

THE CHARACTERISTICS, FUNCTIONS, BEHAVIORS AND
EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS
IN AMERICAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Sylvia B. Mays

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Community College Education

APPROVED:

Dr. Daniel E. Vogler, Chairman

Dr. Charles A. Atwell

Dr. Samuel D. Morgan

Dr. F. Marion Asche

Dr. Clifton D. Brvant

May 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

THE CHARACTERISTICS, FUNCTIONS, BEHAVIORS AND
EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS
IN AMERICAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Sylvia B. Mays

(ABSTRACT)

This national study developed a descriptive data base for the characteristics, functions, leader behaviors, and effectiveness ratings of development officers who belong to the National Council for Resource Development. These data were examined with respect to their relationship to institutional size, community wealth, size of staff, and age of the foundations.

Twelve percent of these development officers were minorities and 43 percent were female. The mean age of the development officers was 44 years and more than 30 percent held doctoral degrees. Their graduate majors clustered in four disciplines, while their graduate degrees were overwhelmingly in education. They reported little previous experience in development work, though most prior work experience had been in the field of education. Nearly 70 percent reported directly to the presidents of their institutions. Almost 92 percent of these institutions were found to have foundations and more than half of these foundations were less than five years old.

Development officers indicated that the functional area of greatest importance and the one for which they had the greatest respon-

sibility was that of program planning. Two of the most important program planning functions were those of: (a) identifying funding sources, and (b) cultivating potential funding sources. Yet, the functional area of least importance and the one for which development officers reported the least responsibility, was that of fund raising. This finding was partially explained by the artificial grouping of the functions and by the fact that most development officers reported sharing rather than carrying primary responsibility for the fund raising functions.

Development officers rated high on both the task-oriented and on the person-oriented dimensions of the leadership scale. They were rated by their supervisors as high in overall effectiveness. They were also rated as effective in both fund raising and in "friend raising." Younger development officers were perceived as more effective than their older counterparts. No other relationships were found between characteristics, leader behaviors, functions, effectiveness, and situational differences among institutions.

Implications for these findings include pre-service and in-service education as well as use in the selection and the evaluation of development officers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks go, first of all, to my husband, , and to my son, , for their support and encouragement throughout this endeavor. A very special thanks also goes to my mother and father, , for their enduring belief that I could accomplish all that I set out to do in this world.

I am deeply grateful for the counsel of my esteemed advisor, Dr. Dan Vogler, a kindly taskmaster imbued with wit and wisdom. Thanks also to the members of my committee: Dr. Marion Asche, Dr. Charles Atwell, Dr. Clifton Bryant, and Dr. Samuel Morgan for the interest they took in this project and the individual attention they afforded me from time to time. And finally, my appreciation to the staff of Virginia Tech Development Office, and to the Director, F. Duke Perry, for the support they provided in making this project possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
THE PROBLEM.	1
Research Problem Statement.	3
Purpose of the Study.	4
Research Questions.	5
Delimitations of the Study.	5
Limitations of the Study.	6
Need for the Study.	6
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	8
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
Development	9
Evolution of Development	10
History of Foundations	11
History of Voluntary Support	12
Purposes of a Foundation	15
Effectiveness	19
Effectiveness of Foundations	19
Effectiveness of Development Officers.	21
Functions and Characteristics	22
Functions of Development Officers.	22
Characteristics of Development Officers.	26

	<u>Page</u>
Leadership.	29
Leadership Studies	30
Educational Leadership	34
Summary	37
METHODOLOGY.	39
Research Design	40
Instrumentation	43
Research Questions and Analyses	45
Summary	49
RESULTS OF THE STUDY	50
The Pilot Study	51
Research Questions and Data Analyses.	53
Characteristics.	53
Sex, Race, and Age.	54
Education Levels and Disciplines.	56
Employment History.	60
Supervisor.	61
Prior Position.	61
Functions.	62
Importance of Functions	63
Degree of Responsibility for Functions.	70
Effectiveness of Development Officers.	78
Situational Differences Among Institutions	82
Summary	86
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	88
Characteristics	88

	<u>Page</u>
Age, Race, Sex, and Previous Experience. . .	88
Conclusions.	89
Recommendations.	90
Functions	91
Conclusions.	93
Recommendations.	93
Leader Behaviors.	94
Conclusions.	94
Recommendations.	95
Effectiveness	95
Conclusions.	96
Recommendations.	97
Subjective Interpretations.	97
Future Research	98
REFERENCES	100
APPENDICES	111
A. Development Officers' Questionnaire and Correspondence.	112
B. Development Officers' Immediate Supervisors' Questionnaire and Correspondence.	118
C. First Follow-up Postcard	121
D. Second Follow-up Letter.	122
E. Vita	123

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Sex of Development Officers	54
2. Racial/Ethnic Characteristics of Development Officers.	54
3. Age of Development Officers	55
4. Highest Degree Before Becoming Development Officer	56
5. Development Officer's Major Discipline at the Bachelors Level	57
6. Development Officer's Major Discipline at the Graduate Level.	59
7. Employment History of Development Officers.	60
8. Development Officer's Immediate Supervisor.	61
9. Development Officer's Employment Prior to Current Position.	61
10. Importance of Program Planning Functions.	63
11. Importance of Business and Financial Management Functions	64
12. Importance of Personnel Management Functions.	65
13. Importance of Community Relations Functions	66
14. Importance of Administrative Functions.	67
15. Importance of Fund Raising Functions.	69
16. Importance of Functional Groups in Development.	70
17. Degree of Responsibility for Program Planning	71

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
18. Degree of Responsibility for Business and and Financial Management Functions.	72
19. Degree of Responsibility for Personnel Functions	73
20. Degree of Responsibility for Administrative Functions	74
21. Degree of Responsibility for Community Relations Functions	75
22. Degree of Responsibility for Fund Raising Functions	76
23. Degree of Development Officer's Responsibility for Functional Groups	77
24. Task-Oriented and Person-Oriented Behavior of Development Officers.	78
25. Effectiveness in Fund/Friend Raising.	80
26. Institutional Size.	82
27. Institutions With Foundations	83
28. Age of Foundations.	84
29. Number of Personnel Supervised.	84

Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

Community colleges, like all of higher education, are facing serious financial problems. "All questions of curriculum, students, and institutional mission pale in light of funding issues" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). The decline in resources and its significant impact on community colleges was accentuated by William A. Harper (1976) when he said:

Faced with the first serious threat to the open-door concept since it became the cornerstone of the movement two decades ago, community colleges must now either accept a closing door or find some new ways to prop it open (p. 48).

As higher education in the United States moves from "state supported to state assisted status" (Luck and Tolle, 1978), fund raising will take on increasing significance. Young (1980) wrote that in the past, fund-raising had been an auxiliary service while the primary emphasis had been upon raising and spending tax dollars. But with fewer tax dollars available and with increasing competition for those dollars, Young was prompted to conclude that there was a critical need to expand the fiscal resources of community colleges.

The use of fund-raising, particularly the establishment of an independent foundation, has been suggested as a viable mechanism by

which to solicit local funds to aid in supporting programs and facilities not adequately provided for elsewhere (Woodbury, 1973). Such a foundation would carry additional benefits noted by Lake (1981) and others (Luck and Tolle, 1978, and Harper, 1976) by providing a broader base of community support for the college through involvement of community leaders with the institution.

The history of private contributions in support of education dates back to the days of Plato (Duffy, 1979). Luck and Tolle (1978) trace the history of college development in America from its earliest roots, when the president of an institution was its chief fund raiser, to the present time, where:

... development represents a fourth estate in educational administration, in addition to academics, business management, and student affairs (p. 11).

According to Robison (1982), a private, not-for-profit foundation affiliated with a community college was established in 1922 at Long Beach City College (California). Robison goes on to note that community college foundations were slow to develop and that more than 80 percent of those in existence were established after the late 1960's. The growth in numbers can be seen when comparing two studies completed five years apart. In 1974, Luck found that less than half of the public community colleges in the United States participated in any type of fund raising or had established foundations. By 1979, Degerstedt reported that the rate at which foundations were being established was increasing, with 58 percent of public community

colleges having one and half the remainder planning to form one within five years. This increased interest in fund-raising activities was also supported by Webb and Jackson (1979) when they noted that "... the position of resource development officer, dean of development, or grantsman is increasingly appearing on public community college campuses throughout the nation" (p. 40).

Statement of the Problem

Little is known about the demographic characteristics, the educational background, or the previous employment experience of development officers, yet Luck and Tolle (1978) are emphatic in saying that "The success of any development or fund-raising program is dependent upon the personnel directing the enterprise" (p. 91). Still less is known about the leadership skills these officers bring to the position, though Hemphill demonstrated as early as 1955 that competence in educational administration was related to task-oriented and person-oriented behaviors.

There is some information in the literature regarding the functions of development officers, but there is by no means uniform agreement concerning these functions generally. There is almost no information in the literature concerning the functions of community college development officers in particular.

Though they have grown in numbers, questions concerning the effectiveness of foundations and of development officers remain. Sims (1973) concluded that the most effective foundations were those that

brought in large amounts of money, while Duffy (1979) judged a successful foundation as one which established strong public relations with the community and one which involved community leaders in the activities of the institution. No studies to date have examined the effectiveness of development officers.

Situational variables impact the success of foundations and their development officers. Robison (1982) contended that community wealth should be considered when evaluating a foundation. She also suggested that the size of the college, the age of the foundation, and the foundation staffing be considered.

This study was designed to research the position of the development officer at public community colleges in order to determine characteristics, functions, leader behaviors, and effectiveness of development officers. This was one of three studies designed to develop data bases to describe these elements of selected community college administrators. The other two studies focused on the positions of Dean of Occupational Education and on the Chief Business Officer (Calver, 1984; Suydam, 1984).

Purpose

The purposes of this study were a) to synthesize the extant literature related to community college development offices, officers, and applied leadership characteristics; b) to describe selected demographic characteristics of community college development officers; c) to identify functions performed by development officers and

determine the levels of importance and responsibility associated with these functions; d) to assess leadership behaviors of development officers using a standardized instrument; e) to determine the overall effectiveness rating of development officers; and f) to test designated relationships among and between these individual factors.

Research Questions

As a result of this research, the following questions were answered:

1. What are the selected demographic characteristics, educational backgrounds, and work histories of development officers?
2. What are the functions performed by development officers?
3. What are the leadership behaviors of development officers as measured by the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire XII (LBDQ XII)?
4. What is the overall effectiveness rating of development officers as measured by the Brass and Oldham In-Basket test?
5. What are the situational differences among institutions?
6. What relationships exist among and between these individual factors?

Delimitations

This study was confined to the 453 public community colleges who were members of the National Council for Resource Development.

This study was also limited to those development officers who had reported to their present supervisors for at least one year.

Limitations

1. The findings of this study are of relevance primarily to those community colleges exhibiting similarity with those included in this study.

2. The study is descriptive research and the findings can not be used to establish cause-effect relationships.

3. This study is limited by a functional classification system which used artificially created groupings.

Need for the Study

It is clear that while the position of development officer is of growing importance on community college campuses around the nation, there is little information to describe these officers. Little is known of their functions, their leader behaviors, or their effectiveness.

In Rowland's 1983 research summary of doctoral dissertations related to institutional development, he found only five dissertations related to community college foundations over the last ten years: two in 1974 (Luck and Silvera), and three in 1979 (Degerstedt, Duffy, and Snead). Only two of these dissertations were national studies; two were statewide and one was a regional study.

Definitions

Consideration represents those behaviors indicative of mutual trust, respect, and friendship. (Hemphill and Coons, 1950)

Development pertains to the planned fund-raising programs which seek the private dollar. (Luck and Tolle, 1978)

Development officer is that individual responsible for the day-to-day operations of the foundation. (Luck and Tolle, 1978)

Foundation is an agency established by a college for the purpose of raising and allocating private funds for use by the college.

Initiation of Structure represents those behaviors which delineate the relationship between the leader and the other members of the group and establish well-defined patterns of organization. (Hemphill and Coons, 1950)

Leadership ". . . is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill and Coons, 1957, p. 7)

Leadership effectiveness is the extent to which the leader's group or organization performs its task successfully and attains its goals. (Yukl, 1981)

Situational factors include the age of the foundation and the wealth of the district as measured by statements regarding affluence as well as by per-capita assessed evaluation.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized around five chapters. The first chapter includes the introduction, a statement of the problem, a purpose statement, general research questions, significance of the study, definitions, delimitations, and limitations of the study. Chapter two contains a comprehensive review of the literature as it relates to the history of foundations, the characteristics and functions of development officers, the study of leadership, and measures of effectiveness. Chapter three describes the design of the study, the population, the instrumentation, the research questions to be answered and the procedures to be used when analyzing the data. Chapter four represents a report of the findings and answers the research questions. Chapter five includes a summary of the findings, interpretations of the results, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The focus of this study was upon the community college development officer's profile, role functions, leader behaviors and leadership effectiveness. Because this study also focused on those public community colleges which have established foundations, this literature review also includes an examination of the history, purposes, and effectiveness measures related to foundations. The first section of this chapter explores the evolution of the term "development," defines "foundations," "educational foundation," and "development officer." The next sections traces the history, identifies the purposes, and assesses the measures of effectiveness of foundations. The final sections describes the literature related to the functions of development officers, the characteristics of development officers and the leader behavior research that was used in this study.

Development

Because the term "development," as it relates to colleges and universities, tends to be confused with other activities of the institutions such as developmental (remedial) education, it might be

useful at the outset to trace the origin of the term and to define it precisely as it was used in this study.

Evolution

According to Luck and Tolle (1978), the term was first used in 1924 to describe the Development Campaign of the University of Chicago, a fund-raising effort which netted \$10 million. Later the term was used by Northwestern University and then by other colleges and universities to describe their fund raising endeavors.

Leslie (1969) has a more colorful description of the origin of the term development. It was his perception that college presidents were reluctant to have "fund raisers" on their administrative staff but were willing to employ such individuals for the euphemistic function called "development." In Leslie's words, "Somehow it was felt that to call a spade a spade was demeaning and undignified. Hence, the term 'development' was born" (p. ix).

Leslie goes on to note that in many colleges and universities, the functions of the development officer have been expanded. They now include responsibility for publicity, public relations, alumni relations, special events and other activities, ". . . but it has been clear for years that one of his major responsibilities is to raise money" (p. ix).

Luck and Tolle (1978) also support Leslie's findings that the responsibilities of the development office have been broadened, so much so, they say, that ". . . development represents a fourth estate in educational administration, in addition to the three of academics, business management, and student affairs" (p. 11).

