



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2012

An Analysis of the Variables Associated with Alumni Giving and Employee Giving to a Mid-Sized Southeastern University

Christine Hawk Loveday
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Loveday, Christine Hawk, "An Analysis of the Variables Associated with Alumni Giving and Employee Giving to a Mid-Sized Southeastern University" (2012). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1216. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1216>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

An Analysis of the Variables Associated with Alumni Giving and Employee Giving to a Mid-Sized
Southeastern University

A dissertation

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

by

Christine Hawk Loveday

May 2012

Dr. Terrence Tollefson, Chair

Dr. Virginia Foley, Committee Member

Dr. Jim Lampley, Committee Member

Dr. Kurt Loess, Committee Member

Keywords: Alumni, Alumni Giving, Employee Giving, Fundraising, Philanthropy

ABSTRACT

An Analysis of the Variables Associated with Alumni Giving and Employee Giving to a Mid-Sized

Southeastern University

by

Christine Hawk Loveday

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship among selected demographic variables and donor or nondonor status of alumni and employees at the participating university. The variables involving alumni were gender, highest degree earned, and college of major study. The variables regarding employees were gender and position.

The study was conducted using archived alumni data from the Alumni Association's database program and the archived employee data from the Office of Human Resources' database program.

The population for this study consisted of the 76,728 alumni and the 2,279 full-time employees of a mid-sized southeastern university during the fiscal year 2009-2010.

The results of the data analysis gave insight into what degree alumni and employees gave back to their university and place of employment. For example, 3.9% of alumni were found to be donors while 18.4% of employees were shown to be donors. The percentage of alumni who donated increased with each advanced degree earned. Males in both categories, alumni and employees, donated at a higher percentage than females. In the employee category, faculty were shown to

donate at a higher percentage than administrators or staff. The study provided an increase in the body of knowledge of the variables of alumni giving and employee giving at the participating university.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my husband Bob Loveday, my two daughters Ashley and Alyssa, and my parent's JC and Ruth Hawk. I want to thank Bob for 32 years of marriage and for supporting my educational efforts for 15 of those 32 years. Ashley and Alyssa, I hope this inspires you to fulfill your goals, no matter what your age is, but hopefully sooner than later. To my Mom and Dad, thanks for all the years of encouragement, watching the girls while I was in class, and not giving up on me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to several people for their support and encouragement throughout my program and dissertation process:

To Dr. Terrence Tollefson, Chair, for your unending guidance, advice, and encouragement, not only through my doctorate program and dissertation but during my master's degree program as well.

To Dr. Jim Lampley, Committee Member, for your guidance through my dissertation, particularly the statistical portion.

To my committee members Dr. Kurt Loess, Dr. Louise MacKay (until retirement), and Dr. Virginia Foley for your support during my dissertation process.

To BettyAnn Proffitt, Executive Aide, for all of your years of assistance in the ELPA program.

To Tammy Hamm, Human Resources Director, and Shea Renfro, Advancement Services Director, for approving access to university data.

To Eric Crigger, HR Systems Manager, and Donald Harvill, Computer Operations Coordinator, for your expertise in data mining and retrieval. In particular thanks to Donald Harvill for years of questions and guidance regarding the data.

To Anita Black for your expert editing skills.

To Dr. Susan Twaddle for your expert statistical skills. I will always appreciate your encouragement and guidance.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION.....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
LIST OF TABLES	10
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	11
Statement of the Problem.....	13
Significance of the Study.....	13
Research Questions.....	13
Definitions and Explanations of Terms	14
Limitations and Delimitations.....	15
Procedures.....	15
Organization of the Study	16
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
What is Philanthropy?	18
History of Charity or Philanthropy	21
History of Philanthropy in Higher Education	25
History of Fundraising.....	26
Principles, Values, and Ethics of Fundraising.....	27
Fundraising and Campaigns.....	30
The Need for Donations to Higher Education.....	33
Funding Crisis in Higher Education	33

Rising College Costs to Students.....	34
Foundations and Corporate Giving Shifts	36
Fewer Alumni Making Donations	37
Rising Costs to Provide Higher Education.....	39
Declining Financial Support by State Governments.....	40
Giving Models and Donor Motivation.....	40
Alumni Giving Theories and Decision Models	44
Alumni and Nonalumni Giving Variables	47
Demographic Variables	48
Academic Variables.....	51
Attitudinal or Motivational Variables.....	53
Involvement Variable	54
Philanthropic Variables	56
The Status of Giving in the USA: Donors and Recipients	57
Donors.....	58
Recipients	60
The Status of Giving to Higher Education.....	62
Those Who Donate to Higher Education	62
Uses of the Contributions to Higher Education.....	64
How Giving is Affected by Economic Slowdowns and Recessions.....	64
Summary	68
3. RESEARCH METHODS	70
Research Design	70
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	70
Research Question 1.....	70

Research Question 2.....	71
Research Question 3.....	71
Research Question 4.....	71
Research Question 5.....	72
Instrumentation.....	72
Population	72
Threats to Validity	72
Data Collection.....	73
Data Analysis.....	74
Summary	74
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	75
Research Questions	75
Research Question 1.....	76
Research Question 2.....	77
Research Question 3.....	79
Research Question 4.....	82
Research Question 5.....	83
Summary	84
5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
Summary of the Findings	85
Research Question 1.....	86
Research Question 2.....	86
Research Question 3.....	87
Research Question 4.....	87
Research Question 5.....	88

Conclusions	88
Recommendations to Improve Practice	89
Recommendations for Further Study	91
REFERENCES	93
VITA	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Alumni and Employee Donors and Nondonors	76
2. Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by Gender	77
3. Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by Degree.....	78
4. Pairwise Comparisons Using the Holm's Sequential Bonferroni Method for Alumni Giving by Degree Earned	79
5. Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by College of Major Study.....	81
6. Cross-Tabulated Table for Employee Giving by Gender	82
7. Cross-Tabulated Table for Employee Giving by Position	83
8. Results for the pairwise Comparisons Using the Holm's Sequential Bonferroni Method.....	84

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze the demographic variables associated with alumni giving and employee giving. Philanthropy has been important to the development of colleges and universities as far back as the 13th century; Oxford probably owes its existence to the benefaction of William of Durham, who died in 1249. Colonial colleges in the United States date back to the 17th century, when John Harvard, for example, donated half of his estate to support the college that would bear his name. Americans have continued giving generously of their time and possessions to support higher education. Today private donations to higher education have developed into a multi-billion dollar enterprise with a total of \$28 billion given to public and private colleges and universities in the 2009-2010 fiscal year alone (Council for Aid to Education, 2011). This total is comprised of giving from corporations, foundations, religious organizations, other organizations, alumni and nonalumni individuals, with alumni and foundations consistently representing the largest sums. Without alumni supporting their alma maters there would not be funds for colleges to support their visions and turn dreams into reality (Baluss, 1995). Buckla wrote in his 2004 doctoral dissertation,

Understanding philanthropic phenomena in higher education merits study because fundraising is a critical source of revenue that helps maintain academic program quality, invigorates capital projects, and spurs exponential endowment growth providing a stable source of operating income during times of prosperity and times of financial distress. (p. 2)

During the fiscal year 2009-2010 alumni donated 25.4% or approximately \$7.10 billion of the \$28 billion donated to American colleges and universities (Council for Aid to Education, 2011). Even though this is a staggering number, it represented a decline in alumni giving from the previous year. It is important to study the variables and demographics associated with alumni giving, because it provides substantial financial support to colleges and universities. Knowing precisely who is likely to contribute and why may enhance the effectiveness of university fundraisers, a development that would have significant implications for administrators and policy makers.

According to Rhodes (1997) fundraising was critically important to colleges and universities. He stated that two prerequisites for successful fundraising were public trust in the institution and public confidence in the integrity of its leaders and programs. It takes time and effort to build trust and confidence. Contacts have to be made and relationships have to be cultivated. Rhodes (1997) contended that “friend-raising was the basis for fundraising” (p. xviii) when he said:

To solicit funds is not to go, cap-in-hand, begging support for some marginal activity. It is, instead, to invite a friend to share in the privilege of the greatest partnership of all, the quest for knowledge, on which our present existence and our future well-being depend. (p. xxiv)

The donations of alumni and other supporters of higher education have certainly added to the framework of higher education through their support of research, curricular development, property, buildings and equipment, and community outreach. Their generous efforts have helped to start the careers of numerous professionals, scientists, and scholars. Their visionary endeavors

also have led to countless endowed chairs and professorships and supplemented endless educational activities.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study is to determine if there are any associations for both university employees and alumni between or among age, gender, faculty or staff status and giving status.

Significance of the Study

Alumni and employee financial contributions provide the potential for increased revenue for colleges and universities. In this study, I have attempted to determine a method of differentiating between alumni and employee donors and nondonors. Knowing who the likely donors are can allow development officers to target those who are most likely to give.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?
2. Is there a significant relationship among highest degree earned and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?
3. Is there a significant relationship among college of major study and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

4. Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university?
5. Is there a significant relationship among positions of staff, faculty and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university?

Definitions and Explanations of Terms

Following are definitions of words and terms that are pertinent within this study:

1. Alumna: A girl or woman who has attended or graduated from a particular school, college, or university. (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition,, 2003, p. 37)
2. Alumnae: Women who have attended or graduated from a particular school, college, or university. (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition, 2003, p. 37)
3. Alumni: Persons who have attended or have graduated from a particular school, college, or university. (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition, 2003, p. 37)
4. Alumni giving: The process whereby alumni of a college or university give back monetarily by any method (one-time, annual, planned) to their alma mater. (Researcher)
5. Alumnus: A person who has attended or has graduated from a particular school, college, or university. (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition, 2003, p. 37)
6. Capital Campaign: An intensive fundraising effort designed to raise a specified sum of money within a defined time period to meet the varied asset-building needs of an organization.

http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/TheFundRaisingSchool/PrecourseReadings/precourse_capitalcampaignspierpont.aspx

7. Donation: The act of donating, making a gift or free contribution to a charity or public institution. (*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition,, 2003, p. 371)
8. Employee Giving: The process whereby employees, including staff, administrators, and faculty of a college or university, give back monetarily by any method (one-time, annually, payroll deducted, planned) to that college, or university. (Researcher)
9. Fundraising: Strategized efforts of institutions or organizations to secure funds from targeted populations. (*Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, 1981, unabridged).
10. Philanthropy: Altruistic concern for human welfare and advancement, usually manifested by donations of money, property, or work to needy persons, by endowment of institutions of learning and hospitals, and by generosity to other socially useful purposes. (*Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, 1966).

Limitations and Delimitations

This study is limited to the alumni data on giving in the database of the university's Banner System for the fiscal year 2009-2010. This study is additionally limited to the employee data on giving in the database of the university's Banner System for the fiscal year 2009-2010. The results of this study may not be generalized to other institutions.

Procedures

The following procedures were employed in conducting the study:

1. Approval of the study by chair and members of the dissertation committee.
2. Approval to conduct the study was requested and obtained from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB).
3. A review of related literature was conducted.
4. Predictor variables and criterion variables were identified.
5. Predictor variables were analyzed in relationship with criterion variables.

Organization of the Study

The subjects for this study included all certificate, associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree recipients from a mid-sized southeastern university who were in the alumni association's Banner database program and ended with fiscal year 2009-2010; and full-time employees from the same mid-sized southeastern university during the fiscal year 2009-2010. University records regarding alumni giving were generated from the university's Alumni Association in the Office of Advancement using the university's Banner database program and pulled from the fiscal year 2009-2010. University records regarding employee giving were generated from the Office of Human Resources using the university's Banner database program and extracted for the fiscal year 2009-2010. SPSS statistical software was used to conduct the analysis.

The dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 consists of the statement of the problem, significance of the study, the research questions, the definitions and explanations of terms, the limitations and delimitations, the procedures, and the organization of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature and discusses philanthropy, alumni giving, employee

giving, alumni giving models, and the variables concerned with alumni giving and employee giving. Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures used, including information about the research design, population for the study, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter 4 contains the data analysis and findings of the study. The data from the study have been presented, analyzed, and discussed. Chapter 5 integrates the summary, general conclusions, and recommendations to improve practice and for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

What is Philanthropy?

The term, “philanthropy,” is derived from the Greek word, *philanthropia*, meaning “loving mankind.” Fisher and Quehl (1989) stated that philanthropy included voluntary giving, voluntary service, and voluntary association primarily for the benefit of others. Philanthropy is many times used synonymously with charity. The term, “charity” comes from the Latin word *caritas* which means “love”. The two terms, philanthropy and charity, have continued to be intertwined, but philanthropy has become the preferred term. Fisher and Quehl (1989) stated,

Charity is generally considered to be an act of goodness designed to reduce or eliminate human suffering, pain, or any other unfortunate condition immediately. Philanthropy is more general and long-term: It is an action directed at elevating humankind and preventing, rather than allaying, calamity. (p. 19)

Fisher and Quehl (1989) continued to say that there would be no need for charity if philanthropy were practiced to its fullest.

Andrews, in *Philanthropic Giving*, illustrated the difference between charity and philanthropy in the following story, as relayed in Fisher and Quehl’s (1989) *The President and Fund Raising*:

A people lived in a village at the base of a great cliff. At the top of this cliff ran a much-used highway, and so many hapless travelers fell over the cliff that the kindly

villagers were always busy picking them up and caring for their wounds. Finally, at great expense, the villagers bought an ambulance, which they kept ready at the base of the cliff to provide better care for the unfortunate wayfarers. One day, a thoughtful old man said, “Why do you not build a fence at the top?” But the screams of the suffering were loud in the villagers’ ears, and helping the injured kept them so busy that they could not take time to climb the cliff and build the fence. And besides, they all knew, there is little charity in fence building (Andrews, 1950, 43 – original source not certain). (p. 20)

Fisher and Quehl (1989) summarized that philanthropy was for the long term and charity for the short term and that we would most surely always need both. Their view was that philanthropy should be such a staple fixture in universities and that charity would be needed only by the most disadvantaged.

Defining philanthropy also leads us to the dictionary, where *The Second College Edition of The American Heritage Dictionary* (1985) defines philanthropy as “the effort or inclination to increase the well-being of mankind, as by charitable aid or donations; love of mankind in general; an action or institution designed to promote human welfare” (p. 931). This dictionary defines charity as

the provision of help or relief to the poor; almsgiving; something that is given to help the needy; an institution, organization, or fund established to help the needy; an act or feeling of benevolence, good will, or affection; indulgence or forbearance in judging others; leniency; the benevolence of God toward man; the love of man for his fellow men;

brotherly love (p. 260).

Altruism is a close companion of philanthropy. Altruism is defined in *The Second College Edition of The American Heritage Dictionary* (1985) as the: “concern for the welfare of others, as opposed to egoism; selflessness” (p. 99). The altruistic person, as opposed to someone who is egoistic, would believe that an act of charity would be performed with no thoughts of any personal satisfaction to the giver. On the other hand, psychologists such as Fromm (1956) in *The Art of Loving* have suggested that the more a person thought of others, the more others would think of that person and the better the person would think of him or herself. This idea is explored in more detail later in a discussion of the altruism theory and how it relates to donating behavior.

Payton in his book entitled *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good* (1988) presented philanthropy as a “living tradition.” He stated that “philanthropy, as a tradition, has common roots, themes, practices and values.” Payton regarded philanthropy as ever changing and argued that philanthropy was an “essential defining characteristic of civilized society.” Payton defined philanthropy in his book as “large-scale giving by foundations and individuals to enhance the quality of life in the community” including “acts of mercy to relieve suffering, and to provide assistance to those unable to fend for themselves in meeting the ordinary daily challenges of life” (p. 148).

