

**Identifying Key Determinants that Influence Athletic Alumni  
Intent to Give Financially to Intercollegiate Athletic  
Department Fundraising Campaigns**

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BY

Gary W. Holquist

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Darwin D. Hendel, Ph. D.  
Advisor

November 2011

© Gary W. Holquist, 2011

## **Acknowledgements**

There are many people I need to thank and acknowledge that have traveled beside me during the life journey of completing this doctoral dissertation. Though they never had the opportunity for a college education, I am so grateful to my parents who instilled in my brothers and me the value of higher education and being lifelong learners. I witness that same understanding of education in my daughter Samantha, who recently completed her undergraduate degree en route to her aspirations of law school. Her own academic successes and continual encouragement have been an inspiration during my pursuit.

I am indebted to the multitude of student-athletes and coaches I have had the opportunity to compete with and against for the past 37 years of my involvement in college basketball as a player and coach at three different higher education institutions. They are why the subject matter I researched is important. In particular, I want to acknowledge Dale M. Race, who has spent a lifetime coaching college basketball. As my friend and mentor, he has taught me more than I could ever give him credit for here.

To each member of my Dissertation Committee I extend my gratitude and appreciation. I owe my deepest gratitude to my advisor Darwin D. Hendel. Because of his personal and professional guidance, this quest came to fruition. He is truly an educator who continuously motivates. I am also indebted to my many colleagues in the cohort, especially Kim Roufs and Karen Nichols. Kim and Karen are great teammates!

Thanks to all my friends and associates who assisted, advised, and supported my research and writing efforts. Finally, thank you to all the athletic alumni from the

University of Minnesota Duluth for your continued support of the institution; your involvement is needed now more than ever.

## **Dedication**

Dedicated to my wife and partner Karen L. Stromme, a Hall of Fame collegiate coach who is the most giving person I have ever met. She epitomizes the statement “You make a living by what you get, but you make a life by what you give.”

## **Abstract**

National interest surrounding all facets of intercollegiate athletics has reached an all-time high in capturing public attention. Athletics has captured the attention of important outside audiences, especially major donors and annual fund contributors to the university (Coughlin & Erickson, 1984). Government appropriations at the federal, state, and local level directed to institutions of higher education have been declining over the past twenty years (Masterson, 2009). Consequently, colleges and universities are supplementing financial deficiencies by increasingly soliciting gifts and grants from private donors, corporations, and alumni. Donations by alumni are a significant source of revenue for colleges and universities, and their importance promises to grow in the future (Clotfelter, 2001).

Financial contributions from alumni have become an increasingly important source of revenue for intercollegiate athletic departments. The ability to secure monetary donations to intercollegiate athletics has become an integral part of maintaining and building successful athletic programs. This study contributes to the literature in higher education by examining characteristics and motivations of the donating behaviors of intercollegiate athletic alumni from a comprehensive regional university. The purpose of this study was to identify key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants were shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing. Two significant

studies that influenced this research explored developing a donor profile scale for intercollegiate athletics (Strode & Fink, 2009) and examined factors impacting athlete alumni donating to their alma mater (O'Neil & Schenke, 2007). The work of Mann (2007) also provided an excellent framework for theoretical or model perspectives for understanding donor motives by applying his philosophies in studying collegiate athletic alumni financial giving.

A survey questionnaire collected data from 122 athletic alumni who graduated within a 50-year span of time, from 1960 to 2010. The response rate was 30.5 percent for athletic alumni surveyed. In the instrument, there were demographic questions and questions pertaining to trends, attitudes, opinions, experiences, motives, and identification of why the athletic alumni participant in the survey gave or did not give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns.

Descriptive statistics using one-way ANOVA and Chi-Square measures were analyzed to identify key determinants shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, exploring athletic alumni financial giving levels to the athletic department for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. Demographic variables were also analyzed. To encourage athletic alumni to give financially to fundraising campaigns, this study identified a number of initiatives that can be implemented by the athletic department. Results suggest that these initiatives should be derived from the charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and relationship-marketing strategies. The information obtained in this study

can assist in predicting donor behavior and developing actions that will increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Dedication.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xi
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	11
Purpose Statement.....	12
Research Question.....	13
Chapter Two: Review of Literature.....	14
Definition of Terms.....	15
Fundraising Models.....	19
The Seven Faces Approach.....	21
Altruistic Giving Model.....	26
Organizational Identification Model.....	26
Social Identification Model.....	27
Economics or Utility Model.....	28
Services Model.....	30
Relationship-Marketing Model.....	31
Competition for Development Money between Athletics and Academics.....	32

Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Donor Behavior .....	37
Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Success and Alumni Giving .....	46
Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Giving .....	53
Future Implications for Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Fundraising .....	58
Chapter Three: Methodology .....	61
Purpose of the Study .....	61
Description of the Research Design.....	63
Participants.....	65
Institutional Context.....	66
Ethics of the Study .....	68
Survey Instrument.....	69
Demographic Questions.....	71
Substantive Questions.....	74
Research Question .....	82
Data Analysis Procedures .....	82
Chapter Four: Results .....	87
Overview of Results for Five Charitable Giving Models and Motivations to Give .....	87
Relationships between Actual Financial Contributions and Motivations of Charitable Giving Models .....	89
Altruistic Giving .....	89
Organizational Identification .....	91

Social Identification .....	92
Economic or Utility Satisfaction.....	94
Receiving Services.....	96
Comparisons among Results for Five Charitable Giving Models.....	97
Relationships between Relationship-Marketing Behaviors and Charitable Giving .....	98
Relationships between Demographic Variables and Actual Financial Contributions.....	108
Qualitative Responses.....	115
Altruistic Giving .....	115
Organizational Identification .....	117
Social Identification .....	119
Economic or Utility Satisfaction.....	121
Receiving Services.....	121
Relationship-Marketing .....	123
Chapter Five: Discussions and Conclustions .....	125
Summary of the Study .....	126
Discussion.....	132
Altruistic Giving .....	134
Organizational Identification .....	136
Social Identification .....	139
Economic or Utility Satisfaction.....	141
Receiving Services.....	144

Relationship-Marketing .....	146
Implications and Recommendations for Athletic Alumni Development Campaigns .....	153
Limitations of the Current Study .....	159
Suggestions for Future Research .....	162
References.....	165
Appendix A: Initial First Email Letter to Sample Population Introducing Survey .....	178
Appendix B: Second Email Letter to Sample Population That Includes Survey Instrument.....	179
Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire .....	180
Appendix D: Supplemental Tables .....	191

## List of Tables

Table 1: Charitable giving models, substantive questions in the survey .....	75
Table 2: Summary of the mean item responses of athletic-alumni from five charitable giving models.....	88
Table 3: Relationships between the charitable giving model of <b>“Altruistic Giving”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level.....	90
Table 4: Relationships between the charitable giving model of <b>“Organizational Identification”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level .....	92
Table 5: Relationships between the charitable giving model of <b>“Social Identification”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level .....	93
Table 6: Relationships between the charitable giving model of <b>“Economic or Utility Satisfaction”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level .....	95
Table 7: Relationships between the charitable giving model of <b>“Receiving Services”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level .....	96
Table 8: Summary of the relationships between the charitable giving models with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level.....	97
Table 9: Summary of the relationships between the charitable giving model questions in <b>“Relationship-Marketing”</b> with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level.....	99
Table 10: Summary of the relationships between demographic questions and athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and total lifetime financial giving level.....	109
Table D-1: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use.....	192

Table D-2: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use.....	193
Table D-3: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use about financial giving.....	194
Table D-4: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use about financial giving.....	195
Table D-5: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at games .....	196
Table D-6: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at games .....	197
Table D-7: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at events .....	198
Table D-8: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at events .....	199
Table D-9: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to preferred methods of contact about financial giving .....	200
Table D-10: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to preferred methods of contact about financial giving .....	201
Table D-11: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of contacts to financially give over the last ten years.....	202
Table D-12: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of contacts to financially give over the last ten years.....	203
Table D-13: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of times financially given over the last ten years.....	204
Table D-14: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic	

department in relationship to the number of times financially given over the last ten years.....	205
Table D-15: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to methods of contact that prompted most recent financial gift .....	206
Table D-16: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to methods of contact that prompted most recent financial gift .....	207
Table D-17: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to financially given for 2010.....	208
Table D-18: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to financially given for 2010.....	209
Table D-19: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to gender, marital status, and children .....	210
Table D-20: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to gender, marital status, and children .....	211
Table D-21: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to giving to academic programs and level of education.....	212
Table D-22: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to giving to academic programs and level of education.....	213
Table D-23: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to yearly household income .....	214
Table D-24: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to yearly household income .....	215
Table D-25: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to varsity sport participated on.....	216
Table D-26: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to varsity sport participated on.....	217
Table D-27: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic	

department in relationship to receiving an athletic scholarship.....	218
Table D-28: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to receiving an athletic scholarship.....	219
Table D-29: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to current residence distance from institution .....	220
Table D-30: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to current residence distance from institution .....	221
Table D-31: Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to decade of graduation.....	222
Table D-32: Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to decade of graduation.....	223

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **Introduction**

Intercollegiate athletics at colleges and universities throughout the United States became a much-publicized side of student life on campuses and in communities during the late 1920s. Colleges and universities developed large public followings through their athletic programs. Over the next century, spectator sports grew at the intercollegiate level and continued to be an enormously popular activity, which has had a significant impact upon American culture (Brubacher & Rudy, 2004). “College presidents and National Collegiate Athletic Association officials often speak in grand terms about sports as a good way to educate the public about colleges. Football and men’s basketball in particular are said to be the front porch of the university” (Suggs, 2003, p. A17). Sports are what many people see from the outside and sports are what connect them to the university on the inside. College sports in today’s society are heavily covered and emphasized via the media outlets of television, radio, newsprint, and Internet. Collegiate athletics brings regional and national recognition to the public image of a particular higher education institution.

Frans (2002) opined that the increased popularity of college athletics, combined with the financial escalations due to upgrading facilities, recruiting expenditures, and coaching salaries, resulted in the “arms race” of institutions competing athletically to be the best. Because of the “arms race,” college and university athletic departments face unprecedented financial challenges to continue to expand (Suggs, 2000). These challenges have created an unbalanced importance that intercollegiate athletics has

developed vis-à-vis the fundamental mission of the institution (Cowley, 1999). That influence has become so overwhelming that movements are taking place to reform college athletics because of the over commercialization of sports, athletic priorities versus academic priorities, and the exploitation of the student-athlete. Two national organizations, The Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), are aligning with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) to propose reforms that will integrate college sports back into the overall academic mission of institutions and allow intercollegiate athletics to remain a positive factor on campuses (Knight Foundation Commission, 2001; Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2007).

The NCAA is a national organization responsible for the governance of intercollegiate athletics. However, NCAA rules, regulations, and constitution state the requirement for each higher educational institution having membership with the NCAA is to control their own intercollegiate athletic department, deemed “institutional control.” There are vast difference among colleges and universities in the United States. Similarly, intercollegiate athletic programs vary greatly in philosophy and scope. Because of this diversity, the NCAA has established three competitive divisions that are determined by the number of teams an institution sponsors, playing schedule requirements, spectator mandates, and athletic scholarship limitations. The financial implications of athletic programs in each division have become an integral part of balancing college and university operating budgets.

NCAA Division I institutions are required to sponsor at least seven sports for men and seven for women, with two team sports for each gender. There are minimum spectator attendance requirements, minimum financial aid awards for the athletic program, and there are maximum financial aid awards for each sport. The philosophy of institutions sponsoring NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics is to have the department recognized on a national level and be self-supported by generating revenue from sporting events which have associated financial sponsorship coming from various corporations, boosters, and fans. NCAA Division II institutions have to sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender. There are no spectator attendance requirements, and there are maximum financial aid awards for each sport; however, the scholarship maximums in Division II are far lower than in Division I. Division II teams feature a regional competition philosophy with local or in-state student-athletes that pay for school through a combination of athletic scholarship money, grants, student loans, and employment earnings. Division II athletic programs are financed in the institution's budget like other academic units on campus. NCAA Division III institutions have to sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender. Division III athletics feature student-athletes who receive no financial aid related to their athletic ability. Division III athletics place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than the spectators. Emphasis is placed on in-season training and conference competition.

Because intercollegiate athletic programs have become such a prominent part of institutions of higher education, the visibility factor continues to increase the importance

of intercollegiate athletics on all campuses. Toma (1999) suggested that intercollegiate athletics are an image-building tool that administrators in external relations should use extensively albeit cautiously. So many people are paying close attention to college athletics that it has become an important tool to use for advancing institutional ambitions. Intercollegiate athletics can contribute to the successful mission of colleges and universities in many ways. Frans (2002) alluded to “indirect or intangible benefits that a university may receive because of its athletic program such as greater exposure, enhanced reputation, increased applications, and even a higher quality of applicants” (p. 2). Successful athletic programs result in greater interest and greater pride in the institution.

National interest surrounding all facets of intercollegiate athletics has reached an all-time high in capturing public attention. Athletics has captured the attention of important outside audiences, especially major donors and annual fund contributors to the university (Coughlin & Erekson, 1984). Because of the exposure to the public, athletics has the ability to enhance the university’s development efforts to increase the level of financial support from donors, resulting in an increased level of donations not only in support of athletics, but also to the university’s general fund (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Grimes and Chressanthis (1994) stated, “Empirical results suggest that the athletic success of a school’s overall sports program can positively influence the level of alumni giving to the academic side of the institution. Thus, intercollegiate athletics is found to generate a spillover benefit to the university in this case” (p. 38).

Government appropriations at the federal, state, and local level directed to institutions of higher learning have been declining over the past twenty years (Masterson,

2009). Consequently, colleges and universities are supplementing financial deficiencies by increasingly soliciting gifts and grants from alumni, private donors, and corporations. In a 1996 report produced by the Council for Aid to Education, the total amount of money donated to higher education by alumni, non-alumni, corporations, foundations, or other sources in 1979 was 3.8 billion dollars. In 1996, the total amount of money donated increased to 12.3 billion dollars. In 2008, the annual report from the Council for Aid to Education, which documents charitable giving to higher education, indicated a record-breaking total of 31.6 billion dollars donated to colleges and universities. Alumni of institutions of higher education accounted for 23.9 percent of monies donated in 1979, 28.5 percent in 1996, and 27.5 percent in 2008. In 1979 and 1996, the alumni group's percentage numbers of monies donated to institutions of higher learning was the largest segment among the other categories of non-alumni, corporations, foundations, or other sources reported. However, in 2008, the percentages of charitable giving from alumni followed a recent declining trend and dropped to second place behind the foundations segment, which made up 28.7 percent of monies charitably given to higher education.

The decline in the percentage of the monies alumni are giving has concerned many fund raising experts. Parry (2009) suggested there is added urgency to soliciting alumni because the alumni giving participation rate is also falling. This statistic is used in regard to the total number of alumni contributing financially to their institution.

According to the Council for Aid to Education, the rate has declined from 13.8 percent in 2001 to 11 percent in 2008. Masterson (2009) reported that the recent collapse in the economy has caught up with university fundraising campaign efforts, and donors are

postponing, rethinking, or downsizing future donations. As a result, university fundraising officials are retooling approaches to donors in an attempt to increase or maintain contributions (Hall, 2009). Institutional fundraising officers feel that this is an ideal time to shape donors' giving patterns so development campaigns do not falter and donors stay connected to the university (Preston, 2009). Administrators believe that if the economic slump continues, more serious budget cuts will continue to be made at campuses in all areas. Masterson (2009) suggested that, "It's a situation institutions cannot ignore as they look to private giving to make up for huge endowment losses and declining government support" (p. A1).

Regardless of recent trends that indicate a slight decrease in the percentage of alumni accounting for record setting combined number of monies donated to institutions of higher education, the numbers do show the high presence that alumni have in supporting their alma mater financially. Donations by alumni are a significant source of revenue for colleges and universities, and their importance promises to grow in the future (Clotfelter, 2001). Significant patterns of giving to one's alma mater have been studied through a wide variety of research studies. Studies indicate that a variety of determinants influence alumni donations. Monks (2002) showed that generosity coincides with satisfaction with one's undergraduate experience. Personal experiences often link donors to the organizations to which they donate (Clotfelter, 2001). The Clotfelter study also explored the significance of alumni giving over time with considerations to charitable giving with tax deductions, market fluctuations, and donating through organized class reunion years. Volunteering while in college, majoring in a social science area, residing

in states with active alumni chapters, and employment within the financial sectors are all factors indicative of increased probability of alumni donating to their alma mater (Wunnava & Lauze, 2000). Social pressure, such as solicitation by friends and inclusion on a publicized list of contributors, is a key determinant of alumni giving as well (Long, 1976).

Philanthropy has been studied quite extensively through the past thirty years in a variety of disciplines (Katz, 1999). Bekkers and Wiepking (2007) wrote an exhaustive overview of published academic literature on philanthropy focusing on how much people give and why they give. They surveyed the literature on characteristics of individuals that related to giving, investigating variables of religion, education, income, home ownership, financial position, age, marital status, having children, employment, place of residence, gender, race, citizenship status, parental background, youth participation, current participation, volunteering, personality, cognitive ability, and a few other less studied variables. They also examined the academic literature on philanthropy that identifies eight variables as the most important determinants that drive giving: awareness of need, solicitation, costs and benefits, altruism, reputation, psychological benefits, values, and efficacy. Though their overview is much broader than singling out alumni, and describing the actions of alumni giving, the literature they present can assist in making a conceptual framework for other studies on higher education philanthropy, including research on examining alumni giving in intercollegiate athletics.

Financial contributions have become an increasingly important source of revenue for athletic departments. The responsibility to solicit monetary donations to

intercollegiate athletics has become an integral part of maintaining and building successful athletic programs. Intercollegiate athletic departments face the rapidly rising costs of fielding athletic teams, awarding scholarships to participants, and maintaining facilities. Professional fundraisers indicate that endowments are now seen as the best resource for furthering financial stability in intercollegiate athletic departments (Splitt, 2003). Splitt, in his study that investigated reforms in intercollegiate athletics, questions the drain on the university's academic endowment as the athletic department taps into wealthy donors, loyal sport fans, and graduates to grow their own endowments. However, Splitt pointed out that one need only follow the money trail to see what donors value the most. Research indicates that athletic success appears to increase general giving to colleges and universities (Goff, 2000).

Many studies have produced evidence concerning the ways in which intercollegiate athletics contribute to the success of university development efforts. Intercollegiate athletic success can positively influence the level of alumni giving to the academic side of the institution (Grimes & Chressanthis, 1994). Research has concluded that higher education institutions found that the majority of well-attended fundraising programs have been connected to intercollegiate athletic events (Toma, 1999). Aside from major reunions, athletic contests, especially football and men's basketball, tend to draw more alumni back to campuses of colleges and universities than any other events (Turner, Meserve, & Bowen, 2001). Spectator sports attract key constituents and allow them to view the university in positive terms. Coughlin and Erekson (1984) found that bowl participation and basketball winning percentages increase gifts from alumni.

Turner, et al. (2001) further indicated that while alumni may lose track of changes in the faculty, the state of core curriculum, or the amenities in college dorm rooms, they follow scores and standings as presented in the media. For some graduates, these results stimulate intense reactions. College and university development officers need to stay abreast of the athletic outcomes of their institutions' sporting events, because it does influence alumni giving.

These findings may help explain the growth of college and university athletic programs, the intense following of sport teams, and the prominent role intercollegiate athletics has in higher education. Over the past decade, budgets for intercollegiate athletic departments have grown rapidly. Like Suggs (2000) and Frans (2002), Lovaglia and Lucas (2003) also liken this growth to an "arms race," as colleges and universities strive to avoid being left behind in the race to produce successful athletic programs. The results of their study support findings that a high-visibility athletic program can enhance the prestige of a university's graduates. It also connects the visibility of university athletic programs to the prestige of their academic programs. Clotfelter's (2001) research identified two university actions that would have the largest emotional and negative impact on alumni giving: a perceived shift in emphasis from teaching to research, and an emphasis away from sports. Some studies indicate that university fundraising research has shown that identification with or emotional attachment to the university are significant indicators of giving. Intercollegiate athletic programs provide avenues for undergraduates and graduates, as well as community members, to become emotionally attached to the university. Emotional attachment to the university apparently increases

during a winning season, which is correlated with increases in donations. Purchasers of university insignia goods were more likely to donate than alumni who did not purchase insignia products (Brady, Noble, Utter, & Smith, 2002). Research consistently indicates that a donor's identification with an organization increases the intent to give.

Participation in intercollegiate sports by student-athletes has long provided many benefits to team members. Besides the immediate tangible benefit of scholarship opportunities for financial support, many intangible benefits come from being a part of a collegiate athletic team. Participation in college athletics signifies signs of ambition, competitive drive, dedication to work, and team loyalty. Many measurable determinants of traits that encourage labor market success find that athletic participation enhances the development of discipline, confidence, motivation, and competitive drive (Long & Caudill, 1991). Attitudes formed while experiencing these benefits have a significant effect on a donor's later willingness to make a contribution back to the institution (Brady, et al., 2002). Many studies suggest that involvement in intercollegiate athletics for males as well as females does significantly influence alumni involvement socially and financially with their university. Wunnava and Lauze (2000) concluded that consistent and occasional donors have a greater probability to donate financially to the institution they attended if they played a varsity sport. Their study examined the financial giving of alumni at a liberal arts college, covering a 23-year period of consistent and occasional donors. Findings showed that alumni that were involved with intercollegiate sports were 20 percent more likely to donate financially to the institution than alumni that did not participate in athletics. Tsotsou (1998) stated that participation and involvement with

athletics is positively related to the frequency of the contributions made to educational institutions.

Though there are research findings that indicate alumni of intercollegiate athletic teams donated to institution development campaigns at a rate higher than non-athlete alumni did, there is also contrasting literature that suggests athlete alumni do not give as generously as they could to their alma maters in comparison to the general alumni population (O'Neil & Schenke, 2007). One author stated that athletes who often got public attention during their college playing days are among the least likely to donate money back to the institution (Rhoden, 2007). Research indicates that alumni giving is inconsistent and has peaks and valleys of participation. A wide spectrum of alumni engagement and motivation to donate occur at various stages of life for all collegiate alumni (Meyers, 2006). Research indicates that alumni offices benefit from the policies of rating potential donors, and a statistically significant predictor of intent to give is intercollegiate athletic participation (Wunnava & Lauze, 2000). Being able to identify factors that influence intent to give will assist athletic departments to encourage engagement. Researchers have long considered the study of philanthropy for alumni of higher education, but there is limited research on the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni.

### *Problem Statement*

Financial contributions from alumni have become an increasingly important source of revenue for not only intercollegiate athletic departments, but also for the entire institution. The ability to secure monetary donations to intercollegiate athletics has

become an integral part of maintaining and building successful athletic programs. Drape (2009) reported that many colleges and universities nationwide have had to make financial adjustments to athletic department ventures because of failed financial campaigns due to the slow economy. Alumni, representing the largest segment of any group donating to institutions of higher education, have been affected by the economic downturn. Lindahl and Conley (2002) predicted that fundraisers “will see as much change between now and 2015 as we have since 1985” and “practitioners need to continue not only following research but increasingly integrate research findings into their work” (p. 106). Mael and Ashforth (1992) indicated, “Alumni are the financial backbone of educational organizations” (p. 106). Despite the research devoted to the revenue that alumni have donated to their institution, little is known about the characteristics and motivations of individuals who are most likely to donate back to their alma mater (Monks, 2002). From this group of alumni, less is known about the characteristics and motivations of the donating behaviors of intercollegiate athletic alumni (O’Neil & Schenke, 2006).

#### *Purpose Statement*

The purpose of this study is to identify key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants shaped from models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, will help develop a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Developing a donor profile

will assist in predicting donor behavior and increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments.

*Research Question*

This study will be designed to enable the researcher to answer a research question based on six models associated with charitable giving that shape the purpose of the study in identifying key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. This study will address the following research question – To what degree are there differences among levels of financial giving in athletic alumni motivations to donate associated with six models of charitable giving?

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **Review of Literature**

The intent of this chapter is to survey and review the literature on higher education fundraising relating to intercollegiate athletic alumni and the impact on the institution. Because of the limited research on the giving habits of intercollegiate athletic alumni, investigating literature that reveals theories of philanthropy and characteristics of charitable giving to their alma mater by all institutional alumni will assist in exploring characteristics for the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni. Models on philanthropy emerged through the literature that also included motives for giving, patterns to giving, and factors that can predict giving. The literature also revealed factors of competition in soliciting money from outside constituents between institutional departments, specifically athletics and academics. Reviewing the literature on higher education fundraising, while linking the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni to the findings, will help address the gaps in the literature referring to the donor behavior of intercollegiate athletic alumni. The review of literature is outlined in seven sections: (1) Definition of Terms, (2) Fundraising Models, (3) Competition for Development Money between Athletics and Academics, (4) Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Donor Behavior, (5) Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Success and Alumni Giving, (6) Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Giving, and (7) Future Implications for Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Fundraising.

### *Definition of Terms*

According to Toma (1998), college sports programs represent the “collegiate ideal” that is perceived by external constituents. He indicated that the collegiate ideal of college sports causes people both to be drawn to campus and to come to know something favorable about the institution. This outcome “serves the goals of institutional advancement by increasing the level of contact that external constituents have with the institution and motivating them to want to enhance the visibility of their organizational affiliation” (Toma, 1998, p. 84). He concluded that the combination of the collegiate ideal, intercollegiate athletics, and external relations, enhances the institutional functions of governmental relations, alumni relations, and development. Institutional advancement and development work together, but should be viewed as separate entities.

Defining the terms for basic fundraising programs provides a framework for distinguishing what institutional advancement and development mean in higher education. Caulkins, Cole, Hardoby, and Keyser (2002) indicate that “advancement” refers to all activities that build awareness and support from constituents, including alumni relations, public relations, and government relations, while “development” focuses more narrowly on acquiring financial support for the institution’s programs. “Development is like a business. There’s a product (e.g., a building), a seller (the institution), and a buyer (the donor)” (Caulkins, et al., 2002, p. 37).

Fundraising programs are usually annual giving programs and major fundraising campaigns. Caulkins, et al. (2002) defines an institution’s annual giving program as “typically small, unrestricted gifts made on a yearly basis to support annual budgets or

general operations” (p. 37). These types of development operations tend to be a minor source of funds, but very important for cultivating alumni as significant future donors. The institution, through these transactions, receives various levels of alumni giving. Major fundraising programs are considered to be “campaigns or organized efforts to raise a specified amount of money for a particular purpose in a specified period of time” (Caulkins, et al., 2002, p. 38). “Lindahl found two tracks of major donors: one type builds up giving over the years and provides a major outright gift in the later years of life; the other type, perhaps more motivated by the income that a charitable trust or gift annuity provides, will make a deferred gift in the later years of life regardless of the past outright giving history” (Lindahl & Conley, 2002, p. 104). Meyers (2006) agreed that institutions now are pursuing a relationship with alumni that spans the different stages of their lives. Both of these types of development programs have become important to intercollegiate athletic departments at colleges and universities nationwide.

Shulman and Bowen (2001) indicated in their research that most of the intercollegiate athletic departments in the United States are now losing money and are being held accountable to operate within budget parameters. As a result, “athletic departments are increasingly expected to be self-sufficient, and outside donations have been identified as having the greatest potential for increasing revenue” (Frans, 2002, p. 13). Other researchers have found that the increased attention paid to development efforts is appropriate because gifts from alumni are the single largest source of external support for colleges and universities (Lindahl & Conley, 2002). Some researchers see alumni giving as a myth, and believe that athletic departments’ main source of donations come

from boosters that are not alumni. Sperber (1990) defines the distinction between alumni and boosters. “Alumni are the graduates or former students of a particular college or university. Boosters, on the other hand, have no connection to a school other than their support of its teams” (Sperber, 1990, p. 71). Athletic alumni are a subgroup of all institutional alumni. Linking the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni with all institutional alumni in research findings can reveal donor behavior of intercollegiate athletic alumni. Various researchers think that alumni may be interested mainly in giving money to the academic programs of their schools and are less concerned about the athletic programs, while boosters donate exclusively to college sports teams and seldom give to the academic units of the institution (Staurowsky, 2003).

Though they are not the sole source of donations, alumni are critical constituencies for athletic departments, who need to get institutional attention throughout various stages of their lives (Turner, et al., 2001). Shulman and Bowen (2001) emphasized this point further by stating, “the leading United States colleges and universities have always been highly dependent upon the generosity of their alumni” (p. 205). They discussed the importance of the positive emotions that intercollegiate sports bring to many constituents that the university depends on, and in particular, its alumni who had various experiences while enrolled in the institution and “continue to identify with the school throughout their lives which constitutes an important reality of the institution, in the same way that the buildings, the faculty, and the fight songs do” (Shulman & Bowen, 2001, p. xxxv).

Researchers have found that there are many different reasons why alumni are donating to their institutions. Caulkins, et al. (2002) stated that alumni donate to realize personal fulfillment, out of dedication to an institution, just to give back, say thanks, provide opportunities for others, improve the quality of life, solve problems in society, or to preserve our nation's values. Researchers have also investigated who the alumni are that are giving. "Alumni donors tend to be wealthy, middle-aged or older, have strong emotional ties to their alma maters, have earned at least a bachelor's degree, participate in some alumni activities, and have religious or voluntary affiliations" (Caulkins, et al., 2002, p. 4). The authors go on to discuss new trends in younger donors that include a style of donation that restricts gifts to certain programs and pays attention to investment strategies. The research on motives of donor giving as well as variables of predicting alumni giving and patterns of giving will be discussed later in this paper.

The constant cultivation of donors is always a priority for higher educational development offices. Researchers are constantly seeking to get detailed understanding of the concerns, interests, needs, and motivations of donors (Prince & File, 1994). By knowing the donor's characteristics and personalities, more appropriate and effective development strategies can be implemented to reach solicitation goals. Often development officers just know how to go ask for the donation; they do not understand the framework or model of why a donation was made from an individual. It is important to be able to understand both concepts. Development officers have to know the frameworks and models about why institutional constituents are donating to the university. Lindahl and Conley (2002) believe that fundraising practitioners should have

an emphasis on understanding philanthropy by knowing more of the “why” someone is donating than the traditional emphasis on the “how to.” Theories and models on development help fundraisers understand the why. Prince and File (1994) state that development professionals should know and understand the theoretical of philanthropy so “they can craft situational strategies for creating stewardship that is meaningful for both donor and institution” (p. xvii). Because of the understanding of theories and models, tailored approaches to specific donor populations can be developed by the institution so fundraising campaigns will be more effective for the targeted donor and organizational program (Prince & File, 1994).