For the purposes of this study, however, the earlier, more limited definition of development will be used: planned fund-raising programs which seek the private dollar (Luck and Tolle, 1978, p. 23). More specifically, this study will be limited to the function of educational fund-raising, defined by Cheshire (1977) as ". . . the practice of soliciting gifts and grants for schools, colleges, and universities from interested individuals and organizations" (p. 121). And even more limiting, this study will focus on those public community colleges who have established a foundation through which to solicit such funds.

Foundations

As Zurcher and Dustan (1972) noted, a number of organizations and associations call themselves foundations. Some are corporate, some are trusts, others are mere associations (pp. 1-2). Andrews (1950) offers an operational definition of the word "foundation" as used in the context of this study: "A foundation is a non-governmental, non-profit organization, having a principal fund of its own and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable or other activities serving the common welfare" (p. 90).

An educational foundation is defined even more narrowly by Luck and Tolle (1978) as

. . . an agency established by a college or an interested administrative body which is not-for-profit and has as

its sole purpose the raising and allocating of private funds for use by the college. (p. 26)

This narrow definition limits the focus of this study to those community college foundations which are engaged in raising and allocating private funds. Though some development officers may also be responsible for securing governmental grants, the scope of this study focused primarily on those individuals who were responsible for the day-to-day operation of public community college education foundations which are engaged in raising and allocating private funds.

History of Voluntary Support

The history of private contributions in support of education dates back to the days of Plato (Duffy, 1979). But, according to Muller (1977), private support of higher education, for the most part, is a uniquely American phenomenon. He notes that in most other countries, higher education institutions are owned and operated by national governments. Public support in the United States derives from the distinctive character and history of this society. Initially, institutions of higher education in the United States were founded by religious organizations in order to educate the clergy. Historically, this country has practiced a policy of separation of church and state, and so these early colleges depended upon private philanthropy for their very existence. Later colleges and universities were modeled after these earlier institutions.

Muller notes another factor unique to American higher education: colleges compete with each other for resources, for students, and for faculty members. This leads him to an important observation:

In the United States. . . reputation is an important factor in the availability of resources; for institutions that live on very thin financial margins, not only their well-being but also their very existence may be at stake. Support is usually more generous for colleges perceived to be growing rather than declining. (p. 4)

If Muller is correct in his observation, American community colleges should be in a very advantageous position in view of their phenomenal growth in recent years.

In their review of the history of college foundations, Luck and Tolle (1978) report that the oldest independent, but affiliated college foundation, was formed in 1893 to aid The University of Kansas. They report that the first not-for-profit foundation formed to support a public community college was believed to be the one established in 1962 at Highland (Illinois) Community College. They go on to note that Macon Junior College (Georgia) established a foundation in 1970 and that John A. Logan Community College (Illinois) followed suit in 1971.

Robison (1982) has documented foundations older than those noted by Luck and Tolle: Long Beach City College (California), 1922; Santa Monica City College (California), 1955; and Vincennes University (Indiana), 1949. Robison also notes that a 1980 study

found that 18 community colleges reported that their foundations were 20 years old or older, indicating that they were established prior to 1960. Robison does concede that community college foundations were slow to develop and that more than 80 percent were established after the late 1960's (p. 33).

Historically, Jones (1977) sees college and university fund-raising as a post World War II phenomenon. He conducted a title search of pre-1940 college and university catalogs and found almost no titles such as "vice president for development" or "director of deferred giving" (p. 266). Writing in 1978, Luck and Tolle estimated that approximately half of all public and private colleges and universities engaged in fund-raising activities or had established development offices. This increased interest in development activities on the part of all colleges and universities, but particularly at public community colleges in the United States, was confirmed by Webb and Jackson (1979) who found that ". . . the position of resource development officer, dean of development, or grantsman is increasingly appearing on public community college campuses throughout the nation" (p. 40). In 1981 Angel and Gares extrapolated that 62 percent of the community colleges had established a foundation and that 41 percent of these foundations had been formed since 1965. This survey had only a 48 percent response rate, and it is unclear whether nonrespondents were those community colleges with no established foundations.

As higher education in the United States moves from "state supported to state assisted status" (Luck and Tolle, 1978, p. 108), fund raising will take on increasing significance. Young (1980) writes that in the past, fund-raising had been an auxiliary service while the primary emphasis had been upon raising and spending tax dollars. But with fewer tax dollars available and with increasing competition for those dollars, Young was prompted to conclude that there was a critical need to expand the fiscal resources of community colleges. Or, as Kuhnle (1984) observed, "No institution ever became great from public appropriations."

Purposes of a Foundation

The purposes for forming voluntary groups rather than seeking governmental funding were identified in 1975 by the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. The following examples illustrate the purposes served by the formation of voluntary groups: (a) to initiate new ideas and pioneer where other agencies lack knowledge or are afraid to venture; (b) to support local interest and deal with small scale activities; (c) to provide services that governmental agencies are barred from providing such as minority scholarships; (d) to bring government and business together; and (e) to further active citizenship and altruism, serving as an outlet for public-spirited initiative and activity.

The establishment of an independent educational foundation was suggested by Woodbury (1973) as a viable mechanism by which to

solicit local funds to aid in supporting programs and facilities not adequately provided for elsewhere. Other, equally practical reasons for establishing a foundation were identified by Robison (1982), and include the need to provide flexibility in investment funds; the need to avoid legislative check-offs; the need to provide for the college what the college cannot provide for itself; the need to provide increased voice in the use of funds; and the need to provide a vehicle for donor anonymity.

Kuhnle (1984) identified advantages of establishing a foundation and included, among them, the advantages of a tax exempt status, flexibility in managing gifts outside legislative scrutiny (e.g., seed-money for new programs), and the broadening of community support through the establishment of a foundation board.

This broadened community support is recognized by other writers as a major advantage of a community college foundation. Lake (1981) writes that a foundation broadens

. . . the base of community support for the college through the involvement of members of the community who have identified with the needs of the institution and who are willing to articulate those needs back to the people. (p. 18)

This view was supported by Harper (1976), who saw the foundation serving as ". . . a means of fostering interest in and appreciation for the work of an institution" (p. 48). Research conducted by Duffy in 1979 confirmed that the most significant characteristic of a successful

foundation was that it established strong public relations with the community.

While improved public relations might produce monetary benefits, other writers suggest that a community college foundation should be used as a vehicle for a more direct approach to the community, citing the commonality of interests between the college and its community. Degerstedt (1982) speaks to this purpose when he writes:

In characteristic form, community colleges are returning to the communities from which they grew for their redefinition. And communities across the nation are rallying around a new type of support: the community college foundation. The purpose of this support is to help this "new kid on the educational block" retain its benefits for the community and, wherever possible, to provide an added "margin of excellence."
(p. 51)

Beckes (1982) sees community gifts to the college foundation as investments in the future development of the community itself, investments that ". . . will enhance the services of an institution that is a vital part of the community life" (p. 102). He likens members of the community to good business leaders who are aware that they cannot continuously take from their businesses for personal interests but must periodically reinvest in order to maintain the vitality of the business.

In a similar vein, Kolb (1984) urged community college foundation personnel to rely for support, not on alumni, but on the community itself, saying, "Community colleges are the life blood of the communities--their non-alumni friends." This sentiment is echoed by Gollattscheck, President of Valencia Community College (Florida) (1977) who said:

What we are beginning to realize is that very likely, if we are going to continue as a really comprehensive community college and meet the needs of our community, we are going to have to expect our community to support many of our activities. (p. 2)

As to the uses to be made of the funds generated by the foundation, there also seems to be some general agreement. Robison (1982) reviewed the literature and concluded that the most wide-spread use of foundation funds was in support of student aid in the form of scholarships, loans, or grants-in-aid. Other uses she found were for educational programs, community service programs, capital equipment, and capital facilities. Beckes (1982) found two additional uses for foundation funds: program improvement and faculty development; Keener (1982) added community improvement and student activities to the list.

It seems clear, then, that there are many unmet needs which could be addressed through the use of fund-raising activities. And, in fact, this may be the only way these needs can be met by community colleges. For, as Jones (1977) noted:

Those (institutions) that depend primarily upon public funds face growing taxpayer resistance, and many are reducing the quality and quantity of their services.

In the years ahead, fund-raising success will be more important than ever before. (p. 265)

Effectiveness

The preceding discussion on the purposes of a community college foundation leads naturally to a discussion of effectiveness assessment. Leslie (1969) raised the issue of efficiency vs. effectiveness by defining efficiency as the relationship between the funds expended and the money raised, while effectiveness was defined as measuring the degree to which objectives were achieved. Or, as he suggested ten years later, a foundation's effectiveness should be measured by how well it does with respect to what it sets out to accomplish.

Effectiveness of Foundations

If the primary purpose of a foundation is to bring in large amounts of money, evaluation would be a simple matter: the best foundations would be those which raised the largest amounts of money. And in fact, many earlier writers encouraged this means of evaluation. In 1969, Leslie wrote, "At this stage . . . the amount and cost of gift dollars appear the best measurement of productivity for many institutions, state and private, college and university" (p.

95). In a 1973 study, Sims concluded that the most effective foundation was one that brought in the largest amount of money. With only a slight modification, Silvera (1974) defined a successful foundation as one which raised the largest number of dollars per FTE. But using this criterion, Robison (1982) noted, does not take into account factors such as ". . . the age and size of the college, the age of the foundation, the foundation staffing (if any), and finally community wealth" (p. 36). And, as noted earlier, foundations serve a number of purposes in addition to their fund-raising function.

Luck and Tolle (1978) argued that a foundation should be judged by the fiscal assistance it provided to the college; Lake (1981) implied that the foundation should be judged on the basis of the broadened community support it engenders. Akin to this, others (Sharron, 1978, and Woodbury, 1973) saw an effective foundation as one which improved public relations between the college and the community it served.

The most definitive work to date on the effectiveness of community college foundations was reported by Duffy (1982). Using a panel of experts as well as a survey of presidents and development officers throughout the South, Duffy found that a successful foundation was one which "(a) established strong public relations with the community; (b) involved effective community leaders and potential donors as members; (c) provided a vehicle for community involvement in the institution; (d) had a series of ongoing projects sponsored by

the foundation that were oriented to the college; (e) raised large amounts of money; (f) provided a major source of student aid; and (g) initiated new ideas and processes" pp. (70-71). These functions are rank-ordered and seem to reflect the direction taken by current writers when assessing the effectiveness of community college foundations. An examination of the objectives for the Valencia Community College Foundation (Gross, 1982) confirms Duffy's findings. Examples of these objectives include: increase community interest and annual contributions over the previous year; increase the visibility of the Foundation in the community through public relations activities; increase the visibility of the foundation within the college; increase Board participation and contributions to the College/Foundation; and initiate an appropriate recognition program for donors and supporters of the Foundation.

It seems clear that the goals of the foundation extend beyond fund-raising and that increasing emphasis is being placed on "friend-raising." It is equally clear that a foundation should be evaluated on the basis of its stated purposes, only one of which is that of fund-raising. And, as we shall see, development officers should also be evaluated on multiple dimensions.

Effectiveness of Development Officers

Schein (1980) cites the work of Argyris (1964), Bennis (1962) and McGregor (1960) in arguing that no single factor, such as successful fund raising, be used to determine effectiveness. Instead,

he makes a forceful case for the use of multiple criteria when assessing effectiveness.

Brass and Oldham (1976) developed a means of measuring effectiveness in an industrial setting using multiple criteria. These measures are based on leadership dimensions and include: (a) product quality, (b) training, (c) employee welfare, (d) corrective action, (e) technical ability, (f) customer job requirements, (g) manpower utilization, and (h) administrative functions (p. 654).

This study used an educationally appropriate adaptation of the Brass and Oldham measurements. The instrument utilized a Likert scale and multiple criteria based on the agreed-upon purposes of a foundation noted earlier, and upon the functions outlined below. The development officer's immediate supervisor was asked to conduct the evaluation.

Functions and Characteristics

Are the functions performed by development officers those which would lead to establishing strong public relations, involving community leaders in the institution, organizing projects, raising money, providing major sources of student aid, and initiating new ideas and processes?

Functions of Development Officers

The literature review presents a broad spectrum of notions about

the functions of a development officer. Some, like Cheshire's (1977), are global:

Today, educational fund raisers must be planners, organizers, and solicitors. In these roles, they sometimes serve as advisers and sometimes as doers. As planners, they conceive, express, and negotiate decisions on fund-raising programs. As organizers, they get the right people to do the right things with enthusiasm and commitment. As solicitors, they court prospects, develop a commitment, and follow through on gift decisions. (p. 126)

Or the functions may be defined as narrowly as Robison (1982), who said, "The director's basic job is to provide the foundation board with everything it needs to be effective, which may range from training and promotional materials to well-planned and executed events" (p. 45).

In a 1972 study of community foundations, Zurcher and Dustan found that the duties of the executive director included preparing reports for the board; preparing minutes of board meetings; preparing annual reports; preparing financial reports; securing and supervising office staff; handling correspondence; soliciting gifts and encouraging bequests; promoting the foundation; interpreting the foundation to the public; and maintaining liaison with local officials and leaders (p. 39).

Writing from his own experience in institutional development, Broce (1979) identified three functions performed by a development

officer: planning, fund raising, and public relations. The planning function included learning the needs of the institution and the reasons for these needs. The fund-raising function included soliciting direct gift support from individuals and corporations, developing programs to obtain government support, directing mail appeals, and developing deferred gift programs. The public relations function included writing and printing publications, conducting news-bureau activities, and maintaining media relations.

Rather than defining functions directly, Gross (1982) outlined the skills needed by a development officer in order to be effective. The skills he identified include technical, human, and conceptual skills and provide a glimpse at the functions they serve. One of the functions is that of selling the college and its programs, and the technical skills needed to perform this function include detailed knowledge of the institution, its history, goals, student body, faculty, programs, and community it serves. The function of state and federal reporting requires the working knowledge of reporting systems relevant to the foundation; the function of soliciting planned and deferred gifts requires the knowledge of these and other forms of solicitation. Another function is that of working with the foundation board and with the college staff and requires human skills, including the ability ". . . to get things done with and through other people" (p. 270). Gross identifies conceptual skills which include the ability to visualize the development effort in harmony with the totality of the

collegiate community, but these skills do not lead to a concomitant function.

Webb and Jackson (1979) identified five roles associated with development and these five roles can easily be seen as five functions: 1) lobbyist, 2) conceptualist, 3) writer, 4) budget analyst, and 5) negotiator. As lobbyist, the development officer identifies funding sources and cultivates them. As conceptualist, the development officer aligns community needs with the requirements of the donor. As writer, the development officer prepares proposals for potential contributors. As budget analyst, the development officer prepares a budget which will support the services of the office and conform with all guidelines. And as negotiator, the development officer negotiates funding with the donor.