Contemporary academic groups continue to debate the precise meaning of philanthropy, and the definition changes to meet the interests of the academic groups using the term (Sulek, 2008). Salamon proposed that an accepted contemporary working definition of philanthropy was “the private giving of time or valuables (money, security, property) for public purposes” (Sulek,

2008, p. 4). Sulek analyzed Salamon's definition in his "On the Meaning of Philanthropy" (2008) and synthesized that philanthropy might be "best understood... as the application of private means to public ends;" contrasted with "government taxation, defined as the application of public means to public ends;" or the "market exchange, defined as the application of private means to private ends" (p. 4). This Salamonian definition of philanthropy has been accepted by most scholars of philanthropy (Sulek, 2008, p. 4).

As has been shown, the term "philanthropy" has a very complex existence with deep, rich shades of meanings. Such meanings may both differ and interrelate and may depend on the settings where used whether historical, common, contemporary, or academic.

History of Charity or Philanthropy

Charity can be traced back to Egyptian civilization as early as 4000 B.C. where in the *Book of the Dead* passages can be found that praised those who gave bread and water to the hungry and the thirsty (Budge, 1967). From the Egyptian tombs built around 2500 B.C. records have been found of giving and doing "good" because of a desire to improve in the afterlife. Charity held a high priority in ancient Egypt and it was motivated by religious beliefs.

Although charity arose from the Egyptian cultures, classical civilizations gave us philanthropy. It is commonly understood that philanthropy has its roots in Ancient Greece and Rome. Sulek (2008) in his presentation *On the Meaning of Philanthropy* stated that during the 4th century B.C., the term, "philanthropia," began to be used more widely throughout Athenian society. That was more likely due to the establishment of institutions of higher learning in Athens including Plato's Academy, founded in around 387 B.C. and Aristotle's Lyceum, founded in 335

B.C. In addition during this time there were oratorical schools such as the one started by Isocrates (436-338 B.C.), who founded his school of oratory in approximately 392 B.C., that would certainly have influenced later generations of Athenian orators including Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.), and Aeschines (389-322 B.C.) (Sulek, 2008). Isocrates used the word “philanthropia” in his first known speech, *Panegyricus*, an oration delivered in 380 B.C. at the pan-Hellenic gathering at Olympia (Sulek, 2008). Sulek (2008) discussed how Demosthenes had suggested “that philanthropia must be supplemented by thoughtfulness, or risk becoming mere benevolence” (p. 27); but how Aeschines, on the other hand, asserts “that philanthropia signified only friendliness or kindness, signaling the advent of its social form of usage” (p. 28). Sulek (2008) described how members of Plato’s Academy compiled a dictionary of terms that were philosophically significant during the mid-4th century and how 183 terms were later included in the 2nd century A.D. edition of Plato’s works published by Thrasyllus. Thus, the only known formal definition for philanthropia in existence from the classical age of Greece is as follows: “Philantropia. A state of well educated habits stemming from love of humans. A state of being productive of benefit to humans. A state of grace. Mindfulness together with good works” (Sulek, 2008, p. 28). The example of the Greeks was later followed by Pre-Christian Romans. Their motivation for charity was not out of pity for the needy but also for the benefit of any worthy citizen or for the state (Fisher & Quehl, 1989).

According to Messina the major world religions can all point to their belief in service to those in need. Buddhists believe that compassion is a basic part of living right, and Muslims practice charitable giving as one of their five pillars of correct behavior. Hindus feed the holy men who wander in India and have extended this charity for thousands of years. The holy book of

Islam, the Koran, states “Your smiling in your brother’s face is charity.” The Zoroastrian scripture states that there are 33 ways to paradise, and, “He who is blessed on account of charity is able to go on all those ways” (Messina, 2009, p. 1).

The Jewish charitable tradition can be dated back to the Egyptians and this charity is termed “tzedakah,” which means “sharing what we have with the poor and doing good deeds” (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 22). Fisher and Quehl explained that in the *Old Testament*, Jacob saw a vision and promised to give a 10th of all that God had given him back to God. According to Mosaic Code, all land was to be plowed but left unseeded every 7th year (Shemitah) and crops that grew on their own from the land were for the poor. It was the religious duty of the Hebrews to give, and one was cursed if he, did not give.

The Christian charitable tradition may have set the highest ethical standards where both *Old and New Testaments of the Bible* (New International Version Study Bible, 1995) teach generosity as a way of life for God’s redeemed people—not as a rote duty but as a joyful response to God’s saving grace. As Fisher and Quehl (1989) have discussed, God taught that wealth was fleeting and accumulation was dangerous. He further states that Jesus in the *New Testament* taught that we should raise our standard of giving and not our standard of living. Fisher and Quehl (1989) contended that Jesus further had taught that gifts should be given in secret, and not for public acknowledgement.

In the 4th century A.D. as Christianity emerged as an organized religion and Roman philanthropy began to recede, pre-Christian Romans and Greeks had given for the benefit of any worthy citizen rather than out of pity for the needy (Fisher and Quehl, 1989). Continuing throughout the Middle Ages, Roman philanthropy was replaced by charity, the more restrictive

form of giving of the two. The Catholic Church depended on charity to support its charitable programs helping the poor, the widowed, the elderly, the sick, and the orphans, but there was always more to support than gifts given. Thus, the situation had reversed itself. As Fisher and Quehl (1989) asserted although there was a period of little concern for the poor and more concern for the improvability of society, later there was little concern for the improvability of society and almost total concern about the poor.

Fisher and Quehl (1989) contended that by the end of the Middle Ages in England there was a rise of the secular state followed by a rise of the new middle class. The church became less influential as the power and wealth of the state grew more vast. The Mercantile Age brought preindustrial cities and a new prosperity, but it also produced a segment of the population that had no jobs, family, or church for support. Thus, the rising English middle class stepped up and provided endowments for schools, scholars, and orphanages (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). This brought rise to the Statute of Charitable Uses in 1601 and poor laws during the reign of Queen Elizabeth (Bremner, 1960). Poor laws provided for the public collection of funds for the poor and included sanctions for noncompliance. Finally, complete taxation was created in the Poor Rate in the Act of 1601 (Andrews, 1950).

Philanthropy in the United States has developed into organized philanthropy, which is supported by systematic fundraising and is a largely a 20th century American phenomenon (Cutlip, 1965). Volunteerism emerged and was encouraged by the liberties associated with the United States that have allowed individuals the freedom of speech and association. Gurin and Van Til (1990) reported that American society had been shaped by the practice of meeting community needs outside of government. Today many major social institutions such as libraries and museums

in the United States are organized and supported by volunteers.

History of Philanthropy in Higher Education

Philanthropy has played an important part in the development of colleges and universities in America. Until the 20th century needy causes were funded “by a wealthy few in response to personal begging appeals” (Fisher & Quehl, 1989, p. 25). The money raised went to the extremely poor, to churches, and for the founding of colleges and schools. As discussed by Fisher and Quehl (1989) the first known organized effort to raise funds in the United States occurred in 1641 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Three clerics, Hibbens, Peter, and Weld, were sent to England to raise money in support of Harvard College to “educate the heathen Indians,” because wealthy British citizens considered this a worthy mission. Hibbens returned with 500 pounds sterling for the college (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Oxford, Harvard, William and Mary, Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Brown, Columbia, Rutgers, Pennsylvania, and Delaware all were colonial colleges that acquired property, courted benefactors, and were aided in their establishment by generous donors (Rhodes, 1997). Those colonial colleges were saved by the development of popular interest in higher education both in America and in the British Isles, and large donations were given to them (Cutlip, 1965). The early American colleges were faced with the same problem of raising enough money to fund their programs as colleges are today. Grants from their colonial government or grants from the King of England were sought and lotteries were used to support their budgets because student fees did not cover all of the costs. U.S. land-grant colleges were authorized by the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 and these types of institutions led to the growth of other public institutions as well. The benefactors of Johns Hopkins University with

their multimillion dollar bequest strived to formally link a graduate school in medical science with a sophisticated teaching hospital. The efforts of John D. Rockefeller and Reverend Henry T. Gates aided in the establishment of the University of Chicago, Rush Medical College, and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research (Roberts, Coverdale, & Louie, 2006).

Today, the financial distinction between private and public institutions is becoming increasingly blurred. Public institutions that once described themselves as “state-supported,” are now describing themselves as “state-assisted,” “state-affiliated,” or “state-located” (Rhodes, 1997, p. xviii). Private institutions, on the other hand, are growing more reliant on public funds as they acquire federal support for research and student financial aid.

History of Fundraising

The terms philanthropy and charity are also used synonymously and interchangeably with fundraising in today’s society. Fundraising can be viewed as a term to describe the instrument by which philanthropy or charity is derived. The end results of fundraising are most often monetary gifts of time and self.

The evangelist Rev. George Whitefield (1714-1770) was perhaps the most dynamic and most successful early college fundraiser in America. He sought financial assistance for a number of charitable causes and for the hard-pressed colonial colleges including Harvard, Dartmouth, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania (Cutlip, 1965). Benjamin Franklin was also a prolific fundraiser and never accepted a cause in which he did not believe. He shrewdly organized his fundraising tasks, carefully cataloging his prospective donors and personally calling on each one. Benjamin Franklin’s advice to a friend in a letter about fundraising should be heeded by

those new to fundraising and will bring a note of familiarity to those experienced in the fundraising business (Cutlip, 1965):

In the first place, I advise you to apply to all whom you know will give something; next to those whom you are uncertain whether they will give anything or not and show them the list of those who have given; and lastly, do not neglect those whom you are sure will give nothing, for in some of them you may be mistaken (p. 6).

Throughout the Jacksonian period there continued to be attempts at systematic fundraising—some failures and some successes. A successful attempt was made by James Smithson, a British chemist, who in 1829 left an estate of a half-million dollars to the United States federal government to found the Smithsonian Institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men (Cutlip, 1965). Then in 1834 Miss Mary Lyon founded the women’s seminary, Mount Holyoke College, with a successful fund drive when she went house to house and raised \$30,000 in less than 2 months (Fisher & Quehl, 1989). Evidence of the use of matching gifts can be found as early as 1871 when \$25,000 was raised by the public to meet the conditions of Sophia Smith’s will for Smith College (Fisher & Quehl, 1989).

College presidents began to emerge as fund gatherers and many colleges stayed alive thanks to their presidents and their fundraising efforts. One such president was E. P. Tenney of Colorado College. Whenever funds were scarce, Tenney would take the next train to the East to solicit both money and students and seldom returned empty-handed (Cutlip, 1965, p. 19).

Principles, Values, and Ethics of Fundraising

Fundraising has become commonplace and a basic function of both private and public

institutions. The financial distinction between private institutions and public institutions has been increasingly blurring. Private institutions are using more public funds and public institutions are turning increasingly to private philanthropy (foundations, corporations, and individuals) (Rhodes, 1997). It is fair to say that today all institutions, both private and public, are relying on private support to some degree. Additionally, all institutions are under more and more scrutiny to improve performance, contain costs, justify expenses, and provide accountability to governing bodies, students, and the public. Thus, fundraising should be seen as a critical factor in satisfying these expectations and in the success and continued growth of all institutions

College and university fundraising should be thought of as a continuous activity. This continuous activity should have the involvement of four key participants (Rhodes, 1997, p. xix): (1) the president; (2) campus leaders, including the provost, deans, and faculty; (3) the vice president over development and his or her staff; (4) a committed group of volunteers including alumni, parents, faculty, students, friends, and trustees.

At the foundation of successful fundraising is integrity, and Rhodes (1997, pp. xxi-xxii) stated that effective fundraising required integrity of the institution, integrity of the program, integrity of the proposal, integrity of the donor relationship, integrity in the negotiation of the gift, integrity in the acknowledgment of the gift, integrity in the recognition of the gift, integrity in the accounting of the gift, and integrity in the use of the gift.

The Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) has been bringing fundraising professionals together for over 40 years to advance philanthropy and professionalism in fundraising. The Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), together with the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP), the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and the Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Nonprofits created the Donor Bill of

Rights, which has been endorsed by numerous organizations and reads as follows (Association of Fundraising Professionals, *Donor Bill of Rights*, n.d.):

Philanthropy is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To ensure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the nonprofit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

- I. To be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes.
- II. To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization's governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgment in its stewardship responsibilities.
- III. To have access to the organization's most recent financial statements.
- IV. To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.
- V. To receive appropriate acknowledgement and recognition.
- VI. To be assured that information about their donation is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.
- VII. To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.

- VIII. To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors.
- IX. To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.
- X. To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers. (para. 3)

Fundraising and Campaigns

One popular form of fundraising is the campaign. Campaigns require intricate forethought where needs, priorities, timing, morale, capacity, and feasibility are all considered. To embark on a campaign requires a thorough review of the institution's programs and resources so that priorities and needs can be clearly understood and articulated. To assure the success of a campaign those involved should not be afraid of hard work, project confidence, and have deep conviction. Campaigns are long term and thus will require patience and steadfastness.

Rhodes (1997, pp. xix-xx) offered discerning observations regarding campaigns. He stated several general principles and guidelines from his own experiences as follows:

A campaign is not

- A quick fix for an ailing institution,
- a remedy for anemic annual giving,
- a booster shot for existing feeble fund drives or
- a sure thing, with automatic success guaranteed.

A campaign is

- an intensely demanding, time-consuming activity,

- an institution-building activity,
- an affirmation of agreement and confidence in the future,
- an effective means of achieving extraordinary one-time gifts and
- an increase in the general level of annual giving. (pp. xix-xx)

Rhodes (1997) contended “campaigns required considerable forethought; a rigorous, independent feasibility study; comprehensive analysis of needs, priorities, and costs; a sound academic justification; a fully documented, prospective donor-alumni record; considerable financial support; and widespread agreement on priorities, goals, timing and responsibilities” (p. xx). Staffing and leadership were critical to campaigns and Rhodes (1997) stated that effective campaigns needed to employ seasoned, effective professional staff and be guided by “consistent leadership from and with participation by the president” (p.xx). In addition, campaigns should “utilize persuaded, proactive, and informed volunteer leaders.” Rhodes (1997) further asserted that a campaign should have an “effective strategic plan, regularly updated, and should provide regular public reports, with full disclosure” (p. xx). He stated that a campaign should implement a “substantial unofficial prelude, include a professional promotion or ‘kick-off,’ have continued publicity, and end with vigorous, sustained post-campaign activities” (p. xx).

Rhodes (1997) contended that an effective campaign generated many useful end-products. Such positive outcomes included “an infusion of major gifts, a sustainable elevation in annual giving, thoughtful strategic planning and choice of priorities, new programs and program support, institutional commitment, unity, confidence and pride and presented a springboard for post-campaign activity” (Rhodes, 1997, p. xx).