### *Fundraising Models*

Fundraising theories and models have been developed to address and identify certain aspects of giving behavior. Okunade and Wunnava (1994) are two of the many researchers who have explored charitable donations through several different theoretical or model frameworks. They believe that no single theory or model contains the sole reason or motive for actions of charitable giving. This remains a challenge for all fundraisers for building effective programs of development. The engagement of alumni with the institution goes beyond just communication or correspondence; it continues to be how their interest is being captured so alumni become involved in active ways to contribute. Theories and models help establish baselines and frameworks for assisting in program development by providing initial reasons why people may donate to development efforts. Baade and Sundberg (1995) indicated that “research for the past two decades has recognized that alumni giving is a complex phenomenon determined by three

sets of variables: college or university characteristics, student characteristics (especially family wealth), and institutional efforts to solicit funds” (p. 75). Belfield and Beney (2000) found alumni generosity to be determined by better student outcomes, better institutional quality, and greater solicitation efficiency. To fit actions of alumni donation behavior into one theory or model is not possible. However, Mann (2007) believes that by viewing the behavior of alumni giving through multiple theoretical perspectives, it will be beneficial to fundraisers. Through the theoretical lens, fundraisers can consider a variety of perspectives to understand donor motives.

Mann (2007) discussed various theoretical foundations that can shape the fundraising philosophy of the institution. He believes that these perspectives have practical implications on how the college and its alumni interact through development efforts. Through investigating various fundraising theories or models, programs of development can explore existing practices by examining: which theoretical perspectives reflect the donor’s motives for giving, theories that apply to different alumni cohorts, theories that motivate donors to give to a particular ask, and theories that fit the mission of the institution (Mann, 2007). Many researchers and authors shared Mann’s belief, that it is vitally important for development programs to focus initially on determining the most effective ways to connect with their alumni base for not only annual giving campaigns but also for major campaign solicitations.

Sherry (1983) viewed gift giving from an anthropological perspective, stating that it is a form of reciprocity or exchange that integrates a society. He views it as a social communication with a symbolic dimension that has meaning through stages of the

exchange, including: social conditions related to the exchange, economic attributes associated with giving and receiving, personal characteristics of the giver and receiver, and situational conditions of the exchange. Belk (1982), another anthropologist, concluded that gift giving is an exchange that has four functions: communication, social exchange, economic exchange, and socialization. Quigley, Bingham, and Murray (2002) indicated that both of these two anthropologists explained alumni donations from the perspective of the gift giving process. “Gift giving is a multi step process that essentially conveys sentiments between giver and receiver. The exchange leads to the development of a relationship between the giver and receiver” (Quigley, et al., 2002, p. 76). Quigley, et al. indicated that early research on gift exchange has helped formulate theories on donation patterns of alumni in higher education that should be used by development officers. However, recent researchers like Tsotsou (2007) feel that athletic fundraising programs have disregarded theoretical perspectives.

#### *The Seven Faces Approach*

Prince and File (1994) took their research and developed an extensive framework of donor behavior. Their framework is composed of seven faces or segments in which a donor approaches philanthropy. They felt that one set of motivations tends to dominate people’s decisions to donate, though donors may feel additional motives besides the initial dominating factor. The study involved 476 donors that contributed at least \$50,000.00 to various nonprofit organizations over a two-year period. Though the study involved only affluent donors, the authors believe that fundraisers from every organization that solicits money can use the framework to build financial commitments.

“Each seven segments represents a characteristic and distinctive way a donor group approaches philanthropy, a set of typical attitudes and beliefs, a range of considerations, a process of evaluation, and a style of involvement with nonprofits” (Prince & File, 1994, p. 13). The authors stated that because the seven categories explain the range of major donor behavior, the framework can be a useful tool if it is adapted to fundraisers searching to escalate contributions of their donors. “The donor segmentation approach offers four principal advantages to nonprofit resource development managers as they target major donors: efficient identification of current and prospective donor groups, clear selection for developing these benefactors efficiently, ability to tailor solicitation methods appropriately, and provide a basis for the design of on-going relationship-management programs geared to donors’ needs” (Prince & File, 1994, p. 2).

The seven segments may not be directly tied to development in higher education, but a description of each category does show how alumni of higher education institutions can be categorized. The seven segments are: Communitarians, Devout, Investors, Socialites, Repayers, Altruists, and Dynasts.

- Communitarians were the largest segment of the study at 26%. They are community business owners, predominately middle-aged males, and their formal education is lower on average. They give because they want to give something back to the local community and believe “nonprofits are more effective in addressing social and human problems than are federal, state, and local governments” (Prince & File, 1994, p. 18). They use professional advisors on giving, want to be recognized for why they are giving, and look for long term relationships with the organization.

- The Devout, 21% of the study, are motivated to donate for religious reasons. As a result they channel all their giving to religious institutions and associated organizations. They are mostly male, owners of businesses, and college educated. They feel a moral obligation to give, do not use professional advisors, make decisions based on trust after extensive evaluation of the organization, and do not look for any influence because of their donation.

- Investors, 15% of the study, give because of personal tax and estate consequences. They want to take advantage of tax benefits and will donate to a wide variety of nonprofits. They are predominantly males, college educated, and provide for the family through business ownership, which is why they give, to donate for tax advantages. There is no feeling of obligation to give, the relationship with the organization is strictly business, and the investor wants to be treated like a major customer.

- The Socialite comprises 11% of the study, donates to make the world a better place, and appreciates the social aspect of fundraising. This group is comprised principally of women, who are college educated, and are business owners with their spouse. The social network is as important as is creating ways for others to give. They want involvement in the organization and acknowledgement for their involvement as part of the donor system.

- Repayers, 10% of the study, are constituents of a school or hospital, and feel an obligation to return gratitude they experienced at the institution by giving financial support now. They are male by a 2-to-1 ratio, college educated, business owners, and

give because they have received some type of positive support from the institution they now are donating to. They focus on donating to just one or two organizations. Prince and File (1994) believe that higher education institution donors are comprised mainly of Repayers.

- Altruists, 9% of the study, give because it gives their life a greater sense of purpose. They are college educated, give because it is morally correct, want to be known for their altruism, and want nothing in return.
- The Dynasts comprise 8% of the study, and give because they have been taught to—it is tradition. They are college educated, and there are as many females as males in this group. They employ professional advisors, are very careful before they commit to a project, and prefer a role in the background of the organization.

After identifying donor characteristics and placing the donor into one of the seven distinct segments, Prince and File presented methods of donor cultivation to build commitment for continued giving. The research presented in the study emphasized how important understanding a donor's motivations and goals are to developing an effective fundraising program. However, just understanding motives is not enough. Fundraisers have to progress from understanding to action by developing a strategy for solicitation within a theoretical framework of who they are pursuing (Prince & File, 1994).

The work of Prince and File was one of many ways in which researchers have categorized donor behavior. Using the various theoretical perspectives presented by Mann (2007) as an overview in reviewing the literature on philanthropy in higher education, many researchers and authors state findings that can be aligned with one or

more of the theoretical frameworks. Grouping the research of the various theories or models that were consistent throughout the literature with Mann's (2007) theoretical framework for understanding donor motives, a better understanding can be derived concerning why an individual makes a donation. Following Mann's (2007) perspectives, six models identified through much of the research in various ways are: Altruistic Giving Model, Organizational Identification Model, Social Identification Model, Economics or Utility Model, Services Model, and Relationship-Marketing Model.

As mentioned previously, no single theory or model can be a stand-alone explanation for why people donate to an organization. Mann (2007) alluded that every institutional campus in higher education has a unique culture and characteristic. Multiple theoretical or model perspectives can be used to understand why donors are or are not contributing to development efforts. In reviewing the literature, there is a connection between the many theoretical or model concepts the researchers discuss. The concept of social exchange and how it affects alumni giving is a good example of a theory or model that can be contained in many theoretical perspectives. Alumni perceptions of institutional values, past experiences, or involvement as an undergraduate are all elements of social exchange theory that can be a significant piece of the six models that will be presented in this study. There were other theories or models that emerged through the research as well. They included the "warm glow theory" which neuropsychological studies suggest that donors feel from the joy of giving (Mayr, Harbaugh, & Tankersley, 2008). The following is a synopsis of how various researchers defined each model in

their research as well as a review of each perspective from Mann (2007) on how alumni react to each model.

#### *Altruistic Giving Model*

Okunade and Wunnava (1994) concluded that altruistic giving individuals are driven by a sense of obligation to the organization to which they donate. Clotfelter (2001) says altruistic giving is an “often cited motivation for alumni giving as a desire to pay back the institution” (p. 125). Altruistic giving also represents gratitude rather than a belief in the ideals of the institution (Belfield & Beney, 2000). Lindahl and Conley (2002) and Brady, et al.(2002) stated that people in society feel obligated to respond in a favorable way after other people have helped them. Sperber (2000) indicated that if the institutions’ graduates are content with their experience in school and proud of their degrees, “they will want to give something back to their alma mater and continue a life-time relationship with it” (p. 257). Quigley et al. (2002) writes that giving can focus on alumni loyalty, also. Mann (2007) stated that when financial gifts are made three motivations help explain why people give: altruism, reciprocity, and direct benefits. He believes “alumni feel a sense of obligation towards alma mater; have pride in their association with their college, and alumni feel a responsibility to make donations” (p. 37).

#### *Organizational Identification Model*

Higher education uses organizational identification frequently. An example Brady, et al. (2002) gives is the symbolism colleges and universities use for the graduating students as they become part of the school’s alumni community. Graduates may pass through symbolic archways or are greeted off stage by alumni. Often

institutions use promotional material of the school's programs to create pride and affiliation with the organization from its alumni. Mael and Ashforth (1992) stated that organizational identification is "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member" (p. 104). Harrison (1995) believes good development offices at institutions have the ability to shape alumni perceptions of the school to keep them positively identifying with programs. Part of organizational identification is an emotional attachment to the institution, and researchers believe that is the strongest predictor of alumni contribution status (Tom & Elmer, 1994). Tom and Elmer go on to say that alumni identification with their alma mater brings about "desirable outcomes such as making financial contributions, willingness to recommend their children and others to attend the university and attendance of university-sponsored activities" (p. 58). Mann (2007) believes "alumni who feel connected to the college as an organization will celebrate the achievement of its strategic and fund-raising goals" (p. 37). Alumni, thus, will be more inclined to support the institutional fundraising goals and be a donor.

#### *Social Identification Model*

Mann (2007) wrote that a person's identity evolves from their ordering and connecting to a group to which they belong. As a result, connections with fraternities, sororities, intercollegiate athletics, gender grouping, or class cohorts increase the likelihood of an individual to donate to an institutional campaign (Belfield & Beney, 2000). Past personal experiences with specific groups link donors to the organization in which they donate (Clotfelter, 2001). Harrison, Mitchell, and Peterson (1995) believe

social pressure is derived from this model. Social pressure provides a motive for giving. Identification with a group increases the pressure to donate because one's peers or predecessors in the group have been generous. "Donors seem to want the psychic satisfaction that accompanies recognition from their former school—from appearing in a list of names in the alumni bulletin, to receiving free football tickets, to having a scholarship or building named after them" (Harrison, et al., 1995, p. 398). Other researchers think that creating different levels of giving within an organization that lists people by categories of donations will produce more money as a result of social pressure. Long (1976) researched social pressure and discovered that it did affect the level of charitable contributions, but the form of the pressure was an important determinant. Personal forms of solicitation were more effective than impersonal forms such as mailings. Personal contact from past associates was more effective than requests by strangers. Past experiences bond individuals within the group, so appeals to alumni members to reach specific cohort goals, such as creating an endowed scholarship for a basketball player from former members of the team, can be more readily attained. Mann (2007) indicates that social identification with a group allows alumni to maintain a positive psychological connection with the institution.

#### *Economics or Utility Model*

Characteristics of the economics or utility model suggest that when donors see an obvious need for their money, they become more motivated to contribute. Donors feel useful in making a donation that will benefit the recipients (Mann, 2007). Harrison (1995) thinks, "the economic person gives as a response to others whose income or

wealth is less than his or hers” (p. 74). Economists explain philanthropy as “interdependent utility” in the sense that a prospective donor’s utility is influenced by the need of others (Harrison, et al., 1995). Okunade, Wunnava, and Walsh (1994), in their research on alumni giving from a large public university in a major United States metropolitan area, examined the giving habits of 303 randomly selected undergraduate alumni over a 50-year span. They discovered that “each donor can be said to derive some utility (or satisfaction) from giving to charities, regardless of the specific motives for giving. Since alumni are individuals with ranging motives for donating, the utility-based theories appear to be globally compatible when modeling alumni charities using micro-data” (p. 75). Weerts and Ronca (2007) state in their research findings that if alumni donors develop a view that the institution needs their support, they will be more likely to give. The economics or utility model is a common thread among many researchers. When donors become aware of a need, feel that their contribution makes a difference to the cause, they then feel because of their donation that they are an important part of the organization. Coughlin and Erekson (1984) concluded through their research on contributions to support intercollegiate athletics that “individuals might derive utility from feeling that their contributions have aided the team and, therefore, can feel justified in sharing in the fortunes of their favorite team” (p. 184). Mann (2007) simply states, “When a potential donor better understands the need or value for gift, there is an increased likelihood that they will make a gift” (p. 37).

### *Services Model*

In this model, Mann (2007) views alumni intentions to contribute as stemming from the institution's quality of service provided to the potential donor, the value of that service, and the satisfaction level the donor feels about that service. The research from Stinson and Howard (2004) indicated, "donations made in exchange for tangible donor benefit would be more subject to the services model" (p. 139). Tangible benefits of giving for the donor in intercollegiate athletics could come from preferred seating in stadiums, access to luxury suites, close associations with coaches, valet parking at athletic events, or athletic department gifts of clothing (Turner, et al., 2001). "Some scholars have observed a recent corporate trend of giving financial gifts to fewer academic institutions in order to get something in return. Often that something in return is access to prospective employees" (Wunnava & Lauze, 2001, p. 533). Belfield and Beney (2000) used the services model in examining alumni generosity at two doctoral granting universities in the United Kingdom. They indicated that donations reflected the perceived quality of education received by the donor and larger gifts were attributed because of the high quality of education received by the donor from the institution, which allowed the donor to attain an occupation with high earnings. In this example, donations could be considered as payments for the intangibles the donor received. Brady, et al. (2002) concluded in their findings that new, young, and less experienced potential donors are more concerned about the value of their donations, not only the value for themselves but also for the organization. They wanted to know in what way their gift would make a difference.

### *Relationship-Marketing Model*

“Communication is the key variable that impacts relationship-marketing” (Mann, 2007, p. 43). Mann continues, that with communication, cultivating and sustaining positive relationships between the organization and the donor is possible. “Effective communication with alumni will help shape a positive relationship between the college and the alumnus...developing a positive relationship between alumni and their college will create an emotional connection that may support fund-raising efforts” (Mann, 2007, p. 37). Harrison, et al. (1995) emphasized from their findings that expenditures on alumni relations by the institution influences alumni giving. “The probability that an alumnus will give is found to increase with spending on alumni relations” (Harrison, et al., 1995, p. 400). Marketing strategies that maintain close contact with alumni through high-quality alumni publications describing donors as well as descriptions of institutional objectives and philosophies of development all encourage alumni giving (Harrison, 1995). Boulding’s (1962) research acknowledges that a theory of relationship development is apparent during the cycle of giving and receiving that occurs over time, allowing the donor and the organization to build a relationship. Sun, Hoffman, and Grady (2007) also showed evidence from their findings on the importance of building and sustaining relationships through continuous contact with alumni. They found, “Since alumni experiences are closely related to alumni marketing efforts such as parties, reunions, newsletters, and solicitations, the results confirm that these efforts do engage alumni, and that alumni may be more likely to donate than those less or not engaged. The findings also suggested that alumni who were more informed about the university had

more positive perceptions of it, were more aware of and linked with perceived institutional needs, and, therefore were more likely to give than those not well informed” (Sun, et al., 2007, p. 18).

*Competition for Development Money between Athletics and Academics*

There is evidence in the research concerning both sides of the debate that athletic development efforts reduce giving to the academic side of university fundraising (Baade & Sundberg, 1996). The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an alliance of 55 NCAA Division I faculty senates whose mission is to provide a national faculty representation on intercollegiate athletic issues. The underlying premise of the organization is that intercollegiate athletics, while providing positive benefits to athletes, the campus, and the broader community, at times clashes with the educational goals and missions of the institution (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2007). The COIA states that “recent NCAA data demonstrates that athletic department budgets across the country are rising much more quickly than the rest of the university” (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2007, p. 11). This group of faculty feels that finding enough resources to meet the rising costs of intercollegiate athletics is straining institutional finances that should be directed to rising academic expenses. Frank (2004) believes that rather than participating in a financial arms race to escalate athletic programs, schools should devote these resources to improving academic units. James Duderstadt, President Emeritus at the University of Michigan, stated to the Knight Commission investigating intercollegiate athletics in 2000, that collegiate athletics are corruptive to the academic enterprise and suggested that intercollegiate athletics be put in the academic budget where the institution

“could then use a counter flow of athletic department revenue into the general and education budget” (Duderstadt, 2000, p. 5). Naughton’s (1998) investigations led him to one university where the student body organized against athletic department solicitations and ultimate spending to upgrade facilities, money they believed would be better spent on academics.

The rise in restricted donations made to athletics has concerned university academic development officers. Humphreys and Mondello (2005) concluded through their research that, “Because restricted donations include those funds earmarked for the athletic department, our results indicate that the academic units at institutions may not benefit from athletic-related increases in donations” (p. 23). Alumni fundraisers from the institution’s academic units are competing with athletic department development efforts more frequently in recent years (Sun, et al., 2007). Turner, et al. (2001) advises schools to be sensitive to these factors of competition for money between athletics and academics, understanding that “a dollar given to support the football team could be a dollar that otherwise might have gone to the library” (p. 814). While Sperber (2000) was doing research, he interviewed development officers at various schools and “found that most complained that athletic department fundraisers competed with them for money from the same alums” (p. 307). He believes that all university development officers have to have a team approach to development efforts, and institutions would be better served if athletics were further engrained with the academic units.

Shulman and Bowen (2001) have found research that athletic department development efforts not only increase the number of athlete alumni making donations for

athletics, but also for the university's general fund. Their research indicated that male donors in both the 1951 and 1976 entering cohorts gave to intercollegiate athletic programs, but in comparison, more athlete alumni gave to academic programs. From the 30 colleges and universities they studied, which encompassed data on 90,000 alumni, 20 percent of athlete alumni gave financially to intercollegiate athletics, whereas 50 percent made financial gifts for general-purpose funds. However, their research reveals a recent concern they have "that younger graduates who are strongly interested in athletics may prove less inclined than their predecessors in the 1950s to be equally enthusiastic supporters of the broader purposes of the college" (Shulman & Bowen, 2001, p. 215). Several studies find no effect on athletic development efforts crowding out giving to academic units. Rhoads and Gerking (2000) concluded from their research, "university presidents seeking to expand educational contributions may find it advantageous to support athletic programs at their institutions" (p. 257). They believed building or maintaining quality athletic programs is less costly compared to building up academic programs and the "payoff from establishing an athletic tradition may come more quickly, particularly if prospective donors have difficulty judging academic improvements" (p. 257). Tsiotsou (2007) found in her research that prestige is related to giving; strong intercollegiate athletics can increase prestige and attract contributions to assist in increasing donations to academic programs.

Stinson and Howard (2004) empirically examined if increased giving to athletics has a negative impact on charitable giving to educational programs at the same institution. The sample for the study included all donors making gifts of \$1,000 or more

between 1994 and 2002 at a large NCAA Division I west coast university. The data indicated strong support that giving to athletics undermines giving to academics, particularly for non-alumni. For non-alumni, academic gifts fell significantly, while gifts to athletics from non-alumni significantly increased. Over the period studied, the average academic gift by non-alumni has fallen \$671.35, while the average non-alumni gift to athletics has increased \$962.88. For alumni, “There has been no significant change in alumni giving to academics in terms of total dollars donated. However, alumni have significantly increased their giving to athletics, and now donate a significantly larger percentage of their gift to the athletic department” (Stinson & Howard, 2004, p. 136). The authors conclude, “It is quite plausible that donors view a donation to the athletic department as the best of both worlds: the donor is helping students and the university while at the same time receiving significant personal benefit” (p. 139). Two common views of athletic fundraising are that it brings new donors to the institution as well as brings donors who would not donate to the institution through other areas. Stinson and Howard (2004) think their research contradicts the two views, “While athletic-based fundraising has been successful at recruiting new institutional donors, such recruitment is coming at a price to academic giving” (p. 139). The research suggests that new donors to athletics are not being transitioned into potentially contributing to academics. The institution needs to cultivate these new donors to contribute to the academic mission as well. The academic aspects of most colleges and universities look alike to the majority of people on the outside, while different college sport teams have unique identities. “Whether or not one supports the idea of high profile intercollegiate athletics, it is

difficult to deny that college sports matter greatly in the public life of the university” (Toma, 1998, p. 87). Innovative development officers could use intercollegiate athletics effectively to enhance development efforts for the academic side of the institution. Alumni contributions to intercollegiate athletics and to academic programs can complement each other (Goff, 2000).

Grimes and Chressanthis (1994) took data gathered from the alumni development foundation of a large NCAA Division I southern university for the 30-year period between 1962 and 1991 and investigated if athletic success creates an external monetary benefit for the academic programs of an institution. Their findings concluded, “The athletic success of a school’s overall sports program can positively influence the level of giving to the academic side of the institution” (p. 38). Frank (2004) presented to the Knight Foundation Commission a review of empirical studies that included the investigation if alumni donations earmarked specifically for college athletic programs displaced donations that would have been made for academic programs. He concluded through a survey of the literature that athletic alumni donations sometimes do rise after successful seasons at a few institutions, but such increases are likely to be small and have no impact on displacing academic donations. The myth that intercollegiate athletic programs encourage significant financial contributions from alumni for the entire institution confuses fundraising efforts (Sperber, 2000).

Kahn (2007) viewed athletic success creating two indirect benefits: financial benefits that come from donations or possible state appropriations, and reputation. He emphasized, “Many econometric studies have investigated the effects of sport success on

donations with mixed results” (p. 222). He believes findings in the various studies are sensitive to the variables studied so outcomes of giving by alumni or non-alumni may have many meanings. Kahn (2007) concluded, “Some evidence suggests, although not unambiguously, that college sports have positive indirect effects on public and private contributions” (p. 224). Goff (2000) indicated that many benefactors to institutions are interested in giving to both athletic and academic programs but have a fixed amount of money they are willing to give. His research found that an increase in athletic success, or an emphasis to give to athletics, might steer these donors toward athletics and away from academics. “On the other hand, greater exposure for a university, whatever its source, may help spur giving across many fronts. The effect that is expected to dominate (athletic vs. general giving) cannot be theoretically determined” (Goff, 2000, p. 93).

#### *Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Donor Behavior*

Tsiotsou (1998, 2006, and 2007) conducted three studies over a ten-year period to investigate why people donate to university athletic departments. In her first study in 1998, Tsiotsou developed a model and tested the model through survey research methods to study athletic department donors of the Florida State University athletic department. She randomly surveyed 800 athletic donors and had a response of 387 returned questionnaires. The questionnaires were coded and mailed to the donors through the foundation office, which had a sample of 400, and the athletic department, which had a sample of 400. Donors of the foundation office donated to both academics and athletics, while the athletic department sub-sample consisted of individuals who donated to only the athletic department. Through her study, she attempted to confirm previous research

findings on development efforts, which would increase the effectiveness of athletic department campaigns. Based on her review of the literature, she developed a model from development and marketing theories as well as results of fund raising studies to help explain why people donate to athletic departments. Tsotsou (1998) believed at the time of her investigation, that “the majority of the fundraising and the athletic fundraising literature have been focused on variables such as demographics and attitudes toward giving” and indicated “that there is no study in the literature that includes other factors and no effort has been made to combine these variables in a logical chain of relationships that may explain why people make donations to particular causes/programs” (p. 1).

Tsotsou (1998) identified seven factors that were expected to influence people in making a decision to contribute money to athletic departments. The Giving to Athletics Model she developed included the following variables: Values, Socioeconomic Status, Involvement with Athletics, Sport Experience, Attendance of Athletic Events, Emotional Motivation, and Practical Motivation. She used a sophisticated statistical technique, the structural equation model, to explain how each variable contributed to the likelihood of donating to athletic departments. Tsotsou found five significant paths in the model that lead to donations to athletics. The paths from the variables of Emotional Motivation, Practical Motivation, Involvement with Athletics, Attendance of Athletic Events, and Sport Experience were statistically significant for donations to athletic departments. When individuals are emotionally motivated they are more likely to donate to athletic programs. Priority seating, tax deductions, professional contacts, and social contacts were all indicative of motives for practical reasons. The more involved an individual is with

athletics, the more they will donate. The more experience with sports that someone has, the higher the probability to donate. People who attend athletic events are more likely to experience excitement from the contest. “The more athletic events they attend the more emotionally motivated they are to give” (Tsiotous, 1998, p. 10). The findings from Tsiotou (1998) have theoretical and practical implications. The Giving to Athletics Model presents theoretical understanding of why people donate to athletic departments. She states the practical implications by indicating, “this information suggests that the fundraisers should identify people involved in sports as well as people having experience in sports as their prospective athletic donors” (p. 10). This suggests that future donors for athletic departments could even be identified through the institution’s record of participants in intramural programs.

In 2006, Tsiotsou took her 1998 research and investigated differences between female and male donors to athletic programs in order to improve fundraising effectiveness. She stated that studies on female athletic donors are limited and more research needs to be conducted to better understand this growing athletic contributor population. Tsiotsou believes that in all venues of charitable giving, women are becoming important contributors. She cites a study conducted for the State of Michigan that surveyed 990 Michigan residents on their charitable giving habits. “Women have become a significant economic force and should be taken seriously by fundraisers. A study conducted in the State of Michigan (Michigan Giving and Volunteering) in 2003 revealed that the number of women donors increased over the years and exceeded that of men” (Tsiotsou, 2006, p. 211). In Tsiotsou’s 2006 study, she found that women usually make

many small contributions rather than a few large donations and give a higher percentage of their income than males. The research revealed that women feel stronger about causes, so are less motivated by tax and estate benefits than are male donors. The study indicated that with regard to annual contributions, females donated far less than males. Females also attended collegiate sporting events less frequently and had less sport experience than males. Because of these findings, Tsiotsou indicated that athletic fundraisers need to design programs for potential female donors that will be less expensive, keeping their involvement high. The author gave an example to motivate attendance at sporting events and increase involvement; fundraisers should organize programs before games for their female donors so they attend it afterwards. She found that women want to be involved with athletic fundraisers and constitute a significant segment of athletic donors that are increasing in size and importance. “This is a very important trend that might result from the increased number of working and consequently financially independent women. In addition, more and more women are involved in sports either by playing or by attending sporting events” (Tsiotsou, 2006, p. 220).

Women contributing to fundraising campaigns have begun to attract attention from researchers (Staurowsky, 1996). The revolutionary effects in intercollegiate athletics from Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which mandates equal access and opportunities for women in education, present new challenges for institutions of higher education. The addition of more teams, scholarships, facilities, coaches, and programs of support to achieve equality and compliance for intercollegiate women athletic programs has had major benefits not only for the athletes themselves, but also for

institutional missions (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Staurowsky (1996) opined that historically fundraisers have overlooked women, but they now are a viable economic resource. “As intercollegiate athletic departments search for ways to relieve financial pressures brought on by a poor economy, escalating expenses, and the projected costs associated with gender equity, it behooves athletic fundraising professionals to develop a greater understanding of the relationship between athletic donor behavior and gender” (Staurowsky, 1996, p. 402).

In her 2007 study, Tsiotsou once again used the information gathered from her 1998 research, but now focused on profiling athletic donors’ motivations by using sociodemographic, psychographic, and behavioral variables to identify and describe donors. She described her findings as motivation-based donor segmentation. The gathered data used to compile results for the 2007 study employed various instruments and inventories for assessment, and consisted of five parts: measuring motivation, gathering demographics, measuring involvement with the athletic department, measuring donor’s values, and gathering data on giving. Tsiotsou (2007) provided new insight into both theoretical implications and practical implications “into the relationship between athletic donor’s motivation and amount of donation, future donation intentions, values, involvement with the athletic department of the university, and household income” (p. 86).

The theoretical implications that Tsiotsou described will assist athletic fundraisers to have a better understanding of athletic donors’ motivations. She stated four distinct implications from her findings. The first is, “Donors (alumni and non-alumni) make

contributions because they identify themselves with the institution (identity salience) and aim at keeping their bonds or building relationships with it (commitment)” (p. 86).

Financial donations can accomplish this. The second is that when a donation is made, the donor trusts the leadership and vision of the university, which represents shared values between the donor and the institution. Third, donors feel prestige when contributing to a successful organization. Association with prestigious institutions assists in providing self-esteem, which occurs when donors relate themselves to successful athletic programs and institutions. The fourth theoretical implication consists of utilitarian motives to donate, which could be tax deductions and priority seating.

A cluster analysis of the factors produced two segments of donors: athletic donors, highly motivated, and athletic donors, less motivated. Tsotsou (2007) indicated, “Less motivated donors seem to question the vision and leadership of the university, lack trust and do not believe that their financial contributions to athletic programs would increase the prestige of the university” (p. 86). They also are less involved with events of the athletic program. Highly motivated donors reflected the factors in the four segments listed above that are indicative of giving financially to the athletic department. Tsotsou (2007) believes her study findings can profile the two segments in this manner: “The low motivation segment consists of donors who make smaller donations, are less involved in the athletic program of the university, and score less in the values instrument. The high motivation segment consists of donors who contribute larger amounts, are more involved with athletics and appreciate more values such as sense of belonging, excitement, self-fulfillment, being well respected, self respect, and a sense of accomplishment” (p. 87).