Although there are some commonalities regarding the functions of the development officer, there is by no means uniform agreement concerning these functions generally, and almost no information in the literature concerning the functions of community college development officers in particular. Therefore, this study developed a list of functions using this partial list gleaned from the literature and from advertisements from recent issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education and validated this list using a panel of experts from the Board of Directors of the National Council for Resource Development, an affiliate council of the AACJC.

Characteristics of Development Officers

As was true of the identification of functions of development officers, so is it also true that the characteristics of development officers receive scant attention in the literature. Perhaps, as Broce (1979) declared, development is a ". . . profession without a measurable skill base" (p. 6). He maintained that this administrative position had no formal "body of knowledge" upon which to draw and that there were no college courses in fund-raising methods, and that what skills there were, were taught by apprentice methods to those who had been trained in other fields and who learned the work by trial and error. Cheshire (1977) confirmed this observation, saying, "The field of educational fund raising traditionally consisted of transplanted administrators, teachers, journalists and businessmen" (p. 125). Heeman (1979) also supported this when he said, "Few people prepare themselves for careers in development. Most of us tend to slide into it from the side" (p. xii). Kolb, in a 1984 AACJC presentation, stated that "The only qualification for a development officer in an Ivy League school is that he wear a blazer with a letter on it."

Edwards and Bender (1983) identify another problem which makes it difficult to characterize development officers in community colleges: those individuals who serve as professional staff often have part-time rather than full-time assignments with the foundation. A 1979 survey by Degerstedt found that only 24 percent of community colleges reported employing any paid staff. Luck and Tolle (1978)

reported that about one-third of the community colleges use a foundation "administrator" as their chief fund-raiser and that most combine the positions of foundation director and chief development officer. They continue by noting that ". . . there are as many different groups or individuals in charge of community college foundations as there are existing foundations" (p. 36).

Though unlikely to specify the characteristics possessed by community college development officers, a number of writers have suggested certain characteristics they believe to be needed. Jones (1977) singled out a "creative imagination" as the most important attribute of a successful fund-raising administrator. Robertson (1982) wrote that the person chosen should have credibility both within the institution (academic credentials) and outside the institution (business experience). Luck and Tolle (1978) stated that the characteristics needed included strong communication skills, human sensitivity, marketing skills, and managerial abilities. Gross (1982) characterized the ideal development candidate as ". . . someone who has administrative competency and professional skills combined with imagination, integrity, and humility" (p. 269).

One national study, conducted in 1980 by Astin and Scherrei, identified the characteristics of development officers in private liberal arts colleges. These researchers found that 90 percent of the development officers were male, that 16 percent had doctorates, and that their mean age was 47 years. The development officers in this study identified qualities needed by their staff as those of

cooperation, initiative, and professional or technical competence. The researchers found that development officers were more likely than other administrators to give high priority to salesmanship, aggressiveness, personal ambition, and competitiveness. These development officers were less likely to value scholarship, interpersonal skills, and effectiveness in dealing with students. (The latter finding was probably due to the fact that development officers have less contact with students than other administrators).

It seems certain that, outside of the Astin and Scherrei study, little effort has been made to identify the characteristics of development officers at colleges and universities nationwide; and almost nothing is known of the demographics, previous employment, or educational background of community college development officers.

One of the aspects of this study was to determine the characteristics of community college development officers. What is the sex, race, and age of these officers? What educational background and work experience do they bring to the position? To whom do these officers report and how large are their staffs? Answers to these questions not only give us a description of the characteristics of community college development officers, but also provide us with insight into the relative importance of the position on community college campuses today.

Leadership

A discussion of the characteristics of development officers leads naturally to a question of their leadership behaviors. There is no information in the literature which describes the leadership behaviors of development officers, though the significance of this position, at least in the mind of some (Luck and Tolle, 1978), ranks with academics, business management, and student affairs in importance. And the issue of leadership was addressed by these same writers when they said, ". . . a community college foundation with inspired leadership can ensure the pragmatic accommodation of institutional needs" (p. 35). This point of view was supported by Degerstedt (1979) who maintained that the selection of the development officer was one of the critical factors in the long term success of the foundation.

So there is some consensus that the position of development officer is of growing importance in community colleges and that the leadership characteristics of the individual occupying that position are critical to the success of development activities. What we do not know is what leadership behaviors are possessed by development officers, and what kinds of behaviors are associated with successful foundations. We do, however, have some information from research studies related to leadership in general.

Leadership Studies

This review gives prompt attention to the fact that there is much disagreement about definitions of leadership and about its substantive nature. As Spotts (1974) observed, "The general conclusion that one might draw is that there is very little consensus about what leadership is or what it should be" (p. 11). This observation was confirmed by Stogdill (1974) when he said: "There are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 7). Not only is there disagreement about how leadership is defined, others question whether leadership makes a difference in outcomes. March (1982) challenges the belief in the efficacy of leadership as well as the reliability of leader success, saying

It seems likely that the difference between a successful leader and an unsuccessful leader is less than we believe, and it seems possible that we may want to question the conventional idea that great leader action should be built on great expectations for the consequences of action.
(p. 13)

Despite these pessimistic observations, an impressive body of research has been conducted regarding the nature of leadership as well as its effects on followers. Stogdill (1974) summarized this research, noting that it fell into eleven classification schemes: "(a) leadership as a focus of group process, (b) leadership as personality and its effects, (c) leadership as the art of inducing compliance, (d)

leadership as the exercise of influence, (e) leadership as act or behavior, (f) leadership as a form of persuasion, (g) leadership as a power relation, (h) leadership as an instrument of goal achievement, (i) leadership as an effect of interaction, (j) leadership as a differentiated role; and (k) leadership as the initiation of structure" (pp. 7-16).

Spotts (1974) divided research studies into four classifications: trait, situational, functional, and interactionistic. Spotts found that early studies utilized the trait oriented approach and sought to discover how leaders differed from followers. Some studies found that leaders were bigger, brighter, and better adjusted than followers but leaders did not differ to a marked degree from followers. Others found that leaders were more enthusiastic, friendly, decisive, knowledgeable, imaginative, and courageous. But rarely did any two tests of traits agree on the essential characteristics to be found in leaders.

Studies exercising the situational approach assume that traits and skills of a "good" leader will vary from situation to situation. These studies show that leadership varies with the needs of the situation.

Spotts found that the functional approach turns the focus away from the individual as leader, to the study of the group. Here, interest is on group survival and attainment of goals. These studies reveal that the behavior of leaders varies with the task at hand and,

further, that this leader behavior ". . . can have marked effects upon group member performance" (p. 18).

Spotts found the interactionistic studies unique in that they stress the quality of leader-subordinate interaction and its effect on productivity, morale, and other goals. This approach uses field studies rather than contrived laboratory settings in order to observe interaction.

Yukl (1981) also summarized the leadership research into four classifications. He noted the trait approach and the situational approach identified by Spotts, but added two slightly different dimensions. Yukl identified a behavior approach which is similar to Spotts' functional dimension in that it focuses on leader behavior. The difference seems to be that the behavior approach seeks to identify differences in behavior patterns between effective and ineffective leaders. He also identified the power-influence approach to the study of leadership which seeks to explain leader effectiveness in terms of the kinds of power available to the leader and how this power is exercised. This classification is similar to Stogdill's classification of leadership studies on power relationship.

With respect to the early trait studies, Yukl agreed with Spotts and Stogdill, saying, ". . . individual traits failed to correlate in a strong and consistent manner with leadership effectiveness" (p. 90). But, he noted, later trait studies carried out in assessment centers have shown the predictive value of traits and skills measurements.

In his critique of the power approach to the study of leadership, Yukl notes that there are some serious methodological problems related to the interpretations of the results. One is that it is difficult to measure the manner in which one individual exerts influence over another individual. Another difficulty is that the studies have omitted intervening variables. In light of conflicting studies regarding the use of power, Yukl concludes that there is a strong possibility of biased results from these studies.

In reviewing behavioral research relative to leadership, Yukl was particularly critical of the use of the questionnaire scales to measure Consideration and Initiating Structure in order to determine leadership effectiveness. These studies, he says, have produced inconsistent results except for the finding that ". . . subordinates are usually more satisfied with a leader who is highly considerate, which is hardly a momentous discovery" (p. 129). He does express some confidence in recent developments aimed at improving this approach using a behavior taxonomy to reconcile diverse findings.

According to Yukl, the situational approach involves complex theories which are imprecisely formulated, and therefore difficult to test. These studies require the use of comparative field studies, longitudinal field studies, and laboratory experiments in order to determine the situational variables as well as the consequences of leader behavior in different situations.

After citing the shortcomings of leadership research to date, Yukl summarizes his findings by saying:

The many hundreds of studies on leadership behavior have provided only limited insight into what leaders do and why they are or are not effective. . . . Improvements are needed in the conceptualization and measurement of leadership behavior. (p. 286)

Though one might agree with Yukl that improvements are needed, we are still left with the knowledge that an impressive body of research related to leadership has been amassed through the years. And some of this research has given particular attention to educational leadership.

Educational Leadership

Many studies of educational leadership have utilized the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII (LBDQ XII) developed by Hemphill (1950). This instrument measures the task-oriented and person-oriented behavior of leaders. It has a 10-item scale for Consideration (person-oriented behavior) and a 10-item scale for Initiating Structure (task-oriented behavior). Each stem describes a leadership act and a set of frequency adjectives for the respondent to indicate how often the leader engages in that behavior (Yukl, 1970). Hemphill (1955) used this instrument to study the leadership of academic department heads and found that administrative competency was related to Consideration and Initiation of Structure.

Stogdill (1974) reported a number of additional education studies supporting Hemphill's findings. There were many studies related to

the leadership of school principals. Studies of administrators other than school principals include Luckie (1963), Carson & Schultz (1964), Lindemuth (1969), Flocco (1969), Bell (1969), Hunter (1959), Charters (1964), Dawson (1970) and Dawson et al. (1972). In these and other studies, superiors' and subordinates' descriptions of Consideration and Initiation of Structure were related to leader effectiveness ratings.

Some of the more important findings in the Stogdill (1974) review were the studies by Greenfield and Andrews (1971) which showed that the Consideration and Initiation of Structure behaviors of teachers were significantly related to the achievement scores of their students. A related finding by Keller and Andrews (1963), and by Hood (1963), was that the leader behavior of second-level leaders was also significantly related to test achievement of followers. From these findings, Stogdill concludes that

. . . the significance of consideration and structure is to be explained, not in terms of leadership, but in terms of followership. The two patterns of behavior emerge as important, not because they are exhibited by the leader, but because they produce differential effects on the behavior and expectations of followers. (p. 141)

Though the significance of consideration and structure may indeed be in terms of their effects on followers, it is still appropriate to examine these dimensions in educational leadership precisely because of their profound effect on achievement. Yukl (1981) asserts

that "The most commonly used measure of leader effectiveness is the extent to which the leader's group or organization performs its task successfully and attains its goals" (p. 5). Certainly, student achievement is a primary goal of education, and it is therefore appropriate to study variables which impact that goal.

Clearly, the ideal methodology in this study would be to triangulate the LBDQ XII scores as rated by superiors and subordinates with the self-description of the development officers. Though desirable, inclusion of this tactic might severely limit the number of usable responses. As Degerstedt (1979) found, only 24 percent of the community colleges employ any paid staff and many of these serve part-time with the foundation (Edwards and Bender, 1983). Because of this expected small number of subordinates, little could be learned from a superior's rating of the development officer's leadership behavior when supervising them. More importantly, the significance of the development officer's leader behavior is to be found in the interaction with the external community rather than with subordinates, and it would be difficult if not impossible to have an external evaluation of leader behavior. In addition, Calver (1984) and Suydam (1984) found no significant difference between an individual's own rating scores and those of his or her supervisor on the LBDQ XII. Therefore, this study was confined to using only a self-description of the development officer's leader behaviors, secure in the knowledge that the LBDQ XII is an attitude measure and that ". . . leaders who are more task-oriented than person-oriented in

their attitudes tend also to be more task-oriented than person-oriented in their behavior" (Yukl, 1970, p. 211).

In addition to assessing leader behavior, situational variables should be considered when assessing the effectiveness of a foundation and its development officer (Robison, 1982). One of these variables is community wealth. As Breneman and Nelson (1980) observed, "Because of variations in district wealth, some communities can support their community colleges more generously . . . than can other districts" (p. 75). Robison (1982) agreed that community wealth should be considered when evaluating a foundation; she also suggested that the size of the college, the age of the foundation, and the foundation staffing be considered.

This study compared the measures of effectiveness of the development officer with the size of the institution based on unduplicated head count. It also compared these effectiveness measures with the age of the foundation and the number of staff members as reported by the development officer, and with the assessed valuation and district population as reported by the development officer's immediate supervisor.

Summary

Though it was clear from this literature review that the position of development officer has become increasingly important on college and university campuses nationwide, there seemed to be little information available on the functions of this position or on the

characteristics of development officers. Though we had some insight as to the characteristics of development officers in private liberal arts colleges, we had no information on those who work at public community colleges. And the only information available related to functions of the position came from studies of community foundations and from first-hand accounts of those practicing in the field.

Though a number of studies had been conducted on leadership behaviors of educational administrators, the leadership behaviors of development officers, thought to be critical to the success of foundations, had not received attention in the literature. It was the purpose of this study to identify the functions of the community college development office position, describe the characteristics of development officers and assess their leadership behaviors.

Recent trends in the literature indicate that the success of a foundation should be measured by its success in meeting its stated purposes and that these purposes extend beyond fund raising. Therefore, the effectiveness of the development officer was measured on a multiple dimension Likert scale which conformed to the purposes of a foundation and with the functions of the development officer as validated by a panel of experts.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to describe the characteristics of community college development officers. Survey instruments were used to determine the sex, race, and age of these officers, their educational background and work experience, the size of their staffs, the age of their foundations, and the names and titles of those supervisors to whom they report. The functions of community college development officers were also determined through the use of a survey instrument. This instrument was developed using a partial list of functions found in the review of the literature, validated first through a perusal of advertisements in recent editions of the Chronicle of Higher Education, and later by a panel of experts from the Board of Directors of the National Council for Resource Development, an affiliate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). This study also describes the leader behaviors of development officers as determined by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire XII (LBDQ XII). Effectiveness was measured using the Brass and Oldham (1976) In-Basket test, modified to reflect the foundation purposes as defined by Duffy (1979) as well as the functions of the development officer as validated by the panel of experts. This instrument was mailed to the

development officer's immediate supervisor. This supervisor was asked to provide information concerning the assessed valuation and district population as well as an opinion concerning the relative affluence of the college district. Information concerning institutional size was found in the 1984 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory.