Institutions using campaign methods are on the rise. Cohen (1998) found that between 50% and 70% of colleges and universities had been engaged in or were planning fundraising campaigns. Campaigns have even hit the \$1 billion mark. In 2004 nineteen institutions were pursuing goals in excess of \$1 billion dollars, including the University of Michigan (which raised half of its \$2.5 billion goal) and the State University of New York System and the University of Virginia announcing \$3 billion campaigns (Strout, 2005). In 2007, 26 higher-education campaigns of \$1 billion or more were underway and, of the top 10 fundraising institutions 5 were in the middle of efforts to raise \$3 billion or more (Strout, 2007). Universities are edging towards even more ambitious campaigns to the point that \$5-billion dollar campaigns are in sight as Stanford, which ended a \$1.1 billion campaign for undergraduate education at the end of 2006, began a \$4.3 billion campaign (Strout, 2007). Stanford consistently ranks among the top three institutions for private donations and usually is in the top place. In the 2006-2007 fiscal year Stanford continued in first place from the previous 3 years by bringing in \$832.3 million. Although Stanford was down from the previous year's total of \$911.16 million, it still achieved a steady increase over the \$603.6 million raised in 2004-2005 (Strout, 2007). In addition, Stanford usually has raised two to three million dollars more than its nearest competitor, which has usually been Harvard. As Martin Shell, the vice president for development at Stanford, stated in 2006, "There's a reason why colleges and universities do campaigns. They provide a vehicle to raise the most money, and they are focused on ideas that individuals want to invest in" (Strout, 2007, p. 2). Stanford's \$4.3 billion campaign was focused on research programs involving health, environmental sustainability, and international peace and security, as well as programs in the arts and in elementary and secondary education (Strout, 2007).

Subsequently, after Stanford announced its \$4.3 billion campaign, Columbia University announced that their \$4-billion campaign started in 2006 would be increased to a goal of \$5 billion (Keller, 2011). In August 2011 the University of Southern California announced the public start of the largest campaign ever begun in American higher education, a 7-year effort to raise \$6 billion (Keller, 2011). “The \$6 billion isn’t about being the largest...It was selected because it’s what we need to continue our academic ascent,” stated Albert R. Checcio, the senior vice president for university advancement at USC” (as cited in Keller, 2011, pp.1-2).

The Need for Donations to Higher Education

Funding Crisis in Higher Education

The Commission on National Investment in Higher Education reported as long ago as 1996 that there was no secret that higher education across the United States had been in a funding crisis (Council for Aid to Education, 1996). The consequences of decreased state funding in higher education have included budget reductions of programs, reduced numbers of entering freshmen, stifled pay raises, reductions in staff and faculty, offers of early retirements, more crowded classrooms, and the elimination of sports teams (Trombley, 2003).

Fischer reported the findings of a survey of more than 1,000 college presidents, conducted from March 10 to April 25, 2011, by the Pew Research Center in association with *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. That survey revealed that in addition to being worried about the rising price of college presidents are concerned about growing international competition and declining student quality (Fischer, 2011). A third of the presidents said their institutions were headed in the wrong direction and that American higher education’s standing around the globe could erode. Seven out of 10 presidents rated the contemporary American system as the best or one of the best in the

world, but only half predicted that the United States would be among the top globally a decade from now. Such values and beliefs are also occurring during an intensification of other challenges such as the challenge of meeting President Obama's goal for retrying to achieve the world's highest proportion of college graduates by 2020. The most positive responses came from presidents of highly selective colleges, which have healthy balance sheets, more top-achieving applicants than they can possibly admit, and a strong portfolio of global partnerships, whereas the responses of the presidents of such nonelite institutions as for-profit, 2-year, and less-selective 4-year colleges held less positive views. Those institutions have been dealing with declining state support, greater government scrutiny and regulation, and student bodies that are underprepared, with many students who are from homes that have traditionally not attended college (Fischer, 2011).

Shi, a former president of Furman University in South Carolina and now senior fellow at the National Humanities Center, noted that financial pressures faced by nonelite colleges during the economic downturn had been acute. Their bottom lines were not maintained by federal stimulus research grants and dollars to the degree of top research universities. Furthermore, those colleges could not replace lost revenue by increasing tuition or relying on endowments or cash reserves, as wealthy colleges have done. Shi stated "The recession really has had an asymmetrical impact on higher education," where the system "has become fragmented between haves and have-nots" (as cited in Fischer, 2011, p. 2).

Rising College Costs to students

A 1998 report entitled "Straight Talk about College Costs and Prices" documented the concern of public anxiety over rising college prices. It was a report to Congress by the National

Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (1998). The report stated that universities and colleges risked “an erosion of public trust” if costs continued to rise as they had been and if institutions did not behave more responsibly to get their costs under control.

Also, there are public concerns about the access to higher education for students from lower income households. The U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce published *The College Cost Crisis: A Congressional Analysis of College Costs and Implications for America’s Higher Education System* on September 4, 2003. That report stated that a college degree was being pushed further out of reach for needy students (Boehner & McKeon, 2003).

The public has continued to be deeply concerned about the rise in college tuition and student debt. The Public Agenda and the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education reported in “Squeeze Play 2009: The Public’s Views on College Costs Today (2009)” the following facts resulting from their survey:

- More than half of Americans (55%) say that college is necessary to succeed in today’s economy, compared with just 3 in 10 Americans (31%) in 2000.
- Two-thirds of Americans (67%) believe that qualified students do not have the opportunity to go to college, (the highest percentage in the 15-year history of the survey).
- 63% of Americans say that college prices are rising faster than the cost of other items, up from 58 % in 2007.
- Nearly eight in ten (77%) of those who think college prices are rising believe that they are going up as fast or faster than health care.
- Over eight in ten (86%) agree that students have to borrow too much, with nearly seven in ten (67%) strongly agreeing, up 7 points from 2007.

- Four in ten Americans (39%) say that financial assistance such as loans is not available to everyone, up from 29% just 18 months ago.
- More than half of Americans (53%) say that colleges could spend less and still maintain high-quality education.
- 55% say that higher education today is run like most businesses, with attention to the bottom line trumping the educational mission as a top priority.(p. 2)

Foundations and Corporate Giving Shifts

Foundation giving to colleges and universities has increased as a percentage of total giving each year since at least 2004 with the exception of 2006. The Council for Aid to Education reported foundations had given at 25.4% of the total amount given to higher education in 2004, then increased to 27.3% in 2005, dropped to 25.4% in 2006, then steadily increased reporting 28.6% in 2007, 28.8% in 2008, 29.6% in 2009, and reached 30.0% in 2010 (Council for Aid to Education 2005; Council for Aid to Education 2006; Council for Aid to Education 2007; Council for Aid to Education, 2008; Council for Aid to Education, 2009; Council for Aid to Education, 2010; Council for Aid to Education, 2011). As foundation giving inched past alumni giving (which was once the largest source of support), by 2011 foundation giving had exceeded alumni giving by almost 5%.

The Council for Aid to Education (2010) reported that in 2009 just under one third (31.1%) of foundation giving on the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey was from family foundations and represented support given to the institutions by individuals including alumni and other friends. Family foundations represented 36.7% of the foundation giving in 2004

but by 2009 had dropped to 31.1%, suggesting an erosion of the significance of personal giving by 2009.

Corporate giving declined from 2004 to 2008 and then shifted to slight increases in 2009 and 2010. In 2004 corporate giving was reported by the Council for Aid to Education at 18% and fell during the next 4 years from 17.2% in 2005 to 16.45% in 2006 to 16.1% in 2007 to 15.5% in 2008. In 2009 corporate giving increased to 16.6% and then edged up ever so slightly to 16.9% in 2010. Foundation giving has surpassed corporate giving in importance, as foundation giving was reported at 30% and corporate giving reported at 16.9% in 2010 (Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Fewer Alumni Making Donations

The total value of alumni donations reached 28% of the total voluntary support given to higher education in 2003 (Council for Aid to Education, 2004). Alumni donations decreased the following year in 2004 to 27.7%. then increased in 2006 to 30% (Council for Aid to Education, 2007). Alumni donations have decreased almost every year after 2006, dropping to 27.8% in 2007, 27.5% in 2008, 25.6% in 2009, and 25.4% in 2010 (Council for Aid to Education, 2008; Council for Aid to Education, 2009; Council for Aid to Education' 2010; Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Although the percentages for alumni donations of the total of all voluntary support have decreased over the years since 2003, the actual dollar amount given has increased each year from 2004 to 2008 with \$6.7 billion given in 2004, \$7.09 billion given in 2005, \$8.4 billion given in 2006, \$8.27 billion given in 2007, and \$8.70 billion given in 2008 (Council for Aid to Education, 2005; Council for Aid to Education, 2006; Council for Aid to Education, 2007; Council for Aid

to Education, 2008; Council for Aid to Education, 2009). Then the total dollar amount of alumni donations fell to \$7.13 billion in 2009 and dropped again to \$7.10 billion in 2010.

The proportion of alumni who made gifts has been on a steady decline as well even when the economy was stronger. Beginning in 2002 alumni participation declined for four consecutive years until it reached 12.4 % in 2005 (Strout, 2006). In 2006 alumni participation fell again to 11.9% (Council for Aid to Education, 2011). By 2008 the proportion of alumni who made gifts had fallen to 11% and then declined further to 10% in 2009 (Council for Aid to Education, 2009, Council for Aid to Education, 2010). In 2010 the proportion of alumni who made gifts declined still further to 9.8%, the lowest level ever recorded on the VSE survey (Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

The average alumni gift also fell from \$1,259 in 2008 to \$1,085 in 2009, and continuing the trend in 2010, the average alumni gift declined by another 0.4% (Council for Aid to Education, 2009; Council for Aid to Education, 2010; Council for Aid to Education, 2011). According to the Council for Aid to Education (2011) the average gift per contributing alumnus is lower in 2010 than in 2006.

According to reports from The Voluntary Support of Education (Council for Aid to Education, 2005; Council for Aid to Education, 2006, Council for Aid to Education, 2009; Council for Aid to Education, 2010) and Strout (2006) there are several possible explanations for the decline in alumni giving:

- (1) a third of foundation giving is from family foundations, so some gifts that could otherwise be counted as alumni donations are instead tallied as foundation gifts;
- (2) possibility that just fewer alumni were inclined to make contributions;
- (3) increased costs of education, and therefore, increased college loan debt;

- (4) institutions now invest in better software and technology to maintain more accurate alumni contact information, therefore the number of alumni on record increased due to better tracking, but the number of donors did not go up;
- (5) lottery-financed scholarship programs may have had a chilling effect on alumni giving because students may be more grateful to the state rather than the college for the educational advantage. (p. 2)

The Great Recession, which occurred between July 2008 and July 2009, may have had a negative effect on alumni giving. During that period the New York Stock Exchange Composite Index declined 28.5%. During the same period gifts designated by donors for capital purposes also declined 25%. While the New York Stock Exchange Index increased substantially from 2009 to 2010, it still has not returned to 2006 levels (Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Rising Costs to Provide Higher Education

The increased financial burden has been increasingly passed on to students. Higher education costs to provide goods and services have increased since 1961 at a rate significantly higher than overall inflation (as measured by the Higher Education Price Index compared to the Consumer Price Index). Even after factoring in the effects of inflation, tuition and fees increased more than 100% from 1976 to 1994 (Council for Aid to Education, 1996; Thomas, 2005). From 1994 to 2002 tuition increased another 45% and continued to outpace the rate of inflation (Boehner & McKeon, 2003). Boehner and McKeon (2003) predicted that continued sharp increases in tuition would negatively affect access to higher education for those who sought it. Based on a report released by Sallie Mae and Gallup Inc, by 2009-2010 families were still turning

to the same mix of resources to pay for college as in previous years but using more money from each source (Supiano, 2010). Supiano reported that the combined annual spending from all sources reported by families in 2009-2010 came to an average of \$24,097 per student, which represented a 24% increase from the year before. Families reported using larger amounts of grants and scholarships, parent borrowing, parent savings and income, student borrowing, student savings and income, and contributions from family and friends than did the respondents in the previous year's report.

Declining Financial Support by State Governments

In his dissertation Thomas (2005) reported that in fiscal year 2002-2003, 37 states made mid-year cuts in their higher education budgets. For the 2003-2004 year almost half reduced spending on higher education by an average of 5.0%. Those that increased spending did so only slightly, with an average gain of 3.0%, with 5 states raising appropriations by less than 1.0% (Potter, 2003; Thomas, 2005). Peterson (2003), president of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), stated that the 2003-04 fiscal year may have been the worst in memory for higher education. As costs had climbed and funding declined, more and more educators and administrators (as stated previously) were referring to their institutions as "state-aided" or "state-located" rather than "state-funded" (Rhodes, 1997; Testimony on Higher Education, 2002; Thomas, 2005).

The report "Trends in College Spending, 1999-2009" states that higher education institutions in the United States had been filling in the financing gaps by increasing tuition (Blumenstyk, 2011). Private colleges used the additional revenue for student aid to offset the higher levels of "tuition discounting" that they use to attract students. Public colleges used the

additional money brought in by tuition increases to make up for cuts in state spending and to cover the rising costs of employee health care and other benefits (Blumenstyk, 2011).

Giving Models and Donor Motivation

The Giving USA Foundation has reported on American philanthropy in its annual *Giving USA* report since 1954. Each year the *Giving USA* report lists four sources of charitable contributions to nonprofits: individuals, foundations, bequests, and corporations. Individuals always represent the largest single source of donations, which usually amount to 75% or more of the total donations each year. Jolly, chair of Giving USA Foundation in 2007, stated that “America’s 1.4 million charitable and religious organizations provide a huge range of services that improve lives, from meeting immediate needs to funding medical research or creating endowments to assure the future of arts or educational institutions”(Giving USA Foundation, 2007, pp 1-2). Ruotolo Jr., CFRE, the chair in 2007 of the Giving Institute: *Leading Consultants to NonProfits*, which is the parent organization of the Giving USA Foundation also stated “While headlines focus on mega-gifts (such as the \$1.9 billion that Warren Buffett paid in 2006 as the first installment on his 20-year pledge of more than \$30 billion to four foundations), they represented 1.3 % of the total. About 65% of households with incomes lower than \$100,000 gave to charity in 2006. That is higher than the percentage who voted or read a Sunday newspaper” (Giving USA Foundation, 2007, pp. 1-2).

Simari (1995) discussed two distinct models to explain donors’ behavior and motivation: the charitable model and the economic model. The charitable model was rooted in altruism. Altruism is defined as “unselfish regard for or devotion to the welfare of others” (Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition, 2003, p. 37). The economic model is a type of

exchange theory and is rooted in the business world, and this model explains that a donor's motives are based on the receipt of goods-- tokens or honors-- in exchange for the gift (Brittingham & Pezzullo (1990). The economic model is emerging as the more prevalent model in philanthropic giving. Boulding (1973) presented an economic theory that complemented the exchange theory. He defined the economic theory of "grant economics" as "the one-way transfer of money or goods, through taxation, redistribution of income, and charity" (p. 3).

Reciprocity is also a theory of exchange and has been divided into two types in most studies: positive reciprocity and negative reciprocity. Positive reciprocity was defined by Fehr and Gächter (1997) as "the impulse or the desire to be kind to those who have been kind to us" (p. 846), and they asserted that negative reciprocity was the need to retaliate for a hurt that had been caused. Moody (2005) stated that it was common to hear philanthropic donors cite repeatedly that their donations were based on a desire to "give back.". Moody (2005) suggested "this desire to give back was a central motive for charitable giving and possibly a key philanthropic value" (p. 1). Baldwin (2008) examined the effects of positive reciprocity as the primary motivator of alumni giving, and her findings determined that positive reciprocity did have an impact on donor motivation.

Pray (1981) identified types of individuals who could be prospects for educational institutions. They included former donors, parents, donors and sponsors of other enterprises, alumni, and corporation officers and directors. When the capability and capacity to give were present, Pray cited the following reasons why individuals gave: "(1) those seeking social approval, acceptance, or position of importance by association; (2) those dedicated to the same cause as the institution; (3) those motivated through sympathy or empathy; (4) those with strong feeling of moral obligation and (5) those desiring to take tax advantages" (pp. 74-75).

