculty or a student associated with the research. In such an unlikely event, the Risk Management Officer should be contacted immediately at (573) 882-3735 to obtain a review of the matter and to receive specific information. Related ethical guidelines about Protection of Human Subjects set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations "45 CFR 46" will be upheld. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

Risks and Benefits: Participation risk is minimal. Research gathered through the course of the study should be assistive to higher education administrators, fundraisers, and corporations to understand the relationship between higher education and corporate citizenship. Participants concerned with level of risk or potential benefits may contact the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585.

To participate in the study, please sign the attached consent form on behalf of [corporation]. (Note that this document may be edited/revised as appropriate. It is a template for the project. Feel free to print it on company stationery, if appropriate.) Please keep a copy of this letter and the signed consent form for your future reference. Thank you for your time and consideration for participation in this study.

Please feel free to contact me with additional questions, ideas, or concerns by phone at (417) 569-6474 or by email at clevenger.morgan@gmail.com. I look forward to working with you to set up interviews in person.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger, MBA, CFRE
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix K: Corporate Informed Consent Form

[Corporation] headquartered in [location] agrees to participate in the research study titled “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-organizational Relationships Between an American Higher Education University and Six U.S. Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum,” being conducted by Morgan R. Clevenger. This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark true philanthropic motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist by using Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today’s fundraisers and higher education institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject’s identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your organization’s participation in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research, Case #1200341. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB by writing Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211; by calling (573) 882-9585; or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

The act of signing this consent form acknowledges that the institution is aware of and understands:

- The identity of [corporation] will remain confidential and not be divulged; rather, an industry label will be used to reference the company.
- Information found during the study will be used for the dissertation and will be printed for future general reference and potential future publications.
- [corporation] participates voluntarily and may withdraw at any time.
- [corporation] agrees to discuss its relationship with [University] and [University Foundation].
- [corporation] will provide individuals to be interviewed for the study (i.e., 2-6 individuals) and allow access to appropriate documents or materials related to the study.
- Individual participants in the interviews do so voluntarily and may withdraw at any time.
- Identity of individuals will be protected in all aspects and reports of the research as confidential.

We have read the information above, and any questions have been answered to our satisfaction. On behalf of [corporation] we voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Corporate Representative Name

Date

Corporate Representative Signature

*Please keep a copy of the consent letter and signed consent form for your records, and mail original to: Morgan Clevenger, 2348 E. Cambridge St., Springfield, MO 65804 or PDF and email to clevenger.morgan@gmail.com

Appendix L: Participant Recruitment Letter to Subjects/Interviewees

Date

Contact

Address

Address

Dear [name]:

I am working to conduct research about the engagement of U.S. corporations in American higher education as part of the requirement for my doctoral program at the University of Missouri-Columbia through a cohort arrangement at Missouri State University. Your input is valuable and will help to provide an understanding of trends in corporate engagement in higher education. Participation is voluntary, and all responses are confidential.

This letter confirms your participation with our meeting on [date] at [time] at [location]. Attached is an informed consent document explaining the rights and responsibilities of participation as well as the guarantee of confidentiality.

Please feel free to contact me with additional questions, ideas, or concerns by phone at (417) 569-6474 or by email at clevenger.morgan@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger, MBA, CFRE
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix M: Subject/Interviewee Informed Consent Letter

Date

Contact

Address

City, State ZIP

Dear [Name], Research Participant:

Thank you for participating in a study of U.S. corporate engagement in American higher education. This study is part of my doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia through a cohort arrangement at Missouri State University.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today's fundraisers and higher education institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

Your rights as a participant will be protected:

- Participation in the study is completely voluntary. You may stop participating at any point without penalty.
- You need not answer all of the questions.
- Your answers will be kept confidential. Results will be presented to others in summary form only, without names; therefore, your identity will remain confidential.

Your responsibilities as a participant:

- Agree to the interview being recorded.
- Understand that the transcript will be typed, and your identity removed for confidentiality.
- Answer questions to the best of your knowledge and in your own words.
- Have the opportunity to review the transcript for accuracy, completeness, and option to strike material of concern. This process is called *member checking*.
- Understand that materials will be used in the dissertation, presentations, and potentially published in journal articles, books, or the like.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject's identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your or your institution's participation in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB by writing Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211; by calling (573) 882-9585; or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

Please contact me at (417) 569-6474 with any questions, ideas, or concerns. Thank you very much for your consideration and time commitment.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger, MBA, CFRE
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix N: Interview Questions for Higher Education Leaders

1. What is your role, and how long have you been at the university?
2. Tell me how your university goes about attracting corporate support.
3. What motivations exist for your University's acceptance of relationships with corporations?
4. Who are key individuals in the university who engage with corporations?