Research Design

The research method selected for this study was a descriptive survey. This research design, in the words of Best (1970), ". . . describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; . . . attitudes that are held; . . . or trends that are developing" (p. 116).

The surveys were conducted using Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method for Surveys. This survey method is grounded in the social exchange theories of Homans, Blau, and Thibaut and Kelley and has been shown to result in average response rates of 74 percent (Dillman, 1978, p. 21). The procedures recommended by Dillman and used in this study were as follows:

1. A cover letter was prepared explaining the subject of the study, its benefit to the respondent, and the importance of each individual respondent to the success of the study. Enclosed with this letter was the questionnaire and a stamped return envelope.

2. One week later a postcard follow-up was sent to all on the original mailing list. This card thanked those who had responded and served as a reminder to those who had not.
3. Three weeks after the original mailing, a second follow-up was sent nonrespondents. This mailing contained a second cover letter, a replacement questionnaire, and a return envelope.
4. Seven weeks after the initial mailing, a letter and questionnaire were sent by certified mail to the remaining nonrespondents.

All initial and follow-up procedures recommended by Dillman were used in this study.

Also following Dillman's recommendation, each questionnaire was coded with an identification number which was explained in the cover letter. These identification numbers were used to match development officers with their corresponding supervisors as well as to determine the need for follow-up mailings. Once the pairing and follow-up were completed, the identifying names were destroyed in order to protect the anonymity of the respondents. Those who wished to receive a summary of the results of the study were asked to place their names and addresses on the backs of the return envelopes.

Community college development officers and their immediate supervisors were surveyed by mail. The development officers were asked to respond to questions concerning their demographic characteristics, their functions, and their leader behaviors. In addition, they were asked the age of the foundation and the title of their immediate supervisors. Their permission was sought to allow

their immediate supervisors to evaluate their effectiveness. The development officers were asked for their signature indicating their approval of the evaluation. The immediate supervisor was sent a questionnaire regarding the effectiveness of the development officer. The supervisor was requested to provide information on the fiscal wealth of the district and on its size. Statistical analyses were then used to describe relationships among these variables.

Population

This was descriptive research and the population consisted of all development personnel who were employed at two-year public community, technical, and junior colleges in the United States and who were members of the National Council for Resource Development, an affiliate council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Edwards and Bender (1983) utilized the membership of this council in their research because of their conviction that ". . . a high proportion of this group would have a foundation" (p. 2). Because many foundations have been established only in recent years (Robison, 1982 and Angel & Gares, 1981), it seems likely that the older, more established foundations have development officers who organized and supported this affiliate council. Since the focus of this study was limited to those development officers who had reported to their present supervisors for at least one year, it was thought that membership in the council might indicate longevity in the position. The 1984 membership of this organization numbers 453; however, not

all of these members were employed in public community colleges. The Directory of the National Council for Resource Development was used to identify individuals affiliated with public community, technical, and junior colleges in the United States; a questionnaire was then mailed to all those individuals and to their supervisors.

Instrumentation

Two questionnaires were used in this research. The first questionnaire was sent to the members of the National Council for Resource Development (excluding those who participated in validating the functions). This questionnaire had three sections. The first section utilized the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire XII to measure the task-oriented and person-oriented behavior of development officers. Each stem of this 20-item scale described a leadership act and a set of frequency adjectives. The five response categories include: 1) NEVER, 2) SELDOM, 3) OCCASIONALLY, 4) OFTEN, and 5) ALWAYS.

Section two identified the functions of the position of development officer as validated by the panel of experts, and asked that the respondent rate these functions along two dimensions: 1) importance of the function and, 2) responsibility for the function. The importance dimension was rated on a four-point scale as follows: 1. NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR (This is not a function of the development officer).

2. LOW IMPORTANCE (This function is useful, but not vital to the position of development officer).
3. AVERAGE IMPORTANCE (This function is important to the position of development officer).
4. HIGH IMPORTANCE (This function is essential to the position of development officer).

The responsibility dimension was also rated on a four-point scale as follows:

1. NO RESPONSIBILITY (The development officer is not responsible for this job function).
2. DELEGATES RESPONSIBILITY (The development officer delegates this job function to a subordinate supervised by the development officer).
3. SHARES RESPONSIBILITY (The development officer shares this job function with another administrative area).
4. PERFORMS (The development officer performs this job function exclusively).

The third section was used to identify demographic characteristics, education level and major field, the experiential background, years in present position, length of time with present supervisor, the age of the foundation, the size of the staff, and the development officer's immediate supervisor.

Data were available regarding the reliability of the LBDQ XII subscales (Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1963, 1964). All fall in the range of .80 and above for several widely

different populations. With regard to the validity of the LBDQ XII, Stogdill (1969) found evidence that the subscales of the instrument "measure what they are purported to measure" (p. 157).

The second questionnaire was sent to the development officer's immediate supervisor. This instrument was designed to measure the effectiveness of the development officer and was an adaptation of the work of Brass and Oldham (1976). It consisted of eight questions related to the functions and goals of the position and used a four point rating scale ranging on a continuum from 1, INEFFECTIVE, to 4, VERY EFFECTIVE. Brass and Oldham have validated this instrument. Based upon a review of the literature, two additional questions regarding effectiveness were added using the same continuum. One question asked the supervisor to rate the development officer's effectiveness in fund raising; the other asked for an effectiveness rating in friend raising.

In addition to rating the effectiveness of the development officer, the supervisor was asked to provide information on the relative affluence of the district, the assessed valuation of the district and the population of the district.

Research Questions and Analyses

The questionnaires used in this research were designed so that the respondents could mark their answers on the instruments. These data were then transferred to a computer data file for statistical analysis using SPSSX.

Research questions noted in Chapter I, along with subsidiary questions, are outlined in this section. The analytic approach used with each question is also noted.

Question One: What are the selected demographic characteristics of development officers?

Subsidiary Questions:

- 1.1 What are the age, sex, and racial characteristics of individuals who serve as development officers? These data were analyzed using means and percentages.
- 1.2 What is the highest degree earned by development officers? These data were reported using percentages and degree types.
- 1.3 What is the development officer's undergraduate and/or graduate major? This was reported using frequencies by discipline.
- 1.4 How many years of experience does the development officer have in the present position? These data were reported using means and standard deviations.
- 1.5 How many years of experience does the development officer have in a similar position at other institutions? Again, these were reported using means and standard deviations.
- 1.6 If other than development officer, what was this individual's previous position? These data were reported using frequencies by category.
- 1.7 To whom does the development officer report? This information was reported using frequencies by title.

Question Two: What are the functions performed by development officers?

Subsidiary Questions:

- 2.1 What is the relative importance of these functions?
- 2.2 For which functions does the development officer have prime responsibility?

Results of these questions were reported using means, standard deviations and frequencies.

Question Three: What are the leadership behaviors of development officers as measured by the LBDQ XII?

Subsidiary Questions:

- 3.1 To what extent do development officers report person-oriented behavior in their leadership roles?
- 3.2 To what extent do development officers report task-oriented behavior in their leadership roles?

The means and the standard deviations for each of these dimensions were computed and reported. In addition, Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed to determine correlations with selected demographics, situational factors, and effectiveness ratings.

Question Four: What is the overall effectiveness rating of development officers:

Subsidiary Questions:

- 4.1 What is the relationship between effectiveness and selected demographics, situational factors, and functions?

4.2 What is the relationship between effectiveness and leader behaviors?

The total scores, means, and standard deviations were reported for each of the dimensions of the instrument. In addition, regression coefficients, chi squares, and Kendall's Tau's were computed to determine relationships between effectiveness, demographics, situational factors, functions, and leader behaviors.

Question Five: What are the situational differences among institutions?

Subsidiary Questions:

5.1 What is the unduplicated Fall 1983 headcount of each institution?

5.2 What is the population and assessed valuation of the district?

5.3 What is the age of the foundation?

5.4 What is the size of the development office staff?

Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed to determine if there was a relationship between each of these factors and the importance and responsibility of functions, between these factors and leader behaviors, and between these factors and perceived effectiveness.

Question Six: What relationships exist among and between these individual factors? As indicated with each of the previous questions, correlations were computed to determine what, if any, relationship exists among and between selected factors.

Summary

With the tabulation and reporting of these data, information is now available describing the characteristics of community college development officers, their functions, their leadership behaviors and their overall effectiveness ratings. This information can be used for more effective decision-making regarding recruitment of development officers, training of new personnel, and retention of those presently serving in this capacity.

Chapter IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The population surveyed in this study consisted of all development personnel who were employed at two-year public community, technical, and junior colleges in the United States and who were members of the National Council for Resource Development. The 1984 membership of this organization totaled 453; however, not all members were selected for the study. The 1984 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory, published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, was used to identify and eliminate members from those institutions which were not public community, technical, or junior colleges. The officers and members of the Board of Directors of the National Council for Resource Development were eliminated because of their participation in the two pilot studies. Others from the same institutions as the officers and members of the board were also eliminated. Only those members whose titles indicated a direct responsibility for the development function were selected. A cross-check was made to eliminate multiple institutional membership and again, selection was based upon those titles most directly linked with the development function. In cases of multiple institutional membership, members were most often the development officer and his or her supervisor. The supervisors were eliminated because they

were to be surveyed later regarding the effectiveness of the development officer. The final population numbered two hundred.

Each respondent received by mail a questionnaire packet which consisted of the following: (a) a cover letter explaining the nature of and the purpose for the investigation, a promise of confidentiality, and a request that the recipient participate in the study; (b) a three-part questionnaire regarding leadership behaviors, functions, and characteristics of development officers; and (c) a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. A first mailing was sent to the subjects in February; one week later, a follow-up postal card was mailed to all who had been selected. The third week after the original mailing, a follow-up letter and questionnaire packet was sent to all who had failed to respond at that time. By March, 136 usable questionnaires (68%) were obtained. A chi square test for "goodness of fit" between respondents and non-respondents was conducted and no significant differences were found.

The Pilot Study

A pilot study conducted in two phases in the fall of 1984 prefaced the actual study which took place in the winter of 1985. The first phase of the pilot study was conducted to validate the functions of development officers. The functions were first developed by the researcher using the literature and employment advertisements in 50 current editions of The Chronicle of Higher Education. Forty functions were identified and grouped into six categories. From this,

a survey instrument was designed and mailed to five officers of the National Council for Resource Development asking that they respond to the level of importance of each function to the work of a development officer. Responses were received from all five officers. An a priori cut-off of a mean of 2.5 on a four-point scale was used to eliminate four items. The four functions which failed to compute a mean of 2.5 were: (a) identify community needs, (b) provide a major source of student aid, (c) conduct mail campaigns, and (d) create automated records.

The second phase of the pilot study was conducted using the revised list of functions. This phase sought to determine the reliability of the instrument by asking participants to respond to two versions. The first version listed the functions and asked for "yes/no" responses regarding performance, formal assignment, and frequency of performance of the functions. The second version used the same functions and requested a scaled response regarding the importance of each function. These two forms were sent to the 24 members of the Board of Directors of the National Council for Resource Development. After the third follow-up correspondence, 19 participants had completed each version of the survey. Five replacements from the general membership were contacted and the final response to the reliability study was 24. The results on each instrument were submitted to the computer for a reliability analysis and were found to have an alpha of .89 and .90 respectively. Because the validity and reliability had been established for both the leader-

ship instrument and the effectiveness instrument, no further pilot studies were conducted.

Research Questions and Data Analyses

Respondents marked their answers on the questionnaires. These data were transferred onto a coding sheet and then into the computer where they were analyzed using SPSSX. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, mean scores, percentages and standard deviations were secured. Additional analyses were performed to determine relationships among or between variables.

Research Question One: What are the selected demographic characteristics of development officers?

Of a total of 136 subjects, 42.6% ($\underline{n} = 58$) were female and 57.4% ($\underline{n} = 78$) were male. Individuals of American Indian descent comprised .7% ($\underline{n} = 1$), Asians 2.2% ($\underline{n} = 3$), Blacks 7.4% ($\underline{n} = 10$) of the development officers surveyed, while individuals of Hispanic origin added 1.5% ($\underline{n} = 2$), and white, non-Hispanics the remaining 88.2% ($\underline{n} = 120$). Table 1 shows frequencies and percents for the variable, sex. Table 2 shows the frequencies and percents for race.

The variable, age, produced the following configuration. The youngest development officers, those below the age of 34, comprised 8.8% ($\underline{n} = 12$) while those between the ages of 35 - 39 were 32.4% ($\underline{n} = 44$) of the total. Another 26.5% ($\underline{n} = 36$) of the respondents were made up of the group between the ages of 40 - 44 and 16.2% ($\underline{n} = 22$) reported ages from 45 - 49. Lastly, 7.4% ($\underline{n} = 10$) were between 50 -

Table 1
Sex of the Development Officers

Sex	Frequency	%
Female	58	42.6
Male	<u>78</u>	<u>57.4</u>
Totals	136	100.0

Table 2
Racial/Ethnic Characteristics of Development Officers

Race	Frequency	%
American Indian	1	.7
Asian	3	2.7
Black, Non-Hispanic	10	7.4
Hispanic	2	1.5
White, Non-Hispanic	<u>120</u>	<u>88.2</u>
Totals	136	100.0

54 and 8.8% ($\underline{n} = 12$) were over 55 years of age. Table 3 shows these frequencies and percents.

The ungrouped data regarding age showed that development officers had a mean age of 43.58 years with a standard deviation of 8.815.

Table 3
Age of Development Officers

Age	Frequency	%
Under 35	12	8.8
35 to 39	44	32.4
40 to 44	36	26.5
45 to 49	22	16.2
50 to 54	10	7.4
55 and older	<u>12</u>	<u>8.8</u>
Totals	136	100.0

When asked to identify the highest degree earned before becoming a development officer, 2.2% ($\underline{n} = 3$) reported less than a bachelor's degree and 16.2% ($\underline{n} = 22$) reported a degree at the bachelor's level. Another 44.9% ($\underline{n} = 61$) held a master's degree while only

6.6% ($\underline{n} = 9$) reported having a sixth year specialist degree. Moreover, 30.1% ($\underline{n} = 41$) had obtained a doctorate prior to becoming a development officer. Table 4 shows these frequencies and percents.