Jordan and Quynn (1991) offered seven sources of donor motivation:

1. Philanthropy – pure and simple. These are people who want to make the world a better place. The donor usually neither expects nor wants attention for the gift and may decline any form of recognition wanting to be anonymous. There are not many of these types of donors.
2. A legacy of giving. These donors are usually widows or widowers or childless couples.
3. Mutual benefit. Most of these gifts involve a benefit to the donor and the institution.
4. Memorials. Many families and friends establish a scholarship or a garden in memory of a deceased family member, colleague or friend.
5. Honor the living. Similar to memorials, but made in honor of someone living.
6. Repay a debt. These are usually donors who received scholarships or who feel that their success in life is due to their having attended the university.
7. A neon light. This is the donor who is motivated by a major need for recognition. These are the donors who need plaques, signs, name plates and their name in print and often. (pp. 654-655)

Hunter (1968) studied donors each of whom had made a gift of \$1 million or more and found that the motivating factors most often mentioned by them were (1) “self-generated convictions” as to the institution’s merits; (2) objectives and plans of the institution; (3) efficiency of the institution; (4) competence of the institution’s leadership and (5) tax advantages.

A study with an interesting outcome was pursued in 1953 by the Russell Sage Foundation, which commissioned the National Opinion Research Center to conduct extended interviews with people of various income levels and other groupings to learn more about givers' attitudes (Andrews, 1953). Andrews (1953) concluded in his study that regarding attitudes toward giving, the only secure generalization was that great variety existed (Andrews, 1953).

Individuals continue to represent a powerful and important donor base. Individuals' motives for giving are complex and many motives weave together, presenting a still more complex and intriguing pattern as to why people give, but the fruits to the recipients are well worth the research to understand more about donors' attitudes.

Alumni Giving Theories and Decision Models

Colleges and universities have been studying the interests, opinions, attitudes, and needs of alumni since they have been keeping records of alumni. Melchiori (1988) identified a need to define alumni research as a field of inquiry and she defined alumni research as:

A process of following alumni through their lives and focusing on lifelong demographics, attitudinal issues, and career data in order to understand more fully the underlying motivational forces of alumni as providers. By isolating the characteristics that distinguish alumni as providers, research can both identify potential providers and suggest methods of stimulating provider behavior. (p. 10)

Several theories about alumni giving exist. Yoo and Harrison (1989) used supply-and-demand analysis to explain alumni giving. They classified donors as conventional buyers and pointed out that they purchased services from recipients. Yoo and Harrison claimed that donors

received benefits from the fundraising expenses and services provided by the recipients. Benefits were presented by the donors and recipients in the forms of honors and alumni services. Yoo and Harrison asserted that donors should be thought of as buyers who received intangible and tangible benefits from the recipients. The authors developed a model using supply and demand in which they categorized gifts as a form of market exchange in which both donors and donees were motivated by self-interest. They tested their model using 13 private colleges and asserted in their findings that donors had been guided by their own self-interest.

Other theories on alumni giving include the use of the social identity theory and the need to seek status. Mael and Ashforth (1992) asserted that social identity theory predicted that individuals tended to participate in activities that matched their own identities and they supported universities representing those identities. Individuals tend to identify themselves by abilities, interests, and groups. Groups can include organization, gender, and age. Mael and Ashforth further contended that alumni giving was a product of organizational identification whereby donors perceived that they belonged to an organization and shared in the successes and failures of the organization. Another theory was proposed by Coelho (1985) who suggested that the need for status was the motivation for donations. Clark (1999) contended that alumni gave because of a need to strongly identify with their institutions' histories, cultures, and missions and their legends as well.

There are several models of alumni giving, but no longstanding models exist in the higher education literature. Volkwein, Webster-Saft, Xu, and Agrotis (1989) proposed one theoretical model of alumni giving that included demographic characteristics, previous university experiences, and gift-giving interest and capacity. Gift giving behavior was considered a function of two major factors: capacity to give and motivation to give. Motivation to give was influenced by capacity to

give and both were influenced by demographic characteristics and the social and academic integration of the alumni with the universities while they were students (Connolly & Blanchette, 1986; Melchiori, 1988; Smart & Pascarella, 1986).

Hoyt (2004) proposed a model from which the best predictor of donor status was willingness to give. In this model seven factors were found to influence willingness to give: (1) alumni involvement, (2) perceived need, (3) capacity to give, (4) the age of the alumnus, (5) student involvement, (6) alumni satisfaction, and (7) level of solicitation. Alumni involvement was tied to student involvement, alumni satisfaction, and level of solicitation. Willingness to give was negatively impacted by religious donations and the presence of an economic recession.

Winston (1999) proposed a model of alumni giving that suggested that universities with more revenue generated from donations would be able to attract brighter students than universities with less revenue from donations. Students pay tuition but also receive subsidies from the university. If a university has more resources to use as subsidies it can attract bright students through the use of these subsidies. Burt (1989) proposed that alumni donations could be an indicator of an institution's educational performance or a measure of the quality of its education. Alumni who donated recognized the role that the institutions had played in their education. Therefore, increased donations, according to Winston's model, would initially attract brighter students through subsidies and also contribute to a higher quality education. Then those brighter students would later as alumni donate back to their alma mater due to their receiving a quality education and positive student experience.

Burt (1989) also studied the alumni associations' effectiveness in solicitations, examining how alumni had given when approached with different initiatives. He found that alumni had

donated to an institution's general budget in support of the ideal of higher education, whereas the donations to individual departments or colleges had been made based on gratitude.

In his dissertation Sun (2005) proposed an alumni-giving decision model that was based on literature from Ackerman (1996), Belfield and Beney (2000), Harrison (1995), and Miracle (1977). He proposed a model that suggested that alumni donations were related to four variables: (1) student experience, (2) alumni experience, (3) alumni motivation, and (4) demographic variables. Demographic variables included graduation year, gender, ethnicity, type of degree, residency in or out of state, and membership status. Sun stated "alumni who were treated favorably as students, who were satisfied with academic experience, and who believe the college education contributed to their career success are more inclined to give as alumni than those with less favorable feelings and beliefs" (p. 2).

Alumni and Nonalumni Giving Variables

The literature on determinants of alumni giving is extensive. O'Connor (1961), one of the earliest researchers of the topic, studied the demographic characteristics of alumni at Alfred University from 1958 to 1960. In his dissertation Mosser (1993) identified 34 studies that had relevance to his own research on predicting alumni-giving behavior. In her dissertation Klostermann (1995) charted 31 studies pertaining to alumni and nonalumni giving, 24 of which pinpointed variables of alumni giving and 7 of which identified nonalumni giving. Klostermann grouped the characteristics of both alumni donors and nonalumni donors into four categories: demographic, academic, motivational, and other variables. Taylor and Martin (1995) also divided donor variables into four key areas: demographic, attitudinal, involvement, and philanthropic.

I have attempted to allocate myriad variables found in the review of the literature into the following five categories: demographic variables, involvement variables, academic variables, motivation variables, and philanthropic variables.

Demographic Variables

General alumni demographic variables include: age, gender (sex), marital status, alumni married to other alumni, number and ages of children, income level, wealth of the alumni, location of residence, living distance from campus, age at time of enrollment, occupation, retirement age, political party preference and political attitude, father's party preference, religious influence on donating, and alumni who are also faculty and staff members. Nonalumni demographic variables include: age, income, and discretionary income.

Regarding the variable "age," Beeler (1982), Bruggink and Siddiqui (1995), Haddad (1986), Korvas (1984), Miracle (1977), Oglesby, (1991) and Broms and Davis (1966) found that older alumni had given more. McKee (1975) found that middle-aged alumni were the most likely to donate to their alma maters. McNally (1985), however, found no significant relationship between age and giving. Overall, "age" was found to have a significant relationship with alumni giving, with donations increasing as age increased until the donors reached retirement age. Connolly and Blanchette (1986) also found that giving had increased with age and then slowly declined. Okunade, Wunnava, and Walsh (1994) found that growth rates of alumni donations had declined after age 52, short of retirement age. Olsen, Smith, and Wunnava (1989) and Grant and Lindaeur (1986) reported that growth rates of alumni giving had remained positive as they aged until they reached retirement, when the growth rate had begun to level off and then to decline. McKillip and Kinkner (1992) found that older alumni donated more than younger alumni.

In regard to “gender” or “sex”, Beeler (1982) and Harrison (1995) found that gender was significantly related to alumni giving, with women more likely to give than men, but McKee (1975), Haddad (1986), McNally (1985) and Melchiori (1988) asserted that males had given more than females and Keller (1982), Korvas (1984), and McKee (1975) found no significant differences between donors and nondonors based on sex. Until recently most institutions when documenting alumni giving for married couples categorized all of their alumni giving under the male alumni. Even in the case of an alumna (female) married to a nonalumnus (male), the documentation of the alumna wife’s gift would be recorded under the nonalumnus husband’s name.

Men and women were found to differ in their philanthropic decision making. Women tended to make individual decisions each year regarding their charitable decisions. Simari (1995) asserted that men tended to have a budgeted list of organizations that they contributed to annually, whereas women decided on each request as they receive it. Because women did not tend to review a list of organizations they contributed to each year, they could be contacted at any time during the year.

Simari’s (1995) extensive study of female donors also revealed, as others have noted, that women gave anonymously far more frequently than men did. Although both male and female donors were more likely to support projects that had measurable results, women had less interest in bricks-and-mortar projects and more interest in projects to transform institutions and would have broader impacts on society. Simari found that women gave the highest preference scores to the importance of helping the next generation, whereas they were more likely to support scholarships or the library than any other programs or projects and least likely to support women’s athletics or building projects. It should be noted here that Simari’s study was conducted

during the time that the field of college athletics was highly male dominated and prior to Title IX, which ensured female athletic support. Simari also found that women preferred to be contacted by mail rather than by phone. If contacted by phone they preferred to be contacted by another alumna.

Marital status has not been studied as extensively as other variables and generally it has been found to be not significant to alumni giving (Beeler, 1982; Keller, 1982; Korvas, 1984). In a 1986 study Haddad found that alumnae who had married other alumni were more likely to give because their spouses contributed to their alma maters. However, in another study (Oglesby, 1991) alumnae married to other alumni were not found more likely to give.

The variables, income of the alumni and wealth of the alumni, had not been studied as extensively as other variables. Some researchers found income to be significantly related to giving (Belfield & Berey, 2000; Blakey, 1975; Bruggink & Siddiqui, 1995; Conley, 1999; Korvas, 1984; Miracle, 1977; Oglesby, 1991), whereas others did not find income to be significant predictors of alumni giving (Grill, 1988; House, 1987; VanHorn, 2002). Wealth was found to be a predictor of alumni giving by Harrison (1995) and Baade and Sunberg (1996). Broms and Davis (1966) found that higher income had been a reliable predictor of giving, and Melchiori (1988) found a predictor of giving was alumni with annual incomes of \$100,000 to \$200,000. Blanchette (1993) found that income was the best indicator for midsize and highest levels of gifts.

Location of residence and distance from institutions were found significant for predicting donors (Beeler, 1982; Caruthers, 1973). Occupation was also found to be significant (Beeler, 1982). Party preference and political attitude as well as father's party preference (McKinney, Williams, & Goodwin, 1979) were additionally found to be significant. Reunion year was found to be a significant factor for alumni contributions by Willemain, Goyal, VanDeven, and Thukral

(1994). In my review of the literature, I found no mention of an alumnus who was also an employee (faculty, staff, or administrator) of the university and how that type of relationship was associated with gift giving.

Age and income were also important predictors of giving by nonalumni. Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) and Auten and Rudney (1989) both predicted that the propensity to give had increased with age. Yankelovich et al. asserted that those who perceived they had moderate to large amounts of discretionary income had given more often or more money. Auten and Rudney (1989) suggested that as people moved up the income scale, average giving had increased faster than income, and Mears (1992) found that large donors had higher incomes than did nondonors.

Academic Variables

Academic variables included college, graduation (versus attendance only), degree, major, undergraduate GPA, graduate GPA, multiple degree holders, multiple degree holders from the same university, undergraduate status, mother's or father's education, year of graduation, children's attendance at alma mater, family attendance at the same institution, spouse's attendance at same university, major (by college), number of terms attended, reunion year, financial aid, scholarship or grant recipient, faculty to student ratio, highest degree earned, number of degrees earned, degrees from other institutions, graduation date, years of attendance, and reunion year.

Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), Caruthers (1973), and Haddad (1986) found that degree earned versus attending college without earning a degree was a significant variable. Multiple degree holders (McKee, 1974) and earning two or more degrees from the same university (Melchiori, 1988) were also significant predictors of donors.

Major has been found to be a significant (Blumenfeld & Sartain, 1974; Grill, 1988; Okunade & Berl, 1997; Okunade et al., 1994) predictor of alumni giving with Okunade et al. (1994) and Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974) finding that business school graduates made larger donations than did graduates with other majors. Korvas (1984), however, found that major was not a significant predictor of giving.

Children who attended the alumni's alma maters (Melchiori, 1988) also represented a predictor of giving. When the spouse also had attended the same institution, this variable was found to be a factor related to alumni contributions (Hueston, 1992). Respondent's mother's or father's education was found significant by McKinney et al. (1979). Actual graduation versus attending college also was a predictor of giving (Blumenfeld & Sartain, 1974; McKinney et al., 1979; Miracle, 1978).

Beeler (1982) found that "receiving financial aid" was a significant predictor of donor status, but Haddad (1986) reported no significant difference in giving associated with this variable. Oglesby (1991) found a negative relationship between receipt of academic performance scholarships and giving. Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano (2002), using the national Voluntary Support for Education Database, found faculty-student ratios at the receiving institutions to be significantly related to alumni giving.

Education was shown to be a factor related to gift contributions among nonalumni. Yankelovich et al. (1985) proposed that giving would grow with education and Mears (1992) found strong donors to have attained higher levels of education than nondonors. Klostermann (1995) asserted that there was such a strong relationship between education and income, that when income data were unavailable, education data could be used in their place as a predictor of the capacity to give due to the confounding effect between income and education.

Attitudinal or Motivational Variables

Attitudinal variables included emotional attachment to the alma mater, satisfaction with the educational experience, satisfaction with undergraduate experience, satisfaction with preparation for the first job, organizational prestige, willingness to recommend the university to others, and having been contacted by staff member for gifts, loyalty, beliefs, and taxes. Significant predictors of giving by alumni included emotional attachment to alma mater, organizational prestige, and willingness to recommend the institution to others (Beeler, 1982; Gardner, 1975; Leslie & Ramey, 1988; Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Okunade & Berl, 1997; Shadoian, 1989; Spaeth & Greeley, 1970). McKinney et al. (1979) showed that being contacted by a staff member for a gift was a factor related to alumni contributions.

In the Lindemann (1983) study 62.3% of the sample reported loyalty to alma mater was a reason for a gift. Sixty-nine point five percent reported that their belief in the need to support higher education was a reason for a gift. Forty-eight point five percent agreed that support for university policies was a reason for a gift. Twenty-two point two percent reported the tax deductibility of gifts as a reason for a gift.

House (1987) reported that need of alumni support was significant. On the other hand, Pearson (1999) asserted that when there was a perception that the university did not need donations as much as other organizations, that could be a deterrent to alumni giving. Satisfaction with preparation for the first job was found to be significant by Beeler (1982) and Gardner (1975) but not significant by Miracle (1977) and Shandoian (1989).

Nonalumni attitudinal and motivational factors that have been related to gift contributions include a sense of moral obligation, personal satisfaction,, tax incentives, family traditions,

political beliefs, religious heritage, involvement, receipt of private goods, increased pressure from boss or fund raiser, increased prestige or friendship, altruism, sense of gratitude, receiving recognition and public acclaim, sense of obligation or guilt, belief in social responsibility, and lack of worry about money.