The researcher stated several practical implications of the study in using the motivation based donor segmentation. Tsotsou (2007) believes athletic department development officers can benefit by using her findings to target marketing strategies toward specific motivation groups, develop an effective marketing mix in order to motivate specific donor segments, and provide easier identification of fundraising opportunities and threats. “Moreover, the results of the study postulate the need for employing relationship marketing in athletic fundraising to build and maintain long-term relationships with donors. To accomplish longitudinal bonds, athletic fundraising marketers need to keep donors motivated, build trust, enhance their loyalty and increase involvement with the athletic programs of the university” (Tsotsou, 2007, p. 87). The author continues that her findings indicate that it is important to target highly motivated athletic donors, donors of academic programs, and those involved with the athletic department. These people want to be associated with the institution; fundraisers should not ignore this group, and must continue to develop tools to strengthen ties between athletic donors and the institution. Social events on a regular basis, in which speeches are delivered by the president, deans, athletic director, coaches, or athletes all will help develop interaction that bonds the donors with the athletic department. “In addition to events, web pages, e-mails, newsletters or newspapers mailed regularly would keep donors informed, increase their involvement with the athletic program and reassure them that they constitute an integral part of the institution” (Tsotsou, 2007, p. 88).

The author suggested that people included in the less motivated group needed to be provided with information about the leadership and vision of the university and

athletic department so the potential donor's trust and understanding can be increased. People in the low motivation segment exhibit low involvement, so first their trust and understanding must be earned, then development officers can increase their involvement with athletic contests and social events. Tsiotso (2007) feels donor recruitment strategies should be differentiated between the highly motivated segment and the lowly motivated segment of contributors.

Plinske (2000) reported findings directed at small college fundraising efforts for athletic programs. He surveyed 387 NCAA Division III vice presidents of development concerning the institution's involvement with athletic fundraising. The objective for his research was to discover trends in small college athletic fundraising and see what initiatives appear to be most successful in development for these types of institutions. A response rate of 66 percent was achieved from the institutions he surveyed. Forty percent of the respondents indicated that their institution had a program for athletic development. Private colleges had the most formalized programs of development and raised more money than the public colleges. Plinske (2000) noted that private institutions make up nearly 82 percent of the small colleges in the United States.

Through his research, "for the largest percentage of schools, the most frequent donors were alumni, followed by parents, boosters, and corporations" (Plinske, 2000, p. 1). He noted that this demographic on donors was unique for NCAA Division III athletics because, "research conducted on larger institutions shows that much of Division I and II fundraising comes from booster and corporate dollars as opposed to alum and parents of student-athletes" (Plinske, 2000, p. 1). Another distinction the author noted between

NCAA Division III schools and NCAA I or II institutions, is the reported findings from development people in Division III indicating the goals of their fundraising programs to be: budget relief, build long-term relationships, increase the donor base of the athletic department, and raise money. The goal of raising money was fourth overall in the gathered data. The author indicated that this is in contrast to priorities for development at the NCAA Division I and II levels where the goal of raising money is the most important objective.

The Plinske survey also gathered data on donor motivation, barriers to fundraising, and sample programs of development. Plinske (2000) stated, "According to experts in this field, the best way to understand how to raise funds is to understand what motivates those who give, and then provide benefits that match the motivations" (p. 2). His research found that Division III colleges thank donors for their contributions with gifts such as newsletters, social invitations, complimentary tickets, membership cards, game program recognition, free apparel, and advertising. The data also revealed that special events were frequently used to reward donors, such as golf tournaments, banquets, homecoming programs, and hospitality tents at athletic functions. These functions were thought to be important to development officers because these events brought people together to strengthen donor ties to the athletic department, thus allowing donors to feel proud about giving funds. However, Plinske (2000) stated, "research has shown that small college constituents seem to be most interested in giving because they believe in and support the ideology and philosophy of Division III athletics" (p. 2). The researcher points out that development at the Division III level is more than just asking

for money, it also includes marketing and promoting the entire school, showing what the institution represents using intercollegiate athletics as a vehicle. The concept of friend raising is as important as fundraising.

Another important finding from the research of NCAA Division III institutions by Plinske (2000) was that, “what draws a donor to a program are areas that athletic directors and coaches can control—such as integrity, emphasis on academic achievement, and recruiting community minded athletes” (p. 3). Findings in his research show that athletic departments that hired a full time fundraiser “had a significant impact on their ability to accomplish goals and establish strong donor-program relationships” (Plinske, 2000, p. 3). Full-time fundraisers were more effective at presenting the institution’s athletic and academic missions, about which donors at the NCAA Division III level wanted to be informed.

*Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Success and Alumni Giving*

The findings in the study conducted by Holmes, et al. (2008) are interesting to note because results show that being a participant in a winning sport program at the NCAA Division III level increases athlete alumni giving. There is a plethora of research that has been conducted investigating whether successful institutional sports programs of intercollegiate athletics lead to greater alumni giving from all of the institution’s alumni. There is research that is discussed in this review that specifically investigates distinctions between the donor habits and characteristics of athlete alumni and the general alumni population. However, athlete alumni are a segment of the entire alumni donor population and research findings assessing all alumni contributions can be adapted for the specific

donor population of athlete alumni as well. Turner, et al. (2001) stated, “Far more has been written about the purported link between athletic success and alumni giving than is justified by the available empirical evidence. A wide array of researchers, including both economists and others, have examined the question, and they have reported empirical results that, on the whole, are far from conclusive” (p. 816). The review of the following studies will explore how collegiate athletic success affects alumni donation behavior.

Over 25 years ago, researchers attempted to dispel the myth that athletically successful teams increase the generosity of alumni to donate financially to institutional development efforts. In 1984, Boston College football quarterback Doug Flutie threw a last second, long, winning, touchdown pass in a nationally televised game. That year he won the Heisman Trophy, which is given to the best collegiate football player in the country. Because of that pass and subsequently being named the best player in the country, Flutie gave much recognition to Boston College. “A surprising result of Flutie’s triumphs, never previously seen in American higher education, was that applications for admission to BC spurted upward during 1985-86; hence the term “Flutie Factor” for application jumps sparked by nationally televised college sports victories” (Sperber, 2000, p. 60). Institutions began to believe that televised athletic success would increase enrollment and financial contributions from alumni and boosters. To examine the widely accepted belief that an institution’s successful athletic program generates greater financial contributions from its alumni, Gaski and Etzel (1984) examined sampled data collected from 99 NCAA Division I institutions from 1970 through 1979, analyzing alumni generosity and winning football and basketball programs. Few significant relationships

were found. The authors noted that there is “no apparent connection between a university’s performance in major sports and the propensity toward generosity on the part of its donors” (Gaski & Etzel, 1984, p. 31). However, the researchers did acknowledge the same premise that is reached by authors today, a successful athletic program “enhances a school’s public image which, ultimately, translates into increased donations” (Gaski & Etzel, 1984, p. 31).

Almost 20 years later, Litan, Orzag, and Orzag (2003) were commissioned by the NCAA to analyze the financial effects of college athletics. The study drew on evidence contained in previous academic studies, statistical analysis of a database from 114 Division I institutions from 1993 to 2001, and a detailed survey of chief financial officers from 17 of those schools. They examined ten hypotheses about college athletics, which included the hypothesis that “increased operating expenditures on sports affect other measurable indicators, including alumni giving” (Litan, et al., 2003, p. 6). Their conclusions found no significance on the relationship to increased spending on intercollegiate athletic programs or successful seasons and alumni giving either to the sports program or to the university.

The Baade and Sundberg (1996) study contrasted the conclusions of Gaski and Etzel (1984) and Litan, et al., (2003) by reaching the conclusion that winning records do translate into higher gifts to institutions in higher education. Baade and Sundberg make the concession that “alumni giving depends on many variables, including significant success in intercollegiate athletics” (p. 789). The data came from 48 private doctorate granting universities, 94 public doctorate granting universities, and 167 liberal arts

colleges for the years 1973 to 1990. However, their results could be misleading because in their findings winning percentages were not a significant determinant of alumni giving. The findings that had significance for increased alumni giving were data indicating success through basketball tournament appearances and football bowl appearances. Won-lost records and alumni contributions showed no relationship. Significance came from post-season athletic success and alumni contributions. The authors state, “Colleges and universities are rewarded by their alumni for sport programs that are extremely successful. Athletic success has an immediate impact on alumni generosity” (Baade & Sundberg, 1996, p. 802). The Baade and Sundberg study indicated that there are many variables to explain alumni giving. Better students get more out of their education, they improve the educational experience that their classmates receive, they earn more after graduation, and all of these are variables that make an institution’s alumni more likely to contribute to their alma mater. Other variables indicative of alumni giving are: institutional expenditures per student, enrollment (students may feel more connected to a small school, or they might appreciate the greater offerings of a large school), as well as an institution’s age (established alumni groups, traditions of giving). Their findings conclude “the extent to which a college or university enhances or refines a matriculant’s skills and abilities, what the institution adds to a student’s value, is critical in explaining variations in alumni giving. Money spent building the sports program may in fact reduce alumni giving, if it is spent at the expense of academic quality” (Baade & Sundberg, 1996, p. 802).

Tucker (2004) sampled 78 NCAA Division I institutions from major conferences across the country, using 2001-2002 data for the class that entered in 1996-1997, to examine football and basketball success on graduation rates and alumni giving rates. Three measures of football and basketball success were used: the winning percentage of games played, bowl and NCAA tournament appearances, and final AP poll rankings. The author believes two measurements indicative of academic success are overall graduation rates and the average alumni giving rates. The U.S. News and World Report rankings also use graduation rates and alumni giving rates as indicators of academic success when evaluating institutions of higher education. Findings on the measurement of higher graduation rates and increased alumni giving because of successful football and basketball teams contrasted each other. The findings indicated a positive statistical relationship between football success and graduation rates, but rejected the argument that success in basketball influences the overall graduation rate. Findings were statistically insignificant between basketball success and graduation rates. In regards to an increase in the average alumni-giving rate, the findings indicated that success of the football team positively correlated with increased alumni giving. Basketball success and an increase in alumni giving were once again statistically insignificant. Findings concluded that having a highly successful football team has a positive impact on both the overall graduation rate and alumni-giving rate. In contrast, a successful basketball team has no significant effect on either of the variables.

Tucker (2004) found his findings to be mixed on the issue of whether there is evidence that athletics positively impacts increased graduation rates and increased alumni

financial contributions. He considered two opposing theories: one is that students have to decide to study or be entertained by college athletics. “If the team is highly successful, there is greater incentive to talk sports, attend games, cut classes, and the opportunity lost is studying and graduating” (Tucker, 2004, p. 660). The opposing theory, according to Tucker, is that winning athletic teams give students extracurricular activities that are satisfying which keep the students engaged and happy at the institution so graduation rates rise. Tucker acknowledges that his study was in contrast to other research that found no significance in the statistical relationship between successful sport programs and increased graduation rates or increased alumni donations. One explanation for his findings of football success positively affecting both graduation rates and alumni giving “might be the impact in recent years from increased television coverage of major-conference football schools by ESPN, ESPN2, Time Warner, and the addition of Thursday night games, extra season games, new bowl games, conference playoff games, and the BCS series” (Tucker, 2004, p. 661).

Turner, et al. (2001) also examined the relationship between football athletic success and the giving behavior of all alumni. Their analysis included giving records for 15,351 full-time students, who in the fall of 1976 entered 15 various private colleges and universities, which competed at either an NCAA Division I or III level. The researchers wanted to examine just athletic success of the football program because of the presumed large financial commitment that institutions make to operate intercollegiate football. The degree of athletic success at the institutions studied did vary over the ten-year period in which the gathered data was investigated. Gifts from the alumni were divided into two

categories: those restricted to athletics, and all other general gifts. The giving data spanned a ten-year period between 1988 and 1998. Won-lost records were matched to individual giving records for each of those years. The researchers indicated that some development officers are concerned with participation rates of giving as well as the total amount of dollars contributed. Both giving rates and the overall level of giving were measured. Turner et al. (2001) emphasized “Participation rates are often thought to be important indicators of connection to the university or college and also as important precursors of giving patterns later in life” (p. 819).

Findings in the Turner, et al. (2001) study showed general giving rates by alumni were not so different across the athletic divisions included in the study. Average giving rates to athletics were low everywhere. Women graduates, though making smaller gifts, were as likely to be general givers as their male classmates were, but they were less likely to give to athletics. The authors debunked previous research findings by stating, “Contrary to much of the mythology about winning and giving, we find no relationship of any kind between won-lost records in football and general giving rates” (Turner, et al., 2001, p. 821). However, football victories were more consequential for giving rates from all alumni in NCAA Division III than in Division I, but there was no significant association at any level of competition between won-lost records and athletic contributions. The authors attribute this difference to the fact that a higher percentage of NCAA Division III alumni played intercollegiate athletics for their institution. Significance was found in the study assessing just alumni that were former athletes. Improvements in the won-lost record of the football team increased the giving rate to

athletics for those who participated in varsity athletics as undergraduates in all the divisions studied. The authors noted this key finding though: “There is no significant association between won-lost records and the general giving rates for any group of non-athletes—those members of the cohort who did not play on intercollegiate teams, regardless of gender or the division” (Turner, et al., 2001, p. 823).

The significant findings of the Turner et al. (2001) study for intercollegiate athletic alumni fundraising are two. First, intercollegiate athletics and winning at the NCAA Division III level increases the frequency of all alumni donations. The authors felt this occurs because not only do the students who play sports feel a closer identity to their schools, but also athletics creates an institutional bonding effect for all students at the NCAA Division III level. Second is the positive relationship between winning and giving. However, the authors felt there is a downside to the second perspective of findings. “The recruited athlete of today is the alumnus of tomorrow, and if this large group of potential donors regard winning as important, the pressures to continue to win may be very great” (Turner, et al., 2001, p. 826). The intercollegiate athletic “arms race” continues to escalate, pitting the continued expansion of athletic departments against the overall academic mission of the institution.

#### *Studies Assessing Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Giving*

There is abundant data available across the country at colleges and universities concerning institutional alumni that researchers have underutilized (Sun, et al., 2007). “The most commonly studied segment of donor giving is clearly in the field of higher education” (Lindahl & Conley, 2002). However, according to researchers O’Neil and

Schenke (2006), “less explored in this growing body of literature is an understanding of the motivations and attitudes of college athletes” (p. 60). Shulman and Bowen (2001) also see the research on former athlete donor behavior as being limited. Though limited, there are studies that assess intercollegiate athletic alumni donation behaviors.

O’Neil and Schenke (2006) researched athlete alumni at a southwest university that competed in the NCAA in 20 Division I sports. A total of 2,711 athlete alumni were contacted and 464 individuals returned the survey instrument, yielding a response rate of 17.1 percent. The athletic alumni were measured in the areas of athletic attitudinal statements, giving amount, perceptions and behaviors related to giving in general, and demographic variables. The study found that most athlete alumni had a positive athletic experience while in school and had a strong connection to the university. The findings that “athlete alumni’s giving amount is tempered by a bad former athletic experience supports research that suggests giving amount is impacted by student’s quality of experience while in school” (O’Neil & Schenke, 2006, p. 69). This is no different from previous stated research of the general student body alumni perceptions of quality of experience while in school influencing donating behavior. Alumni stated the school did benefit from their athletic performance, though this would not affect their giving level. However, athlete alumni did agree with the idea that they have already donated to the institution by playing sports and through required community service. Decisions to donate little or no money stemmed from this outlook. This may help explain findings by Shulman and Bowen (2001) and Rhoden (1997) that athlete alumni do not give back to

institutional development efforts because of the feeling that they have already given through their involvement in athletics.

Rhoden (1997) has a unique perspective on recruited intercollegiate student athletes. He sees the athlete in college as a combination of “entertainer, gladiator, and student who put themselves through school by utilizing the labor intensive skills they have honed for years” (p. 2). He feels this has created a conflict between the university and the athletes who look at the direct and indirect benefits the university gains from the sport teams. Rhoden (1997) indicates that administrators involved in the enterprise of fundraising at institutions do not have a relationship with the student-athletes. The people that do have the relationship, the coaches, are not involved with development efforts. The individuals Rhoden interviewed feel that coaches of the athletes are the significant factors to get a positive response from alumni donors. They believe that not all alumni under 50 years of age may make large contributions because they are still concerned about acquiring wealth; athletes are no different from other alumni and should be kept in contact by development offices throughout the life cycle of giving. O’Neil and Schenke (2006) stated the same conclusion and added, “University coaches need to emphasize to athletes that donating to their alma mater helps to ensure the success of future athletic programs and provides access to athlete alumni clubs that offer social opportunities and networking” (p. 71).

The O’Neil and Schenke (2006) study also suggested marketing tactics that would help future donations: an emphasis from the coach early in an athlete’s career on the importance of contributions, how donors help fund scholarships, facilities, travel funds,

and equipment, or after graduation a phone call from a coach or fellow teammate asking for continued financial support of the athletic team. Findings indicated that alumni athletes through their careers have had recognition that their student counterparts may not have had, so schools should understand that continued recognition of every gift, large or small, is important. Athlete alumni want recognition because of their financial contribution. Whether this recognition is in the form of printed publications or acknowledgement at a social function, for financial support to continue from athlete alumni an acknowledgement program of giving is an important element of intercollegiate athletic development efforts. Other results of the study showed geography is related to giving. Athlete alumni who lived out of state after graduation gave less money than alumni living in state after graduation, which the researchers felt was a result of in state alumni being more connected to the institution through activities and events. The authors recognized limitations of the study including: alumni sampled were from only one university, personal biases may have emerged from loyal athlete alumni as it relates to feelings about athletic and institutional experiences, and a low survey response rate from alumni who did not donate money to the institution. The low response rate may reinforce Shulman and Bowen (2001) and Rhoden (1997) in their beliefs that some athlete alumni may not give back to institutional development efforts because of the feeling that they have already given through their involvement in athletics as a player.

The research findings by O'Neil and Schenke (2006) are important to university development programs targeting athletic alumni. The authors state that athlete alumni and general student alumni have similar development profiles in the quality of experience,

age, income, and geography. However, the idea that athlete alumni at times think they have already given through their involvement in athletics as a player is an important finding and needs to be addressed by institutional development programs that target athlete alumni.

Contrasting the research of O'Neil and Schenke (2006) of athlete alumni at a large NCAA Division I institution is the study conducted by Holmes, Meditz, and Sommers (2008) of athlete alumni at a small NCAA Division III school. The Holmes, et al. study used data on annual giving between 1990 and 2004 for more than 23,000 active alumni (7,316 athletes/16,025 non-athletes) of the institution and analyzed the likelihood of giving and generosity levels, comparing athlete alumni and alumni of the rest of the student body. They also investigated if a winning season in a particular sports program leads to greater alumni giving by those athletes that participated in that season. Results showed that former athlete alumni were 22 percent more likely to contribute to institutional financial campaigns than their non-athlete counterparts. However, participation in athletics does not produce the most generous donors. Alumni who participated as undergraduates in campus leadership activities and fundraising campaigns were significantly more likely to give than former athletes. However, fraternity and sorority members were significantly less likely to give than former athletes. Gender of athlete alumni had no significance, but results showed that age did. Contrary to the findings of O'Neil and Schenke (2006) that found older athlete alumni gave at a higher rate than younger athlete alumni, much like the general alumni population, Holmes, et al. found that older athletes 50 years old or above are significantly less likely to give than

younger athletes. Findings in the Holmes et al. study showed contributions to institutional development efforts from former athletes declined with age. Participation in a winning season was found to be associated with a significantly higher likelihood to give and to give generously for athlete alumni. The authors provide “compelling evidence that alumni who were former athletes will respond favorably to fundraising appeals, both in their propensity to give and in their generosity, especially younger alumni who participated in a historically successful sports program” (p. 14).

*Future Implications for Intercollegiate Athletic Alumni Fundraising*

More research is necessary concerning intercollegiate athletic alumni fundraising. Technological advances and the recent collapse in the economy have changed the business of philanthropy. The Internet has altered how people solicit donations and make them. Masterson (2009) suggested that, major changes are necessary in how financial campaigns are conducted because of the slow-down in financial giving. Higher education development officers have to rethink their strategic pursuits. Weerts and Ronca (2007) discussed the idea of the “80/20 rule,” in which development officers spend time and energy on the top 20 percent of donors who have the greatest capacity to give. This concept is still very valid in today’s economy and other development techniques can supplement that strategy. Development programs may have to put more energy into prospective donors that comprise the mid-range as well as the top 20 percent. Focus could be on both groups of potential donors: the small group of large donors, and the large number of smaller donors. Higher education is experiencing the economy’s sting and it is a situation that cannot be ignored. Budget cuts, endowment losses, and declining

government support are rapidly changing philosophies concerning development efforts in higher education.

The prominence of intercollegiate athletics at colleges and universities across the country can assist institution-wide development efforts. Schools have always had the priority of building and sustaining relationships with their alumni and intercollegiate athletics has played an extensive role in this function. Alumni have always been involved with annual giving, targeted gifts, and capital campaigns for their alma mater. However, philanthropy practices are changing rapidly for higher education. Future research is necessary for fundraisers to be able to successfully adapt to the development needs of the institution. Sargeant (2001) believes development officers spend too much time acquiring new donors rather than servicing and retaining the donors already in the program. His research indicated that the number one reason why donors quit giving to an organization was that the donor felt that other causes were more deserving of their support. Development officers have to stay abreast of what is new in the fundraising profession, and know that what works today may not work tomorrow. Constant evaluation of strategies and techniques has to be utilized to reengage past donors, maintain current donors, and solicit future donors.

When Clotfelter (2001) studied the behavior between alumni cohorts entering 14 colleges and universities in the fall of 1951, 1976, and 1989, data revealed that the alumni of the 1951 group were more generous. He concluded that any observed differences in donating behavior between the cohorts were because of four effects: composition, cohort, life cycle, or income. It is obvious that changes in the student bodies, historical period

differences, age cycles of life, and earned income influenced the financial giving habits of these three cohorts. Some researchers are afraid that the generosity of the current cohort of givers will be lost with the passage of time over the next decade (Clotfelter, 2001).

Issues exploring the effective measurement of donor involvement remain a challenge for many athletic department alumni directors and development officers. Athletic department development officers need to discover how they are capturing alumni interest and getting them involved with the university's athletic department campaigns. Identifying key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns will help understand this donor population. Examining determinants shaped from models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, will help develop a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Developing a donor profile will assist in predicting donor behavior and increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Methodology

This chapter describes the research methods used in this exploratory, descriptive study that will help determine factors that influence the engagement of athletic alumni to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. The methodology is outlined in six sections: (1) Purpose of the Study, (2) Description of Research Design, (3) Participants, (4) Survey Instrument, (5) Research Question, and (6) Data Analysis Procedure.

#### *Purpose of the Study*

The purpose of this study is to identify key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants shaped from models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, will help develop a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Developing a donor profile will assist in predicting donor behavior and increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments. The variables that cause one person to give and negate the other are complex and vary at each institution of higher education.

Though there have been a significant number of studies on overall alumni giving and their connection to intercollegiate athletics, there is limited research on the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni within specific institutions. Two significant studies that influenced the research of this study explored developing a donor

profile scale for intercollegiate athletics (Strode & Fink, 2009) and examined factors impacting athlete alumni donating to their alma mater (O'Neil & Schenke, 2007). Strode and Fink (2009) developed an instrument based on theory to explain motivations to give which led to developing a donor profile for all individuals that give to an athletic program, not just alumni. Items were generated for a survey related to four broad motives to explain giving: achievement, affiliation, philanthropy, and power. The final instrument was sent to a random sampling of 1,334 athletic donors at a large public NCAA Division I midwestern institution, where 683 were returned for a response rate of 46 percent. Based on the survey results, a donor profile for the institution's intercollegiate athletic department was developed. O'Neil and Schenke (2007) surveyed 2,711 athletic alumni from a medium-sized, NCAA Division I southwestern private university. A total of 464 individuals returned the survey instrument, yielding a response rate of 17.1 percent. They measured five different athletic alumni attitude variables and giving level to the athletic department, as well as perceptions and behaviors related to giving, along with demographic variables. The work of Mann (2007) also provided an excellent framework for theoretical or model perspectives for understanding donor motives by applying his philosophies in studying collegiate athletic alumni financial giving.

The donor population of student athlete alumni has not been successfully cultivated at many institutions. Researchers believe that student athlete alumni, during their matriculation, have had unique experiences and developed attitudes different from their peers who did not participate in intercollegiate competition while in school. Because of this, athletic alumni need to be measured in ways to help development officers

understand this donor population. Collecting research data from this group can further reveal theories of philanthropy and characteristics of giving from the specific population of intercollegiate athletic alumni. In researching athletic alumni that have financially given to the athletic department, the expectation of collecting information that characterizes all athletic alumni, will help mold future development efforts. Theories or models of philanthropy that include attitudinal motives to give, patterns to giving, and factors that can predict giving, have helped profile athletic alumni donors in this study.

#### *Description of the Research Design*

The most appropriate method to measure quantitative numeric descriptions of trends, attitudes, opinions, experiences, motives, identification, and demographics of a population is to study a sample of that population by using a survey (Creswell, 2003). The purpose of survey research is to generalize results from a sample to a population, so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of the population of interest (Babbie, 1990). Many disciplines and fields of study employ survey research. Researchers view survey techniques to have a great usefulness for wide application and broad coverage in research. Advantages for survey use are many. Surveys are relatively inexpensive and can be administered from one location via mail, electronic mail, or telephone. Many questions can be asked about a topic, giving flexibility at the creation phase of the survey as well as flexibility in the data analysis procedures. Standardized questions make measurement more precise, allowing the use of similar data to be collected from different cohorts, and then interpreted comparatively. Surveys are useful in describing the characteristics of a large population from a small group of

individuals (Babbie, 1990; Fowler, 2002). Surveys allow sub groups of large populations to be studied, making the results statistically significant when analyzing multiple variables. Though there are disadvantages of surveys, such as methodology relying on standardized questions may miss observations important to some respondents, the survey approach is advantageous for this particular study.

The data collection employed in this study is a cross-sectional, self-administered, Web-based online survey that collected appropriate information from a predetermined sample of intercollegiate athletic alumni at a given point in time from one institution. The growth of the Internet and the expanded use of electronic mail for business and communication purposes have allowed the electronic survey to become a widely used survey instrument. Though the population sample is limited to those with access to a computer and an online network, there are advantages to using the Web. According to Nesbary (2000), Web-based surveys are more cost effective, easier to edit and analyze, provide quicker delivery times, have higher response rates, enable respondents to answer more honestly, and make global coverage possible.

Fowler (2002) describes three elements of sound survey research that this study fulfills. First, the purpose of this study was to produce statistics, quantitative or numerical descriptions, about some aspects of a predetermined population. This study collected information on the attitudes, opinions, experiences, motives, and demographics of intercollegiate athletic alumni through a survey that aimed to identify key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Second, the study asked questions as the primary

means of getting information on intercollegiate athletic alumni donor behavior. Alumni answers constituted the data that was analyzed. Using questions as measures is an essential part of the survey process. Finally, data were collected from a sample of a particular population and the results were generalized to the entire population.

### *Participants*

The participants of this study were intercollegiate male and female athletic alumni that graduated from the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) within a 50-year span of time, from 1960 to 2010. A 50-year span was selected because it provides a broad age range of athletic alumni donors. During this period, according to the UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations, 1,586 student-athletes graduated from UMD, and of that population, 719 have financially donated a minimum of one time to the UMD athletic program. The Office of Development and Alumni Relations was in support of this study and provided all available email addresses from that population. Of the 719 alumni student-athlete graduates, 475 have available, working email addresses on file at the UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations. This represents approximately 66.1 percent of all the UMD student-athletes that graduated and have been financial donors to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department during the span of 1960 to 2010. Those 475 UMD athletic alumni (368 males/107 females) that donated financially comprised the sample for this study.

According to Nesbary (2000), the quality of the sample affects the quality of the research generalizations. This study used descriptive statistics to characterize the dataset. Nesbary (2000) suggests the larger the sample size, the greater the sample will reflect the

general population. The larger the number in the sample surveyed the higher likelihood of a representative distribution of the population. The sampling design for the potential respondents in the population was single-staged. A single-stage sampling procedure is one in which the researcher has access to names in the population and can sample the participants directly (Creswell, 2003). Because of the inclusion of all athletic alumni that donated that have available email addresses on file at the UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations, the sample population can be said to be an unbiased sample. In addition, by including in the survey all of the 475 UMD athletic alumni that donated financially out of a possible 719, stratification does occur. Stratification means that specific characteristics of individuals are represented in the sample and the sample reflects the true proportion of individuals with certain characteristics of the population; thus stratification ensures representation (Fowler, 2002).

### *Institutional Context*

The University of Minnesota Duluth is a comprehensive regional university. Undergraduate students can choose from 13 bachelor degrees in 74 majors. In addition to the two-year program at the School of Medicine and a College of Pharmacy program, UMD offers graduate programs in 21 different fields, participates in three all-university PhD programs (one of which is located primarily on the UMD campus), and cooperates significantly in the delivery of four University of Minnesota Twin-Cities-based PhD programs. Founded in 1895, UMD became a coordinate campus of the University of Minnesota in 1947. Providing an alternative to both large research universities and small liberal arts colleges, the study institution attracts students looking for a personalized

learning experience on a medium-sized campus of a major university. Over 1,971 people work at the study institution including 481 full-time faculty and 207 full-time professional/academic staff, 96 part-time faculty and 43 part-time professional/academic staff, and 862 fulltime/part-time civil service employees. Student enrollment reaches 12,000 with approximately 38 percent of the students from the State's largest metropolitan area and an additional 42 percent from other parts of the State. The Alumni Association lists approximately 58,000 graduates.

Currently the institution's Department of Intercollegiate Athletics competes in seven men's and nine women's varsity sports as members of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference and the Western Collegiate Hockey Association. The varsity sports for the men are baseball, basketball, cross-country, football, hockey, and track (indoor and outdoor). The varsity sports for the women are basketball, cross-country, hockey, soccer, softball, tennis, track (indoor and outdoor), and volleyball. Nationally, the institution belongs to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and competes at the Division II level except for Division I hockey (men and women).

The chronological history must be noted of various years of fluctuation in the Intercollegiate Athletic Department at the study institution, when sport programs were eliminated or added. All graduated athletic alumni that donated financially, regardless of the status of their sport, are included in the sample frame numbers. Though athletics began at the study institution in 1930, the following indicate the sports offered and the years in which the institution participated in sanctioned intercollegiate competition between 1960 and 2010: baseball 1972-2010, basketball (men) 1960-2010, basketball

(women) 1982-2010, cross-country (men) 1960-2010, cross-country (women) 1982-2010, football 1960-2010, golf (men) 1960-1992, golf (women) 1988-1992, hockey (men) 1960-2010, hockey (women) 1999-2010, skiing (men) 1960-1978, skiing (women) 1987-1989, soccer (women) 1994-2010, softball 1982-2010, swimming (men) 1960-1982, tennis (men) 1960-2000, tennis (women) 1982-2010, track (men) 1960-2010, track (women) 1982-2010, volleyball (women) 1982-2010, wrestling (men) 1966-1996.