Of those development officers who reported their undergraduate majors ($\underline{n} = 106$), 21.7% ($\underline{n} = 23$) held degrees in education while 19.8% ($\underline{n} = 21$) had majored in the communication arts (English, Journalism, Theatre, etc.). Another 20.8% ($\underline{n} = 22$) held business degrees and 14.2% ($\underline{n} = 15$) had degrees in the social sciences. The remaining 23.5% ($\underline{n} = 25$) degrees were dispersed among math/science,

Table 4

Highest Degree Before Becoming Development Officer

Level	Frequency	%
Less than a bachelors	3	2.2
Bachelors	22	16.2
Masters	61	44.9
Ed. Specialist or equivalent	9	6.6
Doctorate	<u>41</u>	<u>30.1</u>
Totals	136	100.0

political science, foreign language and others. Table 5 depicts these frequencies and percentages.

Table 5
Development Officers' Major Disciplines at the Bachelors Level

Discipline	Frequency	%
Education	23	21.7
Business	22	20.8
Communication Arts	21	19.8
Social Science	15	14.2
Political Science	7	6.6
Math or Science	6	5.7
Foreign Language	6	5.7
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Totals	106	100.0

Development officers were also asked to report disciplines at the graduate level. Of those reporting degrees at the master's level, ($\underline{n} = 99$), 53.5% ($\underline{n} = 53$) held degrees in education and 12.1% ($\underline{n} = 12$) in business. Degrees in the social sciences accounted for 11.1% ($\underline{n} = 11$), while 10.1% ($\underline{n} = 10$) were in the communication arts. The remainder were scattered among other majors.

Of the 50 development officers presently holding doctorates, 80% ($\underline{n} = 40$) majored in education while 2.0% ($\underline{n} = 3$) had degrees in one of the social sciences, with the remaining degrees scattered among other disciplines. Table 6 summarizes the frequencies and percents for each of these degree levels.

Development officers were found to have a mean of 3.985 years in their current positions and a mean of 1.221 years of prior experience as a development officer. These individuals were found to have a mean of 3.596 years reporting to their present supervisors.

When identifying their previous work experience other than as development officers, these respondents reported a mean of 10.007 years in education and 1.632 years in business, with the remaining experience scattered among industry, government work, self-employment and others. These means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 7.

When asked the title of their immediate supervisors, 69.8% ($\underline{n} = 90$) of the development officers identified the president of the institution as the person to whom they reported. Another 10.3% ($\underline{n} = 14$) said that they reported to a dean, while the remaining 19.9% reported to a vice president, director, or some other administrator. Table 8 summarizes these frequencies and percents.

Table 6

Development Officers' Major Disciplines at the Graduate Level

Discipline	Frequency	%
Masters		
Education	53	53.5
Business	12	12.1
Social Science	11	11.1
Communication Arts	10	10.1
Math or Science	3	3.0
Foreign Language	2	2.0
Political Science	1	1.0
Library Science	1	1.0
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>6.1</u>
Totals	99	100.0
Doctorate		
Education	40	80.0
Social Science	3	6.0
Communication Arts	1	2.0
Foreign Language	1	2.0
Other	<u>5</u>	<u>10.0</u>
Totals	50	100.0

Table 7
Employment History of Development Officers

Experience	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation
Number of years in current position	136	3.985	3.280
Number of years of prior development experience	136	1.221	2.724
Number of years with present supervisor	136	3.596	3.226
Number of prior years in education	136	10.007	8.030
Number of years of military service	136	.449	1.114
Number of years in government service	136	.919	2.733
Number of years in business	136	1.632	4.071
Number of years in industry	136	.684	2.575
Number of years of self-employment	136	.632	2.250
Number of years of other employment	136	1.338	3.884

When questioned about their employment immediately prior to their current position, 56.6% (n = 77) of the respondents reported that they were employed at the same institution, while the remaining 42.6% (n = 58) reported that they had been employed outside their present institution. Table 9 summarizes these frequencies and percents.

Table 8
Development Officers' Immediate Supervisors

Title	Frequency	%
President	90	69.8
Dean	14	10.9
Vice President	13	10.1
Director	7	5.4
Other	<u>5</u>	<u>3.9</u>
Totals	129	100.0

Table 9
Development Officer's Employment Prior to Current Position

Place	Frequency	%
Within present institution	77	57.0
Outside present institution	<u>58</u>	<u>43.0</u>
Totals	135	100.0

Research Question Two: What are the functions performed by development officers?

Using the functions validated in the pilot study, respondents were asked to rate the functions according to their importance. This importance dimension was rated on a four-point ordinal scale as follows:

1. NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR (This is not a function of the development officer).
2. LOW IMPORTANCE (This function is useful but not vital to the position of development officer).
3. AVERAGE IMPORTANCE (This function is important to the success of the development program).
4. HIGH IMPORTANCE (This function is essential to the success of the development program).

Those who marked "Not Responsible For" on the Importance dimension were dropped from the corresponding function on the Responsibility dimension.

The respondents identified Program Planning as the most important functional area. This group of functions scored a mean of 3.714 on the four-point scale. Within this functional grouping, 93.3% of the respondents rated the function, "identifying funding sources," as one of high importance, while 82.1% rated "identifying institutional needs" as a function of high importance. The function, "cultivating potential funding sources," was rated by 80.7% as having high importance. Three other program planning functions were rated high

in importance by at least 68% of the respondents. Table 10 shows this breakdown.

Table 10
Importance of Program Planning Function

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R*	Low	Avg.	High
Identify funding sources	134	0.0	0.0	6.7	93.3
Identify institutional needs	134	4.5	.7	12.7	82.1
Cultivate potential funding sources	135	1.5	.7	17.0	80.7
Match potential donors with community and/or institutional needs	134	3.7	2.2	20.9	73.1
Develop grant proposals	135	4.4	4.4	20.7	70.4
Inform college personnel of funding opportunities	135	0.0	1.5	30.4	68.1

*Not Responsible For

Of the six functional groups, Business and Financial Management ranked second in importance, scoring a mean of 3.301 on the four-point scale. Within this group, the function ranked as most important, "prepare development office budget," had 57.9% of the respondents ranking it as high in importance. "Monitor fiscal aspects

of funded projects" ranked next in importance with 54.5% of the respondents ranking it as high in importance, while "prepare financial reports" had only 42.9% of the respondents ranking it high in importance. Table 11 illustrates these rankings.

Table 11

Importance of Business and Financial Management Functions

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R	Low	Avg.	High
Prepare development office budget	133	6.8	3.8	31.6	57.9
Monitor fiscal aspects of funded projects	134	6.7	7.5	31.3	54.5
Prepare financial reports	133	7.5	11.3	42.9	42.9

The third ranked functional group was that of Personnel Management, with a mean rating of 3.11 on the four-point scale. Within this group, the functions, "supervise staff" and "train staff," scored equal rankings in their level of importance, each receiving 51.9% of the high importance responses. "Recruit staff" had only 46.6% of the respondents ranking it as high in importance. Table 12 depicts these rankings.

Table 12
Importance of Personnel Management Functions

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R	Low	Avg.	High
Supervise staff	133	14.3	3.0	30.8	51.9
Train staff	133	17.3	2.3	28.6	51.9
Recruit staff	133	21.1	6.8	25.6	46.6

Ranking fourth among the functional groups was Community Relations which received a mean of 3.097 on the four-point scale. The functions ranking highest within this group were: (a) "initiate new ideas and processes," with 65.7%; (b) "represent the college to business and governmental leaders, " with 62.1%; (c) "interpret the foundation to the community," with 58.5%; and (d) "involve community leaders in foundation activities," with 57.8%. The remaining four community relations functions were rated as high in importance by fewer than 50% of the respondents, with the function, "conduct planned giving seminars," considered high in importance by only 20.9% of the respondents. These rankings are shown on Table 13.

Ranking as the fifth functional group was that of Administration, with a mean rating of 3.015 on the four-point scale. Four functions within this group were considered as high in importance by more than

Table 13
Importance of Community Relations Functions

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R	Low	Avg.	High
Initiate new ideas and processes	134	6.0	3.0	25.4	65.7
Represent the college to business and governmental leaders	132	5.3	5.3	27.3	62.1
Interpret the foundation to the community	130	19.2	5.4	16.9	58.5
Involve community leaders in foundation activities	128	21.1	5.5	15.6	57.8
Stimulate others to initiate externally funded activities	130	17.7	6.9	36.2	49.2
Prepare promotional publications	132	17.4	5.3	28.0	49.2
Conduct donor recognition activities	128	21.1	4.7	28.9	45.3
Conduct planned giving seminars	129	44.2	14.7	20.2	20.9

50% of the respondents. These four were: (a) "serve as staff director for the foundation," with 62.1%; (b) "insure compliance with appropriate regulations and guidelines," with 60.6%; (c) "oversee the acceptance processing and acknowledgements of private gifts," with

59.8%; and (d) "prepare reports for the foundation board of directors," with 54.5%. Three other administrative functions were seen as less important, with the function, "administer memorial gift program," perceived by only 26.4% as high in importance. These rankings are shown on Table 14.

Table 14
Importance of Administrative Functions

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R	Low	Avg.	High
Serve as staff director for the foundation	132	24.2	4.5	9.1	62.1
Insure compliance with appropri- ate regulations and guidelines	132	11.4	3.0	25.5	60.6
Oversee the acceptance processing and acknowledge- ment of private gifts	127	23.6	5.5	11.0	59.8
Prepare reports for the foun- dation board of directors	132	25.0	3.8	16.7	54.5
Monitor programmatic aspects of funded projects	131	16.0	8.4	26.0	49.6
Prepare status reports on program activities	131	13.7	8.4	34.4	43.5
Administer memorial gift program	129	39.5	7.0	27.1	26.4

The least important functional group was that of Fund Raising, with a mean of 2.829 on the four-point scale. Of the nine specific functions within this group, only three were considered of high importance by more than 50% of the respondents. These three were: (a) "solicit corporate contributions," with 64.1%; (b) "conduct personal visits with potential donors," with 62.2%; (c) "negotiate funding with donors," with 60.6%. The remaining functions were considered of high importance by fewer than 44% of the respondents, with the function, "conduct phonathons," considered as high in importance by only 15.5%. Table 15 illustrates these rankings.

To assess the degree of responsibility, development officers were asked to indicate their level of responsibility along a four-point ordinal scale as follows:

1. NO RESPONSIBILITY (Not a function of the development officer).
2. DELEGATES (Delegates this function to a subordinate).
3. SHARES (Shares this function with another administrative unit).
4. PERFORMS (Has direct performance responsibility).

Those who had previously responded "Not Responsible For" on the Importance dimension were dropped from the corresponding Responsibility function.

As was the case when asked to rate the importance of functional groups, development officers identified Program Planning as the area for which they had the highest degree of responsibility. This group of functions scored a mean of 3.336 on a four-point scale.

Table 15
Importance of Fund Raising Function

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent			
		N/R	Low	Avg.	High
Solicit corporate contributions	131	11.5	7.6	16.8	64.1
Conduct personal visits with potential donors	131	11.5	7.6	18.3	62.6
Negotiate funding with donors	132	11.4	7.6	20.5	60.6
Direct special fund raising events	130	19.2	10.8	26.2	43.8
Recruit volunteers	129	19.4	15.5	21.7	43.4
Direct planned and deferred giving solicitation	131	30.5	10.7	20.6	38.2
Supervise alumni fund drives	128	38.3	11.7	21.9	28.1
Conduct faculty/staff fund drives	130	30.8	15.4	26.2	27.7
Conduct phonathons	129	49.6	17.1	17.8	15.5

The relative rankings of each group with regard to importance can be seen in Table 16.

Table 16
Importance of Functional Groups in Development

Group	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation
Program Planning	135	3.714	.305
Business & Financial Management	133	3.301	.708
Personnel Management	133	3.110	1.024
Community Relations	132	3.097	.759
Administration	132	3.015	.849
Fund Raising	132	2.829	.861

Because the degree of responsibility includes both shared responsibility as well as direct responsibility, and because so few development officers reported delegating responsibility (mean of the means = 7.233), a calculation was made of the combined percentages of the SHARES and the PERFORMS dimensions. The combined percentages in the Program Planning area showed that the function, "cultivate potential funding sources," was rated as the function for which development officers have the most responsibility with a combined percentage of 97.0. The second function in degree of responsibility was "identify funding sources," with 95.5%. The third function was "identify institutional needs," with 91.9%, and the

fourth, "inform college personnel of funding opportunities," with 91.9%. All of the functions within the Program Planning area had combined percentages exceeding 81.0%. Table 17 includes the information regarding the Program Planning functions.

Table 17
Degree of Responsibility for Program Planning

Function	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Cultivate potential funding sources	134	55.2	41.8	97.0
Identify funding sources	135	29.6	69.5	95.5
Identify institutional needs	136	80.9	11.0	91.9
Inform college personnel of funding opportunities	135	25.9	65.2	91.1
Match potential donors with community and/or institutional needs	133	44.4	46.8	91.0
Develop grant proposals	135	37.8	43.7	81.5

Business and Financial Management functions were ranked second in areas of responsibility with a mean of 3.187. Within this functional area, "prepare development office budget" ranked as the function for which development officers carried the greatest responsibility, with a combined percentage of 91.0. The other two functions within this

area were in excess of 71.0%. Table 18 illustrates the responsibilities for the Business and Financial Management functions.

Table 18

Degree of Responsibility for Business and Financial Management

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Prepare development office budget	134	20.1	70.9	91.0
Monitor fiscal aspects of funded projects	135	43.7	35.6	79.3
Prepare financial reports	134	32.1	39.6	71.7

Personnel Management ranked as the third area of functional responsibility, with a mean of 3.093, and with the function, "supervise staff," having the highest combined percentage of 82.8. The functions, "train staff" and "recruit staff," had percentages of 78.9 and 71.4 respectively. Table 19 shows this area of responsibility.

Fourth in rank as an area of responsibility was that of Administration with a mean of 2.839. The functions for which development officers reported the most responsibility were as follows: (a) "insure compliance with appropriate regulations and guidelines," with 78.7%; (b) "serve as staff director for the foundation," with 69.6%; (c) "monitor programmatic aspects of funded projects," with

Table 19
Degree of Responsibility for Personnel Function

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Supervise staff	133	21.1	61.7	82.8
Train staff	133	26.3	52.6	78.9
Recruit staff	133	31.6	39.8	71.4

67.9%; and (d) "prepare reports for the foundation board of directors," with 67.5%. The only function within this group for which the development officers did not report a percentage greater than 63.0 was that of "administer memorial gift program," which scored a combined percentage of only 43.0. Table 20 illustrates these functional responsibilities.