Moral obligation was a predictor of gift contributions found by Yankelovich (1981). Personal satisfaction was another factor related to gift contributions (Odendahl, 1989; Steinberg, 1989; Yankelovich, 1981;). Odendahl (1989) also found that family traditions, political beliefs, religious heritage, concern for the welfare of others, and belief in social responsibility were predictors of giving. Auten and Rudney (1989), Odendahl (1989), and Haggberg (1992) found that tax incentives were strong predictors of giving for individuals in high tax brackets and had a strong positive effect on the amount of giving. Steinberg (1989) found that increased prestige or friendship, increased pressure from boss or fund- raiser, and receipt of private goods, such as seats at campus events were predictors of nonalumni giving. Additionally, Haggberg (1992) proposed that sense of obligation or guilt and receiving recognition and public acclaim were also factors related to contributions. Finally, Yankelovich et al. (1985) reported that nonalumni who gave did not worry about money.

Involvement Variables

Involvement variables were divided by Thomas (2005) into two categories, collegiate involvement and alumni involvement. Collegiate involvement was defined as involvement in university-sanctioned activities while a student. Alumni involvement was defined as involvement in university-related activities as an alumnus. Then there was a third category in the literature that emerges as community and civic involvement outside of the university.

The collegiate involvement in extracurricular activities included participation in sororities or fraternities, special interest groups, intercollegiate athletics, and departmental clubs or other organizations. Bruggink and Sidiqi (1995), Taylor and Martin (1995) and Haddad (1986) found that fraternity or sorority affiliation was positively related to alumni giving, but Okunade et al. (1994) found that participation in a sorority or fraternity was not significantly related to alumni giving. The variable student involvement in general was a factor related to alumni contributions (Blakey, 1975; Broms & Davis, 1966; Gardner, 1975; Haddad, 1986; Keller, 1982; McNally, 1985; McNulty, 1977; Miracle, 1978). Oglesby (1991) and Shandoian (1989) found that involvement in extracurricular activities was a predictor of giving but Grill (1988), Kraus (1991), and Young and Fisher (1996) found that involvement in extracurricular activities had no predictive ability, and Beeler (1982) found extracurricular activities to be a less significant factor. Taylor and Martin found that donors did participate in more activities than nondonors. Taylor and Martin showed that both participation in special interest groups and participation in departmental clubs or organizations were predictors of donor levels.

Alumni involvement variables included involvement with the institution as an alumnus, alumni association membership, reading alumni publications, recommending the college to prospective students, number of visits back to the campus, and postgraduate participation in campus events. Alumni involvement was a significant predictor of alumni giving as reported by numerous researchers. (Blakey, 1975; Broms & Davis, 1966; Caruthers, 1973; Keller, 1982; McKinney et al., 1979; Volkwein et al., 1989). Both Shandoian (1989) and Grant and Lindaeur (1986) found that reading alumni publications were was a predictor of alumni donors. House (1987) and Oglesby (1991) found that postgraduate participation in campus events was not predictive of donors, but Hunter, Jones, and Boger (1999) found that postgraduate participation

in campus events was a significant predictor variable. Shandoian found a significant difference between the group means for donors and nondonors in their numbers of campus visits after graduation. On the other hand, Miracle (1977) and Oglesby (1991) found that no support was found for a statistically significant difference between donors and nondonors on the number of campus visits after graduation.

Nonalumni involvement variables that were significant for giving were volunteer work and church attendance (Yankelovich et al., 1985). Interestingly, Auten and Rudney (1989) found that high-income giving was quite volatile and only 12% had stable giving from year to year. Therefore, they concluded that regular giving is not the standard giving behavior.

Philanthropic Variables

Philanthropic variables included active volunteering in community work or organizations, active participation in civic organizations, and active support of other charitable causes. Although such philanthropic variables have been subjected to limited research, they have been reported to be significantly related to alumni giving by several researchers (Haddad, 1986; House, 1987; Miracle, 1977). Strout (2004) reported that Opinion Dynamics found that for 90.0% of college graduates, when considering philanthropic donations, their alma maters were the last cause they would consider making a donation to. If given \$1,000 that had to go to a charity, 42.0% said they would give it to a local nonprofit group, 25.0% would give it to a medical charity, 22.0% would give it to a religious institution, 6.0% could not decide, and only 5% would give the money to their college.

There are numerous variables identified as possible predictors of alumni giving. Many variables have been subjects of substantial amounts of research, but some have received only

limited research. Much of the research findings had conflicting results. This points to the need for a further study in an attempt to find the variables with the strongest relationship and to eliminate the weakest variables. Thomas (2005) offered possible explanations for the contradictory findings including the use of various sampling procedures, operational definitions, surveys, analyses performed, and the wide variety of settings. With the advent of more powerful alumni database systems, coupled with the need and ability to now extract a multitude of information, there awaits the opportunity to analyze new variables that have never been analyzed in relationship to alumni giving.

The Status of Giving in the USA: Donors and Recipients

The Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Nonprofits was “founded in 1935 to promote the need for professional and ethical standards of practice, and to influence the creation of laws governing philanthropy” (Giving Institute, 2011, p. 1). The Giving Institute was formerly known as the American Association of Fundraising Counsel (AAFRC). The Giving Institute has been involved in the development of the widely accepted *Standards of Professional Conduct*, and in 1985 created the Giving USA Foundation, formerly known as the AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, which is headquartered in Glenview, Illinois. The Giving USA Foundation publishes *GIVING USA*, an annual publication that reports on data and trends about charitable giving and is published by The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. Prior to the formation of the Giving USA Foundation, *GIVING USA* was published by the AAFRC and the publication has documented who gave how much to which organizations for more than 50 years and claims to be America’s most frequently quoted and widely circulated reference compilation of annual giving providing a “statistical breakdown with year-by-year analysis by source, recipient, and location

(Giving Institute, Retrieved October 20, 2011 from http://www.givinginstitute.org/about_gi/index.cfm?pg=history.cfm)." Giving USA Foundation also publishes the *Giving USA Spotlight* e-newsletter four times a year. It is written at The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. It offers research about current trends in philanthropy and practical information that complements the data in the annual *GIVING USA* publication.

Since 1982, there always have been at least four sources of contributions: individuals, bequests, foundations, and corporations, and they consistently remain in that order from highest to lowest percentage through the years, with the one exception that in 1982 corporations contributed at a larger percentage than did foundations by a little less than one percentage point. At that time there also was about a seven percent increase in individual giving. Otherwise, there has been a considerable degree of consistency in the percentage of giving by each group over the past 25 years (*Giving USA*, 1983; *Giving USA*, 1993; *Giving USA*, 2002; *Giving USA*, 2005; *Giving USA*, 2006; *Giving USA*, 2007; *Giving USA*, 2008; *Giving USA*, 2009).

Donors

In 2010, \$290.89 billion was given to charity in the U.S., as reported in the *GIVING USA* 2011 annual report on the state of philanthropy. The four categories of contributors and amounts in 2010 were as follows: \$211.77 (73%) billion from individuals, \$41.00 (14%) billion from foundations, \$22.83 (8%) billion from bequests, and \$15.29 (5%) billion from corporations (Giving USA Foundation, 2011). Total charitable giving dropped \$12.8 billion from 2009 to 2010 (Giving USA Foundation, 2010; Giving USA Foundation, 2011). Total charitable giving had also dropped \$3.9 billion from 2008 to 2009 (*Giving USA*, 2009; *Giving USA*, 2010), after

increasing steadily since 2002. The decrease from 2008 to 2009 reflects the continued recession in 2009. Although exceeding \$300 billion for the second year in a row in 2008, the 2008 total of \$307.65 billion was barely more than \$1 billion more than the \$306.39 billion reported in 2007 (*Giving USA*, 2008; *Giving USA*, 2009). Looking back to 2007, donors gave an estimated \$11.37 billion more in 2007 than in 2006, in which year the charitable giving total was \$295.02 billion (*Giving USA*, 2007; *Giving USA*, 2008). This was a slight drop from the \$11.97 billion increase from 2005 to 2006 where there was charitable giving of \$260.28 billion in 2005 and \$295.02 billion in 2006 (*Giving USA*, 2006; *Giving USA*, 2007). This was impressive, especially in light of several years of slow growth and also following the unprecedented levels of disaster giving in 2005, including those given for Hurricane Katrina. Individuals, corporations and foundations seem remarkably willing to continue to provide support to the causes they prefer despite economic conditions or disaster giving

Individuals always account for the largest proportion of giving. In 2009 individual giving represented \$227.41 billion or 75% of the total \$303.75 billion given to charity. Some gifts are mega-gifts, such as the \$1.9 billion given by Warren Buffett in 2006 as the first installment on his 20-year pledge of more than \$30 billion to four foundations. But mega-gifts only represented 1.3% of the total according to Ruotolo, CFRE, 2006 chair of Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to nonprofits, parent organization of the Giving USA Foundation. Ruotolo was also quoted in a Giving USA Foundation release stating that “about 65 % of households with incomes lower than \$100,000 give to charity and this is higher than the percentage who vote or read a Sunday newspaper” (*Giving USA*, 2007, p. 2). Charitable bequests rose to 8% in 2009 to \$23.80 billion after declining from rose from \$22.91 billion in 2006 to \$23.15 billion in 2007, but this represented a decrease in the total percent of contributions from 7.8% in 2006 down to 7.6% in

2007. This decrease from 2006 to 2007 was after a rather large increase in the total percent of contributions from 6.7% in 2005 to 7.8% in 2006. Foundation giving, mostly representing grant-making, rose slightly from 12.4% in 2006 to 12.6% in 2007. There was almost a full 1% increase from 2005 to 2006 from 11.5% to 12.4% and the increase in dollars from \$30.0 billion in 2005 to \$36.5 billion in 2006 was accounted for by the rapid rise in the stock market in 2006.

Foundations donate money through making grants and those grants are often based on the value of their assets, therefore, grant-making increases when asset values increase. Corporate donations declined from \$13.77 billion (5.3%) in 2005 to \$12.72 billion (4.3%) in 2006. The decline in this category reflected the gifts given in 2005 for natural disasters relief. Then corporate donations rose again from 4.3% in 2006 to 5.1% in 2007 almost back to their 5.3% of 2005 (*Giving USA*, 2006; *Giving USA*, 2007; *Giving USA*, 2008).

Recipients

The recipients of the \$290.89 billion given in 2010 are reported in the *GIVING USA 2011* annual report as being distributed in 10 different categories: \$100.63 billion (35%) for religion, \$41.67 billion (14%) for education, \$26.9 billion (9%) for human services, \$33.00 billion (11%) for foundations, \$2.12 billion (1%) for unallocated gifts, \$22.83 billion (8%) for health, \$24.24 billion (8%) for public-society benefit, \$13.28 billion (5%) for arts and humanities, \$15.77 billion (5%) for international affairs, \$33.00 billion (11%) to individuals, and \$6.66 billion (2%) for the environment and animals (Giving USA Foundation, 2011).

Although religious institutions have always been the largest recipient of contributions, education consistently has come in second over the past 28 years. In 1982, educational contributions were 14.0%, in 1992 11.3%, in 2002 13.1%, in 2005 14.8%, in 2006 13.9%, in

2007 14.1%, held steady at 13% in 2008 and 2009, and rose back to 14% in 2010. In dollars educational contributions had risen from \$7.49 billion in 1982 to a high of \$43.32 billion in 2007 and then dropped to approximately \$40 billion in 2008 and 2009, rising again to \$41.67 billion in 2010 (*Giving USA*, 1983; *Giving USA*, 1993; *Giving USA*, 2002; *Giving USA*, 2005; *Giving USA*, 2006; *Giving USA*, 2007; *Giving USA*, 2008; *Giving USA*, 2009; *Giving USA*, 2010; *Giving USA*, 2011).

Fundraisers in higher education have noted that fundraising success typically mirrors the strength of the economy and that giving to colleges and universities can fluctuate with the economy and the stock market. For the donors, who are usually the alumni, it is not a matter of if they will give but when the time is right to do so (Blum & Hall, 2005).

In 2010 educational institutions received an estimated \$41.67 billion, or 14% of the total contributions of \$290.89 billion, which included gifts to higher education and to secondary and elementary schools. Breaking out the percentage for higher education can be found in the Council for Aid to Education's annual "Voluntary Support of Education (VSE)" report; for the same year, \$28.00 billion was donated alone to higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2011). The Council for Aid to Education (CAE) has managed the survey as a public service and has tracked giving to colleges for more than 50 years. It bases its results on the self-reporting of approximately 900 to 1,000 colleges and universities annually, with most institutions ending their fiscal years on June 30.

The Status of Giving to Higher Education

"The Council for Aid to Education is the nation's sole source of empirical data on private giving to education, through the annual Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey and its Data Miner interactive database" (Council for Aid to Education, 2011). The Council for Aid to

Education (CAE), which is a national nonprofit organization based in New York City, was an affiliate of the RAND Corporation from 1996 to 2005, but it became an independent nonprofit organization in 2006. “Initially established in 1952 to increase corporate support of education and to conduct policy research on higher education, today CAE also is focused on improving quality and access in higher education” (Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Those Who Donate to Higher Education

In the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) surveys, the sources of giving are categorized into alumni, nonalumni, foundations, corporations, religious organizations, and other organizations. Normally the alumni source has represented the largest percentage of support, but in 2007 and 2008 foundations moved into first place by approximately 1%, and then jumped ahead of alumni support in 2009 by 4%. There was a steady increase in voluntary support of higher education from 2004 to 2008: \$24.4 billion in 2004; \$25.6 billion in 2005; \$28.0 billion in 2006; \$29.75 billion in 2007; and in 2008, a record \$31.60 billion (Council for Aid to Education, 2004; Council for Aid to Education, 2005; Council for Aid to Education, 2006; Council for Aid to Education, 2007; Council for Aid to Education, 2008). Then in 2009 the total voluntary support of higher education dipped to \$27.85 billion due to the state of the economy and rose slightly in 2010 to \$28.00 billion. Of the total \$28.00 billion given to education in 2010 foundation giving comprised \$8.40 billion or 30.0% of the total; alumni giving comprised \$7.10 billion or 25.4% of the total; nonalumni comprised \$4.92 billion or 17.6% of the total; corporate giving comprised \$4.73 billion or 16.9% of the total; religious organization giving comprised \$.31 billion or 1.1% of the total; and other organizations comprised \$2.55 billion or 9.1% of the total (Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Alumni support of higher education represented the largest contribution to education every year until the last several years. The percentage of alumni support to higher education was 27.5% in 2004, 27.7% in 2005, 30.0% in 2006, 27.8% in 2007, 27.5% in 2008, 25.6% in 2009, and 25.4% in 2010. Foundation support to higher education as compared with alumni giving was 25.4% in 2004, 27.3% in 2005, 25.4% in 2006, 28.6% in 2007, 28.8% in 2008, 29.6% in 2009, and 30.0% in 2010. Nonalumni support of higher education was as high as 23.4% in 1992 and then dropped to 21.3% in 2004, stabilized around 19% to 20% from 2005 to 2008, then dropped to 17.9% in 2009 and further dropped to 17.6% in 2010. Corporation support of higher education steadily dropped from 2004 to 2008 then resurged in 2009 and 2010 as corporations felt the need to display a more compassionate appearance. Corporation support of higher education was 18% in 2004, 17.2% in 2005, 16.4% in 2006, 16.1% in 2007, 15.5% in 2008, 16.6% in 2009, and then 16.9% in 2010. Since 2004, religious organizations support of higher education has decreased steadily from 1.4% in 2004 to 1.1% in 2010. "Other organizations" support of higher education remained around 6% to 7% until it jumped to 9.1% in 2009 and held steady at 9.1% again in 2010 (Council for Aid to Education, 2005; Council for Aid to Education, 2006; Council for Aid to Education, 2007; Council for Aid to Education, 2008; Council for Aid to Education, 2009; Council for Aid to Education, 2010; Council for Aid to Education, 2011).