### *Ethics of the Study*

Since this study involved the use of human subjects, ethical issues of conducting research were considered. The University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved all aspects of this study prior to beginning research. McNamara (1977) lists five guidelines that help eliminate or control ethical concerns; they are (1) voluntary participation, (2) no harm to respondents, (3) anonymity and confidentiality, (4) identifying purpose and sponsor, and (5) analysis and reporting. The following process ensured voluntary participation. One week before the survey was sent electronically, an initial first email contact was sent informing participants of the study as well as the importance and justification for the study (Appendix A). The second email contact included a short introduction and a link to the Web-based survey (Appendix B). By clicking on the link provided and logging into the secure site, it was assumed that the participant voluntarily indicated agreement to participate in the research study. This study did not include sensitive questions that harmed or made the respondents uncomfortable in any manner. Participants were advised that all information was confidential, and the surveys were returned anonymously. The purpose of the study, which is to identify key

determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to the institution's intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns, was explained in the introductory email as well as when the survey link was emailed. The Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics supported the study. The last ethical guideline, according to McNamara (1977), that the researcher will be responsible for, is accurate reporting and analyzing of both the methods and results of the survey.

### *Survey Instrument*

The survey used for data collection was a Web-based instrument. Through the review of literature exploring intercollegiate athletic alumni fundraising in United States colleges and universities, there was no apparent instrument agreed upon by researchers for the purpose of investigating alumni fundraising. Mentioned previously, two significant studies that influenced the research of this study explored developing a donor profile scale for intercollegiate athletics (Strode & Fink, 2009) and examined factors impacting athlete alumni donating to their alma mater (O'Neil & Schenke, 2007). Permission was granted from both research studies' authors to modify or adapt various aspects of their instruments for the present study.

In survey research, there needs to be some kind of assurance that the instrument that is being used will have validity and reliability while gathering information that will result in accurate conclusions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). While reliability is concerned with the accuracy of the actual measuring instrument or procedure, validity is concerned with the study's success at measuring what the researcher set out to measure. This study

used three principles to improve content validity when designing the survey instrument: used a broad sample of content rather than a narrow one, emphasized important material, and wrote questions to measure the intended domain. Reliability in survey research can be reached by presenting all subjects with the same standardized question format that will help eliminate unreliable conclusions made by the researcher. A standardized survey can eliminate participant and researcher subjectivity. As recommended by Creswell (2003), the questions were carefully worded and specific in order, which obtained data that was numerical and capable of being analyzed. Questions were written in a straightforward, simple, direct language that was specifically tailored to the institution's athletic alumni respondents. Careful wording, format, content, order, and attention to the development of questions as well as consistency in the administration of the survey instrument can reduce the unreliability of each participant in the measured population.

To improve content, face and construct validity, as well as concerns of reliability, staff from the Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics evaluated the survey instrument. Staff from these two departments, along with a group of 15 UMD athletic alumni representing the 50 years surveyed, gave opinions and suggestions on question development. The survey was "pretested" by a random selection of 15 athletic alumni to determine the effectiveness of the instrument. A "participating pretest" dictates that respondents are told that the pretest is a practice run and at the end of the survey, questions are asked about the instrument, including: clarity of instructions, task difficulty, question format, wording, and order, as well as time length of taking the survey. Adjustments to the survey instrument and

administration of the survey instrument that are determined to be necessary were made accordingly before the survey was sent to the final sample population.

The Web-based survey used in this study contained 61 questions. There were mostly forced-choice questions in both the demographic and experimental sections of the survey. In the instrument, there were 12 demographic questions and 49 questions pertaining to trends, attitudes, opinions, experiences, motives, and identification of why the athletic alumni participant in the survey gave or did not give financially to UMD intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. In the formation of survey questions, words indicative of the term “gift” were used instead of “donation.” In the development profession, terms representing the word “gift” imply a relationship between the donor and recipient in which giving involves a social interaction. A “donation” is a term used for financial contribution decisions in a less-connected relationship (Sherry, 1983). The decision to use words associated with the term “gift” rather than “donation” in the survey is because a relationship had been established with the alumni survey participant through previous involvement as a student-athlete in the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department.

#### *Demographic Questions*

Demographic questions, used in a wide variety of research studies on donating habits of college alumni, assist in efforts to determine strategies for developing sound development campaigns and improving fundraising effectiveness (Tsiotsou, 2006). The 12 demographic questions in the survey solicited responses that enabled comparisons to

be made between sub groups, to observe how opinions vary between these groups. Listed are the demographic questions and rationale for including each item in the survey.

*Gender:* Tsiotsou (2006), in her study that investigated differences between female and male athletic donors, found that development officers at colleges and universities need to be able to identify the needs and motives of gender to gain a better understanding of their donation behavior. She stated that women make numerous small gifts rather than a few substantial gifts and that females give a higher percentage of their income than do males. Research indicates that self-esteem for male donors is higher than for female donors (Tsiotsou, 2006).

*Race/Ethnicity:* The question on race and ethnicity is to portray social inclusion to survey participants as well as reflect a population of increasing diversity among athletic alumni at UMD.

*Current Marital Status:* Research indicates that alumni giving is inconsistent and has peaks and valleys of participation, which includes the factor of marital status. A wide spectrum of alumni engagement and motivation to donate occur at various stages of life for all collegiate alumni (Meyers, 2006). Holmes, et al. (2008) indicate that married alumni are more likely to contribute to their alma mater than their single counterparts.

*Highest level of education:* Brittingham and Pezzullo's (1990) summary of research findings on fundraising indicate that the majority of the literature has suggested level of education as a predictor of alumni giving. Caulkins, et al. (2002) found that level of education was a factor that could be used in profiling alumni giving patterns.

*Do you have children/number/ages:* These three items are included because research revealed that parents become active in fundraising campaigns through various stages of their children's life (Plinske, 2000). Plinske also noted that much of Division I and II fundraising comes from booster and corporate dollars as opposed to alumni and parents of student-athletes.

*Approximate mile distance in which your current residence is to UMD:* The O'Neil and Schenke (2006) study suggested that athlete alumni who lived out of state or a distance from the institution after graduation gave less money than athlete alumni living in the state or closer to the institution. The researchers felt this was a result of alumni being more connected to the institution because of a closer living proximity.

*Current age/decade of graduation:* Research has indicated that age is a significant factor in fundraising campaigns. O'Neil and Schenke (2006) found older athlete alumni gave at a higher rate than younger athlete alumni in fundraising campaigns. Holmes, et al. (2008) found that older athletes, 50 years old or above, are significantly less likely to give than younger athletes. Findings in the Holmes, et al. (2008) study showed contributions to institutional development efforts from former athletes declined with age.

*Yearly household income:* Weerts and Ronca (2007), in their research, discuss the idea of the "80/20 rule," in which development officers spend time and energy on the top 20 percent of donors who have the greatest capacity to give. This concept is still very valid in today's economy and other development techniques can supplement that strategy. Development programs may have to put more energy into prospective donors that comprise the mid-range of yearly household income as well as the top 20 percent. Focus

could be on both groups of potential donors, the small group of large donors and the large number of smaller donors.

*Did you receive an athletic financial scholarship from UMD Intercollegiate Athletics at any time:* Researchers O’Neil and Schenke (2006) state that there is limited understanding of the motivations and attitudes of college athletes relating to financial giving to their alma mater. They found that athlete alumni’s giving amount is tempered by perceptions of quality of experience, which could include receiving an athletic financial scholarship. Shulman and Bowen (2001) and Rhoden (1997) indicate that athlete alumni do not give back to institutional development efforts because of the feeling that they have already given through their involvement in athletics.

*Please select what Varsity Sport(s) Team you participated in for UMD Intercollegiate Athletics:* Researchers have explored the differences in alumni donations depending on which sport team the donor was a participant. Holmes, et al. (2000) found that several high-profile collegiate sport participants were less generous in their level of donations than minor sport alumni participants.

#### *Substantive Questions*

The 48 substantive questions fall into six categories and are listed in Table 1. The first 36 substantive inquiries were placed in random order and were shaped from five category models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services.

Table 1-Charitable giving models, substantive questions in the survey	
<b>Charitable Giving Models</b>	<b>Substantive Questions in the survey and item number (The first 36 inquiries are placed in random order and are shaped from five category models asking the survey participant to respond using a likert scale and rate the extent to which they strongly disagree, disagree, are neutral, agree, or strongly agree, when concluding the statement with a given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...”)</b>
<i>Altruistic Giving (4 questions)</i>	<p>3. it is one of a number of non-profit organizations I give to regularly.</p> <p>6. I feel obligated because of my positive experience as a student athlete.</p> <p>18. giving is the right thing to do.</p> <p>31. I grew up in a family that gave to non-profit organizations.</p>
<i>Organizational Identification (10 questions)</i>	<p>2. it gives me the opportunity to help shape the direction of the athletic program with administrators, staff, and coaches.</p> <p>7. I perceive UMD athletic teams to be winning programs.</p> <p>8. doing so gives me an opportunity to voice my opinion to administrators, staff, and coaches on athletic program decisions.</p> <p>12. I am extremely loyal to the athletic program.</p> <p>13. I receive inside information on the athletic program that is not available to the public.</p> <p>22. I want the athletic program to be the best in the country.</p> <p>23. my financial gift will help in creating championship caliber programs.</p> <p>25. doing so allows me to exert influence on the decision making process for the athletic program.</p> <p>27. my financial gift will help in creating championship caliber facilities.</p> <p>34. being associated with a successful athletic program makes me feel good.</p>

Table 1-Charitable giving models, substantive questions in the survey  
(Continued)

<p><b><i>Social Identification</i></b> (14 questions)</p>	<p>4. I am more connected to my teammates than to UMD.            5. I had a positive athletic playing experience due to my teammates.            9. I felt the tradition to give back financially to the athletic program was passed on to me as a student-athlete from alumni players.            10. being a donor gives me the opportunity to have contact and socialize with other UMD athletic program alumni supporters.            15. I want to direct financial gifts to go to the athletic program in which I participated.            16. I had a positive relationship with the Duluth community through volunteer service hours when I was a student-athlete.            19. I had a positive athletic playing experience due to the coaching staff.            20. being a donor gives me the opportunity to develop relationships with other UMD athletic program supporters besides alumni.            24. I gain a feeling of belongingness with fellow alumni through my financial gift.            26. I felt the tradition to give back financially to the athletic program was passed on to me as a student-athlete from my coaches.            29. I valued participating in my sport more than receiving an education.            30. I feel strongly connected to the UMD athletic program.            33. I enjoy the feeling of being a part of a large group of financial supporters.            35. I want to continue the positive community support that I experienced as a student-athlete through participation in my sport.</p>
<p><b><i>Economic or Utility Satisfaction</i></b> (3 questions)</p>	<p>21. my financial gift makes a difference to the athletic program.            32. my financial gift provides an opportunity to help student-athletes.            36. my financial gift makes me feel I am helping others in need.</p>

Table 1-Charitable giving models, substantive questions in the survey (Continued)	
<p><b><i>Receiving Services</i></b> (5 questions)</p>	<p>1. it is important to me that I receive donor benefits such as reduced game tickets, preferred seating, valet parking, or various athletic program gifts.</p> <p>11. the athletic program leadership uses my financial gift responsibly.</p> <p>14. it is important to me that I receive tax deduction benefits.</p> <p>17. it is important to me that I receive recognition for my monetary gifts through publications and acknowledgement programs.</p> <p>28. I feel very good about the communication efforts that the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department has made in keeping me informed of the athletic program.</p>
<p><b><i>Relationship-Marketing</i></b> (12 questions)</p>	<p><b>(The relationship-marketing category questions solicit various close-ended responses from survey participants.)</b></p> <p>37. Have you used the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about the athletic program?</p> <p>38. How many times have you attended a UMD Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year?</p> <p>39. How many times have you attended a UMD Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over the past year? (Dinner Auctions, Golf Events, Coaches Luncheons, Tailgate events...)</p> <p>40. Have you used the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program?</p> <p>41. How do you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the UMD athletic program?</p> <p>42. How many times over the last ten years have you been contacted to financially give to the UMD athletic program?</p> <p>43 How often over the last ten years have you financially given to the UMD athletic program?</p> <p>44. Please indicate your financial gift to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for the most recent tax year:</p> <p>45. Please indicate your total lifetime amount of financial giving to the UMD athletic program:</p>

Table 1-Charitable giving models, substantive questions in the survey (Continued)	
<b><i>Relationship-Marketing</i></b> (12 questions)	46. Have you financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010? 47. Which of the following methods of contact prompted you to make your most recent financial gift to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics? 48. Do you also financially give to the UMD academic program from which you graduated?

They ask the survey participant to respond using the Likert scale and rate the extent to which they strongly disagree, disagree, are neutral, agree, or strongly agree, when concluding the statement with a given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” The relationship-marketing category included 12 closed-ended questions soliciting various responses from the survey participants. The final inquiry on the survey, question #61 asked participants to “add any additional comments concerning motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program.”

1. *Altruistic Giving* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of gratitude to the athletic program. Mann (2007) states that in this type of giving “alumni feel a sense of obligation towards alma mater; have pride in their association with their college, and alumni feel a responsibility to make donations” (p. 37). Altruistic giving also represents gratitude rather than a belief in the ideals of the institution (Belfield & Beney, 2000). This set included four statements that asked the participant to respond using the Likert scale, when concluding the statement with a given

survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” An example of a concluding statement in this set is “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...I feel obligated because of my positive experience as a student-athlete.”

2. *Organizational Identification* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of a sense of belonging to the athletic program.

Alumni feel pride and affiliation, have an emotional attachment, are loyal, and celebrate achievements of the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Tom & Elmer, 1994; Mann, 2007). This set included ten statements that asked the participant to respond using the Likert scale when concluding the statement with a given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” An example of a concluding statement in this set is “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...it gives me the opportunity to help shape the direction of the athletic program with administrators, staff, and coaches.”

3. *Social Identification* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of past personal experiences with specific groups within the athletic program (Clotfelter, 2001). Alumni may feel social pressures to donate, or donate to be identified with a group seeking social engagement (Long, 1976). Schulman and Bowen (2001) and Rhoden (1997) have found that athlete alumni do not give back to athletic department development efforts because they feel they have already given through their involvement in athletics and required community service. This set included 14 statements that asked the participant to respond using the Likert scale when concluding the statement with a given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” An example of a concluding statement in this set is “I give to UMD

Intercollegiate Athletics because...I felt the tradition to give back financially to the athletic program was passed on to me as a student-athlete from alumni players.”

4. *Economic or Utility Satisfaction* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of perceived needs of the athletic program. Characteristics of the economic or utility model suggest that when alumni see an obvious need for their money, they become more motivated to contribute. Donors feel useful in making a donation that will benefit the recipients (Mann, 2007). Weerts and Ronca (2007) state in their research findings that if alumni donors develop a view that the institution needs their support, they will be more likely to give. This set included three statements that asked the participant to respond using the Likert scale when concluding the statement with a given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” An example of a concluding statement in this set is “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...my financial gift provides an opportunity to help student-athletes.”

5. *Receiving Services* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of the quality of service provided to the donor, the value of that service, and the satisfaction level the donor feels about that service (Mann, 2007). Tangible benefits of giving for the athletic alumni donor in intercollegiate athletics could come from preferred seating in stadiums or arenas, access to luxury suites, valet parking at athletic events, invitations to athletic department events, or athletic department gifts of clothing (Turner, Meserve, & Bowen, 2001). This set included five statements that asked the participant to respond using the Likert scale when concluding the statement with a

given survey response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...” An example of a concluding statement in this set is “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because...it is important to me that I receive donor benefits such as reduced game tickets, preferred seating, valet parking, or various athletic program gifts.”

6. *Relationship-Marketing* questions represent inquiries exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of strategies incorporated by the athletic program to solicit funds. “Communication is the key variable that impacts relationship-marketing” (Mann, 2007, p. 43). Boulding’s (1962) research acknowledges that a theory of relationship development is apparent during the cycle of giving and receiving that occurs over time, allowing the donor and the organization to build a relationship. This set included 12 questions. One example is a Yes/No question that asked, “Have you used the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program?” Another question asked, “How would you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the UMD athletic program?” Response options to this question were “Traditional mail, Email, Website, Phone call from Coach, Phone call from a department staff member.”

The survey instrument used a variety of closed-ended questions, which limited the respondents’ answers to the survey. The participants chose from either a pre-existing set of answers, such as yes/no or multiple choice and Likert ranking scale response options. The advantages of using closed-ended questions are numerous. Closed-ended questions are more easily analyzed and are better suited for computer analysis. Every answer can be given a number or value so that statistical interpretation can be assessed. Closed-ended

questions can be more specific, thus not likely to communicate multiple meanings to respondents. When there are a large number of questions being asked, closed-ended questions take less time for the subject to complete. The use of close-ended questions designs a survey instrument that minimizes respondent error, which is an important element of survey research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

### *Research Question*

Along with collecting demographic information, the survey instrument and data collection procedures were designed to enable the researcher to answer a research question based on six models associated with charitable giving that shaped the purpose of the study in identifying key determinants that influence UMD athletic alumni intent to give financially to UMD intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns.

This study will address the following research question – To what degree are there differences among levels of financial giving in athletic alumni motivations to donate associated with six models of charitable giving?

### *Data Analysis Procedures*

The Web-based survey was conducted using surveymonkey.com, a survey software program offered online. The program offers many features including unlimited number of survey questions; unlimited number of survey respondents; the ability to export, print, and share reports; advanced survey design tools that incorporate templates and skip logic; reporting tools that produce custom charts and cross-tabs; result filtering; and the capability to export data for statistical analysis. The program also provides security and data protection. When using surveys, a high reliability can be obtained by

presenting all subjects with standardized close-ended questions; researcher subjectivity is greatly eliminated, thus ensuring reliable conclusions. The design of the survey helped eliminate response issues; it was assumed that the information provided by the respondents was accurate and truthful so survey results were not distorted. All data used for analysis in this study was derived from information obtained through the survey instrument completed by UMD athletic alumni respondents.

Response bias is the effect of non-responses on survey estimates. Bias means that if non-respondents had responded, their responses would have substantially changed the overall results of the survey (Fowler, 2002). During the planning stage of this study, it was determined to survey a large sample. Because of the inclusion of all athletic alumni that donated and provided email addresses to the institution, the sample frame population response bias was reduced. Everyone that was surveyed had indicated through previous contacts with the UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics that they wished to have email correspondence in regards to athletic department projects. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) say non-response errors can occur based on the subject's lack of interest in the topic surveyed, unwillingness to be surveyed, or incorrect addresses. UMD athletic alumni are interested in this subject, the address database is updated frequently, and as stated previously, athletic alumni indicated a willingness to have contact in regards to athletic department projects.

Responses to the survey were recorded and coded, exported in a spreadsheet data file, and transferred to a statistical software package, Statistical Package for Social

Sciences (SPSS) for statistical analysis. SPSS assisted in sorting and organizing the data collected. The variables in the statistical computations and analyses were all assigned specific levels of measurement (Creswell, 2003). Descriptive statistics were used for organizing and summarizing the respondents' numerical data. Stemming from the descriptive statistics, this study identified key determinants that influence UMD athletic alumni intent to give financially to UMD intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, helped develop a donor profile of why UMD athletic alumni donate to UMD athletic department development campaigns.

The analysis of data pertaining to the first five models of charitable giving included statistics and one-way ANOVA measures. The one-way ANOVA used the two variables of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level as independent variables, and the mean of the items representing the five charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services as dependent variables. The one-way ANOVA produces the means, standard deviations, and the associated F-ratio for each category of the independent variable. The F-ratio indicates the associated p-value with the charitable giving model statements and shows if there is a statistically significant difference or relationship in the means across the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving

level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level. The six category giving levels for athletic alumni most recent tax year were: “under \$100,” “\$100-\$299,” “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up.” The six category giving levels for athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level were: “under \$500,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$4,999,” “\$5,000-\$9,999,” “\$10,000-\$14,999,” and “\$15,000 and up.” Athletic alumni that financially donated a minimum of one time to the UMD athletic program self-reported the level of agreement to 36 statements based on a five-point Likert scale that ranged from “Strongly Disagree” (coded 1) to “Strongly Agree” (coded 5) in regards to the previously stated charitable giving model.

The next set of 12 questions focused on behaviors associated with Intercollegiate Athletics and were not answered in the same Likert-scale format as that used for the first five charitable giving theories. Reporting the results of questions representing the charitable giving model of relationship-marketing, the presentation of data was developed by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-Square statistic measure, exploring relationships across the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level.

The next set of 12 questions explored relationships between demographic variables and giving. Results were obtained by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-Square statistic measure, exploring relationships between demographic questions and category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level.

The last question was qualitative in nature and asked respondents to “add any additional comments concerning motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program.” Analysis of the responses were grouped together based on themes linking the comments with one of the six models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Results

This chapter contains the results of the study that was designed to answer a research question based on six models associated with charitable giving in identifying key determinants that influence University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) athletic alumni intent to give financially to UMD intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Along with collecting demographic information, the research question that shaped the purpose of the study was: To what degree are there differences among levels of financial giving in athletic alumni motivations to donate associated with six models of charitable giving?

This chapter is divided into four sections: (1) Overview of Results for Five Charitable Giving Models and Motivations to Give, (2) Relationships between Actual Financial Contributions and Motivations of Charitable Giving Models, (3) Relationships between Demographic Variables and Actual Financial Contributions, and (4) Qualitative Responses.

#### *Overview of Results for Five Charitable Giving Models and Motivations to Give*

The results in Table 2 indicate the mean item scores for motivations to give for five of the models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services, that were investigated based on the five-point Likert scale. The highest ranked charitable giving model was “Economic or Utility Satisfaction” with a

mean item score of 4.00. An example statement of the three items in this model was soliciting a response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because my financial

Table 2

Summary of the mean item responses of athletic-alumni from five charitable giving models

Charitable Giving Model	N	Number of Items	$\bar{X}$	SD
Altruistic Giving	120	4	3.55	0.549
Organizational Identification	114	10	3.26	0.496
Social Identification	113	14	3.38	0.489
Economic or Utility Satisfaction	121	3	4.00	0.566
Receiving Services	119	5	3.13	0.983

gift makes a difference to the athletic program.” The second highest ranked model was “Altruistic Giving” with a mean item score of 3.55. One example of the four items in this theory was soliciting a response to the statement “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because it is one of a number of non-profit organizations I give to regularly.” The third ranked mean item score of the five charitable giving models was “Social Identification” at 3.38. One example of the 14 items in this model was soliciting a response to the statement “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because I gain a feeling of belongingness with fellow alumni through my financial gift.” The second lowest ranked model was “Organizational Identification” with a mean item score of 3.26. An example

statement of the ten items in this model was soliciting a response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because doing so gives me an opportunity to voice my opinion to administrators, staff, and coaches on athletic program decisions.” The lowest ranked model in the mean item scores was “Receiving Services” at 3.13. One example statement of the five items in this model was soliciting a response to “I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because it is important to me that I receive donor benefits such as reduced game tickets, preferred seating, valet parking, or various athletic program gifts.” Given that the five means represented scores from the same set of individuals using a typical one-way ANOVA measure, it was not appropriate to determine whether or not differences among the five means were statistically significant.

*Relationships between Actual Financial Contributions and Motivations of Charitable Giving Models*

*Altruistic Giving*

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and the F-values for the charitable giving model item category of altruistic giving. As noted previously in Table 1, the mean item score for altruistic giving was ranked second highest among athletic-alumni for motivations to give. Table 3 now presents the relationships to altruistic giving and what respondents said regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year as well as total lifetime. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, the difference in means among the categories for athletic alumni level of giving in the most recent tax year with altruistic giving statements was statistically significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level. Table 3 shows that there was statistical significance among the athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level,  $F(5, 111)=2.418, p=.04$ . In examination of the means of the responses for

altruistic giving statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increase as the level of giving increases. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in altruistic giving. This is particularly indicated at the “\$1,000-\$1,499” level that has a mean of 3.91 compared to

Table 3

Relationships between the charitable giving model of "**Altruistic Giving**" with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Level of Giving	Most Recent Tax Year				Level of Giving	Total Lifetime			
	N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD		N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
under \$100	45	38.5	3.36	0.523	under \$500	32	27.1	3.44	0.506
\$100-\$299	44	37.7	3.54	0.545	\$500-\$999	29	24.6	3.40	0.584
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	3.79	0.437	\$1,000-\$4,999	32	27.1	3.60	0.553
\$500-\$999	6	5.0	3.62	0.379	\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	3.85	0.474
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.0	3.91	0.701	\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	3.75	0.433
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	3.81	0.239	\$15,000 and up	10	8.5	3.80	0.586
Total	117	100	3.53	0.538	Total	118	100	3.55	0.551

ANOVA F-Value=2.418\*

ANOVA F-Value=1.885

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

the mean of 3.36 at the “under \$100” level. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 3 also indicates the differences or relationship in the means among athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and altruistic giving statements was not statistically significant.

#### *Organizational Identification*

Table 4 contains similar results for the item mean for the ten items associated with the organizational identification category. As noted previously in Table 2, the mean item for organizational identification was the second lowest ranked charitable giving model among athletic alumni for motivations to give. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 4 shows the difference in means among the categories for athletic alumni level of giving in the most recent tax year was statistically significant at the  $p \leq .01$  level. Table 4 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference among the athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level,  $F(5, 105) = 3.468$ ,  $p = .006$ . In examination of the means of the responses for organizational identification statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increase as the level of giving increases. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in giving because of the organizational identification charitable giving model. The mean at the “\$1,000-\$1,499” level is 3.64 compared to the mean of 3.03 at the “under \$100” level. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 4 also indicates there is no statistically significant difference or relationship in the means among athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and organizational identification statements.

Table 4

Relationships between the charitable giving model of "**Organizational Identification**" with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Level of Giving	Most Recent Tax Year				Level of Giving	Total Lifetime			
	N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD		N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
under \$100	43	38.7	3.03	0.476	under \$500	31	27.7	3.16	0.444
\$100-\$299	41	37.0	3.34	0.463	\$500-\$999	28	25.0	3.34	0.418
\$300-\$499	12	10.8	3.38	0.430	\$1,000-\$4,999	28	25.0	3.29	0.472
\$500-\$999	6	5.4	3.46	0.480	\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.9	2.99	0.685
\$1,000-\$1,499	5	4.5	3.64	0.614	\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.5	3.22	0.794
\$1,500 and up	4	3.6	3.47	0.573	\$15,000 and up	10	8.9	3.52	0.515
Total	111	100	3.25	0.502	Total	112	100	3.25	0.500

ANOVA F-Value=3.468\*\*

ANOVA F-Value=1.573

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

### *Social Identification*

Indicated previously in Table 2, the mean item for social identification was the third highest mean item score of the five charitable giving models. Means, standard deviations, and F-values were calculated for the charitable giving model item category in social identification. Results in Table 5 show that there was a statistically significant difference for social identification among the athletic alumni most recent tax year

Table 5

Relationships between the charitable giving model of "**Social Identification**" with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Level of Giving	Most Recent Tax Year				Level of Giving	Total Lifetime			
	N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD		N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
Under \$100	44	40.0	3.21	0.492	under \$500	29	26.1	3.30	0.454
\$100-\$299	41	37.2	3.43	0.400	\$500-\$999	29	26.1	3.41	0.430
\$300-\$499	11	10.0	3.65	0.647	\$1,000-\$4,999	30	27.0	3.47	0.498
\$500-\$999	6	5.5	3.57	0.225	\$5,000-\$9,999	8	7.2	3.16	0.759
\$1,000-\$1,499	4	3.6	3.75	0.783	\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.5	3.38	0.609
\$1,500 and up	4	3.6	3.23	0.467	\$15,000 and up	10	9.0	3.42	0.490
Total	110	100	3.38	0.495	Total	111	100	3.38	0.493

ANOVA F-Value=2.611\*

ANOVA F-Value=.715

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

financial giving level,  $F(5, 104)=2.611$ ,  $p=.029$  using one-way ANOVA analysis. In examination of the means of the responses for social identification statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increase as the level of giving increases, except the mean does drop at the "\$1,500 and up" level to a mean of 3.23. This is close to the mean of 3.21 at the "under \$100" level. The highest mean level is 3.75 at the "\$1,000-\$1,499" level. This suggests that the larger the financial gift

athletic alumni made through the \$1,000-\$1,499” level, the higher the belief in agreeing with social identification responses for giving. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 5 also indicates there is no statistically significant difference or relationship in the means for the social identification statements among athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels.

#### *Economic or Utility Satisfaction*

Table 6 presents the means, standard deviations, and the F-values for the charitable giving model item category in economic or utility satisfaction. Table 2 indicated that the mean item for economic or utility satisfaction was the highest ranked charitable giving model among all athletic alumni respondents. The F-value for the economic or utility satisfaction questions and the athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level indicates that there is a statistically significant difference across the six giving level categories,  $F(5, 112)=2.523, p=.03$ . Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 6 shows the difference in means among the categories for athletic alumni level of giving in the most recent tax year with economic or utility satisfaction statements was statistically significant at the  $p \leq .05$  level. In examination of the means of the responses for economic or utility satisfaction statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, there is a near linear relationship: as the level of giving goes up, so does the mean.

Table 6

Relationships between the charitable giving model of "**Economic or Utility Satisfaction**" with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Level of Giving	Most Recent Tax Year				Level of Giving	Total Lifetime			
	N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD		N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
Under \$100	45	38.2	3.80	0.641	under \$500	32	26.9	3.82	0.682
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	4.01	0.487	\$500-\$999	29	24.4	4.02	0.562
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	4.27	0.565	\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	4.00	0.478
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	4.14	0.465	\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	4.23	0.545
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.0	4.33	0.421	\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	4.20	0.380
\$1,500 and up	4	3.3	4.33	0.272	\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	4.24	0.449
Total	118	100	3.99	0.570	Total	119	100	4.00	0.568

ANOVA F-Value=2.523\*

ANOVA F-Value=1.520

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

The means ranged from a high of 4.33 at the “\$1,500 and up” giving level to a low of 3.80 at the “under \$100” giving level. Once again, this suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made the higher the belief in the charitable giving model of economic or utility satisfaction. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 6 also indicates the difference or relationship in the means among athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and economic or utility satisfaction statements was not statistically significant.