Ranking fifth as an area of responsibility, Community Relations had a mean of 2.791. Three specific functions within this group had combined percentages in excess of 87.0. They were: (a) "represent the college to business and governmental leaders," with 91.0%; (b) "initiate new ideas and processes," with 87.1%; and (c) "stimulate others to initiate externally funded activities," with 87.1%. All but one of the five remaining Community Relations functions had combined percentages exceeding 58.0. The exception was the function, "conduct planned giving seminars," which scored a combined percentage of 29.8. These responsibilities are shown on Table 21.

Table 20
Degree of Responsibility for Administrative Functions

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Insure compliance with appropriate regulations and guidelines	132	29.5	49.2	78.7
Serve as staff director for the foundation	132	3.0	63.6	69.6
Monitor programmatic aspects of funded projects	131	37.4	30.5	67.9
Prepare reports for the foundation board of directors	132	15.2	52.3	67.5
Prepare status reports on program and project activities	132	28.8	37.9	66.7
Oversee the acceptance processing and acknowledgement of private gifts	131	22.1	41.2	63.3
Administer memorial gift program	128	12.5	30.5	43.0

Ranking last as an area of responsibility for development officers was that of Fund Raising, with a mean of 2.597. The function, "solicit corporate contributions," had the highest combined percentage, with 83.7; "negotiate funding with donors" ranked second with, 78.6; and "conduct personal visits with potential donors,"

Table 21
Degree of Responsibility for Community Relations

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Represent the college to business and governmental leaders	134	70.1	20.9	91.0
Initiate new ideas and processes	132	55.3	31.8	87.1
Stimulate others to initiate externally funded activities	132	55.3	31.8	87.1
Interpret the foundation to the community	130	42.5	33.1	74.6
Involve community leaders in foundation activities	129	46.5	27.9	74.4
Conduct donor recognition activities	127	38.6	28.3	66.9
Prepare promotional publications	131	30.5	28.2	58.7
Conduct planned giving seminars	124	16.1	13.7	29.8

third, with 77.7. The two lowest ranking functions in this area had combined percentages of 45.7 and 21.8 respectively. These rankings are shown on Table 22.

The degree of responsibility for functional groups is shown on Table 23. The functional areas considered most important (Table 16) by development officers and the functional areas for which

Table 22
Degree of Responsibility for Fund Raising

Function	<u>n</u>	Percent		
		Shares	Performs	Total
Solicit corporate contributions	129	42.6	41.1	83.7
Negotiate funding with donors	131	42.7	35.9	78.6
Conduct personal visits with potential donors	130	46.2	31.5	77.7
Direct special fund raising events	130	34.6	33.1	67.7
Recruit volunteers	131	38.2	25.2	63.4
Direct planned and deferred giving solicitation	126	31.0	27.0	58.0
Conduct faculty/staff fund drives	125	28.0	20.8	48.8
Supervise alumni fund drive	127	21.3	24.4	45.7
Conduct phonathons	129	10.5	11.3	21.8

development officers reported carrying the most responsibility (Table 23) were similar in rank on both dimensions, with the areas of Administration and Community Relations reversing positions on the responsibility dimension.

Table 23

Degree of Development Officer's Responsibility for Functional Groups

Group	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation
Program Planning	135	3.336	.372
Business & Financial Management	134	3.187	.687
Personnel Management	133	3.093	1.028
Administration	132	2.839	.876
Community Relations	132	2.791	.658
Fund Raising	131	2.597	.793

Research Question Three: What are the leadership behaviors of development officers as measured by the LBDQ XII?

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to measure the extent to which development officers reported person-oriented (Consideration) or task-oriented (Initiation of Structure) behaviors in their leadership roles. The results showed that development officers scored high on both dimensions of the leader behavior scale. Of the 135 responses, the mean score of person oriented behavior on the five-point ordinal scale was 4.076 with a standard deviation of .346, while the mean score of

task-oriented behavior was 4.034 with a standard deviation of .367. Table 24 illustrates these findings.

Table 24

Task-Oriented and Person-Oriented Behavior of Development Officers

Behavior (<u>n</u> = 135)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Person-Oriented (Consideration)	4.076	.346
Task-Oriented (Initiation of Structure)	4.034	.367

Research Question Four: What is the overall effectiveness rating of development officers?

To measure the effectiveness of development officers, an adaptation of the Brass and Oldham (1976) instrument was sent to the immediate supervisors who had been identified by the development officers in the initial survey. These supervisors were asked to respond on a four-point scale to the first eight questions which were taken from the Brass and Oldham instrument. These questions were designed to measure the general effectiveness of the development officers. Ninety-eight development officers who had reported to their present supervisors for at least one year granted permission to contact these supervisors. This questionnaire was mailed in March; a

follow-up was sent three weeks later. Eighty-seven responses were returned (89% of those granting permission).

Because the original instrument had been subjected to adaptation to reflect the difference between an academic setting and an industrial environment, a statistical analysis was conducted to determine the reliability of the modified questions. This analysis produced an alpha of .885 and the instrument was presumed to be reliable.

Effectiveness, as measured by this instrument, was found to have a mean of 3.203 and a standard deviation of .503 on a four-point ordinal scale. Caution is advised when interpreting these data regarding effectiveness because only those development officers who granted permission for the evaluation were included. A self-selection bias is likely to be in operation.

From a review of the literature, two additional questions regarding effectiveness were added to the questionnaire and were analyzed separately. The first question asked the supervisor to rate the development officer's effectiveness in fund raising; the second asked for an effectiveness rating in "friend raising." Supervisors were asked to choose among four responses ranging from 1, INEFFECTIVE, to 4, VERY EFFECTIVE. These responses were collapsed into a table which shows the percentage of development officers who are regarded as effective or not effective fund raisers and as effective or not effective friend raisers.

Of the 86 development officers rated on the fund raising dimension, 79.1% (n = 68) were considered effective, while 20.9% (n = 18)

were considered not effective. Of the 87 rated on the friend raising dimension, 92.0% ($\underline{n} = 80$) were considered effective, while 8.0% ($\underline{n} = 7$) were considered not effective. Table 25 shows the results produced by these two questions.

Table 25
Effectiveness in Fund/Friend Raising

Effectiveness	<u>n</u>	Percent
Fund Raising		
Effective	68	79.1
Not Effective	<u>18</u>	<u>20.9</u>
Totals	86	100.0
Friend Raising		
Effective	80	92.0
Not Effective	<u>7</u>	<u>8.0</u>
Totals	87	100.0

Because the literature suggests that there is a relationship between effectiveness ratings and leader behaviors, a statistical analysis using Pearson's correlation was performed to discover if there was a relationship between effectiveness ratings and leader behaviors of development officers. No such relationship was found.

Task-oriented behavior and effectiveness had a coefficient of $-.0453$, while person-oriented behavior and effectiveness had a coefficient of $-.0756$.

Correlations were also computed to determine if there was a relationship between leader behaviors and the fund raising/friend raising dimensions of the evaluation instrument. Again, no relationships were found, with fund raising having a coefficient of $.0005$ with task-oriented behavior and a coefficient of $-.1266$ with person-oriented behavior, while friend raising had a coefficient of $.0756$ with task-oriented behavior and a coefficient of $-.0411$ with person-oriented behavior.

Correlation coefficients were computed to determine if there was a relationship between effectiveness and certain demographics, situational factors, functions, and leader behaviors. No significant correlations were found between effectiveness and: (a) the number of development office staff members; (b) the population of the district; (c) the wealth of the district; (d) the importance of, and degree of responsibility for, the fund raising function; and (e) the importance of, and degree of responsibility for, the community relations (friend raising) function. Crosstabulations were computed to determine if there was a relationship between effectiveness and sex, race, and institutional size; none was discovered. The only statistically significant relationship with effectiveness was that of the development officer's age. This relationship had a coefficient of $-.2888$, suggesting that as age increased, effectiveness decreased.

Research Question Five: What are the situational differences among institutions?

The unduplicated Fall 1983 headcount as reported in the 1984 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory was used to determine the size of the institutions. Of the 136 institutions used in the study, 14.0% ($\underline{n} = 19$) had fewer than 1500 students, 41.95% ($\underline{n} = 57$) had between 1500 and 4000 students, while 44.15% ($\underline{n} = 60$) had more than 4000 enrollments. Table 26 displays these frequencies and percents.

Table 26

Institutional Size Based Upon Unduplicated Headcount

Size	Frequency	%
Under 1500	19	14.00
1500 - 4000	57	41.95
Over 4000	<u>60</u>	<u>44.15</u>
Totals	136	100.00

Of the 135 development officers who responded to the question regarding the existence of a foundation at their institutions, 91.9% ($\underline{n} = 124$) reported having one while 8.1% ($\underline{n} = 11$) reported having no foundation. The frequencies and percents regarding the existence of foundations are reported on Table 27.

Table 27

Numbers of Institutions Which Have Established Foundations

Have Foundation	Frequency	%
Yes	124	91.9
No	<u>11</u>	<u>8.1</u>
Totals	135	100.0

In reporting the age of these foundations, it was learned that 32.1% ($\underline{n} = 43$) had been established for fewer than two years while 18.7% ($\underline{n} = 25$) were from three to five years old. Another 38.1% ($\underline{n} = 51$) were reported to be between six and 15 years old and 11.2% ($\underline{n} = 15$) had been established for more than 16 years. The frequencies and percents regarding the age of foundations are reported on Table 28.

With regard to the size of the office staff, it was found that development officers supervised a mean of 1.081 administrators, .681 faculty, and 2.667 staff. The range was from zero to ten for administrators, zero to 25 for faculty, and zero to 30 for staff. The means and standard deviations are reported on Table 29.

Table 28
Age of Foundations

Years	Frequency	%
Under two years	43	32.1
Three to five years	25	18.7
Six to 15 years	51	38.1
16 years and older	<u>15</u>	<u>11.2</u>
Totals	134	100.0

Table 29
Number of Personnel Supervised by Development Officers

Personnel	<u>n</u>	Mean	Standard Deviation
Administrators	136	1.081	1.967
Faculty	135	.681	3.075
Staff	135	2.667	4.119

Supervisors were asked to report both the property values as well as the populations of their districts. The wealth of the district

was then computed by dividing the property values by the population. But with only 49 of the supervisors responding to the question regarding property values of the districts, caution is advised in interpreting the results. A cross-check on wealth was made by asking supervisors to respond on a five-point ordinal scale regarding the affluence of their districts. A Pearson's correlation was used to determine if there was a relationship between wealth and effectiveness as measured by the Brass-Oldham instrument, and between wealth and effectiveness in fund raising. These respective coefficients were .0461 and .0091. The coefficient for affluence and effectiveness was $-.0677$ and for affluence and effectiveness in fund raising, .0111, indicating that there was no significant relationship between either wealth or affluence and the effectiveness of development officers.

Research Question Six: What relationships exist among and between these individual factors?

Crosstabs as well as correlations were computed for variables which the literature suggested might be related. As was expected, there was significant and positive correlation between the number of staff reporting the development officer and both the importance and degree of responsibility for the personnel management function (coefficients of .2232 and .1879). The other significant relationship found in this study was that which existed between the age of the development officer and effectiveness as measured by the Brass and Oldham instrument. Yet even this relationship can be considered

weak, with age accounting for about 8 percent of the variance in effectiveness.

Summary of Chapter Four

While other research has supported a relationship between leader behaviors and effectiveness, no such relationship was found in this study. The suggestion that effectiveness might also be related to institutional size, the wealth of the district, or the age of the foundation also was not supported in this study. However, the self-selection of those development officers who were evaluated and the low response rate for district property values may make these findings misleading.

This study does offer some support for the significance of the community relations (friend raising) function by showing that this function ranks above that of fund raising in both importance and degree of responsibility. Development officers were also rated as more effective on this dimension than on that of fund raising. However, both functions received relatively low ratings on both the Importance and Responsibility dimensions.

Also supported by this study is evidence of the growing numbers of institutions which have established foundations. Another finding supported by this study is that development officers possess diverse educational backgrounds and that they supervise a very small number of staff members.

This study was conducted primarily as descriptive research and as such developed a body of information regarding the characteristics and the functions of community college development officers who are members of the National Council for Resource Development. There were few confirmations of previous studies and only one significant relationship which could not have been expected. The relationship between the age of the development officer and the effectiveness measure was unexpected, but hardly of major significance.

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem identified for purposes of this study was that very little was known about the demographic characteristics, the educational background, or the previous employment experience of community college development officers. Even less was known about their leadership skills, the functions they perform, and their effectiveness. Yet, the position of development officer was becoming one of increasing importance on community college campuses nationwide. This study addressed that problem through the use of survey research to determine the characteristics, functions, leader behaviors, and effectiveness of development officers who were members of the National Council for Resource Development.

This chapter will be devoted to discussions and conclusions of the four dimensions of this study: the characteristics, the functions, the leader behaviors, and the effectiveness of community college development officers. This chapter will also include interpretations and research implications where warranted.

Characteristics

Age, Race, Sex, and Previous Experience

Most of the development officers in this study were white, non-Hispanics, but nearly 12 percent were minorities. More than half

were male. The mean age of these development officers was 44 years and more than 30 percent had received doctoral degrees before becoming development officers.

Though most of these development officers came to their present positions from educational settings, some support was found for Cheshire's (1977) contention that development officers were former teachers, administrators, journalists or businessmen. Most of these development officers reported little previous experience in development work.

Conclusions

Astin and Scherrei (1980) found that development officers employed by private liberal arts colleges were 90 percent male and had a mean age of 47 years. Sixteen percent of those development officers held doctoral degrees. Thus, it would seem that development officers in the present study were more evenly divided between male and female, were younger, and were better educated than those serving in the private colleges studied by Astin and Scherrei.

This study found that more than half of the community college foundations had been established within the last five years. Thus, it can be concluded that the field of development is an expanding administrative area at a time when other administrative positions have become static or have fallen under the ax of retrenchment. This study also suggests that women and minorities are using development as a ladder of opportunity for upward mobility into community college administration.

This study supported Broce's (1979) speculation that the profession was one without a measurable skill base in that these development officers were quite varied with respect to their undergraduate disciplines. Their undergraduate degrees were about evenly divided among education, communication arts, business and the social sciences. Thus, one can conclude that development officers have no formal training at the baccalaurate level for the positions they hold. Graduate degrees were overwhelmingly in the field of education and one can intuit that these development officers also had no graduate training in development work.

It would seem that not only do these development officers have no formal education in the field, they also have had little on-the-job training. What they know of the development field they have had to learn in the limited time they have spent in their present positions.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, it is recommended that colleges of education provide graduate training or clinical experience in community college development. It is further recommended that professional organizations such as the National Council for Resource Development continue to provide workshops, seminars and other in-service activities and that community colleges encourage and support the development officer's participation in these activities.