Uses of the Contributions to Higher Education

As important as the need to raise funds is the need to explain and justify the effectiveness of their use. The Council for Aid to Education (CAE) reports how donations to higher education are spent and separates the expenditures into seven categories: (1) restricted current operations; (2) unrestricted current operations; (3) restricted endowments; (4) unrestricted endowments; (5) property, buildings and equipment; (6) deferred gift (counted at present value); and (7) loan funds. Using the Council for Aid to Education's (CAE) Voluntary Support of Education results from 2004-2005, 2005-2006 and 2006-07 following are the data and statistics. Restricted current operations accounted for the largest percentage in 2006-2007 at 45.2% and increased .6% from 2005-2006, although restricted current operations had declined 1.7% from 2004-05 to 2005-06. Unrestricted current operations were 8.4% in 2006-07 and had been slightly decreasing for two years, from 8.8% in 2004-2005 to 8.5% in 2005-2006 to 8.4% in 2006-2007. Although the restricted current operations expenditures were slightly decreasing the restricted endowment expenditures were slightly increasing. Restricted endowments were 25.4% in 2004-2005 and 27.5% in 2005-2006 and 27.2% in 2006-2007. Unrestricted endowment remained nearly steady at 2.1% in 2004-2005 and 2.0% in both 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. Property, buildings and equipment remained close for the 3-year period at 14.2% in 2004-2005, 14.8% in 2005-2006 and 14.7% in 2006-2007. Loan funds were completely stable at .1% all 3 years. Deferred gifts, which were counted at present value, decreased from 3.2% in 2004-2005 to 2.5% 2005-2006 and then decreased again slightly to 2.4% in 2006-2007.

How Giving is Affected by Economic Slowdowns and Recessions

Giving USA Foundation (*Giving USA Spotlight*, 2008) offered advice from its Giving

Institute members on successful fundraising during a recession period that included maximizing the use of all fundraising tactics available and focusing efforts on renewing gifts from current donors. It said that no donor should be taken for granted. Other advice was that thank you calls should be made and information about planned giving should be sent to loyal, long-term donors. Online giving options and public relations and media relations should be effectively used. Fundraisers should work closely with the board of trustees to make sure that each board member is a current donor and an advocate for the organization's vision and purpose. Finally, fundraising professionals should develop and follow a fundraising, communications, and stewardship plan to stay focused and maintain momentum.

As discussed earlier in this paper, *Giving USA* reports giving by recipient organization types, including religion, education, foundations, human services, health, public-society benefit, arts, international affairs, and environment. These recipient organizations weather recessions and economic slowdowns in different degrees (Giving USA Spotlight, 2008):

- Human services and public-society benefit both show growth in giving in recessions and even higher rates of growth in longer recessions.
- Religion shows little effect in giving during recessions and little effect from slowdowns.
- International affairs and environment both show slower rates of growth during recessions than during non-recession years, but there is no sign of drops during recessions or during slowdowns.
- Health shows a much slower rate of growth in recessions and in slowdowns.
- Education shows a strong effect, with giving dropping during recessions,

dropping further during longer recessions, and an average drop in slowdowns.

- Foundations show a mixed effect with a slower rate of growth in giving during recessions and a drop during slowdowns.
- The arts subsector also shows a mixed effect. (p. 7)

Giving USA data (*Giving USA Spotlight*, 2008) showed that in recessions since 1967 that the amount given to education had fallen on average by 1.9% in each recession. Religion also showed a decline on average but only an average annual drop of 0.1%. Giving to foundations and to arts also showed a drop during slowdowns. Other types of recipient organizations saw slowed rates of growth in recession years but on average no declines.

Regarding education, *Giving USA* data (*Giving USA Spotlight*, 2008) showed education giving fell in 5 of 11 recession years, with the largest drops in the latter years of the 1973-1975 recession. There was a decline of 1.1% during recessions and a drop of 1.9% in years with 8 months or more of recession.

Contributions to higher education, as reported earlier in the 2008 Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) released by the Council for Aid to Education (CAE), grew by 6.2% from 2007 to 2008 reaching \$31.60 billion, but what does the future look like for giving to colleges and universities? The CAE (2009) stated that three factors historically had played major roles in annual VSE survey results. One factor was the strength of the stock market, which affects capital-purpose gifts to higher education, including endowments and gifts for buildings and equipment. Another factor has been the overall health of the economy as measured by Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which affects contributions for current operations. Finally, the third

factor has been changes in tax law. Tax laws can increase giving in the current year or shift it into the next year. The most important thing is that advancement professionals anticipate tax laws and manage giving campaigns accordingly.

During recessions gifts used for current operations are expected to decline and then grow more slowly. Then compounding the problem is sharply declining endowments. Endowment values decline due to the performance of the stock market and sometimes to investments that are questionable. In 2008 the core group of 967 institutions reported less than a 1% gain, whereas in 2007 the endowments of institutions reporting to the VSE survey for two consecutive years had increased by 19.7% (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). Institutions posted double-digit percentage increases in 2008 but they were finishing capital campaigns in 2007 and 2008. Some institutions extended their due-date pledges, which is normal during economic slowdowns and recessions. Additionally, advancement professionals reported declines early in 2009, leading to speculation that fiscal year 2010 may be worse than fiscal year 2009 (Council for Aid to Education, 2009).

The 2008 Voluntary Support of Education survey resulted in other interesting findings. Alumni participation declined from 11.7% to 11.0%, but was up among undergraduate-degreed alumni (separate from those earning only a graduate degree or enrolling in one or more courses) from 13.4% to 13.9%. Individuals accounted for nearly half of the \$31.60 billion given in 2008, as alumni giving represented 27.5% and nonalumni giving was 19.4%. Foundation giving was 28.8% of the total, but the Council for Aid to Education (2009) reported that approximately one third of foundation giving reported on the VSE was from family foundations and represented support caused to be given to the institutions by individuals including alumni and other friends. Foundation and corporate giving together was 44.3% but it was also pointed out by the Council

for Aid to Education (2009) that companies supported colleges and universities in many ways that were not counted by the VSE survey, including sponsorships, partnerships, and clinical trials.

Finally, the top 20 fundraising universities accounted for 26.6% of all 2008 gifts to higher education and the increase in gifts to those institutions accounted for 46.9% of the national increase. Furthermore, giving would have actually declined by 4.2% if the donations to those top 20 institutions had been removed. Of the remaining institutions it was noted that about half had reported increases in giving and half had reported declines.

In an earlier report of the Council for Aid to Education (2006) the total amount of alumni giving was reported to have increased in 2005, but the percentage of alumni making gifts had declined to 12.4% and had been declining each year since 2001. The study attributed the 2005 increase to larger gifts rather than to larger number of graduates. As mentioned earlier, the Council for Aid to Education (2009) reported in its Voluntary Aid to Education 2008 report that again although the total amount of alumni giving increased in 2008, the alumni participation declined from 11.7% to 11% a further decline from 2005's reported 12.4%. Although 2008's decline could be contributed to an increase of 5.3% more alumni and only a 1% increase in their giving (Council of Aid to Education, 2009). Still this further points to the fact that the percentage of alumni making donations to their alma mater continues to drop off, and studies of alumni characteristics in giving is even more important.

Summary

“Philanthropy” has become the preferred word to apply to long-term giving of the whole of humanity and its propagation into the future, and charity has been increasingly used to describe the short-term alleviation of society's temporary ills that sporadically occur. The use of the term,

“philanthropy”, has evolved into the more preferred term and it has widespread use in current day giving including its spread into education and higher education.

Theories and decision models on giving are described in this chapter. A myriad of methods were discussed involving the acts of fundraising to secure donations. In addition, the values, principles, and ethical issues surrounding fundraising were outlined. I have been especially interested in giving to higher education institutions, so the “need” for donations to higher education was depicted as well. New theory and research have continued to spawn more research on giving models, patterns, variables, and motives because of the great importance that philanthropy plays in the current financial situation of every institution of higher learning. No longer are there exclusively “private” and “public” institutions. Almost every private institution receives some government funding and almost every public institution is reliant to some degree on private giving. It is known who gives to higher education and how the contributions are used, but again it is the “why” that is illusive. Research into alumni giving is relatively new. During the past several years, however, there has been a proliferation of information and research regarding the topic of philanthropic giving and, in particular, on alumni giving. The need for raising as many dollars as possible for the university and as efficiently as possible has never been more important than in today’s economic climate. I hope that another piece of the puzzle can be found based on my proposed research and added to the existing research in order to maximize the funds raised. We should all look within ourselves and find that inherent philanthropic virtue that when used will serve to keep the chain of good works going in our communities and perpetuating the good in our society.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this study is to identify the relationships between demographic variables of alumni and employees and their donor or nondonor status at the selected institution. This chapter provides detailed information on the study's quantitative research design: population, data collection instrument, threats to validity, measurement of variables, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures.

Research Design

For this study I employed a nonexperimental, applied research design. I used data from the university's alumni database system and the university's human resources database system to determine if any associations existed between the demographic predictor variables of alumni and employees and the criterion variable of giving.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following five research questions controlled the direction of this study:

Research Question 1

Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between gender (male and female) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

Research Question 2

Is there a significant relationship among highest degree earned and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho2: There is no significant relationship among highest degree earned (associate's and certificate, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

Research Question 3

Is there a significant relationship among college of major study and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho3: There is no significant relationship among college of major study (Business & Technology, Arts & Sciences, Public & Allied Health, Continuing Sciences, Education, Medicine, Nursing, & Pharmacy) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between gender (male and female) and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university.

Research Question 5

Is there a significant relationship among positions of staff, faculty and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university?

Ho5: There is no significant relationship between positions of staff, faculty, and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university.

Instrumentation

This analysis was performed using accessed archival data from the Alumni Association's database system and from the Office of Human Resources' database system for the fiscal year 2009-2010. The data included all of the alumni in the Alumni Association's database system during the fiscal year 2009-2010, and this included all alumni who have ever graduated from the participating university that they have records on up until graduation Spring, 2010. The data also included all of the employees in the Human Resources database system during only the fiscal year 2009-2010, not including any employees prior to fiscal year 2009-2010.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the 76,728 alumni and the 2,279 full-time employees of a mid-sized southeastern university during the fiscal year 2009-2010. I did not select a sample or use sampling methods, because I used the data generated for the entire fiscal year 2009-2010 from the Alumni Association's database system and the Office of Human Resources' database system.

Threats to Validity

Threats to the validity of this study include the fact that this is a single-site study and that

some groups contained small numbers of individuals. Additionally, data were limited to the alumni database and the human resources database of only one fiscal year, 2009-2010.

Data Collection

Prior to conducting the study, approval was obtained from the participating university's Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Advancement Services Director of the Alumni Association under the Office of Advancement, and the Human Resources Director in the Office of Human Resources. Data collection was initiated by using reports that were generated by the Computer Operations Coordinator from the University's Alumni Development System and the Human Resources Systems Manager from the Human Resources System. The Computer Operations Coordinator retrieved alumni data from the Alumni Association's database, and the Human Resources Systems Manager retrieved the employee data from the Human Resources System using the school-wide program known as "Banner". Variables selected for this study were divided into two groups, those that relate to alumni giving and those that relate to employee giving. Variables that relate to alumni giving include gender (male, female), highest degree earned (associate and certificate, bachelor's, master's, doctorate), and college of major study (Business & Technology, Arts and Sciences, Public and Allied Health, Continuing Sciences, Education, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy). Variables that relate to employee giving include gender (male, female) and position (faculty, staff, administrators). All identifying information including names, social security numbers, and university I.D. numbers were deleted from the data before they were submitted to me. Data were converted to Excel worksheets for easier analysis. Frequency tables were run on both sets of data, employees and alumni, using SPSS. Alumni "highest degree earned" codes were categorized into four groups: associate's and certificate's,

bachelor's, master's, and doctorates. Alumni "college of major study" codes were categorized into eight groups: Business and Technology, Arts and Sciences, Public and Allied Health, Continuing Sciences, Education, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. Employee "position" codes were categorized into the three position groups: faculty, staff, and administrators. "Gender" codes for both the employee and alumni data needed no further simplification because they were coded male or female. All variables were then analyzed regarding the significance of their relationship to donor or nondonor status of alumni and employees.

Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed objectively and were presented by use of percentages, comparisons by graphs, and illustrated in tables. IBM-SPSS statistical software was used to conduct the analysis. I specifically used the statistical test, chi-square, to test all of the research questions with an alpha level of significance set at .05.

Summary

The intention of this study is to derive information regarding the relationships that exist between alumni giving and the variables gender (male, female), highest degree (associates & certificates, bachelor's, master's, doctorate), and college of major study (Business & Technology, Arts and Sciences, Public and Allied Health, Continuing Sciences, Education, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy); and employee giving and the variables gender (male, female) and position (faculty, staff, administrators). The results of this study may be able to provide the university's Office of Advancement and Office of Alumni Development with valuable information in order to enhance giving to the university.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study is to determine: (1) if an association existed between the predictor variables gender, highest degree level and college of major study and alumni's giving levels (donors versus nondonors); and (2) if an association existed between the predictor variables gender and position and employees' giving levels (donors versus nondonors). The data used in this study were retrieved from the database system of the Alumni Office and the Office of Human Resources and included 2,279 full-time employees and 76,728 alumni during the fiscal year 2009-10.

As shown in Table 1, 3.9% of the alumni at the participating university were donors and 18.4% of employees at the participating university were donors in the fiscal year 2009-2010. In comparison and as reported in Chapter 3, alumni participation was recorded at 9.8% nationally in 2010 on the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey, which is the lowest level ever recorded on the VSE survey (Council for Aid to Education, 2011) and has declined in every year since 2006. There is little data or information in the literature to compare employee participation at this time.

Table 1

Alumni and Employee Donors and Nondonors

Alumni and Employee Giving	Alumni		Employees		Total
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Nondonors	73,712	96.1	1,860	81.6	75,572
Donors	3,016	3.9	419	18.4	3,507
Total	76,728	100.0	2,279	100.0	79,007

The research questions presented in Chapter 3 and the null hypotheses were used to guide the study. Five research questions were developed to direct the study and five corresponding null hypotheses were tested, one for each research question. Chi-square tests were used to determine if an association existed between predictor variables and alumni giving, and predictor variables and employee giving. All analyses were performed using SPSS.

*Research Questions**Research Question 1*

Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between gender (male and female) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

A chi-square analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in the giving (nondonor versus donor) of female alumnae and male alumni. The chi-square test was

significant, Pearson χ^2 (1, $N = 76,724$) = 91.57, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .04$. As shown in Table 2, a higher percentage of male alumni donated to the university (4.7%) than female alumni (3.3%).