*Receiving Services*

As indicated previously in Table 2, the mean item for receiving services was the lowest ranked mean item score of the five charitable giving models. Means, standard deviations, and F-values were calculated for each of the two financial contributions categories. Using one-way ANOVA analysis, Table 7 indicates the differences in the

Table 7

Relationships between the charitable giving model of "**Receiving Services**" with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Level of Giving	<u>Most Recent Tax Year</u>				Level of Giving	<u>Total Lifetime</u>			
	N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD		N	%	$\bar{X}$	SD
Under \$100	45	38.8	3.04	1.081	under \$500	32	27.4	2.94	0.554
\$100-\$299	42	36.2	3.09	1.108	\$500-\$999	28	23.9	3.04	0.456
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	3.32	0.507	\$1,000-\$4,999	31	26.5	3.23	1.206
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	3.25	0.442	\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	3.14	0.794
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.2	3.50	0.517	\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.3	3.00	0.761
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	3.50	0.476	\$15,000 and up	11	9.4	3.69	2.040
Total	116	100	3.14	0.978	Total	117	100	3.13	0.989

ANOVA F-Value=.461

ANOVA F-Value=1.062

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

means among athletic alumni levels of giving in the most recent tax year as well as athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and receiving service statements were not statistically significant. There was no statistically significant relationship among most recent tax year financial giving levels as well as the athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and the items related to receiving services.

*Comparisons among Results for Five Charitable Giving Models*

Table 8 displays a summary of the data developed from the one-way ANOVA analysis that was previously presented in Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, listing the derived F-values and associated p-values. This measure explored the descriptive statistical differences in the relationships between the two variables of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime

Table 8

Summary of the relationships between the charitable giving models with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic-alumni total lifetime financial giving level

Charitable Giving Model	Most Recent Tax Year		Total Lifetime	
	ANOVA F-Value	Sig.	ANOVA F-Value	Sig.
Altruistic Giving	2.418	0.040*	1.885	0.103
Organizational Identification	3.468	0.006**	1.573	0.174
Social Identification	2.611	0.029*	0.715	0.613
Economic or Utility Satisfaction	2.523	0.033*	1.520	0.189
Receiving Services	0.461	0.805	1.062	0.385

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

financial giving level with scores reflecting the five charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services. It should be noted that because the level of agreement statements (based on a five-point Likert scale) presented to respondents in the survey were centered on how respondents feel at a particular point in time, it can be expected that the results would show athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level to yield statistically significant differences in contrast to athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level that showed no statistical significance or relationship. The giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, and economic or utility satisfaction all showed statistically significant results for athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels. There was no statistical significance or relationship in the charitable giving model of receiving services with athletic alumni most recent tax year giving levels as well as with the five named charitable giving models with athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels.

#### *Relationships between Relationship-Marketing Behaviors and Charitable Giving*

In contrast to the presentation of the results for the charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services, which was identified by standard Likert scale analysis, relationship-marketing is based on questions which were behavioral in nature. Thus, the results for relationship-marketing questions, summarized in Table 9, are structured differently than the previous section for the five charitable giving models.

Table 9

Summary of the relationships between the charitable giving model questions in “**Relationship-Marketing**” with athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and total lifetime financial giving level

Questions	Most Recent Tax Year Chi-Square	Total Lifetime Chi-Square
Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about the athletic program?	2.75	5.79
Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the Athletic program?	4.22	1.23
How many times attended an Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year?	57.23***	44.45**
How many times attended an Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over the past year?	45.30**	31.06
How do you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the athletic program?	34.56*	25.56
How many times over the last ten years have you been contacted to financially give to the Athletic program?	45.35	38.09
How many times over the last ten years have you financially given to the athletic program?	71.90***	95.26***
Which methods of contact prompted you to make your most recent financial gift to the Athletic program?	50.83***	27.06
Have you financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010?	41.40***	9.73
Do you financially give to the UMD academic program from which you graduated?	0.30	5.28

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

The results summarized in Table 9 were developed by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-Square statistic measure, to explore relationships among questions regarding relationship-marketing behaviors across the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level. Appendix D (Table D-1 through Table D-18, and part of Table D-21 and Table D-22) contains the specific results of the 20 separate tables, representing the ten questions in relationship-marketing, across the six category financial giving levels in most recent tax year and total lifetime.

The results in Table 9 indicate that there is no statistically significant relationship between Intercollegiate Athletic website use to gather information about the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. Similarly, there is no statistically significant relationship between Intercollegiate Athletic website use to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. There is also no statistically significant interaction or relationship indicated between the number of times contacted over the last ten years to financially give to the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime.

The Chi-Square test showed there was statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .001$  level between the number of times athletic alumni attended an Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year and giving levels for the most recent tax year. Examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “zero” Intercollegiate Athletic games over the past year, a category total of 93.8 percent gave at

combined “under \$100” and \$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. The percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “21 times or more” Intercollegiate Athletic games over the past year, a category total of 77 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” and “\$1,000-\$1,499” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that if athletic alumni are not involved in game attendance their most recent tax year financial giving levels are low; conversely, the more athletic alumni are involved in game attendance the greater the motive to financially give at a higher level for the most recent tax year. Likewise, there was statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .01$  level between the number of times athletic alumni attended an Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year and total lifetime financial giving levels. Examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “zero” Intercollegiate Athletic games over the past year, a category total of 78.2 percent gave at combined “under \$500” and “\$500-\$999” levels of giving for total lifetime. The percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “21 times or more” Intercollegiate Athletic games over the past year, a category total of 77 percent gave at combined “\$1,000-\$4,999,” “\$5,000-\$9,999,” “10,000-\$14,999,” and “\$15,000 and up” levels of giving for total lifetime. This may indicate that if athletic alumni are not involved in game attendance their total lifetime financial giving levels are low; conversely, the more athletic alumni are involved in game attendance the greater the motive to financially give at a higher level for total lifetime .

There was also statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .01$  level between the number of times athletic alumni attended an Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over

the past year and giving levels for the most recent tax year. Examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “zero” Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored events over the past year, a category total of 88.1 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. The percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that attend “11 times or more” Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored events over the past year, a category total of 71.5 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” and “\$1,000-\$1,499” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that if athletic alumni are not involved in attending Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored events their most recent tax year financial giving levels are low; conversely, the more athletic alumni are involved in attending Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored events the greater the motive to financially give at a higher level for the most recent tax year. There was no statistically significant relationship between attending an Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event and total lifetime giving levels.

A statistically significant difference is indicated when using the Chi-Square test at the  $p \leq .05$  level, between preferred method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic program and financial giving levels in the most recent tax year. Examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that prefer to be contacted through “Traditional Mail” by the Intercollegiate Athletic department over the past year, a category total of 82.7 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. Similarly, examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that prefer to be contacted through “Email” by the

Intercollegiate Athletic department over the past year, a category total of 73.9 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. These percentages can be compared to the percentages of those athletic alumni that prefer to be contacted by “Phone Call From Coach,” a category total of 46.2 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” and “\$1,500 and up” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that athletic alumni that give financially at lower levels of giving in their most recent tax year prefer to be contacted by “Traditional Mail” and “Email;” however, athletic alumni that financially give at higher levels of giving in their most recent tax year prefer to be contacted by a “Phone Call From Coach.” There was no statistically significant relationship between preferred method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic program and total lifetime giving levels.

Using the Chi-Square test there was no statistically significant difference found between levels of financial giving for the most recent tax year or total lifetime financial giving levels in regards to the question of times contacted over the last ten years to financially give to the athletic program. In examining the percentage of respondents for number of times over the last ten years athletic alumni have been contacted to financially give to the athletic program, regardless of giving levels in the most recent tax year, the following categorical breakdowns can be noted: 31.3 percent indicated the “9-10 times” response, 19.5 percent indicated the “3-5 times” response, 16.1 percent indicated the “6-8 times” response, 12.7 percent indicated the “15 times or more” response, and 8.4 percent indicated the “2 times” response. In examining the percentage of respondents for number of times over the last ten years athletic alumni have been contacted to financially give to

the athletic program, regardless of giving levels for total lifetime, the following categorical breakdowns can be noted: 31.1 percent indicated the “9-10 times” response, 18.5 percent indicated the “3-5 times” response, 16.8 percent indicated the “6-8 times” response, 13.4 percent indicated the “15 times or more” response, and 8.4 percent indicated the “2 times” response.

The Chi-Square test indicated there was statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .001$  level between times over the last ten years athletic alumni have financially given to the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year as well as total lifetime financial giving levels. Examining the percentages of respondents, regardless of financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime financial giving categories, it is the highest at the “3-5 times” response for the question regarding times financially given to the athletic department over the last ten years.

Examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “zero times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 100 percent gave at combined “under \$100” level of giving in the most recent tax year. Similarly, percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “1 time” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 100 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. Percentages also indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “2 times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 93.8 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. Percentages also indicate that of those athletic alumni that have

financially given “3-5 times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 87.9 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. However, the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “15 times or more” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 88.8 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that athletic alumni that give less frequently give at lower financial levels; conversely, athletic alumni that give more frequently give at higher levels of giving categories.

Examination of the percentages for total lifetime giving indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “zero times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 75 percent gave at combined “under \$500” level of giving. Percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “1 time” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 100 percent gave at combined “under \$500” level of giving for total lifetime. Percentages also indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “2 times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 76.4 percent gave at combined “under \$500” and “\$500-\$999” levels of giving for total lifetime. Similarly, percentages also indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially given “3-5 times” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 68.2 percent gave at combined “under \$500” and “\$500-\$999” levels of giving for total lifetime. However, the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have financially

given “15 times or more” to Intercollegiate Athletics over the last ten years, a category total of 80 percent gave at combined “\$5,000-\$9,999,” “\$10,000-\$14,999,” and “\$15,000 and up” levels of giving for total lifetime. This may indicate that athletic alumni that give less frequently give at lower financial levels; conversely, athletic alumni that give more frequently give at higher levels of giving categories.

There is statistical significance at the  $p \leq .001$  level between methods of contact prompting the most recent financial gift to the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year. Examination of the percentages for method of contact that prompted the most recent financial gift to the athletic program from athletic alumni, “Traditional Mail” had a category total of 83.1 percent that gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. Similarly, examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that responded “Email” for method of contact that prompted the most recent financial gift to the athletic program, a category total of 91.6 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. These percentages can be compared for method of contact that prompted the most recent financial gift to the athletic program from athletic alumni, “Phone Call From Coach,” had a category total of 58.9 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that athletic alumni that give financially at lower levels of giving in their most recent tax year, “Traditional Mail” and “Email” prompted them to make their most recent financial gift to the athletic program, while athletic alumni that financially give at higher levels of giving in their most recent

tax year are prompted by a “Phone Call From Coach.” There is no statistically significant relationship between methods of contact prompting the most recent financial gift to the athletic program and total lifetime financial giving levels.

In examining the percentages of respondents for methods of contact prompting the most recent financial gift to the athletic program, regardless of giving levels in the most recent tax year, the following categorical breakdowns can be noted: 53.1 percent indicated “Traditional Mail,” 21.6 percent indicated “Email,” 15.3 percent indicated “Phone Call From Coach,” 7.2 percent indicated “Phone Call From Staff,” and 2.7 percent indicated “Website.” In examination of the percentage of respondents in reference to this question, regardless of giving levels for total lifetime, the following categorical breakdowns can be noted: 52.2 percent indicated “Traditional Mail,” 21.6 percent indicated “Email,” 16.2 percent indicated “Phone Call From Coach,” 7.2 percent indicated “Phone Call From Staff,” and 2.7 percent indicated “Website.”

Results of the Chi-Square test indicated there was statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .001$  level between financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010 and most recent tax year financial giving levels. An examination of the percentages indicate that of those athletic alumni that have not financially given to Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010, a category total of 94.2 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year, compared to those athletic alumni that have financially given to Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010, a category total of 60.6 percent gave at combined “under \$100” and “\$100-\$299” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. Likewise, an examination of the percentages indicate

that, of those athletic alumni that have not financially given to Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010, a category total of 5.7 percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up” levels of giving in the most recent tax year, compared to those athletic alumni that have financially given to Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010, a category total of 39.5percent gave at combined “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up” levels of giving in the most recent tax year. This may indicate that athletic alumni that donate at a higher financial level did give to Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010, while the athletic alumni that donate at a lower financial level did not yet give financially for 2010. Results indicate there is no statistically significant relationship between financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010 and total lifetime financial giving levels.

The last question in Table 9 examined the relationship between athletic alumni financially giving to the UMD academic program from which they graduated and financial giving levels to the athletic program in the most recent tax year as well as total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic program. Results indicate no statistically significant relationship is present between the two questions.

#### *Relationships between Demographic Variables and Actual Financial Contributions*

In this section, results are obtained by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-Square statistic measure, exploring relationships between demographic questions and the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level. The results are summarized in Table 10 by presenting the Chi-Square statistic to determine if there was statistical

significance or association between categorical demographic questions and athletic alumni financial giving levels in the most recent tax year as well as total lifetime. Appendix D (Table D-19 through Table D-32) contains the specific results of the 14 separate tables, representing ten demographic questions, which explored the differences in the six category financial giving levels in most recent tax year and total lifetime that are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10

Summary of the relationships between demographic questions and athletic-alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and total lifetime financial giving level

Questions	Most Recent Tax Year Chi-Square	Total Lifetime Chi-Square
Gender:	10.04	37.48***
Marital Status:	4.81	13.53*
Do you have children?	1.91	15.06**
What is your highest level of education?	16.45	16.17
Indicate your yearly household income:	34.84	35.92
Varsity sport team participated on:	62.46	78.48*
Did you receive an athletic scholarship from the athletic department at any time?	23.80	20.38
Approximate mile distance in which your current residence is from the institution:	24.44*	13.90
Indicate your decade of graduation:	24.90	37.43**

\*p≤.05

\*\*p≤.01

\*\*\*p≤.001

Before examining the results in this section, it should be noted that the researcher made the following decisions after analyzing the collected data in regards to four demographic questions. The question soliciting “Race/Ethnicity” produced only three responses different than “White/Caucasian” so this variable was not used in analysis. The question soliciting “Current Age” was also not a variable used in analysis because the researcher felt the variable indicating “Decade of graduation from UMD” would serve the needs of this project more appropriately. The question “How many children do you have in each of the following age groups” was also not used in analysis because the researcher decided the variable “Do you have children” would serve the needs of this project sufficiently. Finally, the question asking, “Please select what Varsity Sport(s) Team you participated in for UMD Intercollegiate Athletics” was recoded by the researcher if the respondent selected more than one sport. The researcher selected the respondent’s sport that was deemed by the UMD Athletic Department at the time of participation to be a “revenue” producing sport and not a “non-revenue” producing sport if multiple varsity sport teams were selected. For example if a respondent selected both “Hockey (men)” and also selected “Track (men)” the response was coded only in the “Hockey (men)” category because at the time of participation, the Men’s Ice Hockey Team was considered a revenue producing sport and the Men’s Track team was not. As a result, multiple sport team selections were recoded for data analysis purposes to reflect only one sport response.

The results in Table 10 indicate, using the Chi-Square test, that there is no statistically significant interaction or relationship between gender and athletic alumni

financial giving levels for the most recent tax year. However, the Chi-Square test showed there was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .001$  level between gender and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels. Examination of the percentages indicate that a high percentage of females, 73.1 percent, are at the giving level “under \$500” compared to only 14 percent of the males. Comparatively, a larger percentage of males are recorded at higher giving levels than the percentage of females.

The Chi-Square test showed there was no statistically significant interaction or relationship between marital status and financial giving levels in the most recent tax year. The data indicates there was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .05$  level between athletic alumni marital status and total lifetime giving levels. Examination of the data revealed that a larger number of respondents are married/partnered and their percentages at higher levels of giving are greater than respondents who are single. Respondents that are single record 57.1 percent of athletic alumni at the “under \$500” giving level compared to 20.6 percent at that giving level for athletic alumni that are married/partnered. There were no respondents that are single recorded at the “\$15,000 and up” giving level compared to 11.3 percent at that giving level for athletic alumni that are married/partnered.

Table 10 indicates there was no statistically significant interaction or relationship indicated between athletic alumni that have children and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year. However, the Chi-Square test showed there was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .01$  level between athletic alumni that have children and total lifetime financial giving levels. Examination of the data reveals that a larger number

of respondents have children and their percentages at higher levels of giving are generally greater than respondents who do not have children. Respondents that do not have children record 50 percent of athletic alumni at the “under \$500” giving level compared to 20.7 percent at that giving level of respondents that have children. There were no respondents that do not have children recorded at the “\$15,000 and up” giving level compared to 10.9 percent at that giving level for athletic alumni that have children.

Using the Chi-Square test there was no statistically significant interaction or relationship indicated between athletic alumni highest level of education and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. Similarly, there is no statistically significant interaction or relationship between athletic alumni yearly household income and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime.

The Chi-Square test showed there was no statistically significant interaction or relationship between varsity sport team participated on and athletic alumni financial giving levels for the most recent tax year. There was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .05$  level between varsity sport team participated on and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels. Examination of the percentages of survey respondents in athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level and the sport they participated in consists of: Hockey (Men)-23.7 percent, Football-21.2 percent, Basketball (Men)-16.9 percent, Baseball-10.2 percent, Basketball (Women)-7.6 percent, Cross Country and Track (Men)-5.9 percent, Hockey (Women)-4.2 percent, Softball-4.2 percent, Cross Country and Track (Women)-2.5 percent, Volleyball (Women)-2.5 percent, and Soccer

(Women)-.8 percent. There were no respondents from Golf (Men), Golf (Women), Skiing (Men), Skiing (Women), Swimming (Men), Swimming (Women), Tennis (Men), Tennis (Women), and Wrestling. It should be noted that out of the no respondent group of sport teams, the only team that still has intercollegiate varsity sport status is Tennis (Women). The other programs were dropped from the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic department through the years.

Further examination of the relationship between sport team participated on and athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels, indicates that as the financial giving level increases the number of sport teams that give decreases. Data reveals that at the following financial giving levels: “Under \$500” all 11 sport teams are represented, “\$500-\$999” seven sport teams are represented, “\$1,000-\$4,999” six sport teams are represented, “\$5,000-\$9,999” four sport teams are represented, “\$10,000-\$14,999” three sport teams are represented, and “\$15,000 and up” four sport teams are represented. The sport teams of Hockey (Men), Football, and Basketball (Men) are the only three teams that are consistently represented in the three highest giving level categories for athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels.

The results in Table 10 indicate, using the Chi-Square test, that there is no statistically significant interaction or relationship between receiving an athletic scholarship from the athletic department at any time and athletic alumni financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. Examination of the percentages of respondents in reference to this question for both giving levels in the most recent tax year and total lifetime, indicate that generally athletic alumni that had “Full Scholarships” did

not give at a higher level to a greater extent, when compared to the athletic alumni that had less athletic scholarships.

The Chi-Square test indicated there was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .05$  level between approximate mile distance in which current residence is from the institution and athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels. An examination of the percentages of respondents show that generally athletic alumni that donate at a higher financial level have a current residence that is within 50 miles of the institution, with exception at the "\$1,500 and up" giving level. Results indicate there is no statistically significant interaction or relationship between approximate mile distance in which current residence is from the institution and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels.

The last summarized question on Table 10 examined the relationship between athletic alumni decade of graduation from UMD and financial giving levels to the athletic program in the most recent tax year as well as total lifetime financial giving levels. The five category decades are "1960-1969," "1970-1979," "1980-1989," "1990-1999," and "2000-2010." Results indicate no statistically significant interaction or relationship for athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level, however, the Chi-Square test indicated there was statistical significant difference at the  $p \leq .01$  level between decade of graduation and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels. An examination of the percentages of respondents show that generally athletic alumni that donate at a higher financial level graduated in an earlier decade. Recent graduates in the decades of "1990-1999" and "2000-2010" had lower percentages at the higher financial giving levels than

the graduates in the decades between “1960 and 1989.” This suggests that the earlier an athletic alumnus graduates, which coincides with older age, the higher the level of giving to the athletic department.

### *Qualitative Responses*

This section represents an overview of qualitative responses from survey participants invited to answer an open-ended question at the end of the survey asking for additional comments concerning motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program. A total of 36 respondents out of 122 survey participants wrote comments at the end of the survey. Six themes concerning athletic alumni financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program emerged from the comments that closely followed the characteristics of six models this study identified with charitable giving. The charitable giving model is listed along with a sampling of qualitative remarks from survey participants that contain characteristics belonging to that model. As mentioned frequently throughout all the chapters, no single charitable giving theory or model can be a stand-alone explanation for why athletic alumni donate to an organization. Multiple perspectives can be used to understand why donors are or are not contributing to development efforts and it should be noted that many of the remarks that survey participants forwarded could fit into multiple charitable giving models.

#### *Altruistic Giving*

Altruistic giving individuals are driven by a sense of obligation to the organization to which they donate. They have had a positive experience with the program. Athletic alumni give or do not give because of gratitude to the athletic program,

rather than a belief in the ideals of the institution. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of the charitable giving model of altruistic giving include:

“I think that many of us take for granted what we received at UMD. I did for sure...I feel I need to give back.”

“I had an awesome experience during my four years of three sports of UMD athletics!”

“I am thankful for having the opportunity to compete for UMD and do plan to give this year. I have simply procrastinated and give to a few other organizations so adding one in the recent economy has been put off. I do think the programs have grown considerably and am proud to be a UMD alumni. Thank you for this survey which has been a reminder to give back.”

“Had a very positive experience as a UMD student-athlete and want to make sure future students will have the same or better opportunities.”

“My giving is based off of...my relationship/experience that I had with the university and athletic program during my student years...”

“When in college the ‘scholarship fund’ (and its donators) provided me with a

free education. This will be valued forever. The fact that I had an opportunity to receive a free education is the number one reason I give to the Athletic program.”

“I would have given more if my sport was still played. Thus, I give monies to other institutions who do have the sport. Point is I want to support the sport in college athletics.”

### *Organizational Identification*

Athletic alumni that give because of the organizational identification model do so because of a sense of belonging to the athletic program. These donors have characteristics of financial giving due to pride, affiliation, emotional attachment, and a sense of belonging to the athletic program. University sponsored social events are desirable events to facilitate giving. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of organizational identification model giving include:

“My favorite time to give was at an alumni gathering at...whom I ‘competed’ with while at UMD...I felt compelled to start giving again...”

“I feel an increase in communication between head coach and alumni may impact alumni decisions to donate. A feeling of involvement and appreciation coming from the head coach may impact decisions to give. Alumni parents may be a great resource for donations also. Parents reflect on their son/daughter’s experience and are motivated to give. Contact with parents should be in written

form from the head coach with upcoming season preview or news of success, reminding parents and their athletes that they are still an important part of the Bulldog family.”

“Emails from the current coaches about results from each...help me continue to feel connected to the program. I appreciate the updates without requests for money, so I don’t feel like I am constantly being asked for money. Makes me more likely to give when I am asked.”

“Basically...once I left UMD...I had no regular and consistent contact...UMD needs to step up in their program of alumni athletic contact.”

“I participated in a non revenue producing sport and the reason I stayed with it and thus the connection I feel to UMD and the community is because of the great team I was on and because of Coach... and all he did for me while I was at UMD. I feel more connected to him than anything, but I’m still proud to be a Bulldog. I associate my relationship with my team and coach the most with UMD.”

“There needs to be more community support from the region and you need more events for people to participate in.”

“Personally, I would enjoy attending organized gatherings/events structured

exclusively for UMD athletic donors. It doesn't seem like many of these exist-or at least I'm not hearing about them. It would be a nice opportunity to foster relationships and strengthen the bond between us, the university and the athletic department. Plus it would be fun."

"I sometimes feel alone in my passion and commitment to UMD athletics, particularly since I am probably in the youngest demographic of donors. Having more events that bring us all together would be energizing. Given the realities of our state, these events should probably be held not just in Duluth, but also in the Twin Cities."

"I do want the money to go to the sport of my choice."

### *Social Identification*

Charitable giving because of feelings of social identification evolve from athletic alumni experiencing an ordering or a connection to a group to which they belong. Personal contact, past experiences, and social pressure to give are motives to donate that represent this group of financial donors. Creating different levels of giving within the organization that lists people by categories are characteristics of athletic alumni that give because of social identification. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of charitable giving in the social identification model include:

"Thought it was real nice to have an alumni call me after I made my contribution

(even though it wasn't huge) and thank me. Thanks!"

"I did not start giving money until the... team started acknowledging the contributions of past players and made an attempt to include me in what is going on now and also made an attempt to recognize the contributions made by all... alum. It is nice to know that someone still appreciates the contributions we made toward the program."

"The annual donor publication did not accurately state my contributions. I brought this to the attention of the administration and the following year I was dropped completely. I am sure it was an oversight but not very impressive for an academic institution. It is important to me in that it signals to others that I know from UMD that I contribute and maybe it will signal to them that they should do the same."

"More emails asking alumni to donate and include options for different amounts to donate. Make different levels of donations more known to donors, i.e.-bronze, silver, gold."

"It would be nice to get a call from a current player requesting a donation for their sport and then they can update and share experiences."

“The one time that the alumni were contacted by Coach... to donate, it was met with a lot of resistance from older alumni that did not want to give to the program due to the lack of support they felt they received while at UMD. I can only speculate why this is, but I’m guessing that they felt a large disparity to the support for...compared to other sports and are holding on to that angst.”

#### *Economic or Utility Satisfaction*

Athletic alumni give because of perceived needs of the athletic program. Characteristics of the economic or utility satisfaction model suggest that when athletic alumni see an obvious need for their money, they become motivated to contribute. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of charitable giving through the model of economic or utility satisfaction include:

“It is understood that with out donors, these student athletes wouldn’t have an opportunity to get a free education.”

“I give because I would like the current athletes to have it a little better than I did, and to help the program continue to be competitive.”

“I have given less in the last few years, but am saving to set up a scholarship for athletes that are also exceptional students.”

#### *Receiving Services*

Tangible benefits of giving for the athletic alumni donor represent the receiving services model. These benefits could come from preferred seating in stadiums or arenas, access to luxury suites, valet parking at athletic events, invitations to athletic department events, or athletic department gifts of clothing. Donors also want to know the value of their donations and in what way their financial gift was used, which includes public recognition. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of charitable giving through the model of receiving services include:

“I have never seen any information on the use of contributions so I am unaware if such are being used responsibly. I assume so!”

“I favor giving to scholarships although I never receive any feedback about how the money is spent. I also favor giving to special projects for which there is evidence that my contribution made a difference. Financial gifts should be acknowledged in some public way.”

“The reason for so many ‘neutral’ picks on the survey is that I simply do not know. I do not know what percentage of my money will actually go toward uniforms, scholarships, etc. I do not know if it is helping build the strength of the program, etc.”

“Maybe give examples of what a certain donation amount could fund.”

“I understand that the athletic program is trying to support all teams, but in talking with a lot of my fellow teammates and teammates parents they are unwilling to make donations because they do not feel comfortable with how the money will be used.”

### *Relationship-Marketing*

Communication is the key variable for athletic alumni in the relationship-marketing model. They give because of strategies incorporated by the athletic department to solicit funds through developing relationships and marketing the athletic program. Statements from respondents that incorporated characteristics of charitable giving through the model of relationship-marketing include:

“I enjoy receiving the email updates from...”

“I have enjoyed receiving newsletters and...alumni letters from the coaches.”

“I like reading...emails and updates about the season.”

“In recent years, the communication has been poor and my donation hasn't been what it once was. I am not asking for attention, but only for the forms to donate be sent to me. That is the product of poor organization within the university and I would guess has cost you with other donors as well. I have found other ways to

give, but hopefully you are able to rectify your methods of notifying donors.”

“UMD does a very poor job of communicating with its athletic alumni. This is particularly true for those that live out-of-state. In part, for that reason, it is offensive to get only communications asking for money. The older alumni should be more highly regarded by the athletic department. The potential for support and financial contribution is not being nurtured. The weekly, during the season, updates...are greatly appreciated and the kind of communication that helps alumni feel a part of the program and helps to establish a foundation for various types of support.”

“My giving is based off of...How I am treated by the university after I graduate-do they only contact me to ask for money?”

“The communication from both the Athletic Department and...is at a very low point. You can't fund programs and expect support with this lack of communication, Just ask any former player when a personalized letter, email, or phone call has been received, you will soon know why funds have almost stopped. Championships are wonderful, but with those great opportunities so much was lost in lack of personal contact and follow thru!”

“UMD does not sell itself enough. Public relations need some work.”

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **Discussions and Conclusions**

This final chapter will examine and discuss the results of the analysis through the summarization of findings and suggestion of relevant conclusions. This study explored key determinants that influence University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) athletic alumni motivations to give financially to UMD intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants, along with demographic information, shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, will help develop a donor profile of why UMD athletic alumni donate to UMD athletic department campaigns.

This chapter is divided into five sections and will start with a brief introduction and summary of the study, followed by a discussion for each of the six models associated with charitable giving that were examined in the results of Chapter Four. The discussion will also identify relevant connections to the literature that were cited in Chapter Two. The third section is a continued discussion of the implications of the six models identified with charitable giving and of the pertinence of the results for the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics Department. This will include recommending possible initiatives for the Intercollegiate Athletic Department that will assist in athletic alumni development campaigns, including developing a donor profile. This section will also include brief discussion of the demographic variables. Section four will identify limitations of the study, and the chapter will conclude with section five, which offers suggestions for future

research. Some of these sections will also contain my own personal perspectives on the research on intercollegiate athletic department fundraising efforts based on being the principal investigator for this study as well as my involvement first as a collegiate student-athlete and then as a collegiate coach for the past 37 years.

### *Summary of the Study*

Intercollegiate athletic programs are a prominent part of institutions of higher education throughout the United States. Intercollegiate sport teams, consisting of student-athletes, coaches and staff, bring local, regional, and national attention to the institution. Interest surrounding all facets of college athletics has captured the attention of many important constituents from within as well as from outside of higher education institutions. Though many people in education have argued that the increased popularity of intercollegiate athletics has crept toward the commercialization of college sport as an entertainment value rather than part of the overall academic mission of the institution, intercollegiate athletics is still an integral part of the majority of colleges and universities in America.