Functions

With regard to the functions of development officers, evidence was found in support of Zurcher and Dustan (1972) when the present study found some commonality of functions between development officers and executive directors of community foundations. Those included: (a) preparing reports for the board of directors, (b) soliciting gifts, (c) promoting the foundation, (d) interpreting the foundation to the public, and (e) maintaining liaison with local officials and leaders.

That only 75 percent of the development officers serve as executive directors of their foundations was a surprising finding. However, one respondent's explanation, that development officers in his state were required by law to maintain an "arm's length" relationship with their foundations, might account for a good portion of the remainder.

Support was also found for some, but not all of Broce's (1979) identifiable functions. When reporting the importance and the degree of responsibility for functions, development officers in this study revealed various elements of program planning as the most important functions and the ones for which they carried the most responsibility. They also reported that they performed the functions of public relations and of fund raising. These findings are in agreement with Broce. What this study did not confirm was any substantial activity with regard to deferred gift programs as reported by Broce. Broce's function of "conducting mail appeals" was removed from the list of

functions in the major survey because this function was not validated in the pilot study.

This study revealed that development officers considered of little importance the functions of: (a) conducting planned-giving seminars, (b) administering memorial gift programs, (c) supervising alumni fund drives, (d) conducting faculty/staff fund drives, and (e) conducting phonathons. It was not clear from this study whether these functions were performed by others or simply not performed at all. With the exception of the faculty/staff fund drives, these functions can be seen as directly or indirectly related to alumni of the college.

When examining the development office functions, an interesting disparity seems to emerge. Two of the three most important program planning functions and ones for which development officers report the most responsibility were those of: (a) identifying funding sources, and (b) cultivating potential funding sources. Yet the least important functional area and the one for which development officers report the least responsibility was that of fund raising. This disparity may be due solely to the artificial manner in which the functions were grouped. It is possible that, had two or three of the Program Planning functions been shifted to Fund Raising, Fund Raising would have had a higher rating. However, an examination of the data from both the Importance table and Responsibility table offers another explanation. Most of the fund raising functions show a higher percentage of respondents sharing these functions than performing them exclusively. A similar finding was also made

regarding the community relations function in that development officers reported more shared than direct responsibility for this functional area.

Conclusions

Community college development officers occupy second-level staff positions, with most reporting directly to the presidents of their institutions. It can be concluded that development officers have control over program planning, business management, personnel, and administrative functional areas, but exercise less control over the community relations and fund raising areas. It would seem that the presidents of these institutions maintain close control over the fund raising and friend raising functions.

Many believe that community college alumni have few ties of loyalty to these institutions, and this belief may account for the lack of importance for functions related to alumni. This study would support the notion that community colleges have become cognizant of the importance of "friend raising," but have not yet begun to address the need for "friend retention."

Recommendations

In the researcher's opinion, community colleges have done an admirable job of marketing themselves as second-chance emporia and have a wealth of untapped loyalty in the form of grateful alumni. While not likely to be considered prospects for large gifts, these alumni, nevertheless, should be the focus of college efforts at "friend retention." Benefits to the college include a more positive public

image from grateful alumni, foundation support in the form of larger numbers of small gifts, and the prospect of substantial gifts in future years as these alumni age and prosper. It is recommended that community colleges expand their friend raising function to include activities designed to enhance "friend retention" by nurturing their alumni. This is, after all, the successful model long used by four-year colleges and universities.

Leader Behaviors

Stogdill (1963) contended that the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was a research device and, therefore, had no norms. However, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) concluded that those individuals who were high on both the task-oriented and the person-oriented dimensions were ideal leaders in all fields because such individuals were able to please both their superiors and their subordinates. That development officers rated high on both dimensions and were also perceived as effective by their superiors tends to support the conclusions of Hersey and Blanchard.

Conclusions

The position of development officer is a leadership position in a staff role, with little interaction with other administrative positions. Additionally, most development officers have few staff members reporting to them and, as one respondent noted, it was difficult to describe leader behavior when there was ". . . no staff to lead." There is little information in this study with regard to the relative

positions of the development officer, the president, and the trustees and their respective contributions to community relations, fund raising and friend raising.

Recommendations

Community colleges should examine the interface between their development office functions and the functions once reserved to presidents and to the members of the Boards of Trustees. An effort should be made to clarify the development officer's position with regard to leadership roles and coordination of efforts in fund raising and friend raising.

Effectiveness

Development officers in this study were asked to identify their immediate supervisors and to grant permission for an evaluation. An evaluation instrument was then sent to those supervisors so identified. Effectiveness of development officers, as measured by this instrument, was found to have a mean of 3.203 and a standard deviation of .503 on a four-point scale, indicating that supervisors rated their development officers as effective in their performance. Two other questions were asked regarding effectiveness in fund raising and in friend raising and, again, supervisors reported that their development officers were effective on both dimensions. Caution is again advised in interpreting these findings since only those development officers who granted permission for the evaluation were included.

Development officers were rated as most effective on the friend raising dimension of the evaluation, suggesting that there may be some corresponding agreement between this question and earlier questions regarding the relative importance of fund raising and friend raising functions. This would not support Sims (1973) nor Silvera (1974) who believed that effectiveness was measured by the amount of money raised.

Robison (1982) suggested that the size of the college, the age of the foundation, the staffing of the development office, and the wealth of the community might be related to effectiveness. Again, no significant relationships were found. Only one variable of interest, age, was found to be related to effectiveness, with the younger development officers considered to be more effective. However, this relationship can be considered weak, with age accounting for only about eight percent of the variance in effectiveness.

Conclusions

With regard to the effectiveness of development officers, it can be concluded only that those development officers who granted permission to be evaluated were considered to be effective. It was conjectured that those development officers who might have been considered ineffective may have chosen not to grant permission.

A relationship was found between age and effectiveness but no tests were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between age and the granting of permission to be evaluated. For this reason

and for reasons related to the problems with the effectiveness measure, no conclusions can be drawn.

Recommendations

From this study, it seems clear that those who supervise development officers should continue to assign more weight to successful friend-raising activities than fund-raising activities when evaluating these development officers. Another recommendation would be that supervisors continue to encourage and support development officers' participation in in-service educational activities offered by professional organizations. These in-service efforts should certainly be targeted to those development officers who are perceived as being less than effective.

Subjective Interpretations

This study was designed to provide a data base from which to answer several research questions. However, this data base proved larger than the questions it was designed to answer. The real import of this study can be gleaned from a few subjective interpretations. The first of these is that the position of development officer in community colleges is relatively new and is in the process of evolving and establishing functional parameters. Development officers serve in staff positions, planning development activities but having secondary roles in executing these activities. The presidents retain controlling interest in development office functions. It is not clear from this study just what responsibilities development officers now have for

functions formerly reserved for trustees. It is also not clear from this study how the functions of the development officer act to complement the mission of the college, in that the function, "provide a major source of student aid," was not seen as sufficiently important by the panel of experts in the pilot study to remain an identifiable function in the major survey.

It is clear from this study that the characteristics of development officers more closely resemble, in gender and racial composition, the community college student population than do administrators in the 1984 studies of Calver and Suydam. Rather, the real import of this study is not in that finding, which only reflects a moment in time. The substance of this study lies in its clear delineation of functional competencies needed by development officers. With these competencies defined, realistic job descriptions can be developed and more appropriate evaluations can be conducted. Parameters can be established for in-service activities and direction can be set for professional organizations to offer workshops, publish relevant newsletters, and commission topical papers. Colleges of education can incorporate at least an overview of the position in order that graduate students have an opportunity to become familiar with the field of community college development.

Future Research

This study was descriptive in nature and, as such, was designed to gather base-line data. Questions emanating from this

study regarding community college development officers have been alluded to earlier in this chapter. More specificity will be provided in this section.

1. It is recommended that research be conducted to determine which community colleges have developed successful "friend retention" programs with their alumni and to identify elements of these programs which are most conducive to success.

2. A study should be undertaken to determine the respective roles of development officers, presidents, and trustees with regard to the functional areas of community relations, friend raising, and fund raising.

3. With only 75 percent of the development officers serving as executive directors of their foundations, and because some respondents indicated that this was mandated by state law, a study should be undertaken to ascertain the impact of state legislation upon foundation organization and activity.

4. Because this study found a substantial difference in the characteristics of development officers in private, four-year colleges and those in public community colleges, it is recommended that a comparative study be conducted to determine if those same differences exist at private, two-year institutions.

5. In view of the fact that the development position is relatively new and in the process of evolution, it is recommended that another study collecting similar data be conducted within five years to determine what changes have occurred over time.

References

- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1984).
1984 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory.
Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior
Colleges.
- Andrews, F. E. (1950). Philanthropic Giving. New York: Russell
Sage Foundation.
- Angel, D. & Gares, D. (1981). A bull market for foundations.
Community and Junior College Journal, 52, 5-6.
- Astin, A. W., & Scherrei, R. A. (1980). Maximizing leadership
effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Beckes, I. K. (1982). Gifts and bequests for the two-year college
foundation. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), The community
college (pp. 101-117). Washington, DC: National Council
for Resource Development.
- Bell, T. O. (1969). A study of personality characteristics of
school superintendents in relation to administrative behavior.
Dissertation Abstracts, 29A, 2049-2050.
- Best, J. W. (1970). Research in education (2nd ed.). Englewood
Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Brass, D. J. and Oldham, G. R. (1976). Validating an in basket test using an alternative set of leadership scoring dimensions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 652-657.
- Breneman, D. W. & Nelson, S. C. (1980). The community college mission and patterns of funding. In G. B. Vaughn (Guest ed.), New directions for community colleges: Questioning the community college role (pp. 73-82). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Broce, T. E. (1979). Fund Raising. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Calver, R. A. (1984). The profile, functions, behaviors and effectiveness of chief business officers in American public community colleges. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Doctoral Dissertation.
- Carson, J. O. & Schultz, R. E. (1964). A comparative analysis of the junior college dean's leadership behavior. The Journal of Experimental Education, 32, 355-362.
- Charters, W. W. (1964). Teacher perceptions of administrator behavior. St. Louis: Washington University.
- Cheshire, R. D. (1977). The state of the art. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 121-128). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1982). The american community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. (1975). Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector (Research Report).
- Dawson, J. E. (1970). Consideration and ICS: Instructor leadership influencing student performance. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Human Learning Research Institute.
- Dawson, J. E., Meese, L. A., & Phillips, J. L. (1972). Effect of instructor-leader behavior in student performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 369-376.
- Degerstedt, L. M. Non-profit foundations formed by public community colleges: Profile for their use for external funding. (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1979) Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3723-A.
- Degerstedt, L. M. (1982). The strategies and perceptions of community colleges and the foundation: A national perspective. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), Community college foundation (pp. 49-66). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- DeNevi, D. (1984). Notes of an NCRD intern: Billions in funding for the asking. NCRD Dispatch, 9, 15.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: Wiley.
- Duffy, E. F. Evaluative criteria for community college foundations. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4371-A.

- Duffy, E. F. (1982). Characteristics and conditions of a successful community college foundation. In W. H. Sharron (Ed.), Community college foundation (pp. 67-88). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Edwards, J. E., & Bender, L. W. (1983). Women and community college foundations: Status, myths and insights. (Institution for Studies in Higher Education Monograph). Tallahassee: Florida State University College of Education.
- Flocco, E. C. (1969). An examination of the leader behavior of school business administrators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 30(1A), 84-85.
- Greenfield, T. B., & Andrews, J. H. M. (1961). Teacher leader behavior. Alberta Journal of Education Research, 7, 92-102.
- Gollattscheck, J. F. (1977, September). [Interview with Donald J. Tolle]. Luck, M. F., & Tolle, D. J. (1978). Community college development: Alternative fund raising strategies. Indianapolis: R & R Newkirk.
- Gross, E. K. (1982). The role of the executive director. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), Community college foundation pp. 263-277). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Halpin, A. W. (1955). The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders. Harvard Education Review, 25, 18-32.
- Harper, W. A. (1976). College foundations bring in the \$ \$ \$. Change, 8, 48-49.

- Heeman, W. (1979) Editor's notes. In W. Heeman (Ed.), Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. vii-xvi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950). Leader behavior description. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1955). Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputations of college departments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 385-401.
- Hemphill, J. K. and Coons, A. E. (1950). Leader behavior description. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personnel Board.
- Hemphill, J. K. and Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1972). Management of organizational behavior, 2nd. Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Hood, P. D. (1963). Leadership climate for trainee leaders: The army AIT platoon. Washington, DC: Human Resources Research Office.
- Hunter, F. (1959). Top leadership, U.S.A. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Jones, H. L. (1977). The future of educational fund raising. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of insitutional advancement (pp. 265-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keeler, B. T., & Andrews, J. H. M. (1963). Leader behavior of principals, staff morale, and productivity. Alberta Journal of Education Research, 9, 179-191.
- Keener, B. J. (1982). The foundation's role in resource development. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), Community college foundation (pp. 3-17). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Kolb, J. (1984, April). Private fundraising in community colleges. In O. H. Scheidt (Moderator), Special Session 6. Symposium conducted at the 64th annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC.
- Kuhnle, J. (1984, April). Private fundraising in community colleges. In O. H. Scheidt (Moderator), Special Session 6. Symposium conducted at the 64th annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC.
- Lake, D. B. (1981). Founding a foundation: A mini case study. Community and Junior College Journal, 52, 18-20.
- Leslie, J. W. (1969). Focus on understanding and support: A study in college management. Washington, DC: American College Public Relations Association.

- Leslie, J. W. (1979). Variations in fund-raising potential among colleges and universities. In W. Heemann (Guest Ed.), Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. 59-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lindemuth, M. H. (1969). An analysis of the leader behavior of academic deans as related to the campus climate in selected colleges. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Doctoral Dissertation.
- Luck, M. F., & Tolle, D. J. (1978). Community college development: Alternative fund-raising strategies. Indianapolis: R & R Newkirk.
- Luckie, W. R. (1963). Leader behavior of director of instruction. Dissertation Abstracts, 25, 1960.
- March, J. G. (1982). Emerging developments in the study of organizations. The Review of Higher Education, 6, pp. 1-18.
- Muller, S. (1977). The definition and philosophy of institutional advancement. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.) Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 1-9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Robertson, A. J. (1982). The role of the community college foundation. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), The community college foundation (pp. 89-99). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.