PROVIDE LIST OF PARTICIPATING CORPORATIONS:

5. Describe how the University has been engaged with [specific] corporation? [ask for each participating corporation]

IF NEEDED, FOLLOW-ON:

What are examples of your University accepting support from [specific] corporations?

At the end of the day, how is your University receiving benefit from your relationship with [specific] corporation? [ask for each participating corporation]

6. How has the economy the past 5-7 years affected corporations' support of the University?
7. Tell me about any ethical issues or conflicts that have occurred with corporations that created uncomfortable or difficult circumstances?
8. Is there any other information that we haven't covered that you would like to share about your University's activities with corporations?

Appendix O: Interview Questions for Corporate Leaders

Company: CSA   CSB   CMA   CMB   CFA   CFB

Number of employees:

Industry:

1. What is your role, and how long have you been with the company?
2. What is the history of your company's engagement with XYZ University?
3. What has led your corporation to focus on a relationship with XYZ University?
4. Describe the strategy that guides your company's involvement with XYZ

University.

Is that strategy similar or different from other higher educational institutions you're involved with?

5. Could you explain who makes decisions about your company's engagement with XYZ University?

Probe: CEO/Management? Corporate Giving/Social Responsibility Office?

Communications/Marketing/PR Team? Other Employees? Shareholders?

Probe: Do the individuals driving the decisions about your engagement have experience in education? If so, what kind?

6. What are examples of areas of XYZ University that your company supports?
7. Describe the types of benefits your company is getting from your relationship with XYZ University.
8. At the end of the day, what value is the relationship with the University?
9. Tell me about any ethical issues or conflicts that have occurred with XYZ University that created uncomfortable or difficult circumstances?
10. Is there any other information you would like to share about your corporation's

activities with XYZ University?

QUESTIONS FOR KEY CONTACT ONLY

IF NOT FOUND ONLINE:

Describe your company's code of ethics.

Tell me about volunteer opportunities for employees.

Does your company have an employee matching gift program for employees who support XYZ University? If "yes," is there a standard match rate?   Amount?

IF TIME:

What are peer companies in your sector doing in the higher education arena? Probe:

Who are major players?

In looking at the framework of corporate citizenship for my study, where do you see your company being placed?

Appendix P: Post-interview Debriefing Form

Participant Name: _____

Position/Title: _____

Location: _____

Room / Environment (comments): _____

How did it go?   Great   Good   Okay   Poor

Overall mood during the interview

Interviewee's state of mind: Open   Distracted   Guarded   Other

Interviewee's Appearance (comments): _____

University Q	Type of Q	Note if Issue:	Corporate Q	Type of Q
1	Background		1	Background
2	Knowledge		2	Knowledge
3	Opinion/Value		3	Opinion/Value
4	Knowledge		4	Knowledge
5	Knowledge		5	Knowledge
6	Knowledge		6	Knowledge
7	Opinion/Value		7	Opinion/Value
8	Opinion/Value		8	Opinion/Value
			9	Opinion/Value
			10	Opinion/Value

(Question category concepts from Patton, 2002).

“What were main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 53).

“Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions” (Miles & Huberman, p. 53).

“Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting, illuminating, or important in this contact?” (Miles & Huberman, p. 53).

“What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next contact with this site?” (Miles & Huberman, p. 53)

Other: _____

Appendix Q: University Campus Observation Matrix

Observed	Where Found?	What Found?	Significance	Comment(s)
Named Building(s)				
Named Room(s)				
Named Laboratory(ies)				
Photos				
Plaques				
Statue(s)				
Donor Wall(s)				
Marketing Promotions (e.g., billboards or display cases)				
Logos anywhere				
Equipment or books with corporate label				
Other				

Appendix R: Transcriptionist Confidentiality Letter

Date

Contact

Address

City, State ZIP

Dear [Name], Transcriptionist:

Thank you for agreeing to transcribe interviews in a study of U.S. corporate engagement in American higher education. This study is part of my doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia through a cohort arrangement at Missouri State University.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today's fundraisers and higher educational institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