The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 2

Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by Gender

Alumni Giving	<u>Female</u>		<u>Male</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Did not donate	40,374	96.7	33,334	95.3
Donated	1,385	3.3	1,631	4.7
Total	41,759	100.0	34,965	100.0

Research Question 2

Is there a significant relationship among highest degree earned and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho2: There is no significant relationship among highest degree earned (associate's and certificate, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

A chi-square test was conducted to evaluate whether there was a difference in the alumni giving level (nondonor versus donor) among their highest earned degree levels of associate and certificate, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate. The chi-square test was significant, Pearson χ^2

(3, $N = 76,727$) = 278.27, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .06$. As shown in Table 3, the percentage of alumni who donated increased with each advanced degree earned. Sixty (1.8%) alumni with associate's or certificate degrees donated to the university while 1,896 (3.4%) alumni with bachelor's degrees donated. Seven hundred and eighty-four (5.3%) alumni with master's degrees and 276 (7.6%) alumni with doctorate degrees donated to the university. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 3

Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by Degree

Alumni Giving	Associate's or Certificate		Bachelor's		Master's		Doctorate	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Did not donate	3,217	98.2	53,170	96.6	13,982	94.7	3,342	92.4
Donated	60	1.8	1896	3.4	784	5.3	276	7.6
Total	3,277	100.0	55,066	100.0	14,766	100.0	3,618	100.0

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the difference among the levels of degrees. Table 4 shows the results of these analyses. The Holm's sequential Bonferroni method was used to control for Type 1 error at the .05 level across all six comparisons. As shown in Table 4, all six comparisons of degree levels showed significance.

Table 4

Pairwise Comparisons Using the Holm's Sequential Bonferroni Method for Alumni Giving by Degree Earned

Comparison	Pearson Chi-square	<i>p</i> value	(Alpha)	Cramer's <i>V</i>
Bachelor's vs. Doctorate	166.86*	< .001	.008	.05
Associate's vs. Doctorate	124.68*	< .001	.010	.13
Bachelor's vs. Master's	109.90*	< .001	.013	.04
Associate's vs. Master's	72.78*	< .001	.017	.06
Master's vs. Doctorate	28.76*	< .001	.025	.04
Associate's vs. Bachelor's	24.81*	< .001	.050	.02

* significant at the .001 level

Research Question 3

Is there a significant relationship among college of major study and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university?

Ho3: There is no significant relationship among college of major study (Business and Technology, Arts and Sciences, Public and Allied Health, Continuing Sciences, Education, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy) and donor or nondonor status of alumni at the participating university.

A chi-square test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in the giving level (nondonor versus donor) of alumni and the college of major study that they graduated from.

The chi-square test was significant, Pearson $\chi^2 (7, N = 74,363) = 157.82, p < .001$. As shown in Table 5, the College of Medicine alumni had the highest giving percentage, 7.0%, followed by the

College of Pharmacy at 4.6%, Arts and Sciences at 4.3 %, Education at 3.8%, Business and Technology at 3.6%, Public and Allied Health and Continuing Sciences both at 2.7%, and last was Nursing at 2.5%. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 5

Cross-Tabulated Table for Alumni Giving by College of Major Study

	Bus. and Tech.		Arts and Sciences		Public and Allied Health		Continuing Studies		Education		Medicine		Nursing		Pharmacy	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Donor																
No	19,415	96.4	20,774	95.7	7,285	97.3	1,565	97.3	14,033	96.2	2,625	93.0	5,808	97.5	62	95.4
Yes	716	3.6	930	4.3	199	2.7	44	2.7	554	3.8	199	7.0	151	2.5	3	4.6
Total	20,131	100.0	21,704	100.0	7,484	100.0	1,609	100.0	14,587	100.0	2,824	100.0	5,959	100.0	65	100.0

Research Question 4

Is there a significant relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university?

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between gender (male and female) and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university.

A chi-square test was conducted to determine evaluate whether there was a difference in the giving (donor versus nondonor) of male employees and female employees. The chi-square test was significant, Pearson $\chi^2 (1, N = 2279) = 13.35, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .08$. As shown in Table 6, a significantly higher percentage of male employees donated to the university (21.8%) than female employees (15.8%). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 6

Cross-Tabulated Table for Employee Giving by Gender

Employee Giving	Female		Male	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Did not donate	1,092	84.2	768	78.2
Donated	205	15.8	214	21.8
Total	1,297	100.0	982	100.0

Research Question 5

Is there a significant relationship among positions of staff, faculty and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university?

Ho5: There is no significant relationship among positions of staff, faculty, and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees at the participating university.

A chi-square test was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in the employee giving level (donor versus nondonor) among the employee positions of staff, faculty and administrators. The chi-square test was significant, Pearson $\chi^2 (2, N = 2,279) = 157.74, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .26$. As shown in Table 7, faculty had the highest percentage of giving at 27.5%, followed by 22.8% of administrators giving back to the university, while only 4% of staff donated to the university. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 7

Cross-Tabulated Table for Employee Giving by Position

	Administrative		Faculty		Staff	
Employee Giving	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Did not donate	533	77.2	612	72.5	715	96.0
Donated	157	22.8	232	27.5	30	4.0
Total	690	100.0	844	100.0	745	100.0

Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the difference among the levels of position. Table 8 shows the results of these analyses. The Holm's sequential Bonferroni

method was used to control for Type 1 error at the .05 level across all three comparisons. The means for all three pairs were significantly different.

Table 8

Results for the Pairwise Comparisons Using the Holm's Sequential Bonferroni Method

Comparison	Pearson Chi-square	<i>P</i> value	(Alpha)	Cramer's <i>V</i>
Faculty vs. Staff	158.18*	<.001	(.017)	.32
Administrators vs. Staff	110.85*	<.001	(.025)	.28
Administrators vs. Faculty	4.50**	.034	(.050)	.05

* Significant at the .001 level; ** significant at the .05 level

Summary

Chapter 4 focuses on five research questions and one hypothesis for each question regarding an analysis of alumni giving and employee giving at the participating university. Alumni and employee donors versus nondonors were analyzed for relationships among the predictor variables gender, highest degree level, and college of major study regarding alumni donors and nondonors; and the predictor variables of gender and position regarding employee donors and nondonors. All analyses were conducted using the chi-square test.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to analyze the demographic variables associated with alumni giving and employee giving at a mid-sized, southeastern public university. The extent to which the demographics of alumni, including gender, highest degree earned, and college of major study and the demographics of employees, including gender and position played a role in their giving back to the university are also reported. This chapter includes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the research study. Recommendations for further practice and for further research are also presented.

Summary of the Findings

In the colonial period in the United States most philanthropists donated only to private colleges because public colleges did not yet exist. Today great importance is placed on giving to every institution of higher learning regardless of whether it is a “private” institution or a “public” institution. Public universities were in the past almost solely dependent on government funding and tuition paid by students, but with government funding being reduced more and more each year, today’s public institutions must learn to be increasingly reliant on the generosity of donors.

The review of the literature documents the various information accumulated on philanthropy in higher education. The literature was divided into the history of philanthropy in higher education, fundraising principles and campaigns, the need for donations to higher education, alumni-giving decision models, and variables and the status of giving to higher education. Both the literature and data retrieved from the participating university’s databases

were used to address the research questions.

Research Question 1

Findings regarding the relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of alumni were significant. Males at the participating university gave at a higher percentage (4.7%) than females (3.3%). This was consistent with most previous research (Haddad, 1986; McKee, 1975; McNally, 1985; Melchiori, 1988) as reported in the literature review in Chapter 2, although some researchers (Beeler, 1982; Harrison, 1995) found that women were more likely to give than men, and other researchers (Keller, 1982; Korvas, 1984; McKee, 1975) found no significant differences between women and men in their giving levels.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 was intended to determine if there was a relationship between highest degree levels earned and donor or nondonor status of alumni. The chi-square test found a significant difference between alumni giving and highest degree level. Furthermore, the data showed an increase in the percentage of alumni who were donors with each higher level of last degree earned. About 1.8% of alumni with associate's degrees or certificates donated to the participating university. Donations to the university increased to 3.4% of alumni with bachelor's degrees, and then further increased to 5.3% of alumni with master's degrees. Finally, donations to the participating university increased to 7.6% of alumni with doctoral degrees. As stated in the literature review in Chapter 2, Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), Caruthers (1973), and Haddad (1986) also found that highest degree earned was a significant predictor variable. There also are data in the literature to indicate that multiple degree holders from the same university were also

significant predictors of donors. These findings should add more validity to the existing literature regarding highest degree earned being a significant predictor variable.

Research Question 3

Findings regarding the relationship between college of major study and donor or nondonor status of alumni were significant. There were eight colleges at the participating university. The college of medicine showed the largest percentage of alumni giving at 7.0%, followed by the college of pharmacy at 4.6%, and the college of arts and sciences at 4.3%. Alumni of the college of education contributed at the rate of 3.8% followed by the college of business and technology at 3.6%. The bottom three colleges were the college of public and allied health and the college of continuing studies both showing 2.7% of alumni giving to the participating university and lastly the college of nursing's alumni giving back at 2.5%. The variable major was found to be of significance by Blumenfel and Sartain (1974), Grill (1988), Okunade and Berl (1997), and Okunade et al. (1994) as discussed in the Chapter 2 literature review, although Korvas (1984) found that the variable, major, was not significant. The only colleges of major study found to be significant as a variable for giving in the literature review were colleges of business. The findings of Okunade et al. (1994) and Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974) found that business school graduates made larger donations. The data in this study did not make a distinction as to the amount of the donation just whether the alumnus was a donor or not a donor. These findings add to the literature on this subject.

Research Question 4

Findings regarding the relationship between gender and donor or nondonor status of

employees were found to be significant. Male employees at the participating university gave at a higher percentage (21.8%) than females (15.8%). This is congruent with male alumni (4.7%) giving more than female alumni (3.3%). The literature review did not produce any information regarding employees giving back to their university of employment. It is noteworthy to point out that a higher percentage of the employees than alumni at the participating university gave back to the university. These are important findings for development professionals, as they may want to increase their focus and fundraising efforts on employees.

Research Question 5

Research question 5 was intended to find if there was a relationship among employees of different status (staff, faculty, and administrators) and donor or nondonor status of employees. The chi-square test produced a significant difference between employee position and employee giving. Again, the literature review did not produce any information regarding employees giving back to their university of employment, so these findings will add to the research on variables that determine giving to higher education.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were developed from the data analysis and the literature review:

1. Level of highest degree earned was significant across all four degree levels. Furthermore, as the degree increased from associate to bachelor's to master's and then to doctorate, so did the percentage of alumni donors increase with each advanced degree.
2. The college of major study was also significant. Advancement officers should continue to

work with each college to pinpoint alumni's specific motivations for giving back to their college.

3. Male employees, like male alumni, gave back to the university at a higher percentage than female employees or alumnae. It should also be noted that at the participating university, a larger percentage of employees were donors at 18.4%, than was the case for alumni at 3.9%. Development officers should not overlook the importance of employees giving back and develop more fundraising strategies to tap this income source.
4. More than a quarter of the faculty and nearly a quarter of administrators donated back to the university, as there were significant relationships shown among positions of staff, faculty, and administrators and donor or nondonor status of employees. Faculty had the highest percentage of giving at 27.5%, followed by 22.8% of administrators giving back to the university. Only 4% of staff gave back to the university.

Recommendations for Practice

The study provided ongoing recommendations for practice as follows:

1. The participating university should continue to develop fundraising strategies aimed at its employees because employees were shown to give at a higher percentage than alumni.
2. The participating university should continue providing increasingly strong academic programs because students who earn degrees and are successful in their chosen profession are more likely to be donors to the university.
3. The participating university should specifically target alumni who earned doctoral degrees from its programs because it was found that alumni giving increased with each higher degree earned, giving the most if they had received a doctorate degree.

4. Alumni professionals should seek to make special contact with those alumni who have the highest degrees from the university.
5. Advancement professionals should particularly earmark fundraising efforts towards faculty and administrators as these groups of employees have shown a higher potential as donors.
6. The participating university should encourage students to join university organizations and participate in university activities because students who were engaged during their university years are more likely to give back to their university after graduation.
7. The participating university should encourage activities to draw alumni back to the university because alumni who are more engaged in the university after graduation are more likely to be donors to the university.
8. The participating university should continue expecting university personnel, in particular faculty members, to create positive relationships with students because students who have close ties with university personnel are more likely to be donors to the university.
9. The participating university should seek new ideas to attract alumni who have not given in the past.
10. The participating university should expand its development staff to attract new donors and pay more attention to existing ones who could make mid-sized gifts.
11. The participating university should encourage each academic department that does not already have a Foundation Account to establish one and make frequent contact with its departmental alumni.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study provides a broad overview of the relationships between demographic variables of alumni and employees and their donor or nondonor status at the participating university; however, the following represent recommendations for further study:

1. A similar study should be conducted to compare other higher education institutions in order to establish a baseline regarding alumni and employee giving among similar sized public universities in the state where the participating university resides.
2. Research on women as donors should be pursued. Female philanthropists will continue to play a critical role throughout the decade. How universities choose to involve women will be critical to the institutions' philanthropic success.
3. Research should be conducted on the amounts donated by alumni and employees compared to other variables to further enhance the fundraising strategies.
4. Research should be conducted to determine if employees who donated were also alumni at the participating institution and if that motivated them to give or give more.
5. This study identified that alumni with the highest degree were more likely to give back to the participating university. This study only identified alumni by their highest degree. A study should be conducted to also determine the alumni who have more than one degree from the participating university to determine if this increases the chances that an alumnus will give back to his or her university.
6. Research should be conducted to determine if salary levels of employees are related to their giving levels.
7. Research should be conducted to determine if the college or departments where the

employees worked were related to their giving levels.

8. This study should be replicated to determine if the university's expanded doctoral programs have had an effect on the amount of alumni giving.
9. Regarding alumni, professional development officers should continue to focus on male donors, but should not overlook the female donor. Because females have been found not to budget for their charitable giving, they can be solicited at anytime during the year, preferably by mail. If they are called, it was found they would more favorably respond if it were from other alumnae.
10. As the literature review stated, there are several alumni-giving theories and decision models, and numerous giving variables. These deserve exploration to identify those peculiar to the participating university and individual colleges.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, S.R. (1996). Altruism, nonprofit, and economic theory. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34, 701-728.
- Andrews, F.E. (1953). *Attitudes towards giving*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Andrews, F.E. (1950). *Philanthropic giving*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Association of Fundraising Professionals, *Donor Bill of Rights*, Retrieved from http://www.afpnet.org/ka/print_content.cfm?folder_id=898&content_item_id=9988.
- Auten, G. & Rudney, G. (1989). The variability of the charitable giving by the wealthy. In R. Magat (Ed.), *Philanthropic giving: Studies in varieties and goals* (pp. 72-91). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baade, R.A., & Sundberg, J.O. (1996). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review*, 15, 75-81.
- Baldwin, K. (2008). *How reciprocity influences alumni giving: A qualitative study*. The University of Alabama. AAT 3334601.
- Baluss, K.S. (1995). *The spirit of innovation and soul of tradition: Institutional advancement and organizational culture at an Oxford University College*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Beeler, K.J. (1982). *A study of predictors on alumni philanthropy in private universities*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Belfield, C.R., & Beney, A.P. (2000). What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*, 18, 65-80.
- Blakey, B.E. (1975). *Historical and contemporaneous predictors of alumni involvement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Blanchette, R. (1993). *Predicting giving behavior*. Connections: A Publication of the American Prospect Research Association. Vol. V, No. 4, Summer 1993.
- Blum, D. & Hall, H. (2005). Americans donated \$248.5-billion to charity in 2004, a 2.3% rise. *The Chronicles of Higher Education*. June, 2005 v51 i42 pA27 Retrieved November 23, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i42/42a02701.htm>.
- Blumenfeld, W. S., & Sartain, P. L. (1974). Predicting alumni financial donation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 522-523.