Because of this prominence, the subsequent greatest impact intercollegiate athletics has had on colleges and universities over the last century has been the escalation of financial resources needed to operate successful programs. The need for added income and revenue to be competitive in play has always been present. Intercollegiate athletic competition varies from institution to institution depending on the level of play. There is a vast difference between colleges and universities in the United States. Similarly, intercollegiate athletic programs vary greatly in philosophy and scope. Because of this

diversity, the majority of institutions are associated with three distinct National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) competitive playing divisions. The financial implications of athletic programs' affiliation with a particular division of play in intercollegiate athletics have become an integral part of balancing college and university operating budgets. The vast majority of intercollegiate athletic programs are not financially independent. The revenue streams created from competitive play are not sufficient to cover the rising costs of program operations. Athletic programs rely greatly on institutional support and student service fees, as well as additional funding from development efforts.

The development efforts of intercollegiate athletic departments to increase the level of donations in support of athletics are increasingly important. The continued decline of government appropriations at the federal, state, and local level for higher education have hurt all institutional departments, including intercollegiate athletics. Athletic departments' growing athletic budgets are supplementing financial deficiencies by increasingly soliciting gifts and grants from alumni, private donors, foundations, and corporations. Over the last three decades, alumni of institutions of higher education have accounted for close to 28 percent of monies donated to institutions of higher learning (Council for Aid to Education, 2008). Donations by athletic department alumni have become a significant source of meeting revenue shortfalls for athletic department budgets. The importance of development efforts directed specifically at athletic alumni has been present and will continue to grow in the future.

Alumni giving to one's alma mater has been explored through a wide variety of research studies. Studies have indicated that a variety of determinants influence alumni donations. A few of these possible determinants are satisfaction with one's undergraduate experience, personal experience that links donors to an organization, tax deductions, volunteering while in college, proximity to campus after graduation, and participation in intercollegiate athletics, reunions, or social pressures, to name a few. Other determinants in studies came from demographic variables. Researchers have long considered the study of philanthropy for alumni of higher education, but there is limited research on the specific donor population of intercollegiate athletic alumni.

The function to solicit financially from athletic alumni has become an integral part of maintaining and building successful athletic programs. Yet, little is known regarding the characteristics, behavior, and motivations of why athletic alumni financially give to the intercollegiate athletic department of their alma mater. Through the exploration of literature that was reviewed for this study, researchers categorized donor behavior in many ways. By connecting the research regarding philanthropy in higher education to the various theories or models that were consistent throughout the literature with Mann's (2007) theoretical framework for understanding donor motives, a better understanding concerning why athletic alumni make a financial donation can be developed. However, it is unlikely that a single theory or model can be a stand-alone explanation for why athletic alumni donate financially to the athletic department. Following Mann's (2007) perspectives, the six models identified through much of the research in this study were: altruistic giving, organizational identification, social

identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing.

The purpose of this study was to identify key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants shaped from models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing strategies, will help develop a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Developing a donor profile will assist in predicting donor behavior and may increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments.

This study was designed to enable the researcher to answer a research question based on six models associated with charitable giving in identifying key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. The fundamental research question that drove this study was: To what degree are there differences among levels of financial giving in athletic alumni motivations to donate associated with six models of charitable giving?

The institution that was the subject of this study was the University of Minnesota Duluth, a comprehensive regional university. The current structure of the UMD Athletic Department consists of 16 sport teams, which have unique membership status with the governing body of intercollegiate athletics. Nationally, the institution belongs to the NCAA and competes at the Division II level except for Division I hockey (men and women). The varsity sports for the men are baseball, basketball, cross-country, football,

hockey, and track (indoor and outdoor). The varsity sports for the women are basketball, cross-country, hockey, soccer, softball, tennis, track (indoor and outdoor), and volleyball. The majority of research studies conducted over the last few decades have explored intercollegiate athletic development efforts at the NCAA Division I level, but few have studied athletic alumni giving at the NCAA Division II level with only one sport affiliated with Division I.

As noted in Chapter Three, the participants of this study were intercollegiate male and female athletic alumni that graduated from the University of Minnesota Duluth within a 50-year span of time, from 1960 to 2010. A total of 475 UMD athletic alumni (368 males and 107 females) that donated financially to the athletic department comprised the sample for this study and were contacted via a Web-based survey that contained 61 questions. Following the emailing of the survey, 75 emails were returned undeliverable, 400 were deliverable, which included 319 males and 81 females. Total responses to the survey consisted of 122 athletic alumni, which included 95 males and 26 female respondents, approximately 30.5 percent of the deliverable emails. Survey data collection began November 12, 2010 and concluded December 18, 2010.

The data gathered from the surveys were statistically analyzed to examine the variables and determine statistical significance. Statistical testing was completed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical analysis software. Descriptive statistics were analyzed to identify key determinants shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, which include altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-

marketing strategies, to develop a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to UMD athletic department development campaigns.

The analysis of data pertaining to the first five models of charitable giving (altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services), derived from the first 36 survey questions included descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA measures. The one-way ANOVA used the two variables of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level as independent variables, and the mean of the items representing the five models of charitable giving as dependent variables.

The researcher determined that by investigating the financial giving levels of athletic alumni to the UMD athletic department for the most recent tax year and the financial giving levels for total lifetime, key determinants that influence intent to give financially shaped from the models of charitable giving would emerge to help develop a donor profile. The six category giving levels for athletic alumni most recent tax year were: “under \$100,” “\$100-\$299,” “\$300-\$499,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$1,499,” and “\$1,500 and up.” The six category giving levels for athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level were: “under \$500,” “\$500-\$999,” “\$1,000-\$4,999,” “\$5,000-\$9,999,” “\$10,000-\$14,999,” and “\$15,000 and up.”

Reporting the results of 12 questions representing the charitable giving model of relationship-marketing, the presentation of data was developed by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-square statistic measure. Once again, this measure also explored

relationships across the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level.

Descriptive statistics were also used to analyze relationships between demographic variables and the category giving levels from athletic alumni for most recent tax year and total lifetime. Data was developed from 12 demographic questions by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-square statistic measure.

The final question solicited qualitative responses from athletic alumni. A total of 36 out of 122 survey participants wrote additional comments concerning motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program. Six themes concerning athletic alumni financial giving motivations emerged from the comments that closely followed the characteristics of the six models this study identified with charitable giving.

### *Discussion*

This section is devoted to summary, discussion, and associated conclusions derived from results of the survey for identifying key determinants that influenced UMD athletic alumni to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those key determinants or motivations to give financially were shaped from the underlying six models associated with charitable giving.

Comparisons and connections to related literature already researched in the field of philanthropy are also incorporated in each section of the six charitable giving models researched. Each charitable giving model section will contain personal perspectives on the research on intercollegiate athletic department fundraising efforts based on being the

principal investigator for this study as well as my involvement first as a collegiate student-athlete and then as a collegiate coach for the past 37 years.

This study's results indicated statistical significance among some of the charitable giving models and athletic alumni levels of giving for the most recent tax year and total lifetime. It should be noted that the statements and questions presented to respondents in the survey were centered on how respondents feel at a particular point in time. As a result, it was expected that the results would show athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to yield statistically significant differences in contrast to athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels. The charitable giving model of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and receiving services, were presented on the survey through level of agreement statements on a five-point Likert scale, while the charitable giving model of relationship-marketing strategies were presented through forced-choice questions.

Statements associated with altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, and economic or utility satisfaction models all showed statistical significance with athletic alumni most recent tax year, but no statistical significance with athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels. There was no statistical significance in the charitable giving model of receiving services with athletic alumni giving levels in the most recent tax year and total lifetime. Six questions associated with the charitable giving model of relationship-marketing and athletic alumni financial giving levels in the most recent tax year yielded statistical significance. Only two questions associated with

relationship-marketing and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels showed statistical significance.

### *Altruistic Giving*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond through level of agreement to four statements on the survey designed to measure altruistic giving. Altruistic giving statements represent questions exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of gratitude to the athletic program. The altruistic giving model had a mean item score of 3.55, which was the second highest ranked charitable giving model. There was statistical significance in the relationship to altruistic giving and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year. In examination of the means of the responses for altruistic giving statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increased as the level of giving increased. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in altruistic giving. Altruistic giving statements and athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels were not statistically significant.

There were significant recurring themes in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations to give because of the altruistic giving model. Athletic alumni comments on the survey suggested that positive experiences as a student-athlete with the sport program produced a sense of obligation to give financially. There was a perceived feeling of needing to give back financially because of what they received as a student-athlete. Comments suggested that athletic

alumni gave financially because of gratitude to the athletic program for providing opportunities as a student-athlete, both athletically and academically.

The findings of this study indicate that athletic alumni give to athletic department fundraising efforts at a higher level because of motivations derived from the altruistic giving model, in particular from a donor's perspective in the most recent tax year. These results are consistent with literature on financial giving and donor characteristics that resemble altruistic model giving. Clotfelter (2001) says altruistic giving is an "often cited motivation for alumni giving as a desire to pay back the institution" (p. 125). Lindahl and Conley (2002) and Brady, et al. (2002) state that people in society feel obligated to respond in a favorable way after other people have helped them. Okundade and Wunnava (1994) think altruistic giving individuals are driven by a sense of obligation to the organization to which they donate. Altruistic giving also represents gratitude rather than a belief in the ideals of the institution (Belfield & Beney, 2000). In summary, the literature agrees with what this study found, that the charitable giving model of altruistic giving influences the motivations for athletic alumni to give financially.

Coaches of college athletic sport teams often foster the ideals of gratitude and obligation from team members as programs are developed for competition. Current student-athletes are reminded constantly of what has been accomplished before them through the traditions of the sport program. Pictures, plaques, and facilities that bear the names of athletic alumni that preceded them surround current student-athletes daily. Coaches constantly remind the current team members of what players before them have given to the program so success is attainable. This perpetuates the notion of giving back

as much as you have received during each season, so those student-athletes that follow can also have a good experience. On the majority of collegiate athletic teams, that is what the student-athlete encounters until leaving the institution. As a result, if athletic alumni have had a positive experience as student-athletes, they will want to financially give back to their alma mater. They feel gratitude as well as an obligation, and athletic alumni will financially give because of motivations associated with the altruistic giving model.

### *Organizational Identification*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond through level of agreement to ten statements on the survey designed to measure organizational identification giving. Organizational identification giving statements represent questions exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of a sense of belonging to the athletic program. The organizational identification model had a mean item score of 3.26, which was the second lowest ranked charitable giving model. There was statistical significance in the relationship to organizational identification giving and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year. In examination of the means of the responses for organizational identification giving statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increased as the level of giving increased. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in the organizational identification charitable giving model. Organizational identification giving statements and athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels was not statistically significant.

There were significant recurring themes in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations to give because of the

organizational identification giving model. Athletic alumni comments on the survey suggested that an increase in communication between the head coach and alumni has positively affected alumni decisions to give financially. Athletic alumni that gave had feelings of loyalty, involvement in the program, were proud of the success of the program, and commented on having a bond with the program. Many comments emphasized a continued relationship with the coach for athletic alumni giving financially.

It should be noted, there were a few recurring themes in athletic alumni comments that closely followed the characteristics of motivations not to give because of the organizational identification giving model. Athletic alumni comments viewed the institution through the organizational identification model lens and stated that the athletic department was not effective at using this type of motivation for encouraging financial giving. This may show why athletic alumni responses to statements indicated the organizational identification giving model as the second lowest ranked charitable giving model with a mean item score of 3.26, but was still statistically significant in the relationship to organizational identification giving and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year. Comments on the survey suggested some athletic alumni might not give because of a feeling of no regular or consistent contact from the athletic program. There are comments for not giving that stemmed from a perceived lack of gatherings organized for athletic alumni that would allow opportunities to foster relationships with the university and athletic alumni. Comments further suggested a need for organized events, not just in the home city of the

institution but at other cities throughout the state where athletic alumni are currently residing.

As pointed out, the findings of this study did indicate statistical significance that athletic alumni give to athletic department fundraising efforts at a higher level because of motivations derived from the organizational identification giving model, in particular from a donor's giving in the most recent tax year. These results are consistent with literature on financial giving and donor characteristics that resemble organizational identification model giving. Part of organizational identification is an emotional attachment to the institution, and researchers believe that is the strongest predictor of alumni contribution status (Tom & Elmer, 1994). Mael and Ashforth (1992) state that organizational identification is "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member" (p. 104). Brady, et al. (2002) views symbolism as a factor of organizational identification; symbolism helps connect individuals to an organization.

Nostalgia is a part of the symbolism higher education uses frequently to keep its graduates connected to the institution. Symbolism of the institution's mascot that represents the sport teams is often used through promotional material for all of the school's alumni community. This symbolism creates pride and affiliation with the organization from its alumni. Nostalgia of involvement on a sport team encourages a higher level of financial contribution from athletic alumni when the athletic department makes the ask to financially give. Athletic alumni will be more inclined to give when there is a sense of belonging to the athletic program. Athletic alumni who feel connected

to the athletic program will give at a higher level. This connection is created through organized athletic alumni events, newsletters, and emails on the development of the teams, which may present inside information on the program. Successes of the athletic programs will be celebrated by the athletic alumni because of their continued connection with the program through motivations of characteristics reflecting the organizational identification model. Athletic alumni will have a feeling of pride through financial giving that they helped shaped the direction of the program, created championship facilities, and are a part of all the successes of the athletic team.

### *Social Identification*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond through level of agreement to 14 statements on the survey designed to measure social identification giving. Social identification giving statements represent questions exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of past personal experiences with specific groups within the athletic program. The social identification model had a mean item score of 3.38, which was the third ranked mean item score of the five charitable giving models. There was statistical significance in the relationship to social identification giving and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year. In examination of the means of the responses for social identification giving statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increased as the level of giving increased. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in the social identification charitable giving model. Social identification giving

statements and athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels were not statistically significant.

There were significant recurring themes in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations to give because of the social identification giving model. Athletic alumni commented that they financially gave because of a personal contact from a coach or player via a phone call or written correspondence thanking them for the financial donation. Comments on acknowledgement and recognition for financially giving through publications were determinants of higher levels of donations as well. There were also a few recurring themes in athletic alumni comments that closely followed the characteristics of motivations not to give because of the social identification giving model. Some athletic alumni commented that they would not give at a higher level because they perceived the sport team that they participated on had a lack of support from the institution, or the athletic department eliminated their sport team.

The findings of this study do indicate that athletic alumni give to athletic department fundraising efforts at a higher level because of motivations derived from the social identification giving model, in particular from a donor's contribution in the most recent tax year. These results are consistent with literature on financial giving and donor characteristics that resemble social identification model giving. Harrison, Mitchell, and Peterson (1995) believe social pressure is derived from this model. Social pressure provides a motive for giving. Identification with a group increases the pressure to donate because one's peers or predecessors in the group have been generous. Long (1976)

researched social pressure and discovered that it did affect the level of charitable giving. Past personal experiences with specific groups link donors to the organization to which they donate (Clotfelter, 2001). Mann (2007) indicated that social identification with a group allows alumni to maintain a positive psychological connection with the institution.

This study suggests that motivations for athletic alumni to give financially to athletic department development efforts can be determined through behaviors associated with the social identification model. Athletic alumni want personal methods of solicitation when approached to give financially. Contact from past team members, coaches, or staff of the sport team will influence financial giving at a higher level. Past playing experiences form a bond between team members from various years of participation. An opportunity for social engagement of athletic alumni connects generations of teammates and provides a sense of belongingness to the current program. Coaches and athletic alumni would be well served to communicate with current players in the sport program they represent about the importance of financially giving in the future to the athletic program. As long as athletic alumni maintain memories of a positive athletic playing experience and the opportunities that were provided to them, the likelihood to give financially is present due to determinants of social identification with the athletic program.

#### *Economic or Utility Satisfaction*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond through level of agreement to three statements on the survey designed to measure economic or utility satisfaction giving. Economic or utility satisfaction giving statements represent questions exploring if athletic

alumni give or do not give because of perceived needs of the athletic program. The economic or utility satisfaction model had a mean item score of 4.00, which was the highest ranked charitable giving model. There was statistical significance in the relationship to economic or utility satisfaction giving and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year. In examination of the means of the responses for economic or utility satisfaction giving statements and the level of giving in the most recent tax year, the means generally increased as the level of giving increased. This suggests that the larger the financial gift athletic alumni made, the higher the belief in the economic or utility satisfaction charitable giving model. Economic or utility satisfaction giving statements and athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels were not statistically significant.

There was a significant recurring theme in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations to give because of the economic or utility satisfaction giving model. Athletic alumni comments indicated that they gave because there was a perceived need in the athletic program to provide scholarships for the student-athletes. They recognized an opportunity to help the athletic program through giving financially and were motivated to give.

The findings of this study do indicate that athletic alumni give to athletic department fundraising efforts at a higher level because of motivations derived from the economic or utility satisfaction giving model, in particular from a donor's perspective in the most recent tax year. Past literature highlights that characteristics due to the economics or utility satisfaction giving model motivate athletic alumni to give

financially. Mann (2007) found that donors feel useful in making a donation that will benefit the recipients. Okunade, Wunnava, and Walsh (1994) found in their research that donors can be said to derive some utility or satisfaction from giving. Weerts and Ronca (2007) stated in their research that if alumni donors develop a view that the institution needs their support, they will be more likely to give. Coughlin and Ereksen (1984) concluded through their research on contributions to support intercollegiate athletics that “individuals might derive utility from feeling that their contributions have aided the team and, therefore, can feel justified in sharing in the fortunes of their favorite team” (p. 184).

Athletic alumni have to be presented with the reason for the need or value that is derived because of their giving financially. When coaches can show athletic alumni that the financial gift they are providing assists with specific needs in the program, there is an increased likelihood that a gift will be made. Perceived needs can be emphasized to athletic alumni for all aspects of the program including scholarships, travel, equipment, and facilities. This study found that a key determinant of athletic alumni to financially give is motivations developed by the economic or utility satisfaction model. Coaches and administrators should show athletic alumni what their giving specifically provided the athletic program, whether it is enabling a strength coach position, a new set of uniforms, an endowed scholarship, or new lockers for the team room. The findings in this study suggest that because of characteristics of the economic or utility satisfaction model, when athletic alumni see an obvious need for their money, they become motivated to contribute.

### *Receiving Services*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond through level of agreement to five statements on the survey designed to measure receiving services giving. Receiving services giving statements represent questions exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of the quality of service provided to the donor, the value of that service, and the satisfaction level the donor feels about that service. The receiving services model had a mean item score of 3.13, which was the lowest ranked charitable giving model. There was no statistical significance in the relationship to receiving services and what respondents indicated regarding levels of giving for the most recent tax year and levels of giving for total lifetime.

Though this model had the lowest mean item score and no statistically significant relationship in giving levels, there were significant recurring themes in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations not to give because of the receiving services model. Athletic alumni comments viewed the institution through the receiving services model lens and stated that the athletic department was not effective at using this type of motivation for encouraging financial giving. Comments made on the survey questionnaire revealed several aspects for which athletic alumni had low satisfaction levels in regards to the receiving services model. They stated that they were unaware of how the athletic program uses athletic alumni financial gifts or if their gift was being used responsibly. They questioned if their financial gift was making a difference, because there was no feedback or acknowledgement about how the financial gift was used.

Results from this study suggest that the motivation for athletic alumni to give financially because of the receiving services model is not as key a determinant as the previous models presented in altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, and economic or utility satisfaction. However, recent literature on the receiving services model indicated that this model was important to athletic alumni that gave financially. The research from Stinson and Howard (2004) indicated financial gifts were made in exchange for tangible donor benefits. Tangible benefits of giving for the donor in intercollegiate athletics could come from preferred seating in stadiums, access to luxury suites, close associations with coaches, valet parking at athletic events, or athletic department gifts of clothing (Turner, et al., 2001). Brady, et al. (2002) concluded in their findings that new, young, and less experienced potential donors are more concerned about the value of their donations, not only the value for themselves but also for the organization.

The athletic alumni respondent results in this study indicated no statistically significant relationship among most recent tax year financial giving levels as well as the athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels and the items related to the receiving services model. It should be noted that the statements athletic alumni responded to in this study's survey associated with the first four charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, and economic or utility satisfaction, were mostly intangible in nature. The statements associated with the charitable giving model of receiving services were mostly tangible in nature. Survey results indicated athletic alumni motivations to give financially because of the receiving services model

were not as strong as the previous four models, but the findings did suggest additional aspects that the athletic department should consider. Athletic alumni want to know the value of their donation and in what way their financial gift was used. Recognition of giving financially, through institutional publications, alumni publications, yearbooks, media guides, and game programs, will stimulate alumni giving at a higher level. Acknowledgement programs and giving levels should be incorporated to keep athletic alumni informed on how their financial gift is contributing to the academic, social, and athletic success of the department. Because of this publicized information, benefits tangible in nature of giving financially, could be realized as well for athletic alumni in the form of tax deduction benefits, reduced game tickets, preferred seating, and valet parking.

Though the receiving services model appears not to be as important as the other charitable giving models to athletic alumni and relationships with financial giving levels, athletic departments should address aspects of this model. Athletic departments may find it advantageous to emphasize giving financially because of practical reasons of attaining tangible benefits. Tsiotsou (1998) identified in her research that tangible benefits such as priority seating and tax deductions, were indicative of motives for practical reasons to influence giving financially.

#### *Relationship-Marketing*

Athletic alumni were asked to respond to 12 closed-ended questions soliciting various responses on the survey designed to measure strategies for relationship-marketing giving. Relationship-marketing questions represent questions exploring if athletic alumni give or do not give because of strategies incorporated by the athletic program to solicit

funds. The presentation of data was developed by using cross-tabulation and the Pearson Chi-square statistic measure to explore relationships among questions regarding relationship-marketing model behaviors across the six category giving levels of athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving level and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level.

In regards to intercollegiate athletic website use to gather information about the department or about giving financially, there was no statistically significant relationship with athletic alumni giving levels for the most recent tax year or total lifetime. The findings for this group of items are consistent with what other researchers indicate on website use: website use is more of a tool for developing interaction that bonds the donor with the athletic department. Athletic alumni use the website more to gather information rather than give financially. Tsotsou (2007) views websites as a function to keep donors informed, increase their involvement with the athletic program, and reassure them that they are an integral part of the institution.

Athletic alumni game attendance and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime was statistically significant. The findings of these items indicated that if athletic alumni are not involved in game attendance, their giving levels are low; however, the more athletic alumni are involved in game attendance, the greater the motive to financially give at a higher level for the most recent tax year and for total lifetime giving. Literature supports the findings of this study. The more athletic games donors attend the more emotionally motivated they are to give (Tsotsou, 1998).

Number of times athletic alumni attended an intercollegiate athletic sponsored event over the past year and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year were statistically significant. The findings here indicate that if athletic alumni are not involved in attending intercollegiate athletic sponsored events, their most recent tax year financial giving levels are low; conversely, the more athletic alumni are involved in attending intercollegiate athletic sponsored events, the greater the motive to financially give at a higher level for the most recent tax year.

The findings of this study in regards to the relationship-marketing model are consistent with recent literature stating that special events used to connect with donors, such as golf tournaments, banquets, hall of fame programs, or functions around athletic games, allow donors to feel proud about giving funds (Plinske, 2000). Some researchers believe that these types of programs encourage immediate emotional motivation to give financially. Tsotsou (1998) believes athletic alumni that attend department-sponsored events are more likely to experience excitement and become motivated to give. This may suggest why there was statistical significance for number of times athletic alumni attended an intercollegiate athletic sponsored event over the past year and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year, and no statistical significant relationship between times attending an intercollegiate athletic sponsored event and total lifetime giving levels.

Statistical significance was found in this study between preferred method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic program and financial giving levels in the most recent tax year. There was no statistically significant relationship between preferred

method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic department and total lifetime giving levels. It was interesting to note that athletic alumni that give financially at lower levels of giving in their most recent tax year prefer to be contacted by “Traditional Mail” and “Email;” however, athletic alumni that financially give at higher levels of giving in their most recent tax year prefer to be contacted by a “Phone Call From Coach.”

Similarly, statistical significance was found in this study between method of contact prompting the most recent financial gift to the athletic program and financial giving levels in the most recent tax year. As were the results between preferred method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic department and total lifetime giving levels, there was no statistically significant relationship between method of contact prompting the most recent financial gift to the athletic program and total lifetime giving levels. Percentages of the respondents in the survey for both method of contact that prompted the most recent financial gift and preferred method of being contacted about financial giving to the athletic program and financial giving levels in the most recent tax year were similar. For athletic alumni that give financially at lower levels of giving in their most recent tax year, “Traditional Mail” and “Email” prompted them to make their most recent financial gift to the athletic program, while athletic alumni that financially give at higher levels of giving in their most recent tax year were prompted by a “Phone Call From Coach.”

The findings of this study are consistent with literature on contacting athletic alumni. Rhoden (1997) found that the coaches of the athletes are the significant factors to

get a positive response from alumni donors. This study found that marketing strategies for development efforts must involve the athletic department's coaching staff. O'Neil and Schenke (2006) agree that development efforts start with an emphasis from the coach, early in an athlete's career, on the importance of giving financially, and on how athletic alumni donations help fund scholarships, facilities, travel funds, and equipment. The phone call from coach to athletic alumni is a key determinant for continued financial support of the athletic team.

Coaches have to be involved with all phases of development efforts. Athletic alumni want contact from people who have a relationship with student-athletes past and present. Institutional development officers have not formed the intimate relationships that coaches have with the student-athletes. Progression through the program as a player, graduate, and alumnus forms a unique bond. As this progression takes place, coaches need to continuously reinforce to their student-athletes the concept of financially giving back to the program in the future. O'Neil and Schenke (2006) stated the same conclusion, "University coaches need to emphasize to athletes that donating to their alma mater helps to ensure the success of future athletic programs and provides access to athletic alumni clubs that offer social opportunities and networking" (p. 71).

Though this study indicated no statistically significant differences between levels of financial giving for the most recent tax year or total lifetime financial giving levels in regards to the question of times contacted over the last ten years to financially give to the athletic program, recent literature suggests this is a significant factor to motivate athletic alumni to give. Research indicates that alumni giving is inconsistent and has peaks and

valleys of participation. A wide spectrum of alumni engagement and motivation to donate occurs at various stages of life for all collegiate alumni (Meyers, 2006). That is why development offices must maintain contact and incorporate various strategies for the continuous solicitation of financial giving from athletic alumni.

Maintaining contact becomes very important when discussing the survey question in regards to the number of times over the last ten years that athletic alumni have financially given to the athletic program. The results of the survey indicated a statistically significant difference between times over the last ten years athletic alumni have financially given to the athletic program and financial giving levels for the most recent tax year and total lifetime financial giving levels. Results suggest that in giving for the most recent tax year and total lifetime, athletic alumni that give less frequently give at lower financial levels; conversely, athletic alumni that give more frequently give at higher financial levels. This further emphasizes the previous suggestion, which is why development offices must maintain contact and incorporate various strategies for the continuous solicitation of financial giving from athletic alumni.

Examining the question exploring if athletic alumni have given to the athletic program for 2010 also reveals evidence of statistical significance. These findings reinforce the results discussed in the previous paragraph. Athletic alumni that donate at a higher financial level did give to the athletic program for 2010, while the athletic alumni that donate at a lower financial level did not yet give financially for 2010 when surveyed. These findings are reflective of Tsotsou's (2007) research profiling two segments of athletic donors. The low-motivated segment consists of donors who make smaller

donations and are less involved in the athletic program. The high-motivated segment consists of donors who contribute larger amounts and are more involved with the athletic program. Following Tsiotsou's (2007) advice, relationship-marketing model strategies can incorporate an effective marketing mix in order to motivate specific donor segments. Relationship-marketing strategies in athletic development efforts must build and maintain engagement, because the motivation to give occurs at various stages of life for all alumni.

The question examining the relationship between athletic alumni financially giving to the academic program from which they graduated and financial giving levels to the athletic department for the most recent tax year and total lifetime had no statistical significance. Research concerning both sides of the debate that athletic development efforts reduce giving to the academic side of institutional fundraising is prolific. Though this study found no statistical significance in the relationship between athletic alumni financial giving levels to the athletic department and giving to the academic program from which the athletic alumni graduated, it should be noted that approximately 29 percent of respondents indicated they gave to their academic program. Since the focus of this study was to identify determinants that influence athletic alumni financial giving to athletic department development efforts, it was important to discover that there was no statistical relationship between athletic alumni giving levels to the athletic department and giving to the academic program.

There were significant recurring themes in the comments from athletic alumni that closely followed the characteristics of motivations to give or not to give because of the relationship-marketing giving model. Various athletic alumni comments indicated

that they gave because of sport team programs that maintained contact with former players by informing them of the team through email newsletters and updates throughout the year. However, the majority of comments were negative concerning athletic department communication and strategies to solicit money from athletic alumni. Comments reflected a lack of personal contact from the athletic department. Athletic alumni desired a personalized letter, email, or phone call to encourage giving financially. There was a perceived lack of an emphasis on the marketing of sport programs, which in turn negated giving financially. Some comments viewed strategies of athletic department fundraising campaigns to be poorly organized, resulting in athletic alumni not giving, giving at a lower level, or searching out strategies on their own to give financially to the athletic programs. Athletic alumni comments made on the survey revealed additional aspects of the relationship-marketing model; one insinuated the strategy to establish various types of giving to the athletic department other than the financial gift.

*Implications and Recommendations for Athletic Alumni Development Campaigns*

This study used six charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, receiving services, and relationship-marketing, to identify a variety of determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to intercollegiate athletic department fundraising campaigns. This section discusses implications for intercollegiate athletic development efforts regarding this study's findings. It will include recommending possible initiatives for the University of Minnesota Duluth that will assist in athletic alumni development

campaigns, including developing a donor profile that incorporates demographic discussion stemming from the results of this study.

Through the findings of this study, a donor profile of UMD athletic alumni can be developed shaped from the models of charitable giving. Not just one model of charitable giving can be used to identify why athletic alumni gave financially. Multiple theoretical perspectives and models can be used to understand why athletic alumni are contributing financially to development campaigns. Through the charitable giving models used in this study, significance was found in athletic alumni level of giving in the most recent tax year and not level of giving for total lifetime; as a result findings can best be implied for annual fundraising efforts.