Your responsibilities as a transcriptionist:

- Agree to listening to interviews and transcribing the content.
- Understand that the transcripts as well as the audio files are strictly confidential. Identities of individuals or organizations are not to be discussed with anyone.
- Keep electronic files password protected on a single-user computer.
- Provide electronic copies of the transcriptions properly formatted.
- Maintain a backup of information until it is given to the researcher.
- Target completion of the initial sample as soon as possible.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject's identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your or your institution's participation in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research, Case# 1200341. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB at: Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211, by calling (573) 882-9585, or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

Please contact me at (417) 569-6474 with any questions, ideas, or concerns. Thank you very much for your consideration and time commitment.

Sincerely,

Morgan R. Clevenger
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix S: Transcriptionist Acceptance Agreement and Confidentiality Form

I agree to the terms outlined to confidentially manage raw data, transcription, and documents. I have agreed to an hourly rate of \$xx/audio hour. All transcription will be completed by [date]. Remaining balance will be paid by [date].

Gross total project estimate: xx transcripts X \$xx/audio hour = \$x,xxx.

Agreed by parties:

Name: Morgan Clevenger
Doctoral Student

Signature:

Date:

Name: [name]
Transcriptionist

Signature:

Date:

Appendix T: Member Checking Letter

Date

Interview Participant
Address
City, State ZIP

Dear [Name]:

I hope this email finds you well.

Attached is a soft copy transcription of the interview with you for my dissertation regarding corporate support and engagement with American higher education. As promised, you are able to review and approve the content.

In reviewing the text, please consider:

1. Did the explanations you provided answer the questions?
2. Was anything put into writing that you need to clarify or omit?
3. Are there any identifiers that need to be changed to protect the confidentiality of you, the geography, the university, university foundation, or corporations?
4. Please review the document and email your "approval" no later than [date].

Should you have any changes, questions, or concerns, feel free to email me or call me at 417.569.6474. Again, thank you for your time and conscientious consideration to answer the questions to assist in my research. Upon completion of the dissertation, I will be sure to share a finished copy with you.

Again, your identity and all organizations involved in the study will remain confidential.

Please approve your transcript or give feedback for changes no later than [date]. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Morgan Clevenger
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix U: Peer Coding and Analysis Confidentiality Letter

Date

Contact
Address
City, State ZIP

Dear [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to review, code, and analyze interview transcripts relating to a study of U.S. corporate engagement in American higher education. This study is part of my doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia through a cohort arrangement at Missouri State University.

The purpose of this study is to determine the inter-organizational behavior, expectations, and motivations for U.S. corporate engagement in American higher education. This study will benchmark motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today's fundraisers and higher educational institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

Your responsibilities as a peer coder include:

- Agreeing to read the interview transcripts and summarizing content themes.
- Agreeing to read the interview transcripts, coding, and labeling corporate engagement on Cone's (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum as appropriate.
- Agreeing to identify "exemplary quotes" for use in the study as appropriate.
- Understanding that the transcripts are strictly confidential. Potentiality of identities of individuals or organizations is not to be discussed with anyone.
- Committing to the confidentiality of the process. While the transcripts have been distilled to remove names of interviewees, organizational names, geographic references, and other potential tells that could possibly divulge participants, please advise if any interview transcripts need further editing to protect participants' identities and participants' organizational identities.
- Keeping electronic files password protected on a single-user computer.
- Maintaining a password-protected backup of your working and final copy coding and analysis.
- Being available for questions and/or discussions regarding the transcripts.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject's identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your participation as a peer coder in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research, Case# 1200341. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB at: Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211, by calling (573) 882-9585, or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

Please contact me at (417) 569-6474 with any questions, ideas, or concerns. Thank you very much for your consideration and time commitment. Attached is a Word document with the Peer

Coder Consent & Confidentiality Form to review, sign, and return. Please let me know of any questions.