- Blumenstyk, G. (2011). College Spending Trends Show Students Bearing a Growing Share of the Costs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 1, 2011 from <http://chronicle.com/article/College-Spending-Trends-Show/128972/>.
- Boehner, J.A., & McKeon, H.P. (2003, September 4). *The college cost crisis*. Retrieved November 18, 2006, from <http://edworkforce.house.gov/issues/108th/education/highereducation/CollegeCostCrisisReport.pdf>
- Boulding, K.E. (1973). *The economy of love and fear*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bremner, R. H. (1960). *American philanthropy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Brittingham, B. E., & Pezzullo, T. R. (1990). *The campus green – fund raising in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Broms, P.A. & Davis, K.L. (1966). *A study of the characteristics of consistent alumni givers and non-givers*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Colorado.
- Bruggink, T.H., & Siddiqui, K. (1995). An econometric model of alumni giving: A case study for a liberal arts college. *The American Economist*, 39, 53-61.
- Buckla, R.J. (2004). *Organizational culture and alumni annual giving at private Colleges and universities*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
- Budge, E.A.W. (1967). *The book of the dead*. New York, NY: Dover.
- Burt, W. W. Jr. (1989). *Alumni donors and nondonors of Southeast Missouri State University according to institutional involvement, educational satisfaction and demographic characteristics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.
- Caruthers, F.S.S. (1973). *A study of certain characteristics of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their alma mater*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.
- Clark, B. (1999). *The distinctive college*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- Coelho, P.R.P. (1985). An examination into the causes of economic growth: Status as an economic good. *Research in Law and Economics*, 7, 89-116.
- Cohen, A.M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Conley, A. T. (1999). *Student organization membership and alumni giving at a public, research I university*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Connolly, M.S., & Blanchette, R. (1986). Understanding and predicting alumni giving behavior. In J.A. Dunn, Jr. (Ed.), *Enhancing the management of fundraising: New Directions for Institutional Research*, 51, 69-89.
- Council for Aid to Education. (1996). *Breaking the social contract: The fiscal crisis in higher education*. Retrieved November 22, 2011 from <http://www.cae.org/>
- Council for Aid to Education. (2005). *Voluntary support to education*. Retrieved November 22, 2006 from <http://www.cae.org/>
- Council for Aid to Education. (2006). *Voluntary support to education*. Retrieved November 22, 2006 from <http://www.cae.org/>.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2007). *Voluntary support to education*. Retrieved July 19, 2008 from <http://www.cae.org/>.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2008). *Voluntary support to education*. Retrieved July 19, 2008 from <http://www.cae.org/>.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2009). *Contributions to colleges and universities up 6.2 percent to \$31.60 billion*. Retrieved November 19, 2009 from http://www.cae.org.
- Council for Aid to Education, (2010). *Contributions to colleges and universities down 11.9 percent to \$27.85 billion greatest decline ever recorded*. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from http://www.cae.org.
- Council for Aid to Education, (2011). *Colleges and universities raise \$28 billion in 2010 same total as in 2006*. Retrieved August 4, 2011 from http://www.cae.org.
- Cunningham, B.M., & Cochi-Ficano, C.K. (2002). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(3), 540-560.
- Cutlip, S.M. (1965). *Fund raising in the United States: Its role in America's philanthropy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Diamond, W.D., & Kashyap, R. K. (1997). Extending models of prosocial behavior to explain university alumni contributions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 915-928.
- Fehr, E., & Gächter, S. (1997). Reciprocity and economics: The economic implications of homo reciprocans. *European Economic Review* 42, 845-859.

- Fischer, K. (2011). *Crisis of confidence threatens colleges*. Retrieved September, 29, 2011 from <http://jobs.chronicle.com/article/Higher-Education-in-America-a/127530/>
- Fisher, J.L. & Quehl, G.H. (1989). *The president and fund raising*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fromm, Erich. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Gardner, P.M. (1975). *A study of the attitudes of Harding College alumni with an emphasis on donor and nondonor characteristics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio University, Athens.
- Giving Institute. (2011). *About giving institute*. Retrieved October 20, 2011 from http://www.givinginstitute.org/about_gi/index.cfm.
- Giving USA*. (1983). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (1993). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2002). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2005). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2006). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2007). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2008). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA*. (2009). *Giving USA Foundation™*. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>
- Giving USA Foundation. (2010). *Giving USA 2010: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2009*. Retrieved October 20, 2011 from www.givingusareports.org.
- Giving USA Foundation. (2011). *Giving USA 2011: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 2010*. Retrieved October 20, 2011 from www.givingusareports.org.
- Giving USA Spotlight*. (2008). Giving USA Foundation™. Retrieved March 23, 2012 from

<http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Research/givingusa.aspx>

- Grant, J., & Lindaeur, D. (1986). The economics of charity life-cycle pattern alumni contributions. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 2, 129-141.
- Grill, A.J. (1988). *An analysis of the relationships of selected variables to financial support provided by alumni of a public university*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Pennsylvania State University, Altoona.
- Gurin, M.G. & VanTil, J. (1990). In philanthropy in its historical context. In VanTil, J.(Ed.), *Critical issues in American philanthropy* (p. 3) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Haddad, F.D., Jr. (1986). *An analysis of the characteristics of alumni donors and nondonors at Butler University*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Butler University, Indianapolis, IN.
- Haggberg, M. (1992, April). Why donors give. *Fund Raising Management*, April, 39-40.
- Harrison, W.B. (1995). College relations and fundraising expenditures influencing the probability of alumni giving to higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 14, 73-84.
- House, M.L. (1987). Annual fundraising in public higher education: The development and validation of a prediction equation. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 676.
- Hoyt, J.E. (2004). *Understanding alumni giving: Theory and predictors of donor status*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Institutional Research. Boston, MA.
- Hueston, F.R. (1992, July). Predicting alumni giving: A donor analysis test. *Fund Raising Management*, 19-22.
- Hunter, C.S., Jones, E. B., & Boger, C. (1999). A study of the relationship between alumni giving and selected characteristics of alumni donors of Livingstone College, NC. *Journal of Black Studies*, 29, 523-539.
- Hunter, T.W. (1968, Fall). The million dollar gift. *College and University Journal*, 7(4).
- Jordan, R.R., Esq., & Quynn, K.L., Esq. (1991). The psychology of gift giving. In S. S. Stewart, *Charitable giving and solicitation*. (pp. 653-662). Boston, MA: Warren, Gorham & Lamont.
- Keller, J. (2011). U. of Southern California Mounts \$6-Billion FundRaising Campaign, a College Record. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 30, 2011

from: <http://jobs.chronicle.com/article/U-of-Southern-California/128831/>.

- Keller, M.J.C. (1982). *An analysis of alumni donor and nondonor characteristics at the University of Montevallo*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
- Kraus, R. J. (1991). Factors and strategies which influence the marketing of successful fund raising programs in small private colleges. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 3, 153-167.
- Klostermann, B.K. (1995). Development and concurrent validity of a motivation to give scale. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International, (UMI No. 9614944)
- Korvas, R.J. (1984). *The relationship of selected alumni characteristics and attitudes to alumni financial support at private colleges*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Kansas City.
- Leslie, L.L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 39, 115-132.
- Lindemann, W.K. (1983, February). Who makes donations: National survey provides new data. *CASE Currents*. 18-19.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: a partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103-123.
- McKee, D.F. (1975). *An analysis of factors which affect alumni participation and support*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington.
- McKillip, J. & Kinkner, T. (1992). *Alumni donations to SIU: Predictors and preferred uses*. Technical Report.
- McKinney, R.J., Williams, R. H. & Goodwin, T. (1979, April). Factors among select donors and nondonors related to major gifts to a private university. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Francisco, CA.
- McNally, F.E. (1985). *An analysis of alumni philanthropy related to personal, academic, and social characteristics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of San Francisco, CA.
- McNulty, J.W. (1977). Alumni and giving: A study of student personnel sources and alumni philanthropy. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Loyola University of Chicago, IL.

- Mears, P. (1992, April). Understanding strong donors. *Fund Raising Management*, 45-48.
- Melchiori, G.S. (1988, Winter). Applying alumni research to fundraising. In *Alumni Research: Methods and applications*, G.S. Melchiori (Ed.), New directions for institutional research, no. 60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary*, (11th ed.). 2003. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Messina, C. (2009). Religion and Charities. Retrieved, May 3, 2010 from: http://www.edhelper.com/ReadingComprehension_42_73.html.
- Miracle, W. D. (1977). *Differences between givers and non-givers to the University of Georgia annual fund*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens.
- Moody, M. (2005). Reciprocity. *Learning to give*. Retrieved, May 19, 2009, from http://www.learningtogive.org/religiousinstructors/phil_in_america/reciprocity.asp.
- Mosser, J.W. (1993). *Predicting alumni/ae gift giving behavior: a structural equation model approach*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).
- National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education (1998). *Straight talk about college costs and prices*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- New International Version (NIV) Study Bible, 10th Anniversary Edition* (1995), Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan
- O'Connor, W.J. (1961). *A study of certain factors characteristic of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their college*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Buffalo, NY.
- Odendahl, T. (1989). Independent foundations and wealthy donors. In Richard Magat (Ed.), *Philanthropic giving: Studies in varieties and goals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 159-179.
- Oglesby, R.A. (1991). *Age, student involvement, and other characteristics of alumni donors and alumni nondonors of Southwest Baptist University*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Okunade, A. A., & Berl, R. L. (1997). Determinants of charitable giving of business school alumni. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 201-214.
- Okunade, A.A., Wunnava, P.V., & Walsh, J.R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni: microdata evidence from a large public university. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53, 73-84.

- Olsen, K., Smith, A.L., & Wunnava, P.V. (1989, Fall). An empirical study of the life-cycle hypothesis with respect to alumni donations. *The American Economist*, 33(2), 60-63.
- Payton, R. L. (1988). *Philanthropy – voluntary action for the public good*. New York, NY: American Council on Education and Macmillan.
- Pearson, J. (1999). Comprehensive research on alumni relationships: Four years of market research at Stanford University. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 101, 5-21.
- Peterson, V.T. (2003, October 17). Giving to colleges: There's reason for hope. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 3, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i08/08b01601.htm>
- Potter, W. (2003, August 8). State lawmakers again cut higher-education spending. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i48/48a02201.htm>.
- Pray, F.C. (1981). *Handbook for educational fundraising*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed.). (1966). New York, NY: Random House.
- Rhodes, F. (1997). *Successful fundraising for higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- Roberts, L.W., Coverdale, J., Louie, A. (2006, July-August). Philanthropy, ethics, and leadership in academic psychiatry. *Academic Psychiatry*, 30, 269-272.
- Second College Edition of The American Heritage Dictionary* (Rev. ed.). (1985). Houghton Mifflin Company . Of American Heritage dictionary of the English language. New college ed. C1976. p.931, p.260, p.99.
- Shadoian, H.L. (1989). *A study of predictors of alumni philanthropy in public colleges*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Colorado, Athens.
- Simari, R.M. (1995). *Philanthropy and higher education: women as donors*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Smart, J.D., & Pascarella, E. T. (1986). Socioeconomic achievements of former college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 529-549.
- Spaeth, J.L. & Greeley, A.M. (1970). *Recent alumni and higher education: A survey of graduates*. Berkley, CA: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

- Squeeze Play 2009: The Public's Views on College Costs Today*. Retrieved August 19, 2009 from: <http://www.publicagenda.org/press-releases/public-concern-over-college-costs-hits-all-time-high-while-trust-colleges-and-universities-wavers>.
- Steinberg, R. (1989). The theory of crowding out: Donations, local government spending, and the "New Federalism." In Richard Magat (Ed.), *Philanthropic giving: Studies in varieties and goals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 143-156.
- Strout, E. (2004, June). Survey notes negative correlation between alumni giving and political commencement speeches. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(40), Retrieved September 19, 2011 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i40/40a02002.htm>.
- Strout, E. (2005, January). Fundraising: the big gifts had better get bigger. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(18), Retrieved September 19, 2011 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i18/18a00802.htm>.
- Strout, E. (2006, February). Private giving to colleges is up, but fewer alumni make donations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(25). pA27. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i25/25a02701.htm>.
- Strout, E. (2007, March). Donations increase for 3rd year in a row. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 53(26). Retrieved September 19, 2011 from: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v53/i26/26a00101.htm>.
- Sulek, M. (2008). On the Meaning of Philanthropy Classical and Modern, a WIMPS Presentation, April 1, 2008. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from: <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/Education/Meaning-of-Philanthropy.pdf>.
- Sun, X. (2005). *A multivariate causal model of alumni giving at a midwest, public university*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Supiano, B. (2010). Families use more money from all sources to meet rising costs of college, survey finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 29, 2011 from: <http://jobs.chronicle.com/article/Families-Use-More-Money-From/123860/>.
- Taylor, A.L., & Martin, Jr. J.C. (1995). Characteristics of alumni donors and nondonors at a research I, public university. *Research in Higher Education*, 36, 283-298.
- Testimony to the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, New York State Legislature, (Feb. 12, 2002) (testimony of Alan B. Lubin).
- Thomas, J.A. (2005). *The relationship between personal and social growth and involvement in college and subsequent alumni giving*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Databases: Dissertations and Theses. AAT 3199502

- Trombley, W. (2003). College affordability in jeopardy: The rising price of higher education. *National Crosstalk*, 11, 1A-12A. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/affordability_supplement/index.shtml.
- Van Horn, D. L. (2002). *Satisfaction with the undergraduate experience as motivation for smaller dollar alumni donations*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Volkwein, J.F., Webster-Saft, L., Xu, W., & Agrotos, M. H. (1989, May). *A model of alumni gift giving behavior*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. Baltimore, MD.
- Webster's third new international dictionary*. (1981). Springfield: G&C. Merriam.
- Willemain, T.R., Goyal, A., Van Deven, M., & Thukral, I.S. (1994). Alumni giving: The influences of reunion, class, and year. *Research in Higher Education*, 35, 609-629.
- Winston, G. (1999). For-profit education: Godzilla or Chicken Little? *Change Magazine*, 31, 13-19.
- Yankelovich, D. (1981). *The new morality: a profile of American youth in the '70's*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Yankelovich, Skelly, & White (1985). *Study on charitable behavior of Americans for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 1986.
- Yoo, Y.H., & Harrison, W. B. (1989). Altruism in the market for giving and receiving: a case of higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 8, 367-379.
- Young, P.S., & Fischer, N.M. (1996 May 5-8). *Identifying undergraduate and post-college characteristics that may affect alumni giving*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Institutional Research. Albuquerque, NM.

Delta Kappa Gamma Scholarship Award, 1994, East Tennessee State University.

Certificate of Achievement as student leader, 1997, East Tennessee State University.

David Kent Miller Award, 1997, Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, Certificate of Appreciation as a student organization faculty advisor, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, East Tennessee State University.

Achieving Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, 2001, Biennial Convocation, Orlando, Florida.

Achieving Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, 2003, Biennial Convocation, St. Louis, Missouri.

Achieving Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, 2005, Biennial Convocation, Orlando, Florida.

ACE of the ACE Award, 2007, Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, Biennial Convocation, Louisville, Kentucky.

Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), 2007, Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota, Chapter, Biennial Convocation, Louisville, Kentucky.

Executive of the Year, 2008-2009, International Association of Administrative Professionals.

Achieving Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, 2009, Biennial Convocation, Orlando, Florida

Chapter Excellence Award (ACE), 2011, Kappa Delta Pi, Zeta Iota Chapter, Biennial Convocation, Indianapolis, Indiana.