- Robison, S. (1982). The development of the two-year college foundation and techniques of success. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.) The community college foundation (pp. 31-48). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Rowland, A. W. (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Sarthory, J. A. (1974). Education leadership as organizational renewal. In J. A. Sarthory (Ed.), Educational leadership, renewal and planning (pp. 29-38). New York: MSS Information.
- Schein, E. H. (1980). Organizational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Sharron, W. H., Jr. (1978). The development and organization of the community college foundation. (NCRD Resource Paper No. 18). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Silvera, A. L. (1974). The design and utilization of non-profit foundations affiliated with California community colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2017A. (University Microfilms No. 74-21, 509)
- Sims, H. D. (1976). Private funding through public support. Community and Junior College Journal, 47 (2), 30-31.

- Sims, L. M. (1973). The college related foundation as a viable concept for resource development in Alabama. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 6998A. (University Microfilms No. 75-09, 942)
- Smith, H. W. (1979). Voluntary support: The end product of fund-raising activities. In W. Heemann (Guest Ed.), Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising: New directions for institutional advancement (pp. 1-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Snead, J. J. Variables associated with the effectiveness of non-profit foundations affiliated with selected Florida public community junior colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3075-3076A.
- Spotts, J. V. (1974). The problem of leadership: A look at some recent findings of behavioral science research. In J. A. Sarthory (Ed.), Educational leadership, renewal and planning (pp. 10-28). New York: MSS Information.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII. An experimental revision. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1969). Validity of leader behavior descriptions. Personnel Psychology, 22, 153-158.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Macmillan.

- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement (Monograph No. 88). Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. Journal of Psychology, 54, 259-269.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1963). The leader behavior of United States Senators. Journal of Psychology, 56, 3-8.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1964). The leader behavior of presidents of labor unions. Personnel Psychology, 17, 49-57.
- Suydam, W. L. (1984). The function, profile, leader behavior and effectiveness of deans of occupational education in public community colleges of the United States. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Doctoral Dissertation.
- Watkins, B. T. (1984, April 18). 2-year colleges step up pursuit of private funds. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 14.
- Webb, R. D., & Jackson, R. J. (1979). Teaming up for resource development. Community and Junior College Journal, 50 (1), 40-41.
- Woodbury, K. (1973). Community college foundation. Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (4), 16-17.

- Young, J. H. (1980). Resource development in the community college: A time to re-think priorities. Community College Review, 8 (1), 24-26.
- Yukl, G. A. (1970). Leader LPC scores: Attitude dimensions and behavioral correlates. The Journal of Social Psychology, 80, 207-212.
- Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zurcher, A. J., & Dustan, J. (1972). The foundation administrator. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Appendix A
Development Officers' Questionnaire
and Correspondence

Cover Letter

Questionnaire

A LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-6981

February 4, 1985

Dear Development Officer:

Development is an important and ever-expanding function in the community colleges. Many writers believe that this function has become the "fourth estate" in institutions, ranking in importance with academics, student affairs, and business management. Yet little information is available concerning the position of the development officer or the individuals who fill these positions.

You are one of a small number of development officers who are being asked to provide information on this matter. Because this is a national study, it is of crucial importance that each questionnaire be returned in order that the results truly represent the thinking of development officers nationwide.

Your assistance in this project is vital to its success. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only.

The results of this national study will be available to community college administrators, university professors and government officials. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

Should you have any problems with this request, please contact me at my University address, or phone (703) 961 6106. You have my deepest appreciation for your help.

Sincerely,

Sylvia B. Mays
Researcher

Enclosures

QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING FUNCTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

(Please read each function carefully. On the left side of the function CIRCLE the level of importance of this function to your work. On the right side of the function CIRCLE the degree of responsibility you have for the performance of this function. If there are additional functions you feel should be included or corrections in those listed, please add and rate them in the spaces provided).

How important is this function to your work as development officer?

- 1 NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR (Not function of d. officer)
- 2 LOW IMPORTANCE (Useful function but not vital)
- 3 AVERAGE IMPORTANCE (Important to the success of the development program).
- 4 HIGH IMPORTANCE (Is essential to the success of the development program).

When this function is performed, to what degree do you perform it yourself?

- 1 NO RESPONSIBILITY (Not function of d. officer).
- 2 DELEGATES (Delegates to a subordinate).
- 3 SHARES (Shares responsibility with another administrative unit).
- 4 PERFORMS (Has direct performance responsibility).

How Important?				To What Degree?				
HIGH IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR	NO RESPONSIBILITY	DELEGATES	SHARES	PERFORMS	
Functions								
This is a list of functions of college development officers.								
Category A: Program Planning								
4	3	2	1	21. Identify institutional needs.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	22. Identify funding sources.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	23. Match potential donors with community and/or institutional needs.	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	24. Develop grant proposals.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	25. Cultivate potential funding sources.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	26. Inform college personnel of funding opportunities.....	1	2	3	4
Comments or additions: _____								
Category B: Personnel Management								
4	3	2	1	27. Recruit staff.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	28. Train staff.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	29. Supervise staff.....	1	2	3	4
Comments or additions: _____								
Category C: Business and Financial Management								
4	3	2	1	30. Prepare development office budget.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	31. Prepare financial reports.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	32. Monitor fiscal aspects of funded projects.....	1	2	3	4
Comments or additions: _____								
Category D: Fund Raising								
4	3	2	1	33. Recruit volunteers.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	34. Supervise alumni fund drive.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	35. Direct special fund raising events.....	1	2	3	4

How Important?				To What Degree?				
HIGH IMPORTANCE	AVERAGE IMPORTANCE	LOW IMPORTANCE	NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR	NO RESPONSIBILITY	DELEGATES	SHARES	PERFORMS	
4	3	2	1	36. Conduct phonathons.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	37. Conduct faculty/staff fund drives.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	38. Solicit corporate contributions.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	39. Conduct personal visits with potential donors.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	40. Negotiate funding with donors.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	41. Direct planned and deferred giving solicitation.....	1	2	3	4
				Comments or additions: _____				

				<u>Category E: Community Relations</u>				
4	3	2	1	42. Represent the college to business and governmental leaders..	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	43. Interpret the foundation to the community.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	44. Involve community leaders in foundation activities.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	45. Conduct donor recognition activities.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	46. Conduct planned giving seminars.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	47. Initiate new ideas and processes.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	48. Stimulate others to initiate externally funded activities....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	49. Prepare promotional publications.....	1	2	3	4
				Comments or additions: _____				

				<u>Category F: Administration</u>				
4	3	2	2	50. Serve as staff director for the foundation.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	51. Prepare reports for the foundation board of directors.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	52. Insure compliance with appropriate regulations and guidelines.	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	53. Monitor programmatic aspects of funded projects.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	54. Prepare status reports on program and project activities....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	55. Administer memorial gift program.....	1	2	3	4
4	3	2	1	56. Oversee the acceptance processing and acknowledgement private gifts.....	1	2	3	4
				Comments or additions: _____				

These first questions ask for information about your leadership behaviors.*

(Please read each item carefully and think about how often you engage in the behavior described by the item. CIRCLE the number of the response that best describes the frequency of your behavior on that item).

	NEVER	SELDOM	OCCASIONALLY	OFTEN	ALWAYS
1 NEVER (You <u>do not</u> do it).					
2 SELDOM (You <u>do it sometimes</u>).					
3 OCCASIONALLY (You do it about 50% of the time).					
4 OFTEN (You do it <u>most</u> of the time).					
5 ALWAYS (You do it <u>all the time</u>).					
1. Let group members know what is expected of them.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. Am friendly and approachable.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. Encourage the use of uniform procedures.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. Try out my ideas in the group.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. Put suggestions made by the group into operation.....	1	2	3	4	5
7. Make my attitudes clear to the group.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. Treat all group members as my equals.....	1	2	3	4	5
9. Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. Give advance notice of changes.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. Assign group members to particular tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. Keep to myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. Make sure that my part in the group is understood by the group members.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. Look out for the personal welfare of group members.....	1	2	3	4	5
15. Schedule the work to be done.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. Am willing to make changes.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. Maintain definite standards of performance.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. Refuse to explain my actions.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Act without consulting the group.....	1	2	3	4	5

*These items are taken from the list of behaviors developed by Stogdill, 1963.

Finally, we would like to ask you about yourself to help interpret the results: (Please complete each question as indicated).

57. Your sex (Circle number of your answer). 1 MALE 2 FEMALE

58. Your present age: _____ YEARS.

59. Your race (Circle your answer).

- 1 AMERICAN INDIAN
- 2 ASIAN
- 3 BLACK, NON-HISPANIC
- 4 HISPANIC
- 5 WHITE, NON-HISPANIC
- 6 OTHER _____

60. What are the major disciplines of study for the degrees that you have obtained? (Indicate the major subject for each degree you have earned in the space provided, i. e., education, psychology, business, etc.).

LESS THAN A BACHELOR'S DEGREE _____

BACHELOR'S DEGREE _____

MASTER'S DEGREE _____

ED. SPECIALIST OR EQUIVALENT _____

DOCTORATE _____

OTHER (degree name) _____

61. What was the highest degree you had earned when you first became a development officer? (Circle the number of your answer).

- 1 LESS THAN A BACHELOR'S DEGREE
- 2 BACHELOR'S DEGREE
- 3 MASTER'S DEGREE
- 4 ED SPECIALIST OR EQUIVALENT
- 5 DOCTORATE
- 6 OTHER (degree name) _____

62. If you have worked in jobs other than as a development officer, how many years of full-time work experience do you have in any of the areas listed below? (Enter the number of years of full-time work experience in each area listed).

<u>Area</u>	<u>Number of Years</u>
Education	_____
Military	_____
Government	_____
Business	_____
Industry	_____
Self-Employment	_____
Other (type work) _____	_____

63. If you have served as a development officer prior to obtaining your current position, how many years did you serve? (If none, write "0"). . . . _____ YEARS
64. How many years have you served in your current position?
_____ YEARS
65. How many years have you reported to your present supervisor?
_____ YEARS
66. Was the job you held immediately prior to your current position . . . (Circle the correct number).
- 1 WITHIN YOUR PRESENT INSTITUTION?
2 OUTSIDE YOUR PRESENT INSTITUTION?
67. How many and what level of employees do you supervise?
(Number of employees)
- _____ ADMINISTRATORS
_____ FACULTY
_____ STAFF
68. What is your current title? _____
69. Does your institution have a legally-established foundation through which to receive contributions?
(Circle correct number).
- 1 YES
2 NO
70. If the answer to question 69 is YES, how many years has this foundation been in existence? _____ YEARS
71. Who is your immediate supervisor?
- *Name _____ Phone (____) _____
Title _____

* This person will be contacted for information regarding the effectiveness of development at your institution. Please indicate your permission to contact this person by adding your signature below.

SIGNATURE _____

Appendix B

Development Officers' Immediate Supervisors'

Questionnaire and Correspondence

Cover Letter

Questionnaire



A LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-6981

April 4, 1985

Dear Supervisor:

Development is an important and ever-expanding function in the community colleges. Many writers believe that this function has become the "fourth estate" in institutions, ranking in importance with academics, student affairs, and business management. Yet little information is available concerning the position of the development officer or the individuals who fill these positions.

You have been identified by your development officer as his or her supervisor, and you are one of a small number of individuals being asked to provide information on this position. Your institution is one of a limited number of community, technical and junior colleges selected for this study. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the thinking of the development officers and their immediate supervisors, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes, allowing us to check your name off of the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this national study will be available to community college administrators, university personnel and government officials. You may receive a summary of the results by writing "copy of results" on the back of the return envelope.

Should you have any problems with this request, please contact me at my University address, or phone (703) 961 6106. You have my deepest appreciation for your help.

Sincerely,

Sylvia B. Mays
Researcher

Enclosures

DEVELOPMENT OFFICER EVALUATION

Please read each effectiveness item carefully and consider the level of effectiveness demonstrated by the DO* on each dimension. Decide and rate the DO as (1) INEFFECTIVE (2) BELOW AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS (3) ABOVE AVERAGE EFFECTIVENESS (4) VERY EFFECTIVE. Draw a CIRCLE around only ONE of the four numbers following each item to show the answer you have selected.

*Development Officer

	<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Below Average Effectiveness</u>	<u>Above Average Effectiveness</u>	<u>Very Effective</u>
1. PROGRAM QUALITY: the extent to which the DO ensures that the development program is of high quality	1	2	3	4
2. STAFF DEVELOPMENT: the extent to which the DO ensures that staff and volunteers are adequately trained	1	2	3	4
3. EMPLOYEE WELFARE: the extent to which the DO establishes acceptable employee-management relationships	1	2	3	4
4. CORRECTIVE ACTION: the extent to which the DO identifies and corrects problems	1	2	2	4
5. TECHNICAL ABILITY: the extent to which the DO possesses the technical knowledge and ability to do the job	1	2	3	4
6. USER JOB REQUIREMENTS: the extent to which the DO satisfies the various user demands for services	1	2	3	4
7. RESOURCE UTILIZATION: the extent to which the DO coordinates the use of staff, facilities and equipment to maximize productivity	1	2	3	4
8. ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS: the extent to which the DO completes assigned administrative duties	1	2	3	4
9. FUND RAISING: the extent to which the DO is successful in raising funds for the college	1	2	3	4
10. FRIEND RAISING: the extent to which the DO is successful in improving public relations between the college and the community it serves	1	2	3	4

The following questions relate to the wealth of the district served by your college.

11. Please CIRCLE the response that most accurately describes your service area.

- (a) highly affluent
- (b) somewhat affluent
- (c) of average affluence
- (d) below average affluence
- (e) much below average affluence

12. What is the assessed valuation of the property in your district? _____

13. What is the population of your district? _____

Appendix C

Postcard Follow-up to Questionnaire

February 12, 1985

Last week a questionnaire seeking information about your functions as a development officer was mailed to you. You are one of a small number of development officers selected for this national study.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small number of development officers, it is extremely important that your response be included in the study if the results are to accurately reflect the functions of development officers nationally.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it has been misplaced, please call me right now, collect (703-961-6106), and I will get another in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Sylvia B. Mays
Researcher



Appendix D
Letter Follow-up to Questionnaire
 VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

A LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT (703) 961-6081

February 28, 1985

Dear Development Officer:

About three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking information on the functions of development officers as well as on the individuals who serve as development officers in community colleges nationwide. As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire.

Our research unit has undertaken this study because we believe that development officers play a major role in their respective institutions. However, little information exists concerning this position or the individuals who serve as development officers. This study intends to develop a data base for use by community colleges, universities and state officials to better understand the significance of the development officer in community college administration.

I am writing you again because of the importance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. You are one of fewer than 200 development officers nationally who have been contacted regarding this study. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the thinking of development officers, it is essential that each officer complete the questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a duplicate is enclosed. You may receive a summary of the results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope.

Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please call me at (703) 961-6106. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Sylvia B. Mays
 Researcher

Enclosures

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**