In designing an annual fundraising campaign for the athletic department, this study suggests athletic alumni gave at higher financial levels in the most recent tax year, because of their motivation to give due to economic or utility satisfaction, altruistic giving, social identification, and organizational identification models. They will give because of past positive experiences as a student athlete, feelings of gratitude, loyalty, perceived financial needs, having a sense of belonging to the athletic program, and feeling responsible in part for any successes or failures of the team. Financial giving will occur because of a perceived connection to past and current student-athletes as well as coaches. Athletic alumni did not give financially primarily because of the receiving services model. Motivations to give financially did not come from tax deduction benefits, preferred seating, reduced game tickets, or perceived problems of the athletic program leadership using the financial gift responsibly.

Reviewing this study's demographic findings, results indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between demographic questions of gender, marital status, having children, highest level of education, yearly household income, varsity sport participated on, receiving an athletic scholarship, or decade of graduation, and athletic alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels. However, there was a statistically significant relationship between the demographic question of distance in which current residence is from the institution and most recent tax year financial giving levels. Results show that generally athletic alumni that donate at a higher financial level in the most recent tax year have a current residence that is within 50 miles of the institution.

In regards to athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving level and demographic questions of highest level of education, yearly household income, receiving an athletic scholarship, and distance in which current residence is from the institution, there is no statistical significance. However, there is statistical significance between the demographic questions of gender, marital status, having children, varsity sport participated on, and decade of graduation and athletic alumni total lifetime financial giving levels. In summary, for athletic alumni total lifetime giving levels: a higher percentage of females gave at a lower level while a higher percentage of males gave at a higher level; athletic alumni that were married and have children gave at a higher level than did single athletic alumni without children; athletic alumni men that participated in hockey, football, or basketball gave at a higher level than other sport team participants; and athletic alumni that donated at a higher level graduated more than 20 years ago.

If the athletic department is trying to develop a donor profile based on giving at higher levels, the demographic results of this study suggest that athletic alumni that give at higher financial levels in the most recent tax year have a current residence that is within 50 miles of the institution. The donor profile based on demographics for total lifetime giving suggests that athletic alumni who give at a higher financial level are male, married, has children, played hockey, football, or basketball, and graduated between 1960 and 1989.

To encourage athletic alumni to give financially to annual fundraising campaigns a number of initiatives should be implemented by the athletic department. These initiatives should be derived from the charitable giving models of altruistic giving, organizational identification, social identification, economic or utility satisfaction, and relationship-marketing strategies. Though demographic variables are important, intercollegiate athletic department fundraisers should develop a donor profile shaped from the responses that influenced athletic alumni financial giving levels in regards to questions and statements that represented the model perspectives of charitable giving. The information obtained in this study can assist in predicting donor behavior and developing actions that will increase the effectiveness of development campaigns for intercollegiate athletic departments. Actions for the intercollegiate athletic department that represent tangible initiatives from the five charitable giving models that showed significance in the results could include:

- Coaches need to emphasize to current student-athletes on the sport team the importance of them giving financially to the athletic program in the future after

graduation. Coaches and athletic department personnel also need to understand that having a good experience is an important indicator predicting athletic alumni giving financially in the future.

- Bring athletic alumni back to talk to the sport program. This could be educational, informative, or motivational before a contest. Make a connection between past and current players in the athletic program.
- Display pictures and plaques of individual players, coaches, and teams in athletic facilities that emphasize the tradition of the program. These should be in offices, hallways, locker rooms, training rooms, weight rooms, and in all competitive playing venues that include every year the sport team played. This could include developing programs for athletic alumni that incorporate publicizing, marketing, and displaying people in “Halls of Fame,” “Teams of the Decade,” and “Athletic Alumni of Distinction.”
- Each specific sport team coaching staff should develop a weekly or monthly newsletter for athletic alumni that highlights past and current players and coaches. It should also contain summaries of recent games, recruiting, or future program needs. Current student-athletes should also contribute to this publication through writing a story or making comments.
- Athletic alumni use the website to gather information, not to give financially. Websites keep donors informed; continue to use this technology to maintain communication with athletic alumni, but not to solicit funds. Effective marketing assists with building and maintaining relationships with athletic alumni.

- Athletic alumni want to give financially to programs that have visibility. Sports information offices should maintain and develop attractive websites and publications. If this is not feasible for all athletic team programs, the athletic department should select programs to be emphasized keeping in mind development possibilities. However, do not ignore the significant growing population of female athletic alumni. That population in this study will be a segment of athletic alumni that are increasing in size and importance due to the institution's escalation of women's sport programs over the last twenty years.
- Fundraising campaigns should have involvement from coaches and past players. Methods of contacting athletic alumni should not only be through traditional mail or email, but also include a phone call from a coach or former player.
- Fundraising campaigns should have continuity and timing from year to year. Athletic alumni should develop habits of giving each year and this can only be developed by having a consistent method of soliciting funds. The campaign should come at the same time every year, so it is an expectation; athletic alumni will form a habit to give financially. Incorporate structured levels of giving financially that include acknowledgement programs in the forms of display and publications. Athletic alumni will increase their level of giving over time. That is why every athletic alumnus that gives financially is important. The annual development campaign of intercollegiate athletics should incorporate the goal of increasing the donor base of athletic alumni that give financially.

- Develop a variety of ways athletic alumni can give financially to a development campaign. Financial gifts could be sport program specific and have the possibility of being restricted by choice of the athletic alumni donor. Financial gifts could be restricted for equipment, travel, facilities, or scholarship. Endowment programs are another option.
- Continually invite athletic alumni to games and sponsor events around these games. The more games athletic alumni attend, the more they are involved, the more emotionally they are motivated to give financially.
- Sponsor events when teams are out of season. Athletic alumni should always be invited to events such as golf outings, dinner auctions, or any type of booster gathering. Have these events not just in a close radius of the university, but also at venues that may reach athletic alumni living in communities further away from the institution.

#### *Limitations of the Current Study*

Limitations are the constraints on generalization of the findings that help establish validity for the study. The findings of this study cannot be generalized or representative of athletic alumni that competed at other institutions in the NCAA due to the large differences among colleges and universities in the United States, including institutional make-up, student body size, financial resources available, public or private affiliation, and NCAA Division I, II, or III membership. This study investigated only one unique institution. Generalization of the findings reflect only the institution's athletic alumni

population studied, thus interpretations to make inferences to other institutions should be used cautiously.

Further limitations that can be mentioned relate to the ability to draw accurate conclusions from this sample data about the larger population. By design, this study was limited to a select population. That select population includes only 719 athletic alumni graduates in a 50-year period that donated financially, though intercollegiate athletics has been on the study institution's campus for 80 years. Since this survey was Web-based, the select population of 719 is further narrowed to those 475 athletic alumni graduates that have available, working email addresses on file at the institution. This eliminated a group of 244 athletic alumni graduate donors that do not provide email contact information to the study institution. Following the emailing of the survey, 75 emails were returned undeliverable, 400 were deliverable, which included 319 males and 81 females. There may be limitations based on the number of responses. Non-graduates were also eliminated because of a number of reasons, including their limited engagement with the programs as well as a lack of contact information available from that population. Athletic alumni that graduated but do not donate were also eliminated due to the focus of this study concentrating on determinants of donors. The responses collected in this study may not accurately reflect the perspectives of all athletic alumni, especially those that were underrepresented.

Other limitations derive from the chronological history of various years of fluctuation in the Intercollegiate Athletic Department at the study institution, when sport programs were eliminated or added, which includes a period of gender equity issues.

Women's athletics at the study institution were not fully recognized until 1982, prior to which sports were not funded equally for women and men. Respondents may have had negative attitudes directed at the studied institution about the history of the athletic program in which they participated and ignored this survey. These issues combined with the survey, which was of self-reporting method, often present difficulties and may limit results according to Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (2002). Tsiotsou (2007) also indicates that social desirability bias, a common phenomenon associated with self-reports on issues such as giving behavior, is possible. Tsiotsou (2007) further indicates that attempting to measure motives constitutes a difficult task because motives are not primarily cognitive and a person can have a motive to behave in a certain way without necessarily being aware of it.

It should be noted that each of the 48 substantive questions of this study, representing the six various models of charitable giving, were categorized by the principal researcher in regards to what model they would be associated with. Other researchers could have placed the questions into the six category models different than what was presented in this survey, or empirical procedures such as factor analysis could have been used. As pointed out, no single model can be a stand-alone explanation for why athletic alumni donate financially to the athletic department. Some of the questions or statements could represent multiple models. In addition, each model did not have an equal representative number of questions or statements, which may have affected subsequent results and conclusions.

Because this study, by design, researched a population at a given point in time from one institution, a longitudinal study of multiple institutions could best serve to eliminate some of the mentioned limitations on the scope of the inquiry. However, overall, the benefits of this study outweigh its limitations. This study provided quantitative measures regarding key determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Those determinants, shaped from six models associated with charitable giving, assist with developing a donor profile of why athletic alumni donate to athletic department development efforts. The information is current and reflects perceptions of athletic alumni from a comprehensive regional university. This study also provided qualitative information, which offered valuable insight into athletic alumni motivations and attitudes regarding financially giving to an athletic department.

#### *Suggestions for Future Research*

At the conclusion of this study, many new questions and areas deserving of future research regarding intercollegiate athletic alumni fundraising can be identified. This study focused on a single institution at a given point in time. Additional study is needed across a larger number of institutions of higher education. It would be valuable to conduct a study similar to this one, but as a longitudinal study with multiple institutions. However, it would be important to conduct three separate research paths following the distinct competitive playing divisions of NCAA I, II, and III in that longitudinal study. Future studies of that type could examine athletic alumni motivations to give financially to athletic department development campaigns shaped from the six models of charitable

giving that this study identified. By studying a larger number of institutions, it would be possible to compare and contrast results among athletic programs that are affiliated with similar divisions of play. Because athletic program development efforts vary greatly in philosophy and scope depending on their division of play, the information obtained would help summarize a best practice approach for athletic alumni development strategies for institutions depending on their NCAA membership classification.

A second topic for further research could use the six models of charitable giving and explore motivations of why and what financial level athletic alumni gave to the athletic department through various stages of their lives. Once again, the study could be a replication of this study but with a larger sample size from multiple institutions that specified NCAA affiliation. Age, marital status, having children, employment, and income are all variables that affect motivations to financially give. These variables change during the age cycle of life, as could the motivations to give relating to the six charitable giving models. A longitudinal study would be valuable that identified effective development strategies that coincide with the various stages in a donor's life. When is the optimal time in life when alumni of intercollegiate athletic programs donate financially to their alma mater?

A third avenue worthy of exploration is the growing athletic alumni population of women. The effects on intercollegiate athletics from Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which mandates equal access and opportunities for women in education, turns 40 years old in 2012. Regardless of the fact that many institutions in higher education were slow to achieve equality for women in intercollegiate athletics,

through teams, scholarships, facilities, and coaching, women are now a viable resource for development efforts. There is limited research addressing female athletic alumni donors.

A final area of suggested research focuses on the relationship between financial giving to intercollegiate athletics and giving to academics. This study found no statistical relationship between athletic alumni giving levels to the athletic department and financially giving to the academic program from which they graduated. Recent literature suggests that escalating costs of intercollegiate athletic programs are straining institutional finances that should be directed to rising academic expenses. Additional study is needed to determine if intercollegiate athletic alumni fundraising campaigns do compete against development efforts for academic programs.

## References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Arnett, D. B., German, S. D., & Hunt, S. D. (2003). The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 67, 89-105.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1995). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review*, 15, 75-81.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77, 769-803.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007). Understanding philanthropy. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from [http://papers.ssrn.com/so13/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1016108](http://papers.ssrn.com/so13/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1016108).
- Belfield, C. R., & Beney, A. P. (2000). What determines alumni generosity? *Education Economics*, 8(1), 65-80.
- Belk, R. W. (1982). Effects of gift-giving involvement on gift selection strategies. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 9, 531-536.
- Blumenfeld, W. S., & Sarstain, P. L. (1973). Predicting alumni financial donation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 522-523.
- Boulding, K. E. (1962). Notes on a theory of philanthropy. *Philanthropy and Public Policy*, 57-71.

- Brady, M. K., Noble, C. H., Utter, D. J., & Smith, G. E. (2002). How to give and receive: An exploratory study of charitable hybrids. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19, 919-944.
- Brittingham, B.E., & Pezzullo, T.R. (1990). *The campus green: Fund raising in higher education*. Washington D.C.: Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (2004). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Caboni, T. C. (2002). *The influence of social and personal sources of social control on the espousal of college and university fund raising norms*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting held in New Orleans, LA, April 2002.
- Caboni, T. C., & Eiseman, J. (2003). *Organizational identification and the voluntary support of higher education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual meeting held in Portland, Oregon, November 12-16, 2003.
- Caboni, T. C., & Proper, E. (2007). *Dissertations related to fundraising and their implications for higher education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual meeting held in Louisville, KY, November 10, 2007.

- Caulkins, J. P., Cole, J., Hardoby, M., & Keyser, D. (2002). *Intelligent giving: Insights and strategies for higher education donors*. Santa Monica, California: Rand Publishers.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 109-120.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations of alumni from selective colleges. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12, 119-138.
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2007). Academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics: Principles, rules, and best practices. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics at <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>.
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2007). Framing the future: Reforming intercollegiate athletics. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics at <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>.
- Cook, B. W., & Lasher, W. F. (1996). Toward a theory of fund raising in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20, 33-51.
- Coughlin, C. C., & Erikson, O. H. (1984). An examination of contributions to support intercollegiate athletics. *Southern Economic Journal*, 51, 180-195.
- Cowley, W.H. (1999). Athletics in American colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70(5), 494-502.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. (2001). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37, 540-566.
- Drape, J., & Evans, T. (2008). Financial straits of boosters hit athletic programs. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/21/sports/21boosters.html?\\_r=1&p](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/21/sports/21boosters.html?_r=1&p).
- Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). Some observations on the current state and future of intercollegiate athletics. (Prepared for the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.)
- Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fraenkel, J., & Wallen, N. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Frank, R. H. (2004). Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic success, student quality, and donations. (Prepared for the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.)
- Frans, K. A. (2002). *Ways in which intercollegiate athletics contribute to university success*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Gaski, J. F., & Etzel, M. J. (1984). Collegiate athletic success and alumni generosity: Dispelling the myth. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 12(1), 29-38.

- Gerdy, J. R. (2002). Athletic victories, educational defeats. *Academe Online*, Retrieved April 19, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2002/JF/Feat/gerd.htm?PF=1>.
- Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sports Management*, 14, 85-104.
- Grimes, P. W., & Chressanthins, G. A. (1994). Alumni contributions to academics: The role of intercollegiate sports and NCAA sanctions. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53, 27-40.
- Hall, H. (2009). Proving what works in fund raising: Scholars dispel myths. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 20(11), F-1.
- Harrison, W. B., Mitchell, Shannon K., & Peterson, S. P. (1995). Alumni donations and colleges' development expenditures: Does spending matter? *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 54, 397-412.
- Harrison, W. B. (1995). College relations and fund-raising expenditures: Influencing the probability of alumni giving to higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(1), 73-84.
- Holmes, J. A., Meditz, J. A., & Sommers, P. M. (2008). Athletics and alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Journal of Sports Economics*. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from <http://jse.sagepub.com>.
- Humphreys, B. R., & Mondello, M. (2005). More evidence on intercollegiate athletic success and donations. Retrieved April 19, 2009, from [brh@uiuc.edu](mailto:brh@uiuc.edu).

- Kahn, L. M. (2007). Markets: Cartel behavior and amateurism in college sports. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1), 209-226.
- Katz, S. N. (1999). Where did the serious study of philanthropy come from, anyway? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(1), 74-82.
- Kelly, K. S. (1995). The fund-raising behavior of U. S. charitable organizations: An explanatory study. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 7(2), 111-137.
- Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2001). A call to action. Retrieved December 20, 2008 from Knight Commission at <http://www.knightfdn.org>.
- Koch, J. V., & Leonard, W. M. (1978). The NCAA: A socio-economic analysis: The development of the college sports cartel from social movement to formal organization. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 37, 225-239.
- Krotz, J. L. (2009). A plea to the \$100-million mystery donor. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 21(16), 5.
- Lindahl, W. E., & Conley, A. T. (2002). Literature review: Philanthropic fundraising. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13, 91-112.
- Litan, R. E., Orzag, J. M., & Orzag, P. R. (2003). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An interim report*. Report commissioned by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Long, S. H. (1976). Social pressure and contributions to charities. *Public Choice*, 55-66.

- Long, J. E., & Caudill, S. B. (1991). The impact of participation in intercollegiate athletics on income and graduation. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73, 525-531.
- Lovaglia, M. J., & Lucas, J. W. (2003). High visibility athletic programs and the prestige of public universities. *The Sport Journal*, 8, 1-9.
- 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.
- Mann, T. (2007). College fund raising using theoretical perspectives to understand donor motives. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(1), 35-45.
- Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Siegfried, J. J. (2003). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 45, 123-143.
- Masterson, K. (2009). College's billion-dollar campaigns feel the economy's sting. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(30), A1
- Mayr, U., Harbaugh, W. T., & Tankersley, D. (2008). Neuroeconomics of charitable giving and philanthropy. Retrieved June 29, 2009, from [http://books.google.com/books?id=bym66k8-ysCEDq=Mayr,+Harbaugh,+Tankersley&source=gbs\\_navlinkr-s](http://books.google.com/books?id=bym66k8-ysCEDq=Mayr,+Harbaugh,+Tankersley&source=gbs_navlinkr-s).
- McNamara, J. R. (1977). Ethical considerations in psychological research: A comparative review. *Journal of Behavior Therapy*, 8, 703-708.

- Meyers, H. S. (2006). Homeward bound: A field guide to alumni engagement. *Currents*, 1, 17-21.
- Monks, J. (2002). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 121-130.
- Mount, J. (1996). Why donors give. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 7(1), 3-14.
- Naughton, J. (1998). A financial and moral battle over the role of athletics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A37.
- Nesbary, D. K. (2000). *Survey research and the world wide web*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Okunade, A. A., Wunnava, P. V., & Walsh, R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni: Micro-data evidence from a large public university. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53(1), 73-84.
- Olsen, K., Smith, A. L., & Wunnava, P. V. (1989). An empirical study of the life-cycle hypothesis with respect to alumni donations. *American Economist*, 33(2), 60-64.
- O'Neil, J. O., & Schenke, M. (2006). An examination of factors impacting athlete alumni donations to their alma mater: A case study of a U.S. university. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12, 59-74.
- Parry, M. (2009). Colleges weigh "yes we can" approach to fund raising. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(33), A1.
- Plinske, P. (2000). Raising friends, raising funds. *Athletic Management*. Retrieved April 18, 2008, from <http://momentumedia.com/articles/am/am1206/funds.htm>.

- Preston, C. (2009). Majority of donors say economic woes won't affect their giving. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 21(11), 15.
- Prince, R. A., & File, K. M. (1994). *The seven faces of philanthropy*. San Francisco, California: Josey-Bass.
- Quigley, C. J., Bingham, F. G., & Murray, K. B. (2002). An analysis of the impact of acknowledgement programs on alumni giving. *Journal of Marketing*, 75-86.
- Rhoads, T. A., & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality, and athletic success. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18, 248-258.
- Rhoden, W. C. (1997). Players don't show colleges the money. Retrieved April 20, 2009, from <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/04/06/education>
- Sack, A. L. (2001). Big-time athletics vs. academic values: It's a rout. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved April 18, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/free/v47/i20/20b00701.htm>.
- Sander, L., & Fuller, A. (2011). In athletics, ambitions compete with costs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. LVII(40), A1.
- Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behavior. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15, 215-238.
- Sargeant, A. (2001). Managing donor defection: Why should donors stop giving? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 32, 59-74.
- Shapiro, B. J. (1983). John Hannah and the growth of big-time intercollegiate athletics at Michigan State University. *Journal of Sport History*, 10, 26-40.

- Sherry, J. F. (1983). Gift giving in anthropological perspective. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 10(2), 157-168.
- Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York, New York: Holt Publishing.
- Sperber, M. (1990). *College sports, Inc.* New York, New York: Holt Publishing.
- Splitt, F. G. (2003). Reclaiming academic primacy in higher education: Working for reform in intercollegiate athletics and engineering education. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from [www.ece.northwestern.edu/EXTERNAL/Splitt/](http://www.ece.northwestern.edu/EXTERNAL/Splitt/).
- Splitt, F. G. (2005). Are big-time college sports good for America? Retrieved April 19, 2009, from [www.ece.northwestern.edu/EXTERNAL/Splitt/](http://www.ece.northwestern.edu/EXTERNAL/Splitt/).
- Stannard-Stockton, S. (2009). Philanthropy's information revolution. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 21(13), 40.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1996). Women and athletic fund raising: Exploring the connection between gender and giving. *Journal of Sports Management*, 10, 401-416.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (2003). *The relationship between athletics and higher education fund raising: The myths far outweigh the facts*. Paper prepared for the United States Department of Education Commission on Opportunities in Athletics.
- Stinson, J. L., & Howard, D. R. (2007). Athletic success and private giving to athletic and academic programs at NCAA institutions. *Journal of Sports Management*, 21, 235-264.

- Stinson, J. L., & Howard, D. R. (2004). Scoreboards v. mortarboards: Major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*, 13, 129-140.
- Strode, J., & Fink, J.(2009). Using motivational theory to develop a donor profile scale for intercollegiate athletics. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 3, 335-354.
- Suggs, W. (2003). Sports as the university's 'front porch?' The public is skeptical. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51, A17.
- Suggs, W. (2000). 10 years later, another look at big-time college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A69.
- Sun, X., Hoffman, S. C., & Grady, M. L. (2007). A multivariate causal model of alumni giving: Implications for alumni fundraisers. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*. 7(4), 307-332.
- Thelin, J. R. (2002). Academics on athletics. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 409-419.
- Tom, G., & Elmer, L. (1994). Alumni willingness to give and contribution behavior. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 8, 57-62.
- Toma, J.D. (1998). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 81-90.
- Trail, G. T., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic goals and processes: The influence of personal values. *Journal of Sports Management*, 16, 289-310.

- Tsiotsou, R. (2007). An empirically based typology of intercollegiate athletic donors: High and low motivation scenarios. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 15(2), 79-92.
- Tsiotsou, R. (2006). Investigating differences between female and male athletic donors: A comparative study. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 11, 209-223.
- Tsiotsou, R. (1998). Motivations for donation to athletic programs. Retrieved April 21, 2009, from <http://fulltext.ausport.gov.au/fulltext/1998/cjm/v2n2/tsiotsou22.htm>.
- Tucker, I. B. (2004). A reexamination of the effect of big-time football and basketball success on graduation rates and alumni giving rates. *Economics of Education Review*, 23, 655-661.
- Turner, S. E., Meserve, L. A., & Bowen, W. G. (2000). Winning and giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82, 812-850.
- Wagner, J., Ettenson, R., & Verrier, S. (1990). The effect of donor-recipient involvement on consumer gift decisions. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17, 683-689.
- Wasley, P. (2009). Donors in 'giving circles' contribute more and act more strategically, study finds. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 21(16), 20.
- Weerts, D. J., & Ronca, J. M. (2007). Profiles of supportive alumni: Donors, volunteers, and those who "do it all." *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(1), 20-34.

Wolverton, B. (2009). Commercialization in college sports may have 'crossed the line,' report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(38), A23.

Wunnava, P. V., & Lauze, M. A. (2000). Alumni giving at a small liberal arts college: Evidence from consistent and occasional donors. *Economics of Education Review*, 20, 533-543.

Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

## Appendix A

### Initial First Email Letter to Sample Population Introducing Survey

November 5, 2010

Dear UMD Athletic Alumni Donor:

I am writing to ask your help in a study on the motives and determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department. **In seven days, you will be contacted again via email with a link to a Web-based survey containing questions on your specific motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD athletic program.** This study is to complete my Doctorate of Education at the University of Minnesota, but it will also help improve the function of how we solicit financial support from our athletic alumni. The UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department are in support of this study.

On behalf of UMD Athletics and myself, thank you for your time regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Holquist  
Head Basketball Coach  
University of Minnesota Duluth  
gholquis@d.umn.edu  
(218)726-6185

## **Appendix B**

### **Second Email Letter to Sample Population That Includes Survey Instrument**

#### **Consent Form**

November 12, 2010

Dear UMD Athletic Alumni Donor:

Seven days ago, I contacted you asking for your help in a study on the motives and determinants that influence athletic alumni intent to give financially to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department. This study is to complete my Doctorate of Education at the University of Minnesota, but it will also help improve the function of how we solicit financial support from our athletic alumni. The UMD Office of Development and Alumni Relations and the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department are in support of this study.

You have been selected from a pool of UMD athletic alumni that graduated from the institution between 1960-2010 and previously financially gave to the athletic program. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your relationship with UMD or the Intercollegiate Athletic Department. The results of this study will be used to better understand why athletic alumni engage in financially giving to college sports, and this data will help UMD better accommodate the needs of donors such as yourself.

I hope to complete the gathering of the questionnaires by November 26, 2010, so I appreciate your prompt attention to the survey. Your participation by this date will allow me sufficient time for analysis of the data. The responses you make in this survey are anonymous and confidential. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. There is no direct benefit for participating in this study and taking the survey implies consent. If you have any questions regarding my research, please do not hesitate to contact me personally. When you are ready to begin the survey please click on the URL/Web address listed below.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ZYLBM5F>

On behalf of UMD Athletics and myself, thank you for your time regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Holquist  
Head Basketball Coach  
University of Minnesota Duluth  
gholquis@d.umn.edu  
(218)726-6185

## **Appendix C**

### Survey Questionnaire

## University of Minnesota Duluth Athletic Alumni Donor Survey

### Introduction

The purpose of this survey is to identify key reasons that influence athletic alumni intentions to give financially to the Intercollegiate Athletic Department at the University of Minnesota Duluth. We are interested in what motivates you to financially give to Intercollegiate Athletics at UMD. Thank you for your participation.

### UMD Athletic Alumni Donor Survey

Please rate the extent to which you DISAGREE or AGREE with each by checking the appropriate circle in the scale below each statement. The following 36 statements complete the sentence, "I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because..."

"I give to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics because..."

**1. it is important to me that I receive donor benefits such as reduced game tickets, preferred seating, valet parking, or various athletic program gifts.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**2. it gives me the opportunity to help shape the direction of the athletic program with administrators, staff, and coaches.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**3. it is one of a number of non-profit organizations I give to regularly.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**4. I am more connected to my teammates than to UMD.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**5. I had a positive athletic playing experience due to my teammates.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**6. I feel obligated because of my positive experience as a student-athlete.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-                             

**7. I perceive UMD athletic teams to be winning programs.**

Strongly Disagree      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly Agree  
-

**8. doing so gives me an opportunity to voice my opinion to administrators, staff, and coaches on athletic program decisions.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**9. I felt the tradition to give back financially to the athletic program was passed on to me as a student-athlete from alumni players.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**10. being a donor gives me the opportunity to have contact and socialize with other UMD athletic program alumni supporters.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**11. the athletic program leadership uses my financial gift responsibly.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**12. I am extremely loyal to the athletic program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**13. I receive inside information on the athletic program that is not available to the public.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**14. it is important to me that I receive tax deduction benefits.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**15. I want to direct financial gifts to go to the athletic program in which I participated.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**16. I had a positive relationship with the Duluth community through volunteer service hours when I was a student-athlete .**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**17. it is important to me that I receive recognition for my monetary gifts through publications and acknowledgment programs.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**18. giving is the right thing to do.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**19. I had a positive athletic playing experience due to the coaching staff.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**20. being a donor gives me the opportunity to develop relationships with other UMD athletic program supporters besides alumni.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**21. my financial gift makes a difference to the athletic program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**22. I want the athletic program to be the best in the country.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**23. my financial gift will help in creating championship caliber programs.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**24. I gain a feeling of belongingness with fellow alumni through my financial gift.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**25. doing so allows me to exert influence on the decision making process for the athletic program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**26. I felt the tradition to give back financially to the athletic program was passed on to me as a student-athlete from my coaches.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**27. my financial gift will help in creating championship caliber facilities.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**28. I feel very good about the communication efforts that the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic Department has made in keeping me informed of the athletic program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**29. I valued participating in my sport more than receiving an education.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**30. I feel strongly connected to the UMD athletic program.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**31. I grew up in a family that gave to non-profit organizations.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**32. my financial gift provides an opportunity to help student-athletes.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**33. I enjoy the feeling of being a part of a large group of financial supporters.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**34. being associated with a successful athletic program makes me feel good.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**35. I want to continue the positive community support that I experienced as a student-athlete through participation in my sport.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

**36. my financial gift makes me feel I am helping others in need.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
-	<input type="radio"/>				

For the next set of questions please offer the appropriate response.