Sincerely,
Morgan R. Clevenger
Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix V: Peer Coder Consent and Confidentiality Form

I, [name], of [city, state], agree to participate in the research study titled, “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-Organizational Relationships Between a Public American Higher Education University and Six U.S. Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum,” being conducted by Morgan R. Clevenger. This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark true philanthropic motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today’s fundraisers and higher educational institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject’s identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your organization’s participation in the study. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research, Case #1200341. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB at: Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211, calling (573) 882-9585, or emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

The act of signing this consent form acknowledges that the peer coder is aware of and understands the responsibilities of:

- Agreeing to read the interview transcripts and summarizing content themes.
- Agreeing to read the interview transcripts, coding, and labeling corporate engagement on Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum as appropriate.
- Agreeing to identify “exemplary quotes” for use in the study as appropriate.
- Understanding that the transcripts are strictly confidential. Potentiality of identities of individuals or organizations is not to be discussed with anyone.
- Committing to the confidentiality of the process. While the transcripts have been distilled to remove names of interviewees, organizational names, geographic references, and other potential tells that could possibly divulge participants, please advise if any interview transcripts need further editing to protect participants’ identities and participants’ organizational identities.
- Keeping electronic files password protected on a single-user computer.
- Maintaining a password-protected backup of your working and final copy coding and analysis.
- Being available for questions and/or discussions regarding the transcripts.

I have read the information above, and any questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study as a peer coder.

_____
Name

_____
Date

_____
Signature

*Please keep a copy of the consent letter and signed consent form for your records, and mail original.

Appendix W: External Reviewer Agreement

I, [name], of [city, state], agree to review the dissertation titled, “An Organizational Analysis of the Inter-Organizational Relationships Between a Public American Higher Education University and Six U.S. Corporate Supporters: An Instrumental, Ethnographic Case Study Using Cone’s Corporate Citizenship Spectrum,” researched and written by Morgan R. Clevenger. This study serves as dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to determine the expectations and motivations for corporate engagement in higher education. This study will benchmark true philanthropic motives of corporations supporting programs in higher education as well as assign what type of relationship expectations exist using Cone’s (2010) corporate citizenship spectrum. Today’s fundraisers and higher educational institutions must understand the ramifications of support received.

This project follows ethical guidelines in the use of human subjects and adequately safeguards the subject’s identity, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. These steps will ensure there are no foreseeable risks to your participation in the study as an external reviewer. The project is being supervised by Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Professor, Educational Administration, Missouri State University; her telephone number is (417) 836-6046. The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board has also approved the research, Case #1200341. You may contact the University of Missouri IRB at: Campus Institutional Review Board, 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211, by calling (573) 882-9585, or by emailing umcresearchirb@missouri.edu.

The act of signing this consent form acknowledges that the external reviewer is aware of and understands the responsibilities of:

- Agreeing to read the dissertation.
- Agreeing to provide feedback or comments by March 1, 2014.
- Understanding that the identity of organizational participants was confidential. Potentiality of identities of individuals or organizations is not to be discussed with anyone.
- Being available for questions and/or discussions regarding the dissertation.

The researcher agrees to provide a letter of thanks for the external reviewer’s personnel or promotion and tenure file.

I have read the information above, and any questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study as an external reviewer.

My identity of having been an external reviewer _____ may be _____ may not be divulged.

Accordingly, my institution’s identity _____ may be _____ may not be divulged.

_____
Name

_____
Date

_____
Signature

*Please keep a copy of the consent letter and signed consent form for your records, and mail original to: Morgan Clevenger, 65 West South Street, Wilkes Barre, PA 18701, or PDF and email to clevenger.morgan@gmail.com

VITA

“To keep a lamp burning, we have to keep putting oil in it.”

~ Mother Teresa (National Philanthropic Trust, 2012, ¶ 32)

Having worked more than two decades in higher education, Morgan Clevenger values and understands the importance of quality programs, core academic standards and teaching methodologies, lifelong and hands-on learning, networking, and resource development in all facets of university life. From his various administrative, teaching, fundraising, and marketing positions, he has gained extensive, valuable experience.

A Clarksburg, WV native, Morgan graduated from Liberty High School in 1987. After attaining a 1991 WVU Perley Isaac Reed School of Journalism Bachelor of Science degree cum laude in journalism with a major in news-editorial and a minor in political science, Morgan went on to earn a 1996 master’s degree in business administration from the WVU College of Business and Economics.

In 1997 Morgan achieved Certified Fundraising Executive (CFRE) status, which recognizes his tenure, success, and professionalism in fundraising, marketing, and public relations. His passion for education, students, and philanthropy led to his being named a 1998 Outstanding Young Man of America and the 2002 Outstanding Fundraising Professional by the West Virginia Chapter of the Association of Fundraising Professionals. In 2014 Morgan earned a doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.