**37. Have you used the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about the athletic program?**

Yes

No

**38. How many times have you attended a UMD Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year?**

- zero
- 1 time
- 2 to 4 times
- 5 to 10 times
- 11 to 20 times
- 21 times or more

**39. How many times have you attended a UMD Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over the past year? (Dinner Auctions, Golf Events, Coaches Luncheons, Tailgate Events...)**

- zero
- 1 time
- 2 to 4 times
- 5 to 10 times
- 11 times or more

**40. Have you used the UMD Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program?**

- Yes
- No

**41. How do you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the UMD athletic program?**

- Traditional mail
- Email
- Website
- Phone call from a Coach
- Phone call from a department staff member

**42. How many times over the last ten years have you been contacted to financially give to the UMD athletic program?**

- zero
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 to 5 times
- 6 to 8 times
- 9 to 10 times
- 11 to 14 times
- 15 times or more

**43. How often over the last ten years have you financially given to the UMD athletic program?**

- zero
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 to 5 times
- 6 to 8 times
- 9 to 10 times
- 11 to 14 times
- 15 times or more

**44. Please indicate your financial gift to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for the most recent tax year:**

- under \$100.00
- \$100.00-\$299.00
- \$300.00-\$499.00
- \$500.00-\$999.00
- \$1,000.00-\$1,499.00
- \$1,500.00-\$2,499.00
- \$2,500.00-\$4,999.00
- \$5,000.00 and up

**45. Please indicate your total lifetime amount of financial giving to the UMD athletic program:**

- under \$500.00
- \$500.00-\$999.00
- \$1,000.00-\$4,999.00
- \$5,000.00-\$9,999.00
- \$10,000.00-\$14,999.00
- \$15,000.00-\$19,999.00
- \$20,000.00-\$24,999.00
- \$25,000.00 and up

**46. Have you financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010?**

- Yes
- No

**47. Which of the following methods of contact prompted you to make your most recent financial gift to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics?**

- Traditional Mail
- Email
- Website
- Phone call from a Coach
- Phone call from a department staff member

**48. Do you also financially give to the UMD academic program from which you graduated?**

- Yes
- No

### Demographic Questions

Please tell us a little about yourself by offering the appropriate response:

**49. Gender:**

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

**50. Current age:**

- <25 years
- 25-35 years
- 36-45 years
- 46-55 years
- 56-65 years
- >65 years

**51. Highest level of education:**

- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)
- Professional Degree

**52. Current Marital Status:**

- Single
- Married/Domestic Partnership

**53. Do you have children?**

- Yes
- No (If No, skip to question 55)

**54. How many children do you have in each of the following age groups?**

0-6 years	<input type="text"/>	▼
7-12 years	<input type="text"/>	▼
13-18 years	<input type="text"/>	▼
19-23 years	<input type="text"/>	▼
over 23 years	<input type="text"/>	▼

**55. Yearly household income:**

- <than \$30,000
- \$30,001-\$40,000
- \$40,001-\$55,000
- \$55,001-\$75,000
- \$75,001-\$100,000
- \$100,001-\$150,000
- >than \$150,000

**56. Race/Ethnicity:**

- American Indian
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- White/Caucasian
- Other

**57. Please select what Varsity Sport(s) Team you participated in for UMD Intercollegiate Athletics:**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Baseball             | <input type="checkbox"/> Hockey(men)     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tennis(men)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basketball(men)      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hockey(women)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Tennis(women) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basketball(women)    | <input type="checkbox"/> Skiing(men)     | <input type="checkbox"/> Track(men)    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-Country(men)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Skiing(women)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Track(women)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-Country(women) | <input type="checkbox"/> Soccer          | <input type="checkbox"/> Volleyball    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Football             | <input type="checkbox"/> Softball        | <input type="checkbox"/> Wrestling     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Golf(men)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Swimming(men)   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Golf(women)          | <input type="checkbox"/> Swimming(women) |  |

**58. Did you receive an athletic financial scholarship from UMD Intercollegiate Athletics at any time?**

- Full Scholarship
- Three Quarter Scholarship
- Half Scholarship
- Quarter Scholarship or less
- Did not receive athletic financial aid

**59. Approximate mile distance in which your current residence is to UMD:**

- Within 50 miles
- Beyond 50 miles but within 150 miles(Includes the Twin Cities Metro Area)
- Beyond 150 miles but within 250 miles
- Beyond 250 miles

**60. Decade of graduation from UMD:**

- 1960-1969
- 1970-1979
- 1980-1989
- 1990-1999
- 2000-2010

**61. You have now completed the survey. Thank you for your time and willingness to participate. Your responses will be used to better understand why athletic alumni engage in giving to college sports, and this data will help UMD better accommodate the needs of donors such as yourself. All responses are anonymous and confidential. Please add any additional comments concerning motives, attitudes, and opinions for financially giving to the UMD Intercollegiate Athletics program. Thank you, again!**

**Appendix D**  
**Supplemental Tables**

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-1

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use (N=117)

Level of Giving	Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about the athletic program?						$\chi^2$
	Total		Response				
	N	%	Yes	%	No	%	
Total	117	100	100	100	17	100	2.751
under \$100	45	38.5	38	38.0	7	41.2	
\$100-\$299	43	36.8	36	36.0	7	41.2	
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	10	10.0	2	11.8	
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	7	7.0	0	0.0	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	6	6.0	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	3	3.0	1	5.9	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-2

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use (N=118)

Level of Giving	Total		Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about the athletic program?				x <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	Yes	%	No	%	
Total	118	100	101	100	17	100	5.790
under \$500	32	27.1	29	28.7	3	17.6	
\$500-\$999	29	24.6	26	25.7	3	17.6	
\$1,000-\$4,999	31	26.3	24	23.8	7	41.2	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	7	9.7	3	17.6	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	5	4.9	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.3	10	9.9	1	5.9	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-3

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use about financial giving (N=117)

Level of Giving	Total		Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program?				x <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	Response		No	%	
			Yes	%			
Total	117	100	15	100	102	100	4.213
under \$100	44	37.6	4	26.7	40	39.2	
\$100-\$299	44	37.6	7	46.7	37	36.3	
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	3	20.0	9	8.8	
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	0	0.0	7	6.9	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	1	6.7	5	4.9	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	0	0.0	4	3.9	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-4

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to website use about financial giving (N=118)

Level of Giving	Total		Response				χ <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	Yes	%	No	%	
Used the Intercollegiate Athletic website to gather information about financially giving to the athletic program?							
Total	118	100	15	100	103	100	1.233
under \$500	32	27.1	4	26.7	28	27.2	
\$500-\$999	24	23.7	4	26.7	24	23.3	
\$1,000-\$4,999	27	27.1	5	33.3	27	26.2	
\$5,000-\$9,999	9	8.5	1	6.7	9	8.7	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	0	0.0	5	4.9	
\$15,000 and up	10	9.3	1	6.7	10	9.7	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-5

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at games (N=118)

Level of Giving	How many times have you attended an Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year?														
	Total		zero		1 time		2 to 4 times		5 to 10 times		11 to 20 times		21 times or more		$\chi^2$
	N	%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
Total	118	100	32	100	22	100	26	100	16	100	9	100	13	100	57.230***
under \$100	45	38.1	16	50.0	8	36.4	10	38.5	6	37.5	4	44.4	1	7.7	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	14	43.8	9	40.9	12	46.2	6	37.5	1	11.1	2	15.4	
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	0	0.0	2	9.1	2	7.7	2	12.5	3	33.3	3	23.1	
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	6.3	1	11.1	4	30.8	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	2	6.3	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	23.1	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	0	0.0	3	13.6	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-6

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at games (N=119)

Level of Giving	How many times have you attended an Intercollegiate Athletic game over the past year?														$\chi^2$
	Total		zero		1 time		2 to 4 times		5 to 10 times		11 to 20 times		21 times or more		
	N	%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
Total	119	100	32	100	23	100	27	100	16	100	8	100	13	100	44.450**
under \$500	32	26.9	14	43.8	3	13.0	7	25.9	4	25.0	3	37.5	1	7.7	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	11	34.4	9	39.1	2	7.4	5	31.3	0	0.0	2	15.4	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	3	9.4	6	26.1	13	48.1	3	18.8	4	50.0	3	23.1	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	2	6.3	1	4.3	4	14.8	1	6.3	1	12.5	1	7.7	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	1	3.1	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	2	15.4	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	1	3.1	3	13.0	1	3.7	2	12.5	0	0.0	4	30.8	

\*\* $p \leq .01$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-7

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at events (N=118)

Level of Giving	How many times have you attended an Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over the past year? (auctions, luncheons...)												$\chi^2$
	Total		zero	%	1 time	%	2 to 4 times	%	5 to 10 times	%	11 times or more	%	
Total	118	100	59	100.0	29	100	19	100	4	100	7	100	45.301**
under \$100	45	38.1	31	52.5	8	27.6	6	31.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	21	35.6	15	51.7	5	26.3	1	25.0	2	28.6	
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	3	5.1	1	3.4	5	26.3	2	50.0	1	14.3	
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	1	1.7	2	6.9	1	5.3	1	25.0	2	28.6	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	1	1.7	2	6.9	1	5.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	2	3.4	1	3.4	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	

\*\* $p \leq .01$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-8

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to attendance at events (N=119)

Level of Giving	How many times have you attended an Intercollegiate Athletic sponsored event over the past year? (auctions, luncheons...)												$\chi^2$
	Total N	%	zero	%	1 time	%	2 to 4 times	%	5 to 10 times	%	11 times or more	%	
Total	119	100	59	100	29	100	20	100	4	100	7	100	31.063
under \$500	32	26.9	21	35.6	6	20.7	5	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	16	27.1	10	34.5	1	5.0	1	25.0	1	14.3	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	12	20.3	7	24.1	8	40.0	3	75.0	2	28.6	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	6	10.2	2	6.9	2	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	1	1.7	2	6.9	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	3	5.1	2	6.9	3	15.0	0	0.0	3	42.9	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-9

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to preferred methods of contact about financial giving (N=116)

How do you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the athletic program?													
Level of Giving	Total		Traditional		Email	Website	Phone Call Coach		Phone Call Staff		$\chi^2$		
	N	%	Mail	%			%	%	%	%			
Total	116	100	52	100	46	2	100	13	100	3	100	34.562*	
under \$100	45	38.8	24	46.2	18	0	0.0	3	23.1	0	0.0		
\$100-\$299	43	37.1	19	36.5	16	2	100	4	30.8	2	66.7		
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	5	9.6	4	0	0.0	3	23.1	0	0.0		
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	2	3.8	4	0	0.0	1	7.7	0	0.0		
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.2	2	3.8	4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
\$1,500 and up	3	2.6	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	2	15.4	1	33.3		

\* $p \leq .05$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-10

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to preferred methods of contact about financial giving (N=117)

How do you prefer to be contacted about financially giving to the athletic program?													
Level of Giving	Total		Traditional		Email	%	Website	%	Phone Call Coach		Phone Call Staff		$\chi^2$
	N	%	Mail	%						%		%	
Total	117	100	51	100	46	39.3	2	100	14	100	4	100	25.563
under \$500	32	27.4	17	33.3	12	26.1	0	0.0	3	21.4	0	0.0	
\$500-\$999	29	24.8	13	25.5	9	19.6	2	100	3	21.4	2	50.0	
\$1,000-\$4,999	31	26.5	11	21.6	16	34.8	0	0.0	4	28.6	0	0.0	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	4	7.8	5	10.9	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.3	1	2.0	3	6.5	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	10	8.5	5	9.8	1	2.2	0	0.0	2	14.3	2	50.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-11

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of contacts to financially give over the last ten years (N=118)

Level of Giving	Total		How many times over the last ten years have you been contacted to financially give to the athletic program?																χ <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	zero	%	1 time	%	2 times	%	3-5 times	%	6-8 times	%	9-10 times	%	11-14 times	%	15 times more	%	
Total	118	100	4	100	4	100	10	100	23	100	19	100	37	100	6	100	15	100	45.349
under \$100	45	38.1	3	75.0	3	75.0	2	20.0	6	26.1	8	42.1	15	40.5	2	33.3	6	40.0	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	8	34.8	8	42.1	16	43.2	3	50.0	7	46.7	
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	6	26.1	1	5.3	2	5.4	1	16.7	1	6.7	
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	1	25.0	1	25.0	3	30.0	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	3	8.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.7	0	0.0	1	6.7	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-12

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of contacts to financially give over the last ten years (N=119)

Level of Giving	Total		How many times over the last ten years have you been contacted to financially give to the athletic program?																		$\chi^2$
	N	%	zero	%	1 time	%	2 times	%	3-5 times	%	6-8 times	%	9-10 times	%	11-14 times	%	15 times more	%			
Total	119	100	4	100	4	100	10	100	22	100	20	100	37	100	6	100.0	16	100	38.088		
under \$500	32	26.9	2	50.0	2	50.0	2	20.0	7	31.8	7	35.0	9	24.3	0	0.0	3	18.8			
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	18.2	4	20.0	13	35.1	3	50.0	4	25.0			
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	0	0.0	1	25.0	3	30.0	7	31.8	6	30.0	9	24.3	1	16.7	5	31.3			
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	10.0	2	9.1	0	0.0	4	10.8	1	16.7	1	6.3			
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	2	10.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	6.3			
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	1	25.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	1	4.5	1	5.0	2	5.4	0	0.0	2	12.5			

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-13

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of times financially given over the last ten years (N=118)

Level of Giving	Total		How many times over the last ten years have you financially given to the athletic program?																		$\chi^2$
	N	%	zero	%	1 time	%	2 times	%	3-5 times	%	6-8 times	%	9-10 times	%	11-14 times	%	15 times more	%			
Total	118	100	4	100	7	100	16	100	44	100	16	100	18	100	4	100	9	100	71.898***		
under \$100	45	38.1	4	100	6	85.7	7	43.8	21	47.7	4	25.0	2	6.9	1	25.0	0	0.0			
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	8	50.0	18	40.9	9	56.3	6	33.3	1	25.0	1	11.1			
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	2	4.5	1	6.3	5	27.8	1	25.0	2	22.2			
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	2	12.5	1	5.6	0	0.0	3	33.3			
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	3	16.7	0	0.0	2	22.2			
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	0	0.0	1	5.6	1	25.0	1	11.1			

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-14

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to the number of times financially given over the last ten years (N=119)

How many times over the last ten years have you financially given to the athletic program?

Level of Giving	Total		zero		1		2		3-5		6-8		9-10		11-14		15 times more		$\chi^2$
	N	%		%	time	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	times	%	
Total	119	100	4	100	7	100	17	100	44	100	15	100	18	100	4	100	10	100	95.258***
under \$500	32	26.9	3	75.0	7	100	10	58.8	11	25.0	0	0.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	17.6	19	43.2	4	26.7	2	11.1	1	25.0	0	0.0	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	17.6	9	20.5	8	53.3	8	44.4	1	25.0	2	20.0	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	2	4.5	1	6.7	4	22.2	1	25.0	1	10.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.3	1	6.7	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	20.0	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5	1	6.7	2	11.1	1	25.0	5	50.0	

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-15

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to methods of contact that prompted most recent financial gift (N=111)

Level of Giving	Total		Traditional Mail		Email		Website		Phone Call Coach		Phone Call Staff		$\chi^2$
	N	%		%		%		%		%		%	
Total	111	100	59	100	24	100	3	100	17	100	8	100	50.832***
under \$100	41	36.9	22	37.3	11	45.8	1	33.3	4	23.5	3	37.5	
\$100-\$299	44	39.6	27	45.8	11	45.8	0	0.0	3	17.6	3	37.5	
\$300-\$499	11	9.9	8	13.6	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	11.8	0	0.0	
\$500-\$999	6	5.4	1	1.7	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	11.8	2	25.0	
\$1,000-\$1,499	5	4.5	1	1.7	1	4.2	1	33.3	2	11.8	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	23.5	0	0.0	

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-16

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to methods of contact that prompted most recent financial gift (N=111)

Level of Giving	Total		Traditional		Email	Website	Phone Call Coach		Phone Call Staff		x <sup>2</sup>	
	N	%	Mail	%			%	%	%	%		
Total	111	100	58	100	24	3	100	18	100	8	100	27.059
under \$500	30	27.0	16	27.6	8	1	33.3	4	22.2	1	12.5	
\$500-\$999	29	26.1	16	27.6	7	0	0.0	2	11.1	4	50.0	
\$1,000-\$4,999	31	27.9	17	29.3	7	2	66.7	3	16.7	2	25.0	
\$5,000-\$9,999	9	8.1	5	8.6	2	0	0.0	2	11.1	0	0.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	4	3.6	2	3.4	0	0	0.0	2	11.1	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	8	7.2	2	3.4	0	0	0.0	5	27.8	1	12.5	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-17

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to financially given for 2010 (N=118)

Level of Giving	Have you financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010?						$\chi^2$
	Total		Response				
	N	%	Yes	%	No	%	
Total	118	100	66	100	52	100	41.40***
under \$100	45	38.1	9	13.6	36	69.2	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	31	47.0	13	25.0	
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	10	15.2	2	3.8	
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	6	9.1	1	1.9	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	6	9.1	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	4	6.1	0	0.0	

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-18

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to financially given for 2010 (N=119)

Level of Giving	Have you financially given to UMD Intercollegiate Athletics for 2010?						$\chi^2$
	Total		Response				
	N	%	Yes	%	No	%	
Total	119	100	66	100	53	100	9.73
under \$500	32	26.9	14	21.2	18	34.0	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	12	18.2	17	32.1	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	20	30.3	12	22.6	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	8	12.1	2	3.8	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	4	6.1	1	1.9	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	8	12.1	3	5.7	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-19

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to gender, marital status, and children

Level of Giving	Please indicate your gender, marital status, and if you have children:																				
	Gender							Marital Status							Children						
	Total		Male		Female			Total		Single		Married/Partnered			Total		Yes		No		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$
Total	118	100	92	100	26	100	10.036	117	100	20	100	97	100	4.806	117	100	92	100	25	100	1.907
under \$100	45	38.1	29	31.5	16	61.5		45	38.5	10	50.0	35	36.1		44	37.6	33	35.9	11	44.0	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	36	39.1	8	30.8		43	36.8	7	35.0	36	37.1		44	37.6	35	38.0	9	36.0	
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	12	13.0	0	0.0		12	10.3	0	0.0	12	12.4		12	10.3	10	10.9	2	8.0	
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	6	6.5	1	3.8		7	6.0	2	10.0	5	5.2		7	6.0	5	5.4	2	8.0	
\$1000-\$1,499	6	5.1	5	5.4	1	3.8		6	5.1	1	5.0	5	5.2		6	5.1	5	5.4	1	4.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	4	4.3	0	0.0		4	3.4	0	0.0	4	4.1		4	3.4	4	4.3	0	0.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-20

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to gender, marital status, and children

Level of Giving	Please indicate your gender, marital status, and if you have children:																				
	Gender							Marital Status							Children						
	Total		Male		Female			Total		Single		Married/Partnered			Total		Yes		No		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$
Total	119	100	93	100	26	100	37.479***	118	100	21	100	97	100	13.531*	118	100	92	100	26	100	15.064**
under \$500	32	26.9	13	14.0	19	73.1		32	27.1	12	57.1	20	20.6		32	27.1	19	20.7	13	50.0	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	26	28.0	3	11.5		29	24.6	3	14.3	26	26.8		29	24.6	26	28.3	3	11.5	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	30	32.3	2	7.7		31	26.3	5	23.8	26	26.8		32	27.1	26	28.3	6	23.1	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.4	10	10.8	0	0.0		10	8.5	1	4.8	9	9.3		10	8.5	6	6.5	4	15.4	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	5	5.4	0	0.0		5	4.2	0	0	5	5.2		5	4.2	5	5.4	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	9	9.7	2	7.7		11	9.3	0	0	11	11.3		10	8.5	10	10.9	0	0.0	

\* $p \leq .05$

\*\* $p \leq .01$

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-21

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to giving to academic programs and level of education

Level of Giving	Do you also financially give to the academic program from which you graduated and what is your highest level of education?																			
	Give to Academic Program								Highest Level of Education											
	Total		Yes		No		$\chi^2$	Total		Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral		Professional		$\chi^2$		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N		%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Total	117	100	35	100	82	100	0.303	116	100	68	100	38	100	4	100	6	100	16.446		
under \$100	44	37.6	14	40.0	30	36.6		45	38.8	29	42.6	11	28.9	1	25.0	4	66.7			
\$100-\$299	44	37.6	13	37.1	31	37.8		43	37.1	23	33.8	16	42.1	3	75.0	1	16.7			
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	3	8.6	9	11.0		12	10.3	5	7.4	7	18.4	0	0.0	0	0.0			
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	2	5.7	5	6.1		7	6.0	5	7.4	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0			
\$1000-\$1,499	6	5.1	2	5.7	4	4.9		6	5.2	4	5.9	2	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0			
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	1	2.9	3	3.7		3	2.6	2	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7			

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-22

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to giving to academic programs and level of education

Level of Giving	Do you also financially give to the academic program from which you graduated and what is your highest level of education?																	
	Give to Academic Program							Highest Level of Education										
	Total		Yes		No			Total		Bachelor's		Master's		Doctoral		Professional		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	$\chi^2$
Total	118	100	35	100	83	100	5.280	117	100	68	100	39	100	4	100	6	100	16.172
under \$500	31	26.3	5	14.3	26	31.3		32	27.4	18	26.5	11	28.2	1	25.0	2	33.3	
\$500-\$999	29	24.6	11	31.4	18	21.7		28	23.9	17	25.0	10	25.6	0	0.0	1	16.7	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	27.1	9	25.7	23	27.7		32	27.4	19	27.9	11	28.2	1	25.0	1	16.7	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	3	88.6	7	8.4		10	8.5	5	7.4	3	7.7	2	50.0	0	0.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	2	5.7	3	33.6		5	4.3	4	5.9	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.3	5	3.3	6	7.2		10	8.5	5	7.4	3	7.7	0	0.0	2	33.3	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-23

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to yearly household income (N=114)

Please indicate your yearly household income:																	
Level of Giving	Total		under		\$30,001 to \$40,000		\$40,001 to \$55,000		\$55,001 to \$75,000		\$75,001 to \$100,000		\$100,001 to \$150,000		over \$150,000		x <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	\$30,000	%	\$40,000	%	\$55,000	%	\$75,000	%	\$100,000	%	\$150,000	%	\$150,000	%	
Total	114	100	4	100	5	100	3	100	16	100	21	100	35	100	30	100	34.838
under \$100	43	37.7	3	75.0	2	40.0	3	100	8	50.0	8	38.1	10	28.6	9	30.0	
\$100-\$299	42	36.8	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	6	37.5	9	42.9	15	42.9	11	36.7	
\$300-\$499	12	10.5	1	25.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	4	19.0	3	8.6	2	6.7	
\$500-\$999	7	6.1	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	4	11.4	1	3.3	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6	3	10.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	13.3	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-24

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to yearly household income (N=114)

Please indicate your yearly household income:																	
Level of Giving	Total		under		\$30,001 to \$40,000		\$40,001 to \$55,000		\$55,001 to \$75,000		\$75,001 to \$100,000		\$100,001 to \$150,000		over \$150,000		χ <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	\$30,000	%	\$40,000	%	\$55,000	%	\$75,000	%	\$100,000	%	\$150,000	%	\$150,000	%	
Total	114	100	4	100	5	100	4	100	16	100	20	100	35	100	30	100	35.924
under \$500	30	26.3	3	75.0	3	60.0	2	50.0	6	37.5	5	25.0	10	28.6	1	3.3	
\$500-\$999	27	23.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	5	31.3	7	35.0	7	20.0	7	23.3	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	28.1	1	25.0	2	40.0	1	25.0	4	25	5	25.0	11	31.4	8	26.7	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	2	10.0	1	2.9	6	20.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6	2	6.7	
\$15,000 and up	10	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	3	8.6	6	20.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**  
Supplemental Tables

Table D-25

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to varsity sport participated on (N=117)

Sport	Total		Level of Giving												x <sup>2</sup>
			Under \$100		\$100-\$299		\$300-\$499		\$500-\$999		\$1,000-\$1,499		\$1,500 and up		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Total	117	100	44	100	44	100	12	100	7	100	6	100	4	100	62.464
Baseball	11	9.4	3	6.8	7	15.9	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Basketball (M)	19	16.2	5	11.4	4	9.1	6	50.0	0	0.0	4	66.7	0	0.0	
Basketball (W)	9	7.7	4	9.1	5	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
CC-Track (M)	7	6.0	4	9.1	2	4.5	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	
CC-Track (W)	3	2.5	2	4.5	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Football	25	21.4	6	13.6	12	27.3	3	25.0	3	42.9	0	0.0	1	25.0	
Golf (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Golf (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Hockey (M)	29	24.8	10	22.7	11	25.0	3	25.0	1	14.3	1	16.7	3	75.0	
Hockey (W)	5	4.3	5	11.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Skiing (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Skiing (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Soccer	1	0.9	1	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Softball	5	4.3	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	
Swimming (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Swimming (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Tennis (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Tennis (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Volleyball	3	2.6	1	2.3	2	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Wrestling	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**  
Supplemental Tables

Table D-26

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to varsity sport participated on (N=118)

Sport	Total		Level of Giving												$\chi^2$
	N	%	Under \$500		\$500-\$999		\$1,000-\$4,999		\$5,000-\$9,999		\$10,000-\$14,999		\$15,000 and up		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Total	118	100	32	100	29	100	31	100	10	100	5	100	11	100	78.479*
Baseball	12	10.2	1	3.1	4	13.8	7	22.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Basketball (M)	20	16.9	3	9.4	5	17.2	7	22.6	3	30.0	1	20.0	1	9.1	
Basketball (W)	9	7.6	5	15.6	2	6.9	2	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
CC-Track (M)	7	5.9	2	6.3	3	10.3	1	3.2	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
CC-Track (W)	3	2.5	3	9.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Football	25	21.2	1	3.1	10	34.5	9	29.0	1	10.0	1	20.0	3	27.3	
Golf (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Golf (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Hockey (M)	28	23.7	6	18.8	4	13.8	5	16.1	5	50.0	3	60.0	5	45.5	
Hockey (W)	5	4.2	5	15.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Skiing (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Skiing (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Soccer	1	0.8	1	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Softball	5	4.2	2	6.3	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2	
Swimming (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Swimming (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Tennis (M)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Tennis (W)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Volleyball	3	2.5	3	9.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Wrestling	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	

\* $p \leq .05$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-27

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to receiving an athletic scholarship (N=116)

Level of Giving	Total		Full Scholarship		Three Quarter Scholarship		Half Scholarship		Quarter Scholarship or less		Did not receive athletic aid		x <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	Scholarship	%	Scholarship	%	Scholarship	%	Scholarship	%	athletic aid	%	
Total	116	100	34	100	14	100	23	100	14	100	31	100	23.799
under \$100	45	38.8	9	26.5	5	35.7	7	8.9	6	42.9	18	58.1	
\$100-\$299	43	37.1	14	41.2	4	28.6	11	47.8	5	35.7	9	29.0	
\$300-\$499	12	10.3	6	17.6	2	14.3	2	8.7	1	7.1	1	3.2	
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	0	0.0	2	14.3	1	4.3	1	7.1	3	9.7	
\$1,000-\$1,499	5	4.3	2	5.9	1	7.1	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	3	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-28

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to receiving an athletic scholarship (N=117)

Level of Giving	Total		Full Scholarship		Three Quarter Scholarship		Half Scholarship		Quarter Scholarship or less		Did not receive athletic aid		x <sup>2</sup>
	N	%	Scholarship	%	Scholarship	%	Scholarship	%	or less	%	athletic aid	%	
Total	117	100	33	100	14	100	22	100	15	100	33	100	20.382
under \$500	32	27.3	10	30.3	4	28.6	6	27.3	3	20.0	9	27.3	
\$500-\$999	29	24.8	5	15.2	2	14.3	7	31.8	4	26.7	11	33.3	
\$1,000-\$4,999	31	26.4	7	21.2	4	28.6	7	31.8	3	20	10	30.3	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.6	6	18.2	1	7.1	1	4.5	1	6.7	1	3.0	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.3	2	6.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	2	13.3	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	10	8.6	3	9.1	3	1.2	0	0.0	2	13.3	2	6.1	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-29

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to current residence distance from institution (N=118)

Level of Giving	Approximate mile distance in which your current residence is from the institution:										
	Total		Within 50 miles		Beyond 50 miles within 150 miles (Twin Cities)		Beyond 150 miles within 250 miles		Beyond 250 miles		$\chi^2$
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Total	118	100	40	100	30	100	21	100	27	100	
under \$100	45	38.1	17	42.5	12	40.0	8	38.1	8	29.6	
\$100-\$299	44	37.3	7	17.5	16	53.3	9	42.9	12	44.4	
\$300-\$499	12	10.2	8	20.0	1	3.3	1	4.8	2	7.4	
\$500-\$999	7	5.9	4	10.0	0	0.0	2	9.5	1	3.7	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	3	7.5	1	3.3	1	4.8	1	3.7	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.1	

\* $p \leq .05$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

## Appendix D

### Supplemental Tables

Table D-30

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to current residence distance from institution (N=119)

Level of Giving	Approximate mile distance in which your current residence is from the institution:										$\chi^2$
	Total		Within 50 miles		Beyond 50 miles		Beyond 150 miles		Beyond 250 miles		
					within 150 miles (Twin Cities)		within 250 miles		Beyond 250 miles		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Total	119	100	40	100	29	100	23	100	27	100	13.897
under \$500	32	26.9	7	17.5	7	24.1	7	30.4	11	40.7	
\$500-\$999	29	24.4	9	22.5	9	31.0	7	30.4	4	14.8	
\$1,000-\$4,999	32	26.9	12	30.0	10	34.5	5	21.7	5	18.5	
\$5,000-\$,9999	10	8.4	3	7.5	2	6.9	2	8.7	3	11.1	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	3	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.4	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.2	6	3.7	1	3.4	2	8.7	2	7.4	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-31

Athletic-Alumni most recent tax year financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to decade of graduation (N=117)

Please indicate your decade of graduation:

Level of Giving	Total		Decade of Graduation										$\chi^2$
	N	%	1960-1969	%	1970-1979	%	1980-1989	%	1990-1999	%	2000-2010	%	
Total	117	100	13	100	23	100	33	100	28	100	20	100	24.896
under \$100	45	38.5	3	23.1	13	56.5	13	39.4	7	25.0	9	45.0	
\$100-\$299	44	37.6	4	30.8	6	26.1	12	36.4	13	46.4	9	45.0	
\$300-\$499	11	9.7	4	30.8	0	0.0	2	6.1	5	17.9	0	0.0	
\$500-\$999	7	6.0	1	7.7	2	8.7	1	3.0	1	3.6	2	10.0	
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	5.1	1	7.7	1	4.3	3	9.1	1	3.6	0	0.0	
\$1,500 and up	4	3.4	0	0.0	1	4.3	2	6.1	1	3.6	0	0.0	

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.

**Appendix D**

Supplemental Tables

Table D-32

Athletic-Alumni total lifetime financial giving levels to the athletic department in relationship to decade of graduation (N=118)

Please indicate your decade of graduation:

Level of Giving	Total N	Total %	Decade of Graduation										$\chi^2$
			1960-1969	%	1970-1979	%	1980-1989	%	1990-1999	%	2000-2010	%	
Total	118	100	14	100	22	100	32	100	29	100	21	100	37.430**
under \$500	32	27.1	1	7.1	3	13.6	7	21.9	8	27.6	13	61.9	
\$500-\$999	29	24.6	3	21.4	9	40.9	6	18.8	7	24.1	4	19.0	
\$1,000-\$4,999	31	26.3	5	35.7	1	4.5	11	34.4	11	37.9	3	14.3	
\$5,000-\$9,999	10	8.5	2	14.3	2	9.1	3	9.4	2	6.9	1	4.8	
\$10,000-\$14,999	5	4.2	1	7.1	2	9.1	1	3.1	1	3.4	0	0.0	
\$15,000 and up	11	9.3	2	14.3	5	22.7	4	12.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	

\*\* $p \leq .01$

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages sum to 100.